CHAPTER - IV
RESULTS

CHAPTER – IV

RESULTS

Table 9 : F values on the different dimensions of alexithymia for the various groups (normal and clinical).

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	F	Sig
Group	Difficulty identifying feelings	201.055	3	23.190	< .0001
	Difficulty describing feelings	32 500	3	6.080	< .001
	Externally oriented thinking	70 600	3	10 450	< .0001
	Alexithymia	706.935	3	26 265	< 0001
Sex	Difficulty identifying feelings	37.845	1	13.095	< .0001
	Difficulty describing feelings	3 380	1	1 867	N S
	Externally oriented thinking	2.880	1	1.279	N.S
	Alexithymia	93.845	1	10.460	< 001
Group X Sex	Difficulty identifying feelings	8.415	3	.971	408
	Difficulty describing feelings	24.420	3	4.569	.004
	Externally oriented thinking	10.600	3	1.569	.198
	Alexithymia	111.055	3	4 126	.007
Error	Difficulty identifying feelings	554.880	192		
	Difficulty describing feelings	342 080	192		
	Externally oriented thinking	432.400	192		
	Alexithymia	1722.560	192		
Total	Difficulty identifying feelings	2149.000	200		
	Difficulty describing feelings	1276.000	200		
	Externally oriented thinking	2642 000	200		
	Alexithymia	15259 000	200		

The data related to alexithymia dimensions for the normal groups (both male and female) and the clinical groups (i e. APD Male, APD female, IBS Male and IBS female) was put to ANOVA as well as t – test analysis.

ANOVA yielded significant results for all the dimensions of alexithymia (i e. difficulty in identifying feeling, difficulty in describing feelings externally oriented thinking and alexithymia presence) with reference to all the different groups.

The F-value with reference to the gender was significant only for the dimension of difficulty in identifying feeling and the presence of alexithymia.

Besides this, the interaction of the groups and sex was significant for the dimensions of difficulty in describing feelings and presence of alexithymia.

Table 10 : F values on the different dimensions of adjustment for the various groups (normal and clinical)

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	F	Sig
Group	Home Adjustment	1275.45	3	13.769	.000
	Health Adjustment	1515.460	3	21.672	.000
	Social Adjustment	357.400	3	7.137	.000
	Emotional Adjustment	1752.175	3	18 652	.000
	Overall Adjustment	15060 820	3	19 612	.000
Sex	Home Adjustment	139.415	1	4.516	0.05
	Health Adjustment	13.520	1	0 580	N S
	Social Adjustment	169.280	1	10 142	0.05
	Emotional Adjustment	.405	1	0.013	N.S
	Overall Adjustment	474 320	1	1 853	N S
Group	Home Adjustment	180.775	3	1 952	N.S
X	Health Adjustment	91 240	3	1.305	N.S
Sex	Social Adjustment	64.600	3	1.29	N.S
	Emotional Adjustment	134 295	3	1.430	N.S
	Overall Adjustment	1737.560	3	2.263	N.S
Error	Home Adjustment	5928.480	192		
	Health Adjustment	4475.280	192		
	Social Adjustment	32.04 720	192		
	Emotional Adjustment	6012.320	192		
	Overall Adjustment	49149.280	192		
Total	Home Adjustment	20923.000	200		
	Health Adjustment	23208 000	200		
	Social Adjustment	34548.000	200		
	Emotional Adjustment	30605.000	200		
	Overall Adjustment	394310.000	200		

The data related to adjustment dimensions (i e Home, Health, Social and Emotional adjustment and overall adjustment) for the normal groups (both

male and female) and the clinical groups ((APD Male, APD Female, IBS Male and IBS Female) was subjected to both ANOVA and t-test analysis.

ANOVA yielded significant results with reference to the various groups on all the dimensions of adjustment.

However, the F-values were significant with reference to sex only on two dimensions viz. Home adjustment and social adjustment.

Besides this, the interaction of groups and sex was also not significant for all the dimensions of adjustment.

Table 11 : F- values on the different dimensions of personality for the various groups (normal and clinical).

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	F	Sig
Group	Neuroticism – Long scale	793.975	3	3 082	0 05
	Extraversion – Long scale	1878.440	3	3.737	0 01
Sex	Neuroticism – Long scale	63 845	1	0 744	N.S
	Extraversion – Long scale	2 420	1	0.014	N S
Group X Sex	Neuroticism – Long scale	414.655	3	1 610	N.S
	Extraversion – Long scale	322 260	3	0 641	N.S
Error	Neuroticism – Long scale	16485 120	192		
	Extraversion – Long scale	32170.000	192		
Total	Neuroticism – Long scale	410167.000	200		
	Extraversion – Long scale	455368.000	200		

The data related to personality dimensions (i.e introversion – extraversion and neuroticism – stability), for the normal groups (both male and female) and the clinical groups (i.e. APD Male and female, IBS Male and female) was subjected to both ANOVA and t – test analysis.

ANOVA yielded significant results with reference to the various groups on both the introversion-extraversion dimension and neuroticism–stability dimensions.

However, the F-values were not significant with reference to sex on both the dimensions.

Besides this, the interaction of groups and sex was also not significant for both the dimensions.

Table 12 : F-values on the different dimensions of anxiety for the various groups (normal and clinical).

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	F	Sig
Group	Motor tension	119.620	3	56.425	000
	Autonomic Hyperactivity	513 615	3	151.453	.000
	Apprehensiveness	59.300	3	46 058	.000
	Vigilance	245 575	3	88.655	.000
	Generalized Anxiety-HAS-G	1796.695	3	140.490	.000
	Overall	3174 100	3	299 302	000
Sex	Motor tension	0.500	1	0 708	N.S
	Autonomic Hyperactivity	7.605	1	6.728	N S
	Apprehensiveness	8.00	1	0.186	N S
	Vigilance	1.805	1	1.955	N S
	Generalized Anxiety-HAS-G	0.405	1	0 095	N.S
	Overall	9.680	1	2.738	N.S
Group X Sex	Motor tension	1 780	3	0.840	N.S
	Autonomic Hyperactivity	14.495	3	4.274	N S
	Apprehensiveness	1.240	3	0.963	N.S
	Vigilance	0 735	3	0 265	N.S
	Generalised Anxiety-HAS-G	15 295	3	1.196	N.S
	Overall	19.000	3	1.792	N S
Error	Motor Tension	135 680	192		
	Autonomic Hyperactivity	217.040	192		
	Apprehensiveness	82 400	192		
	Vigilance	177.280	192		
	General Anxiety – HASG	818.480	192		
	Overall	678.720	192		
Total	Motor Tension	644.000	200		
	Autonomic Hyperactivity	1581.000	200		
	Apprehensiveness	372.000	200		
	Vigilance	909.000	200		
	General Anxiety – HASG	4171.000	200		
	Overall	11202.000	200		

The data related to anxiety dimensions for the normal groups (i e. both male and female), the clinical groups (i.e. IBS Male and Female, APD Male and Female) was put to ANOVA as well as t-test analysis.

This yielded significant results in case of the different groups with reference to the different dimensions of anxiety. The F- values were significant for all the dimensions i.e. Motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety HAS-G and overall anxiety

The F-values for the males and females for the various dimensions were not significant for any dimension

Besides, this the interaction of groups and sex also did not yield any significant F-value

Table 13 : F values on the overall dimension of Depression for the various groups (normal and clinical)

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	F	Sig
Group	BECKTOT	3639.120	3	13 621	<0 01
Sex	BECKTOT	151.380	1	1.700	N.S
Group X Sex	BECKTOT	33.980	3	1.250	N S
Error	BECKTOT	17098.640	192		
Total	BECKTOT	50602 000	200		

The data on depression (total of all the dimensions of depression in BDI) for Normal Groups (both male and female) and the clinical groups (i.e APD Male, APD Female, IBS Male, and IBS Female) was subjected to both ANOVA and t-test analysis.

ANOVA yielded significant results with reference to the various groups on the total of all the dimensions of depression.

However, the F-value was not significant for depression total with reference to sex

Besides this the interaction of the various groups with sex also did not yield any significant result.

Table 14 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of alexithymia for NMG Vs APD Male (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
IDEFEEL	NMG	2.08	1.73	-1.40	48	2 47	0 01
	APD M	3 48	2.24				
DESFEEL	NMG	2.04	1.24	-0.44	48	1.11	N S
	APD M	2.48	1.53				
EXTHINK	NMG	3 36	1.47	-0 72	48	1 76	N.S
	APD M	4.08	1.41				
ALEXI	NMG	7 48	3 25	-2.56	48	2 68	0 01
	APD M	10 04	3.48				

Table 14 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of alexithymia (i.e. difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between feelings and bodily sensations, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and overall presence of alexithymia) for the normal male group and APD male group.

The t-values were significant for the dimensions of difficulty in identifying feelings and presence of alexithymia. The mean values on these two dimension were higher for the APD male group (3 48 and 10.04) as compared to the normal male group (2.08 and 7.48). Thereby indicating that the APD male group had significantly more difficulty in identifying feelings and had the presence of alexithymia.

On the dimensions of difficulty in describing feelings and externally oriented thinking, the mean values again were higher for the APD male group. Hence, it is likely that the APD male group will have more difficulty in describing feeling and have more externally oriented thinking in comparison to the normal male group.

Table 15 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* -values on the dimensions of alexithymia for NMG Vs IBS M (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
IDEFEEL	NMG	2.08	1 73	-2 04	48	4 51	< 0 01
	IBS M	4 12	1 45				
DESFEEL	NMG	2.04	1.24	0.00	48	0 00	N S
	IBS M	2 04	1.27				
EXTHINK	NMG	3 36	1 47	-0.20	48	0 44	N S
	IBS M	3 56	1.73				
ALEXI	NMG	7.48	3.25	-2.24	48	2 64	0 01
	IBS M	9 72	2 70				

Table. 15 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of alexithymia (i e. difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between feelings and bodily sensations, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and overall presence of alexithymia) for the normal male group and IBS male group.

The *t*-values were significant on the dimensions of difficulty in identifying feelings and presence of alexithymia. The mean values on these dimensions were higher for IBS male group (4.12 and 9.72) than those for normal male group (2.08 and 7.48). This indicates that the IBS male group had significantly more difficulty in identifying feelings and presence of alexithymia in comparison to the normal male group.

However, on the dimension of difficulty in describing feelings the mean values were same for both the groups Thereby, making it likely that both the normal male group and IBS male group had similar levels of difficulty in describing feelings. On the other hand on the dimension of externally oriented thinking the mean value for IBS male group was higher than the normal male group. Hence, the IBS male group was likely to have more externally oriented thinking as compared to the normal male group.

Table 16 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of alexithymia for IBSM Vs APDM (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
IDEFEEL	IBS M	4 12	1 45	0.64	48	1.19	N.S
	APD M	3 48	2 24				
DESFEEL	IBS M	2.04	1 27	-0.44	48	1.10	N S
	APD M	2.48	1 53				
EXTHINK	IBS M	3 56	1.73	-0.52	48	1 16	N.S
	APD M	4.08	1 41				
ALEXI	IBS M	9.72	2 70	-0 32	48	0 36	N S
	APD M	10 04	3 48				

Table: 16 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of alexithymia (i.e. difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between feelings and bodily sensations, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and overall presence of alexithymia) for the IBS male group and APD male group.

None of the *t*-values were found significant for the different dimensions.

However the mean values on the dimensions of difficulty in identifying feelings was higher for the IBS male group than that for the APD male group. Hence, the IBS male group was likely to have more difficulty in identifying feeling as compared to the APD male group

On the other hand, the mean value on the dimensions of difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and presence of alexithymia were higher for the APD male group. This indicates that the APD male group was likely to have more difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and presence of alexithymia in comparison to the IBS male group.

Table 17 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of alexithymia for NFG Vs APDF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
IDEFEEL	NFG	0.56	0.82	-2.36	48	6 46	< 0.01
	APD F	2 92	1.63				
DESFEEL	NFG	0 88	1.30	-1 60	48	4.47	< 0.01
	APD F	2.48	1.23				
EXTHINK	NFG	2.60	1 63	-1 00	48	2 52	0.01
	APD F	3.60	1.12				
ALEXI	NFG	4 04	2 85	-4.96	48	6 14	< 0 01
	APD F	9.00	2 86				

Table 17 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of alexithymia (i.e difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between feelings and bodily sensations, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and overall presence of alexithymia) for the normal female group and APD female group

The *t*-values were found to be significant for the all the dimensions (viz. difficulty in identifying feelings, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and presence of alexithymia) .

The mean values on all these dimensions were higher for the APD female group (2.92, 2.48, 2.60 and 9.00) than those for the normal female group (0.56,0.88,2.60 and 4.04). This indicates that the APD female group was having significantly more difficulty in identifying feelings, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and presence of alexithymia in comparison to the normal female group.

Table 18 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of alexithymia for NFG Vs IBS F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
IDEFEEL	NFG	0.56	0.82	-3 16	48	9 44	< 0.01
	IBS F	3.72	1.46				
DESFEEL	NFG	0 88	1.30	-1 84	48	5.47	< 0.01
	IBS F	2.72	1.06				
EXTHINK	NFG	2 60	1.63	-1 32	48	2 67	0.01
	IBS F	3 92	1.85				
ALEXI	NFG	4.04	2.85	-6.32	48	8.53	< 0.01
	IBS F	10 36	2.36				

Table: 18 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of alexithymia (i.e. difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between feelings and bodily sensations, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and overall presence of alexithymia) for the normal female group and IBS female group.

The t-values were found to be significant for the viz. (difficulty in identifying feelings, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and presence of alexithymia). The mean values on all these dimension were higher for the IBS female group (3 72, 2.72, 3.92 and 10 36) than those for the normal female group (0.56, 0.88, 2.60, and 4 04).

This indicates that the IBS female group had significantly more difficulty in identifying feelings difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and presence of alexithymia as compared t the normal female group.

Table 19 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of alexithymia for IBSF Vs APDF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
IDEFEEL	IBS F	3.72	1.46	0.80	48	1.82	N.S
	APD F	2 92	1.63				
DESFEEL	IBS F	2 72	1 06	0.24	48	0.73	N.S
	APD F	2.48	1 23				
EXTHINK	IBS F	3.92	1 85	0 32	48	0 74	N.S
	APD F	3 60	1 12				
ALEXI	IBS F	10.36	2 36	1 36	48	1 83	N S
	APD F	9 00	2 86				

Table 19 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of alexithymia (i.e difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between feelings and bodily sensations, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and overall presence of alexithymia) for the IBS female group and APD female group.

None of the *t*-values were found to be significant

However the mean values on all the dimensions (i e difficulty in identifying feelings difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and presence of alexithymia) were higher for the IBS female group than those for APD female group. Thereby indicating that the IBS female group was likely to have more difficulty in identifying feelings, describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and presence of alexithymia in comparison to the APD female group

Table 20 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of alexithymia for NMG and NFG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
IDEFEEL	NMG	2 08	1.73	1.52	48	3.96	< 0.01
	NFG	0.56	82				
DESFEEL	NMG	2.04	1.24	1.16	48	3 22	< 0.01
	NFG	0.88	1 30				
EXTHINK	NMG	3 36	1.47	0.76	48	1 73	N S
	NFG	2 60	1.63				
ALEXI	NMG	7 48	3.25	3.44	48	3 97	< 0 01
	NFG	4.04	2.85				

Table: 20 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of alexithymia (i.e. difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between feelings and bodily sensations, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and overall presence of alexithymia) for the normal male group and normal female group.

The *t*-values were significant for the dimensions of difficulty in identifying feelings, difficulty in describing feelings and overall alexithymia.

The mean values on these three dimension were higher for the normal male group (2.08, 2.04 and 7.48) as compared to the normal female group (0 56, 0 88 and 4.04). Thereby indicating that the normal male group had

significantly more difficulty in identifying feelings, describing feelings and also had presence of alexithymia as compared to the normal female group.

The mean value for the dimension of externally oriented thinking was higher for the normal male group. So, the normal male group was likely to have more externally oriented thinking as compared to the normal female group.

Table 21 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of alexithymia for APDM Vs APDF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
IDEFEEL	APD M	3 48	2.24	0.56	48	1 01	N S
	APD F	2.92	1.63				
DESFEEL	APD M	2.48	1 53	0 00	48	0 00	N S
	APD F	2.48	1 23				
EXTHINK	APD M	4 08	1.41	0 48	48	1 33	N S
	APD F	3 60	1.12				
ALEXI	APD M	10.04	3.48	1 04	48	1 15	N S
	APD F	9 00	2 86				

Table 21 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of alexithymia (i.e. difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between feelings and bodily sensations, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and overall presence of alexithymia) for the APD male group and APD female group.

The *t*-values were not significant for the dimensions for any of the dimensions.

However, the mean values were found to be higher on all the dimensions for the APD male group. Hence, the APD male group was more likely to have the presence of alexithymia

Table 22 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of alexithymia for IBSM Vs APDF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
IDEFEEL	IBS M	4 12	1 45	0 40	48	0 972	N S
	IBS F	3.72	1.46				
DESFEEL	IBS M	2.04	1 27	-0 68	48	2.05	0 05
	IBS F	2.72	1 06				
EXTHINK	IBS M	3 56	1 73	-0.36	48	0.71	N.S
	IBS F	3 92	1 85				
ALEXI	IBS M	9.72	2 70	-0 64	48	0 89	N.S
	IBS F	10.36	2 36				

Table: 22 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of alexithymia (i e difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between feelings and bodily sensations, difficulty in describing feelings, externally oriented thinking and overall presence of alexithymia) for the IBS male and IBS female group.

The *t*-value was significant on only one dimension, viz. difficulty in describing feelings.

The mean value on this dimension was higher for the IBS female group (2.72) than that for the IBS male group (2.04). Thereby indicating that the IBS female group had significantly more difficulty in describing feeling in comparison to the IBS male group.

However, the mean values on the dimensions of externally oriented thinking and presence of alexithymia were higher for the IBS female group Hence, the IBS female group was likely to have more externally oriented thinking comparison to the IBS male group. On the other hand, the mean value on the dimension of difficulty in identifying feeling was higher for the IBS male group as compared to the IBS female group. Hence, comparatively the IBS male group was likely to have more difficulty in identifying feelings.

Table 23 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of adjustment for APDM and NMG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Home Adjustment	APD M	10.12	6.89	3.40	48	2 05	0.05
	NMG	6 72	4 61				
Health Adjustment	APD M	10.00	6 54	3 88	48	2 72	0 01
	NMG	6 12	2 83				
Social adjustment	APD M	13 72	4.43	1.76	48	1 41	N S
	NMG	11 96	4 39				
Emotional Adjustment	APD M	12 72	5 35	6.20	48	0 03	< 0 01
	NMG	6 52	4.26				
Overall Adjustment	APD M	46 56	19 47	15 24	48	0 00	< 0 01
	NMG	31 32	12.94				

Table 23 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*-values for the dimensions of adjustment for the APD male group and normal male group. The t-values were found to be significant for the areas of Home, health, emotional and overall adjustment The mean values were found to be higher for the APD male group (i e 10.12,10 00,12.72 and 46.56) than that for the normal male group (6 72,6.12,6.52 and 31.32) This indicates poorer adjustment of the APD male group in the areas of home, health, emotional and overall adjustment

Table 24 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of adjustment for IBSM Vs NMG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Home Adjustment	IBS M	11.28	5 65	4 56	48	3.12	0.01
	NMG	6.72	4 61				
Health Adjustment	IBS M	11.76	5 37	5.64	48	4 64	< 0 01
	NMG	6 12	2 83				
Social adjustment	IBS M	12 28	4 05	0.32	48	0 26	N.S
	NMG	11 96	4.39				
Emotional Adjustment	IBS M	12.16	6.94	5.64	48	3 46	< 0 01
	NMG	6 52	4.26				
Overall Adjustment	IBS M	47.48	19 47	16.16	48	3 45	< 0.01
	NMG	31 32	12 94				

Table: 24 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*-values for the dimensions of adjustment for the IBS male group and normal male group.

The *t*-values were found to be significant for the dimensions of Home, Health, emotional and overall adjustment. The mean values were higher for the IBS male group when compared to the normal male group. This indicates that the IBS Males were more poorly adjusted in the areas of home, health, emotional and Overall adjustment than the normal male group

Table 25 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of adjustment for IBSM Vs APDM (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Home Adjustment	IBS M APD M	11 28 10 12	5.65 6 89	1.16	48	0 65	N.S
Health Adjustment	IBS M APD M	11.76 10.00	5.37 6.54	1.76	48	1 03	N.S
Social adjustment	IBS M APD M	12 28 13.72	4 05 4 43	-1 44	48	1 20	N S
Emotional Adjustment	IBS M APD M	12.16 12.72	6.94 5 35	- 56	48	0 31	N S
Overall Adjustment	IBS M APD M	47.48 46.56	19 47 19.47	0.92	48	0 17	N.S

Table: 25 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*-values for the dimensions of adjustment for the IBS male group and APD male group.

None of the *t*-values were found to be significant. Indicating that both the groups did not differ significantly on the dimensions of adjustment

However, the mean values of both the groups on all the dimensions reveal that the APD male group was more likely to be maladjusted While the IBS male group was more likely to be maladjusted in areas of home health and Overall adjustment.

Table 26 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of adjustment for APDF Vs NFG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Home Adjustment	APD F	7.04	5 72	3.08	48	2 31	0.05
	NFG	3.96	3.40				
Health Adjustment	APD F	10.40	5 12	5.52	48	4 41	< 0 01
	NFG	4.88	3.59				
Social adjustment	APD F	11.76	3.54	2 88	48	2 81	0.01
	NFG	8 88	3.70				
Emotional Adjustment	APD F	11.80	4.88	6 84	48	5 44	< 0.01
	NFG	4.96	3 95				
Overall Adjustment	APD F	41.00	16 09	18 32	48	4 60	< 0 01
	NFG	22.68	11 67				

Table 26 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*-values for the dimensions of adjustment for the APD female group and the normal female group.

The *t*-values for all the five dimensions were found to be significant. The mean values were found to be significantly higher for the APD female group than the normal female group. Thereby indicating the poor adjustment of the APD female group in comparison to the normal female group on all the dimensions of adjustment.

Table 27 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of adjustment for IBSF Vs NFG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Home Adjustment	IBS F	12.88	6.00	8 92	48	6.46	< 0.01
	NFG	3.96	3.40				
Health Adjustment	IBS F	14.32	4 85	9.44	48	7 82	< 0 01
	NFG	4.88	3.59				
Social adjustment	IBS F	12.28	2 76	3 40	48	3.68	< 0 01
	NFG	8 88	3.70				
Emotional Adjustment	IBS F	14 84	5 65	9.88	48	7.16	< 0 01
	NFG	4.96	3.95				
Overall Adjustment	IBS F	54 32	15 33	31.64	48	8 21	< 0.01
	NFG 2	22.68	11.67				

Table: 27 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*-values for the dimensions of adjustment for IBS female group and normal female group

The *t*-values were significant for all the dimensions viz, home, health, social, emotional and Overall adjustment. The mean values were higher the IBS female group than those for the normal female group. This indicates that the IBS female group was significantly poorer in terms of adjustment on the dimensions of Home, Health, Social, Emotional and Overall adjustment. In comparison in the normal female group

Table 28 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* – values on the dimensions of adjustment for IBSF Vs APDF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Home Adjustment	IBS F APD M	12.88 7.04	6.00 5.72	5 84	48	3 52	< 0.01
Health Adjustment	IBS F APD M	14.32 10.40	4.85 5.12	3.92	48	2 77	< 0 01
Social adjustment	IBS F APD M	12.28 11.76	2 76 3 54	0.52	48	0 57	N.S
Emotional Adjustment	IBS F APD M	14.84 11.80	5 65 4.88	3.04	48	2 03	0.05
Overall Adjustment	IBS F APD M	54 32 41.00	15.33 16.09	13.32	48	2 99	< 0 01

Table: 28 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*-values for the dimensions of adjustment for the IBS female group and APD female group.

The *t*-values were significant for the dimensions of home, health, emotional and overall adjustment. The mean values for the dimensions of home, health emotional and overall adjustments were higher for the IBS female group, as compared to the APD female group. This indicates that the IBS female group was poorer than the APD female in terms of adjustment in the dimension of home, health emotional and overall adjustment

Table 29 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of adjustment for NMG Vs NFG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Home Adjustment	NMG	6.72	4 61	2.76	48	2 41	0 05
	NFG	3 96	3.40				
Health Adjustment	NMG	6.12	2.83	1.24	48	1 35	N.S
	NFG	4.88	3.59				
Social adjustment	NMG	11.96	4.39	3.08	48	2 68	0.01
	NFG	8 88	3.70				
Emotional Adjustment	NMG	6.52	4.26	1.56	48	1 34	N S
	NFG	4.96	3.95				
Overall Adjustment	NMG	31 32	12 94	8.64	48	2.47	0 01
	NFG	22 68	11.67				

Table 29 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*-values for the dimensions of adjustment for the normal male group and normal female group. The *t*-values for the areas of home, social and overall adjustment were found to be significant. In case of all these three areas the mean values were higher for the normal male group (6 72,11.96 and 31 32) indicating their poorer adjustment in comparison to the normal female group.

Table 30 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on dimensions of adjustment for APDM Vs APDF(n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Home Adjustment	APD M APD F	6.12 7.04	6 89 5.72	3.08	48	1.71	N S
Health Adjustment	APD M APD F	10 00 10 40	6 54 5.12	-0.40	48	2 4	N.S
Social adjustment	APD M APD F	13 72 11.76	4.43 3 54	1.96	48	1.72	N S
Emotional Adjustment	APD M APD F	12 72 11.80	5.35 4.88	0 92	48	0 63	N.S
Overall Adjustment	APD M APD F	46.56 41.00	19.47 16.09	5.56	48	1 10	N S

Table: 30 shows the means, SDs, Mean differences and *t* values for the dimensions of adjustment for the APD male group and APD female group none of the *t*-values were found to be significant This indicates that there was no significant difference in the APD male group and APD female group in terms of their adjustment in the areas of Home, Health, Social, Emotional and Overall adjustment.

However, the mean values were higher for the APD male group (10 12,13.72,12.72 and 46.56) on the dimensions of home, social, emotional and overall adjustment in comparison to the APD female group (7.04,11.76,11.80 and 41.00) Thereby the APD male group was likely to be

more adjusted on these dimensions On the dimension of health adjustment the mean value was higher for APD female group (10 40) as compared to that of APD male group (10.00) Hence APD female group was likely to be more adjusted on the health dimension.

Table 31 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of adjustment for IBSM Vs IBSF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Home Adjustment	IBS M	11.28	5 65	-1 60	48	0.97	N.S
	IBS F	12.88	6 00				
Health Adjustment	IBS M	11.76	5 37	-2.56	48	1.76	N S
	IBS F	14.32	4 85				
Social adjustment	IBS M	12.28	4 05	0 00	48	000	N.S
	IBS F	12.28	2.76				
Emotional Adjustment	IBS M	12.16	6.94	-2 68	48	1 49	N S
	IBS F	14 84	5 65				
Overall Adjustment	IBS M	47.48	19 47	-6 84	48	1 38	N S
	IBS F	54.32	15.33				

Table: 31 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*-values for the dimensions of adjustment for the IBS male group and IBS female group.

The *t*-values were not found to be significant for any of the dimensions of adjustment. Indicating that both the groups did not differ significantly on the dimensions of adjustment.

However, the mean values were found to be slightly higher for the IBS female group for the dimensions of Home, Health, Emotional, and Overall adjustment. Indicating that the IBS females are likely to be more maladjusted in comparison to IBS males.

Table 32 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, df, t - values on the dimensions of personality for NMG Vs APDM (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Neuroticism Long	NMG	43.40	10.61	-1.12	48	0.41	N S
	APD M	44.52	8.57				
Extraversion Long	NMG	49.72	8.52	3.80	48	1.37	N.S
	APD M	45 92	10 82				

Table: 32 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for neuroticism-stability and introversion-extraversion dimensions of personality on the long scale for the normal male group and APD male group.

The *t*-values were not significant on both the dimensions However, the mean value on the neuroticism dimension was higher for the APD male group (44 52) than that for the normal male group (43.40). Thereby the APD male group was likely to have more neurotic tendencies.

On the dimension of extraversion the mean value was higher for the normal male group (49 72) than that for the APD male group (45.92). Hence, the normal male group was likely to be more extraverted than the APD male group

Table 33 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of personality for NMG Vs IBS M (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*p*
Neuroticism Long	NMG	43.40	10.61	- 96	48	0.35	N S
	IBS M	44.36	8.18				
Extraversion Long	NMG	49.72	8 52	11.08	48	3.06	< 0.01
	IBS M	38.64	15.97				

Table: 33 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for neuroticism stability and introversion-extraversion dimensions of personality on the long scale for the normal male group and IBS male group

The *t*-value was found significant for dimensions of extraversion.

The mean value on this dimension was higher for the normal male group (49.72) than that for the IBS male group (38 64). Thereby indicating that the normal male group was significantly more extraverted than the IBS male group.

On the dimension of neuroticism the mean value was higher for IBS male group (44.36). Hence the IBS male group was likely to have more neurotic tendencies as compared to the normal male group

Table 34 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, df, t - values on the dimensions of personality for IBS M Vs APD M (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Neuroticism Long	IBS M	44.36	8.18	-.16	48	0.06	N.S
	APD M	44 52	8 57				
Extraversion Long	IBS M	38 64	15.97	-7.28	48	1 88	N.S
	APD M	45 92	10.82				

Table: 34 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for neuroticism stability and introversion-extraversion dimensions of personality on the long scale for the IBS male group and APD male group

The *t*-values on both the dimension were not significant

However, on both the dimensions the mean values were higher for the APD male group (44.52 and 45.92) than those for the IBS male group (44.36 and 38 64). Hence, the APD male group likely to have more neuroticism tendencies and extraversion than the IBS male group

Table 35 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of personality for NFG Vs APD F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Neuroticism Long	NFG IPD F	37.60 47.40	10.50 8.02	-9 80	48	3.70	0.01
Extraversion Long	NFG APD F	46.16 43.76	14.11 13 25	2.40	48	0.62	N.S

Table: 35 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for neuroticism stability and introversion-extraversion dimensions of personality on the long scale for the normal female group and APD female group.

The *t*-value was significant on the dimensions of neuroticism.

The mean value on this dimension was higher for the APD female group (47.40) than that for the normal female group (37.60). Thereby indicating that the APD female group had significantly more neurotic tendencies than the normal female group.

On the dimension of extraversion, the mean value was higher for the normal female group (46.16) than that for the APD female group (43.76). Hence the normal female group was likely to be more extraverted than the APD female group.

Table 36 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of personality for NFG Vs IBS F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Neuroticism Long	NFG	37.60	10.50	-8.16	48	2.48	0 01
	IBS F	45.76	12.60				
Extraversion Long	NFG	46.16	14.11	5 88	48	1.30	N S
	IBS F	40 28	17.64				

Table 36 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for neuroticism stability and introversion-extraversion dimensions of personality on the long scale for the normal female group and IBS female group

The *t*-value was significant on the dimension of neuroticism.

The mean value on this dimension was higher for the IBS female group (45.76) than that for the normal female group (37.60). Thereby indicating that the IBS female group had significantly more neurotic tendencies as compared to the normal female group.

On the dimension of extraversion, the mean value was higher for the normal female group (46.16) than that for the IBS female group (40.28) Hence the normal female group was likely to be more extraverted than the IBS male group.

Table 37 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of personality for IBS F Vs APD F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Neuroticism Long	IBS F	45.76	12.60	-1 64	48	0 54	N S
	APD F	47.40	8.02				
Extraversion Long	IBS F	40 28	17.64	.-3.48	48	0.78	N.S
	APD F	43 76	13 25				

Table: 37 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for neuroticism stability and introversion-extraversion dimensions of personality on the long scale for the IBS female group and APD female group.

The *t*-values were not significant on both the dimensions

However the mean values on both the dimensions were higher for APD female group (47.40 and 43.76) than that for the IBS female group (45.76 and 40 28). Hence the APD female group was likely to have more neuroticism tendencies and might be more extraverted than IBS female group.

Table 38 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, df, t - values on the dimensions of personality for NMG Vs NFG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Neuroticism Long	NMG	43.40	10.61	5.80	48	1.94	N S
	NFG	37.60	10 50				
Extraversion Long	NMG	49 72	8.52	3.56	48	1.08	N S
	NFG	46.16	14 11				

Table 38 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for neuroticism stability and introversion-extraversion dimensions of personality on the long scale for the normal male group and normal female group.

The *t*-value was significant for the dimensions of neuroticism only.

The mean value on this dimension was higher for the normal male group (43 40) than that for the normal female group (37.60). Thereby indicating that the normal male group was significantly having more neurotic tendencies as compared to the normal female group.

On the dimension of extraversion the mean value was also higher for the normal male group. Thereby indicating that as compared to the normal female group, the normal male group was likely to be more extraverted.

Table 39 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of personality for APD M Vs APD F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Neuroticism Long	APD M	44.52	8 57	-2.88	48	1.22	N S
	APD F	47.40	8 02				
Extraversion Long	APD M	45 92	10.82	2 16	48	0 63	N S
	APD F	43.76	13.25				

Table: 39 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for neuroticism stability and introversion-extraversion dimensions of personality on the long scale for the APD male group and APD female group.

The *t*-values were not significant on both the dimensions

However, the mean value on the neuroticism dimension was higher for APD female group (47.40) than for the APD male group (44.52).

While the mean value on extraversion dimension was higher for the APD male group (45.92) than for APD female group (43 76). This indicates that the APD female group was like to have more neuroticism tendencies. While the APD male group was likely to be more extraverted.

Table 40 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of personality for IBS M Vs IBS F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Neuroticism Long	IBS M	44.36	8.18	-1.40	48	0 48	N S
	IBS F	45.76	12.60				
Extraversion Long	IBS M	38.64	15.97	-1 64	48	0 34	N S
	IBS F	40.28	17.64				

Table 40 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for neuroticism stability and introversion-extraversion dimensions of personality on the long scale for the IBS male group and IBS female group.

The *t*-values were not significant on both the dimensions

However, on both the dimensions the mean values were higher for the IBS female group (45.76 and 40.28) as compared to the IBS male group (44.36 and 38.64). This indicates that the IBS female group was likely to have more neurotic tendencies and be more extraverted as compared to the IBS male group.

Table 41 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SD, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of anxiety for APDM Vs NMG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Motor Tension	APD M	1.24	0.83	.40	48	1.73	N S
	NMG	0 84	0.80				
Autonomic Hyperactivity	APD M	1.72	0.84	1 28	48	6.24	< 0 01
	NMG	0.44	0.58				
Vigilance	APD M	1 24	0.83	0.60	48	2.76	< 0.01
	NMG	0.64	0.70				
Generalized Anxiety HAS – G	APD M	2 44	2 42	1.96	48	3.55	< 0.01
	NMG	0 48	1 33				
Overall	APD M	5 72	1 28	3 20	48	9.03	< 0 01
	NMG	2 52	1 23				

Table. 41 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of anxiety for the APD male group and normal male group.

The *t*-values were significant for the dimensions of autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance generalized anxiety and overall anxiety. The mean values were higher for the APD male group (i.e. 1.72,1.24,2 44 and 5 72) than those for the normal male group (i e. 0.44, 0.64, 0.48 and 2.52) on these dimensions. Thereby indicating that the APD male group was significantly having more autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety as compared to the normal male group.

The mean value for the dimension of motor tension was higher for APD male group. Hence it may be likely to have more motor tension than the normal male group.

Table 42 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SD, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimension of anxiety for IBSM Vs NMG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Motor Tension	IBS M	2.88	1.13	2.04	48	7.36	< 0 01
	NMG	0 84	0 80				
Autonomic Hyperactivity	IBS M	4 76	1.74	4.32	48	11 77	< 0 01
	NMG	0.44	0 58				
Vigilance	IBS M	3.24	1.48	2.60	48	7.94	< 0.01
	NMG	0.64	0.70				
Generalized Anxiety HAS – G	IBS M	7.44	3 65	6.96	48	8.95	< 0.01
	NMG	0 48	1.33				
Overall	IBS M	12.72	3 52	10.20	48	13.68	< 0 01
	NMG	2.52	1.23				

Table 42 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of anxiety for the IBS male group and normal male group.

The *t*-values were significant for all the dimensions of anxiety (i.e motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety. The mean values on all these dimensions were higher for the IBS male group (2.88,4.76,3.24,7.44 and 12.72) as compared to those of normal male group (0.84,0.44,0.64,0.48 and 2.52) Thereby indicating that the IBS male group was significantly having more motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety.

Table 43 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SD, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - values on the dimension of anxiety for IBSM Vs APDM (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Motor Tension	IBS M	2.88	1.13	1.64	48	5.84	< 0.01
	APD M	1 24	0 83				
Autonomic Hyperactivity	IBS M	4.76	1.74	3 04	48	7.86	< 0.01
	APD M	1.72	0.84				
Vigilance	IBS M	3 24	1.48	2.00	48	5 89	< 0.01
	APD M	1 24	0 83				
Generalized Anxiety HAS – G	IBS M	7.44	3.65	5 00	48	5.70	< 0 01
	APD M	2 44	2.42				
Overall	IBS M	12.72	3 52	7.00	48	9.35	< 0 01
	APD M	5.72	1.28				

Table 43 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of anxiety for the IBS male group and APD male group

The *t*-values were found to be significant on all the dimensions of anxiety (i.e. motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety.). The mean values on all these dimensions were higher for the IBS male group (i.e. 2.88, 4.76,3.24,7.44 and 12.72) than those for the APD male group (i.e. 1.24,1.72,1.24,2.44 and 5.72). Thereby indicating that the IBS male group was significantly having more motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety.

Table 44 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SD, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimension of anxiety for APDF Vs NFG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Motor Tension	APD F	1.36	0.64	0.60	48	3 11	< 0 01
	NFG	0 76	0.72				
Autonomic Hyperactivity	APD F	2.84	0 99	2.00	48	8.56	< 0 01
	NFG	0.84					
Vigilance	APD F	1.48	0 82	0.72	48	3 86	< 0.01
	NFG	0 76	0.44				
Generalized Anxiety HAS – G	APD F	3.28	2.35	3.28	48	6 96	< 0 01
	NFG	0 00	0.00				
Overall	APD F	6.92	1 15	3.88	48	13 89	< 0 01
	NFG	3.04	0.79				

Table 44 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of anxiety for the APD female group and normal female group.

The *t*-values were significant for all the dimensions of anxiety (i.e motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety. The mean values for all these dimensions were higher for the APD female group (1.36,2.84,1.48,3.28 and 6.92) than those for normal female group (0.76,0 84,0 76,0 00, and 3.04) Thereby indicating that the APD female group was significantly having more motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety in comparison to the normal female group.

Table 45 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SD, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimension of anxiety for IBSF Vs NFG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Motor Tension	IBS F	2.48	1.00	0.25	48	6.94	< 0.01
	NFG	0.76	0.72				
Autonomic Hyperactivity	IBS F	4 36	1 66	0 35	48	939	< 0 01
	NFG	0.84	0.62				
Vigilance	IBS F	3.60	1 50	0 31	48	9.09	< 0 01
	NFG	0 76	0.44				
Generalized Anxiety HAS – G	IBS F	7.84	2.13	0.43	48	18 3	< 0 01
	NFG	0.00	0.00				
Overall	IBS F	12 20	2.57	0.54	48	17.06	< 0 01
	NFG	3 04	0.79				

Table: 45 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of anxiety for IBS female group and normal female group.

The *t*-values were significant for all the dimensions (i.e. motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety).

The mean values for all these dimensions were higher for the IBS female group (2.48,4 36,3.60,7.84 and 12.20) than those for normal female group (0 76,0 84,0 76,0.00 and 3.04). Thereby indicating that significantly having more motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety.

Table 46 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SD, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimension of anxiety for IBSF Vs APDF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Motor Tension	IBS F	2.48	1.00	1 12	48	4.70	< 0 01
	APD F	1 36	0.64				
Autonomic Hyperactivity	IBS F	4.36	1.66	1 52	48	3.94	< 0.01
	APD F	2 84	0.99				
Vigilance	IBS F	3.60	1 50	2.12	48	6.19	< 0.01
	APD F	1 48	0.82				
Generalized Anxiety HAS – G	IBS F	7 84	2.13	4 56	48	7 17	< 0.01
	APD F	3.28	2.35				
Overall	IBS F	12.20	2.57	5.28	48	9 38	< 0 01
	APD F	6 92	1 15				

Table: 46 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of anxiety for the IBS female group and APD female group

The *t*-values were significant for all the dimensions (i.e. motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety)

The mean values for all these dimensions were found to be higher for the IBS female group. (2.48,4.36,3.60,7.84 and 12.20) as compared to those for APD female group (1.36,2.84,1.48,3.28, and 6 92). Thereby indicating that the IBS female group was significantly having more motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity, vigilance, generalized anxiety and overall anxiety in comparison to the APD female group.

Table 47 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SD, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* – values on the dimensions of anxiety for NMG and NFG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Motor Tension	NMG	0.84	0.80	8 00	48	0 37	N.S
	NFG	0.76	0.72				
Autonomic Hyperactivity	NMG	0 44	0.58	-0.40	48	2 341	0 05
	NFG	0 84	0 62				
Vigilance	NMG	0.64	0 70	-0 12	48	0.728	N.S
	NFG	0 76	0.44				
Generalized Anxiety HAS – G	NMG	0.48	1.33	0 48	48	1.809	N S
	NFG	0.00	0.00				
Overall	NMG	2.52	1.23	-0 52	48	1 780	N S
	NFG	3.04	0 79				

Table. 47 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of anxiety for normal male group and normal female group.

The *t*-value was found to be significant for the dimension of autonomic hyperactivity. The normal female group had higher mean value (0.84) than that for the normal male group (0.44) This indicates that the normal female group had significantly more autonomic hyperactivity in comparison to the normal male group.

The mean values for normal male group were higher on the dimensions of motor tension and generalized anxiety. While on the dimensions of vigilance

and overall anxiety the normal female group had higher mean values. Thereby indicating that the normal male group was likely to have more motor tension and generalized anxiety than the normal female group. While the normal female group was likely to be more vigilant and anxious.

Table 48 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SD, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of anxiety for APDM Vs APDF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Motor Tension	APD M APD F	1 24 1.36	0.83 0 64	-.12	48	0.57	N.S
Autonomic Hyperactivity	APD M APD F	1 72 2.84	0 84 0.99	-1 12	48	4.31	<0 01
Vigilance	APD M APD F	1.24 1.48	0 83 0.82	-.24	48	1.02	N S
Generalized Anxiety HAS – G	APD M APD F	2 44 3 28	2 42 2.35	-.84	48	1 24	N S
Overall	APD M APD F	5 72 6 92	1.28 1 15	-1 20	48	3.49	< 0.01

Table 48 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of anxiety for the APD male group and APD female group.

The *t*-values were found to be significant for the dimensions of autonomic hyperactivity and overall anxiety. The mean values on these two dimensions were higher for the APD female group (i e. 2.84 and 6.92 respectively) as compared to those for APD male group (i.e. 1.72 and 5.72 respectively). Thereby indicating that the APD female group was significantly having more autonomic hyperactivity and overall anxiety than the APD male group.

The mean values were found to be higher for the APD male group on the dimension of motor tension. Hence it is likely to have more motor tension than the APD female group. On the other hand on the dimensions of vigilance and generalized anxiety the APD female group had higher mean values. Thereby indicating that the APD female group was more vigilant and had more generalized anxiety as compared to the APD male group.

Table 49 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SD, $\bar{X}$ds , *df*, *t* - values on the dimensions of anxiety for IBSM Vs IBSF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
Motor Tension	IBS M	2.88	1.13	0.40	48	1 32	N S
	IBS F	2 48	1 00				
Autonomic Hyperactivity	IBS M	4 76	1.74	0 40	48	0.83	N S
	IBS F	4.36	1.66				
Vigilance	IBS M	3.24	1.48	-0 36	48	0 85	N S
	IBS F	3 60	1 50				
Generalized Anxiety HAS – G	IBS M	7 44	3.65	-0.40	48	0 47	N S
	IBS F	7.84	2.13				
Overall	IBS M	12 72	3 52	0 52	48	0 59	N.S
	IBS F	12.20	2 57				

Table: 49 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- values for the dimensions of anxiety for the IBS male group and IBS female group

None of the *t*-values were found to be significant. Thereby indicating that both the IBS male group and IBS female group did not differ significantly on the various dimensions.

However, the mean values on the dimensions of motor tension, autonomic hyperactivity and overall anxiety were higher for the IBS male group Thereby indicating that as compared to the IBS female group the IBS male group was likely to have more motor tensions, autonomic hyperactivity and

overall anxiety. For the dimensions of vigilance and generalized anxiety the mean values were higher for the IBS female group suggesting that the IBS female group was comparatively likely to be more vigilant and having generalized anxiety.

Table 50 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - value on the dimension of depression for NMG Vs APDM (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
BECKTOT	NMG	8.52	8.68	-3.96	48	1.41	N.S
	APD M	12 48	10 97				

Table: 50 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- value for the dimension of depression (overall total of 22 dimensions) for the normal male group and APD male group

The *t*-value was not significant.

However, the mean value was higher for the APD male group (12.48) than the normal male group (8.52). Hence the APD male group was likely to have more depression than the normal male group.

Table 51 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - value on the dimension of depression for NMG Vs IBSM (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
BECKTOT	NMG	8 52	8.68	-11 36	48	4.06	0.01
	IBS M	19.88	10.96				

Table 51 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- value for the dimension of depression (overall total of 22 dimensions) for the normal male group and IBS male group.

The *t*-value was significant. The mean value was higher for the IBS male group than that for the normal male group (8 52) hence, the IBS male group had significantly more level of depression than the normal male group.

Table 52 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - value on the dimension of depression for IBS M Vs APD M (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	P
BECKTOT	IBS M	19 88	10.96	7 40	48	2.38	0.05
	APD M	12.48	10.97				

Table 52 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- value for the dimension of depression (overall total of 22 dimensions) for the IBS male group and APD male group.

The *t*-value was significant

The mean value was higher for the IBS male group (19 88) than that for the APD male group (12.48). Thereby indicating that the IBS male group had significantly more depression than the APD male group.

Table 53 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - value on the dimension of depression for NFG Vs APD F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
BECKTOT	NFG	8.24	5 55	5.64	48	2.66	0.01
	APD F	13 88	9.02				

Table: 53 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- value for the dimension of depression (overall total of 22 dimensions) for the normal female group and APD female group.

The *t*-value was significant.

The mean value was higher for the APD female group (13.88) than that for the normal female group (8.24) Thereby indicating that the APD female group had significantly more depression than the normal female group.

Table 54 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - value on the dimension of depression for NFG Vs IBSF (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
BECKTOT	NFG	8.24	5.55	-9.04	48	4.29	< 0.01
	IBS F	17.28	8.94				

Table: 54 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- value for the dimension of depression (overall total of 22 dimensions) for the normal female group and IBS female group.

The *t*-value was significant

The mean value was higher for the IBS female group (17 28) than that for the normal female group (8.24). Thereby indicating that the IBS female group had significantly more depression than the normal female group.

Table 55 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - value on the dimension of depression for IBS F Vs APD F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
BECKTOT	IBS F	17.28	8 94	3 40	48	1.33	N.S
	APD F	13.88	9.02				

Table: 55 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- value for the dimension of depression (overall total of 22 dimensions) for the IBS male group and APD female group

The *t*-value was not significant.

However, the mean value was higher for the IBS female group (17.28) than that for the APD female group (13 88) Hence, the IBS female group was likely to have more depression than the APD female group.

Table 56 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - value on the dimension of depression for NMG Vs NFG (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
BECKTOT	NMG	8 52	8.68	0.28	48	0 13	N.S
	NFG	8.24	5.55				

Table: 56 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- value for the dimension of depression (overall total of 22 dimensions) for the normal male group and normal female group.

The *t*-value was not significant.

However the mean value was higher for the normal male group (8 52) than that for the normal female group (8.24). Hence the normal male group was likely to be more depressed than the normal female group.

Table 57 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - value for the dimension of depression for APD M Vs APD F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
BECKTOT	APD M	12.48	10.97	-1.40	48	493	N S
	APD F	13.88	9.02				

Table 57 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- value for the dimension of depression (overall total of 22 dimensions) for the APD male group and APD female group.

The *t*-value was not significant

However, the mean value was higher for the APD female group (13 88) than for the APD male group (12.48). Hence the APD female group was likely to have more depression than the APD male group.

Table 58 : Showing $\bar{X}$, SDs, $\bar{X}$ds, *df*, *t* - value on the dimension of depression for IBS M Vs IBS F (n=25)

Dimension	Sample	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$ds	*df*	*t*	*P*
BECKTOT	IBS M	19.88	10.96	2.60	48	0 91	N.S
	IBS F	17.28	8 94				

Table: 58 shows the means, standard deviations, mean differences, *df* and *t*- value for the dimension of depression (overall total of 22 dimensions) for the IBS male group and IBS female group

The *t*-value was not significant.

However, the mean value was slightly higher for the IBS male group (19 88) than the IBS female group (17.28). Hence, the IBS male group was likely to be more depressed that the IBS female group.