CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS
RESULTS

This chapter presents the instrument reliabilities, intercorrelations among the variables, and the multiple regression analysis used to evaluate the research questions. First, instrument reliabilities for the scales and subscales used are presented which is followed by a demographic profile of the participants of the study. Third, means and standard deviations of the measures (along with their dimensions) used in this study are reported. Fourth, the results of parametric statistical analysis (e.g. Chi-square, ANOVA, post-hoc) are reported. Fifth, the intercorrelations among the predictor and criterion variables are given. Lastly, the results of the step-wise multiple regression analyses, which examined resilience, are presented.

Table 4.1 Instrument Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>No: of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience Scale</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Environment Scale</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Environment Scale</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Internal consistency reliability was computed for the instruments that were used to measure resilience, home environment and school environment. The resulting Cronbach's alpha coefficients were adequate and ranged from .75 to .81.
Table 4.2 Participants Demographic Profile: Frequencies & Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Type</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Occupation</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Occupation</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s education</td>
<td>&lt;10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unto 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Graduation</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>&lt;10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Graduation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic groups</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 presents the demographic profile of the respondents. The table shows that the sample comprised of 50% males and 50% females. 30.4% of which came from joint families whereas 69.6% of the participants had nuclear families.58.8% of the participants reported having business as their father’s occupation whereas 40.8% had their fathers in service sector. As far as mother’s occupation is concerned, a sizeable percentage of participants (88.5%) reportedly had their mother’s who where housewives which stands in total contrast to only 11.2% of participants who had their mothers doing service and only 1 participant had her mother in business. Only 5% participants reported having their father’s education as less than grade 10 whereas the largest group which consisted of 110 participants and accounted for 42.3% of the
sample reportedly had fathers with educational qualification beyond graduation. In case of mother’s education, the largest group of the participants (32.7%) reportedly had mothers with educational qualification up to graduation, followed by 21.9 % of the participants who reported their mother’s educational status as up to standard 12 which is followed closely by 20% of the participants who had mothers who were post graduates. The educational status of the mothers of participants as less than standard 10 and up to standard 10 were 10.4% and 15% respectively. The table further shows that 32.7% belonged to the high socio economic group, 18.1% belonged to the middle income group and the participants in the lower group accounted for the largest percentage of the sample i.e. 49.2%.
Table 4.3 shows the descriptive statistics i.e. mean and the S.D values of resilience, home environment and school environment along with their sub-dimensions. On the whole adolescents in the current study had moderate level of resilience as per the norms of resilience measure used in the study.
Table 4.4 Cross-tabulated Frequencies of Levels of Resilience across Boys and Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that majority of the adolescent boys and girls have moderate level of resilience (Boys: f=77; Girls: f=80). In comparison to the boys (f=24) it was the girls who had lower level of resilience (f=32). In comparison to the girls (f=17), it was mostly boys who had higher level of resilience (f=23).

Table 4.4.1 Chi Square Analysis of Resilience across Boys and Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.00 (df=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear by Linear Ratio</td>
<td>2.00 (df=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson’s R (Interval by interval)</td>
<td>2.6 (df=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s R (Ordinal by ordinal)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.60.)

Table 4.4.1 shows that resilience did not differ significantly by gender $\chi^2(2, N = 260) = 2.00, p > .05$. Pearson and Spearman R values in the above table show that the gender and resilience were found to be uncorrelated in the study (Pearson R= -0.08, p>0.01; Spearman R= -0.08; p>0.01). On the whole, the result reveals that resilience was not related with gender.
Table 4.5 Cross-tabulated Frequencies of Levels of Resilience across Joint and Nuclear Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>Nuclear</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.60.)

Table 4.5 shows that most of the adolescents from joint families had moderate level of resilience (f=110). The table also shows that most of the adolescents from nuclear families had moderate level of resilience (f=47). However the number of adolescents coming from joint families is more than those coming from nuclear families. Majority of the adolescents (f=43) had lower resilience while only 13 adolescents from nuclear families had lower level of resilience indicating that resilience is lower mostly in adolescents living in joint families. 24 adolescents who scored higher on resilience were from joint families.
Table 4.5.1 Chi Square Analysis of Resilience across Joint and Nuclear Families

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>3.13(^*) (df=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.09 (df=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear by Linear Ratio</td>
<td>3.04 (df=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson’s R (Interval by interval)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s R (Ordinal by ordinal)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5.1 shows that resilience did not differ significantly with respect to joint and nuclear families of the adolescents \( \chi^2(2, N = 260) = 3.13, p > 0.05 \). Pearson and Spearman R values in the above table shows that the family type of the adolescents and resilience were found to be uncorrelated in the study (Pearson R = 0.11, p>0.01; Spearman R = 0.10; p>0.01). On the whole, the result reveals that resilience was not related with family type.
Table 4.6 Cross-tabulated Frequencies of Levels of Resilience across Three Levels of Socio-Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Socio-economic Status</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.60.)

Table 4.6 shows that majority of the adolescents coming from higher socio-economic background (f=28) had lower level of resilience. Also majority of the adolescents coming from higher socio-economic group had moderate level of resilience (f=75). 52 adolescents from lower socio-economic group had moderate level of resilience. Only 30 adolescents from middle socio-economic group scored moderate on resilience measure. Comparatively most of the adolescents reportedly having higher resilience were from higher socio-economic group (f=21).
Table 4.6.1 Chi Square Analysis of Resilience across Socio-Economic groups of Adolescents

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear by Linear Ratio</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df=1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson’s R (Interval by interval)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s R (Ordinal by ordinal)</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6.1 shows that resilience did not significantly differ with respect to joint and nuclear families of the adolescents $\chi^2(4, N = 260) = 0.60, p > .05). Pearson and Spearman R values in the above table shows that the socio-economic status of the adolescents and resilience were found to be uncorrelated in the study (Pearson R= 0.11, p>0.01; Spearman R= 0.10; p>0.01). On the whole, the result reveals that resilience was not related with socio-economic status.
Table 4.7 Effect of Home and School Environments on Resilience (N= 260): 3 X 3 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Levels (N)</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Environment</td>
<td>H1(159); H2(94); H3(7)</td>
<td>3132.207</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1566.103</td>
<td>11.906**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Environment</td>
<td>S1(78); S2(155); S3(27)</td>
<td>7584.008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3792.004</td>
<td>28.828**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Env X School Env</td>
<td></td>
<td>906.831</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>453.416</td>
<td>3.447*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>33279.229</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>131.538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4571799.000</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>51321.735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>51321.735</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p< 0.01, *p< 0.05

(Key: Hom Env = Home Environment; School Env = School Environment; H1 = Good Home Environment; H2 = Moderate Home Environment; H3 = Poor Home Environment; S1 = Good School Environment; S2 = Moderate School Environment; S3 = Poor School Environment)

Table 4.7 is the summary table of 3X3 ANOVA conducted to test the difference in resilience means scores in terms of home and school environment. The table presents number of participants in each of the three levels of home and school environment. There was a significant main effect of home environment on resilience, $F(2,253) = 11.90, p = < 0.01$. Likewise the school environment also has a significant main effect on resilience, $F(2,253) = 28.82, p = < 0.01$. The interaction effect of home and school environment on resilience was also significant indicating that both the contexts have a joint effect in determining resilience in adolescents. The interaction effect is graphically presented in Figure 1.
Figure 1 is a graphical presentation of the interaction effect of home and school, environment on resilience. The above graph shows a significant interaction effect of both these environments on resilience.
Table 4.8 Effect of Home and School Environments on Resilience in Boys (N=130): 3x3 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Levels (N)</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hom_env</td>
<td>H1(75);H2(49);H3(6)</td>
<td>1762.961</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>881.480</td>
<td>9.612**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schl_env</td>
<td>S1(42);S2(76);S3(12)</td>
<td>2438.055</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1219.027</td>
<td>13.292**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom_env X Schl_env</td>
<td></td>
<td>281.360</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140.680</td>
<td>1.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>11280.402</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>91.711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2291283.0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20086.931</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.01, **p<0.05

(Key: Hom Env = Home Environment; School Env = School Environment; H1 = Good Home Environment; H2 = Moderate Home Environment; H3 = Poor Home Environment S1=Good School Environment; S2=Moderate School Environment; S3= Poor School Environment)

Table 4.8 is the summary table of 3X3 ANOVA done to test the difference in resilience means scores in terms of home and school environment in case of boys. The table presents number of adolescent boys in each of the three levels of home and school environment. There is a significant main effect of home environment on resilience in the case of boys $F(2,123) = 9.61, p = < 0.01$. School environment is also found to have a significant main effect on resilience among boys $F(2,123) = 13.29, p = < 0.01$. The interaction effect of both home and school environment on resilience in case of boys is not found to be significant. This indicates that while both individually have strong influence on resilience level of boys, their aggregated effect on resilience in boys is not significant.
Table 4.9 Effect of Home and School Environments on Resilience among Girls (N= 130): 3 X 3 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Levels (N)</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Env</td>
<td>H1(84);H2(45);H3(1)</td>
<td>2647.740</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1323.870</td>
<td>7.892**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Env</td>
<td>S1(36);S2(79);S3(15)</td>
<td>4682.103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2341.051</td>
<td>13.955**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom Env X Schl</td>
<td>Env</td>
<td>619.758</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>309.879</td>
<td>1.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>20634.038</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>167.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2280516.00</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected Total 31208.308 129

** p< 0.01; * p< 0.05

(Key: Horn Env = Home Environment; School Env = School Environment; H1 = Good Home Environment; H2 = Moderate Home Environment; H3 = Poor Home Environment SI = Good School Environment; S2 = Moderate School Environment; S3 = Poor School Environment)

Table 4.9 shows the effects of home environment and school environment on resilience in the case of girls. This table also presents the number of adolescent girls in each of the three levels of home and school environment. In their case also the home environment's main effect on resilience is significant $F (2,123) = 7.89, p = < 0.01$. School environment as shown in the table, has significant main effect on resilience among adolescent girls $F (2,123) = 13.95, p = < 0.01$. The interaction effect of both home and school environment on resilience in case of girls is also not found to be significant. This indicates that while home and school environment have individual strong effects on resilience, jointly their effect on resilience among adolescent girls is not significant.
Table 4.10 Gabriel Post Hoc Analyses (N= 260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Differences of Resilience across levels of HE (I-J)</th>
<th>Resilience across HE levels in decreasing order</th>
<th>Mean Differences of Resilience across levels of SE (I-J)</th>
<th>Resilience across SE levels in decreasing order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good HE (I)- Mod HE (J) = 11.00 *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good SE (I)- Mod SE (J)= 10.61*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good HE (I)- Poor HE(J) = 24.34 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good SE (I)- Poor SE (J)= 21.90*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod HE (I) - Good HE (J) = -11.00*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mod SE (I) – Good SE (J)= -10.61*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod HE (I) - Poor HE (J) = 13.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod SE (I)– Poor SE (J) = 11.28*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor HE (I) - Good HE (J) = -24.34*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor SE (I) – Good SE (J) = -21.90*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor HE (I)- Good HE (J)= -13.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor SE (I)– Mod SE (J) = -11.28*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

(Key: HE = Home Environment; SE = School Environment)

Table 4.10 shows results of Gabriel post hoc analysis, which was mainly used because the groups were not equal in size. The table depicts the extent of mean differences in resilience across the different levels of home and school environment. On account of the mean differences shown in the table resilience scores are the highest in good home and school environment than in other levels.
Table 4.11 Gabriel Post Hoc Analyses (Boys) (N= 130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Differences of Resilience across levels of HE (I-J)</th>
<th>Resilience across HE levels in decreasing order</th>
<th>Mean Differences of Resilience across levels of SE (I-J)</th>
<th>Resilience across SE levels in decreasing order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good HE (I) – Mod HE (J) = 12.8846*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good SE (I) – Mod SE (J) = 10.1980*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good HE (I) – Poor HE (J) = 20.6533*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good SE (I) – Poor SE (J) = 21.4524*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod HE (I) – Good HE (J) = -12.8846*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mod SE (I) – Good SE (J) = -10.1980*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod HE (I) – Poor HE (J) = 7.7687</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mod SE (I) – Poor SE (J) = 11.2544*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor HE (I) – Good HE (J) = -20.6533*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor SE (I) – Good SE (J) = -21.4524*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor HE (I) – Good HE (J) = -7.7687</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor SE (I) – Good SE (J) = -11.2544*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05

(Key :HE = Home Environment; SE = School Environment)

Table 4.11 shows results of Gabriel post hoc analysis. The table depicts the extent of mean differences in resilience across the different levels of home and school environment in the case of boys. On account of the mean differences shown in the table resilience scores for the boys are the highest in good home and school environment than in other levels.
Table 4.12 Gabriel Post Hoc Analyses for resilience in School Environment (Girls) (N=130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Differences of Resilience across levels of SE (I-J)</th>
<th>Resilience across SE levels in decreasing order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good SE (I) – Mod SE (J) = 11.08 *</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good SE (I) – Poor SE (J) = 22.39 *</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod SE (I) – Good SE (J) = -11.08*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod SE (I) – Poor SE (J) = 11.30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor SE (I) – Good SE (J) = -22.39*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor SE (I) – Good SE (J) = -11.30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

(Key: SE = School Environment)

Table 4.12 shows the Gabriel post hoc analysis. The table depicts the extent of mean differences in resilience across the different levels of school environment in the case of girls. Resilience scores for the girls are the highest in good school environment than in other levels on account of the mean differences shown in the table.
Table 4.13  Significance of Difference in Resilience Means between Good and Moderate Home Environment among Girls: Independent Sample t tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Home Env</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>135.15</td>
<td>14.906</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>125.91</td>
<td>13.220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01

NOTE: Post hoc analysis for resilience means in home environment was not done as only one participant belonged to the poor home environment category. Therefore independent sample t test is conducted to see the mean difference in the resilience between good and moderate home environment among girls.

Table 4.13 presents the result of independent sample t test which reports highly significant difference in resilience between good and moderate home environment in case of girls, \( t(34) = 3.48, p < 0.01 \). The result also highlights that girls coming from mostly better home environments were highly resilient.
Table 4.14 Inter-correlations between Resilience, Home Environment & School Environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>1d</th>
<th>1e</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>2c</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>3b</th>
<th>3c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Resilience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Meaningfulness</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Equanimity</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Self Reliance</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Perseverance</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Ext. Aloneness</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home Env.</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Home-Care</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Home-High</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Home-MP</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School Env.</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. School Care</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. School High</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. School MP</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01; *p<0.05**

(Key: Dimensions of Resilience = Meaningfulness, Equanimity, Self-Reliance and perseverance and Ext. Aloneness = Existential Aloneness; Home Env = Home Environment; Home Care = Caring Relationships at Home; Home Exp = High Expectations at Home; Home MP = Meaningful Participation at Home; School Env = School Environment; School Care = Caring Relationships in School; School High Exp = High Expectations in School; School MP = Meaningful participations in school.)
Table 4.14 shows Pearson product moment correlation between overall resilience, its sub-dimensions, home environment and school environment with their sub-dimensions. According to the correlation matrix shown above all the variable are significantly and positively correlated with each other. This implies that better the home and school environment, higher the level of resilience of adolescents.
Table 4.15 Inter-correlations between Resilience, Home Environment & School Environment among Boys (N=130).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>1d</th>
<th>1e</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>2c</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>3b</th>
<th>3c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Meaningfulness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Equanimity</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Self-Reliance</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Perseverance</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Ext. Aloneness</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home Env.</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Home-Care</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Home-High</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Home-MP</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School Env.</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. School Care</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. School High</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. School MP</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01; *p<0.05

(Key: Dimensions of Resilience = Meaningfulness, Equanimity, Self-Reliance and perseverance and Ext. Aloneness = Existential Aloneness; Home Env = Home Environment; Home Care = Caring Relationships at Home; Home Exp = High Expectations at Home; Home MP = Meaningful Participation at Home; School Env = School Environment; School Care = Caring Relationships in School; School High Exp = High Expectations in School; School MP = Meaningful participations in school.)
Table 4.15 shows the Pearson product moment correlation between overall resilience, its sub-dimensions, home environment and school environment with their sub-dimensions in the case of boys. Most of the variables are significantly and positively correlated with each other, however equanimity was found to be weakly correlated with home meaningful participation ($r = 0.15, p>0.01$) and school caring relationships ($r=0.07; p>0.01$). School meaningful participation was also found to have very low correlation with two dimension of resilience in boys i.e. self reliance ($r=0.14, p>0.01$), perseverance ($r=0.08; p>0.01$). It was also found to be unrelated with the other two dimensions of school environment i.e. school care ($r = 0.00; p>0.01$) and with school high expectations ($r = 0.01; p>0.01$).
Table 4.16 Inter-correlations between Resilience, Home Environment & School Environment among Girls (N=130).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>1d</th>
<th>1e</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>2c</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>3b</th>
<th>3c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Meaningfulness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Equanimity</td>
<td>0.73*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Self Reliance</td>
<td>0.72*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Perseverance</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Ext. Aloneness</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home Env.</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Home-Care</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Home-High Exp</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School Env.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. School Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. School High Exp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01; *p<0.05

(Key: Dimensions of Resilience = Meaningfulness, Equanimity, Self-Reliance and perseverance and Ext. Aloneness = Existential Aloneness; Home Env = Home Environment; Home Care = Caring Relationships at Home; Home Exp = High Expectations at Home; Home MP = Meaningful Participation at Home; School Env = School Environment; School Care = Caring Relationships in School; School High Exp = High Expectations in School; School MP = Meaningful participations in school.)
Table 4.16 shows the Pearson product moment correlation between overall resilience, its sub-dimensions, home environment and school environment with their sub-dimensions in the case of girls. According to the table shown equanimity has been found to be uncorrelated with home caring relationships ($r=0.14; p>0.01$) and home high expectations ($r=0.16; p>0.01$). Home caring relationships and home high expectations have also been found to have no correlation with existential aloneness ($r=0.09; p>0.01; r=0.16; p>0.01$). Rest of the variables is found to be significantly correlated with each other.
Scatter plot: Correlation between Resilience & Home Environment

Figure 2

Figures 2 is a scatter plot displaying positive linear relationship of resilience with home environment for the total sample in this study.
Figures 3 is a scatter plot displaying positive linear relationship of resilience with school environment for the total sample in this study.
Table 4.17: Stepwise Multiple Linear Regressions: Predicting Resilience from Overall Home and School Environments (N=260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 ) (change)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>98.026</td>
<td>3.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.340**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Env</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>78.961</td>
<td>4.296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.442**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Env</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Env</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01

(Key: School Env = School Environment; Home Env = Home Environment)

Table 4.17 presents the results of stepwise multiple regression in order to predict resilience for the total sample participants from overall home and school environment. The above table shows both home and school environment particularly the latter to significantly and positively predict resilience among all the participants. School environment which entered the first step alone accounted for 27% of the variance in total resilience scores and came out to be the strongest predictor variable (\( \beta = 0.39, p<.01 \)) as compared to the home environment, which accounted for only 10% of the variance of the total resilience score. However home environment was also found to significantly predict resilience (\( \beta = 0.35, p<.01 \)).
Table 4.18 Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression: Predicting Resilience from Overall Home and School Environments in case of Boys (N= 130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² (change)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>94.187</td>
<td>4.568</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.81**</td>
<td>20.617**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Env</td>
<td>1.378</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>84.296</td>
<td>4.902</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.37**</td>
<td>6.141**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom Env</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Env</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01

(Key : Hom Env = Home Environment; School Env = School Environment)

Table 4.18 presents the results of stepwise multiple regression in order to predict resilience for male participants from their overall home and school environment. The above table shows that both home and school environment particularly home environment of the boys significantly and positively predicted resilience. Home environment, which entered the first step of regression, is the most significant predictor (β= 0.45, p<. 01) and accounted for approximately 36% of the variance in the resilience scores for boys.
Table 4.19 presents the results of stepwise multiple regression in order to predict resilience for female participants from their overall home and school environment. The above table shows that both home and school environment particularly school environment to significantly and positively predict resilience in case of girls ($\beta = 0.44$, $p<.01$).
Table 4.20 Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression: Predicting Resilience from Dimensions of Home and School Environment (N=260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² (change)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>104.406</td>
<td>3.288</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.631**</td>
<td>32.411**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn MP</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>96.384</td>
<td>3.534</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.359**</td>
<td>27.069**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn MP</td>
<td>2.517</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_HighExp</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>88.190</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.018**</td>
<td>23.538**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn MP</td>
<td>2.241</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_HighExp</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl MP</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>85.143</td>
<td>4.017</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.981**</td>
<td>20.364**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn MP</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_HighExp</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl MP</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn_Care</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01; *p < 0.05

(Key: Horn MP = Home Meaningful Participation; Schl High Exp = School High Expectation; Schl MP = School Meaningful Participation; Home Care = Home Caring Relationships)

Table 4.20 presents the results of stepwise multiple regressions in order to predict resilience for the total sample participants from the dimensions of home and school environment. The above table shows that home meaningful participation; school high expectations school meaningful participations and home caring relationships significantly and positively predicted resilience. Meaningful participation at home entered the first step and emerged to be the most significant predictor of resilience ($\beta=0.21$, p<.01) for the total sample accounting 19.5% of the total variance in the resilience. In the second step High Expectations in School was the second important
predictor of resilience ($\beta = 0.33$, $p < .01$). In the third step Meaningful participation in school was the third important and significant predictor of resilience ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < .01$). In the fourth and final step Caring Relationships at home was the fourth important predictor of resilience ($\beta = 0.17$, $p < .01$). The rest of variables could not enter in regression equation because they could not satisfy the criterion of entrance.
Table 4.21 Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression: Predicting Resilience from Dimensions of Home and School Environment in case of Boys (N= 130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ (change)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>106.584</td>
<td>4.155</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn_Care</td>
<td>2.915</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.861**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>95.672</td>
<td>4.379</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn_Care</td>
<td>2.286</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.982**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_HighExp</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.107**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>87.094</td>
<td>4.847</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn_Care</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.434**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_HighExp</td>
<td>1.652</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_MP</td>
<td>1.854</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.406**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>81.802</td>
<td>4.975</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn_Care</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.917**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_HighExp</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.604**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_MP</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom_HighExp</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.184*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>83.385</td>
<td>4.990</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn_Care</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.131*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_HighExp</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_MP</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.099**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom_HighExp</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom_MP</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$p<0.01$; *$p<0.05$**

(Key: Horn Care= Home Caring Relationships; Scl High Exp = School High Expectations; Scl MP = School Meaningful Participation; Hom High Exp = Home High Expectations; Hom MP = Home Meaningful Participation.)

Table 4.21 presents the result of stepwise multiple regression in order to predict resilience among boys from the dimensions of home and school environment. The above table shows that home caring relationships, school high expectations, school meaningful participation, home high expectations and home meaningful participations significantly and positively predicted resilience in case of the boys as they satisfied the
criterion of entrance. In the first step caring relationships at home entered as the most important predictor ($\beta=0.51; \ p<0.01$) accounting for 26% of variance in resilience followed by high expectations in school, which emerged as the second important predictor of resilience ($\beta=0.30; \ p<0.01$). Meaningful participation in school entered as the next important predictor of resilience ($\beta=0.23; \ p<0.01$). The last two significant predictors of resilience in boys as shown by table 4.21 are high expectations at home ($\beta=0.20; \ p<0.01$) and meaningful participation at home ($\beta=0.16; \ p<0.01$).
Table 4.22 presents the results of stepwise multiple regression in order to predict resilience among girls from the dimensions of home and school environment. The above table shows that school meaningful participation, school high expectations and meaningful participations at home entered the regression analysis. The results indicate that these variables significantly and positively predicted resilience in case of the girls as per the order of predictors’ entry shown in Table 4.22. The rest of the dimensions could not fit the entrance criteria. On the whole Meaningful participation at home and school emerged to be the dominant source of resilience among adolescent girls in this study. However it was meaningful participation in the school, which was the more significant predictor of resilience among adolescent girls accounting alone for 24% of variance in resilience ($\beta=0.49; p<0.01$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ (change)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>104.951</td>
<td>4.353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.345**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SchI MP</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>6.352**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>92.928</td>
<td>4.989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.698**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SchI MP</td>
<td>2.551</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4.650*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_HighExp</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.215**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>79.433</td>
<td>5.895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.363**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SchI MP</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.296**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scl_HighExp</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.044**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horn MP</td>
<td>2.339</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>3.848**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p<0.01$

(Key: SchI MP = School Meaningful Participation; SchI High Exp = School High Expectation; Horn MP = Home Meaningful Participation)