Chart-1

Table-1

Mean of Demographic data and Anthropometric Measurements of Students in Three Programs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Number** | **Mean ± Standard deviation** | | | | | | |
| **Age** | **Weight (lb)** | **Height** | **BMI** | **WC** | **WHR** | **Fat%** |
| **DC** | 20 | 26.30±6.89 | 151.42±28.03 | 5.44±0.39 | 24.79 ± 5.15 | 32.45 ± 4.65 | 0.78 ± 0.065 | 25.10 ± 6.70 |
| **Nutrition** | 20 | 28.70±6.70 | 129.54±22.54 | 5.26±0.34 | 23.17 ± 3.29 | 30.32 ± 3.53 | 0.78 ± 0.07 | 26.19 ± 6.14 |
| **Non- Health related majors** | 20 | 21.20 ± 4.10 | 143.85± 25.67 | 5.45±0.23 | 24.22 ± 3.98 | 29.73 ± 3.80 | 0.76 ± 0.07 | 25.10 ± 6.10 |
| **Total** | 60 | 25.40±6.64 | 141.60±26.69 | 5.39±0.33 | 24.06 ± 4.19 | 30.83 ± 4.12 | 0.78 ± 0.07 | 25.45 ± 6.22 |

DC: Doctor of Chiropractic, BMI: Body Mass Index, WC: Waist Circumference, WHR: Waist-Hip Ratio.

Table 1 shows the mean of Demographic data and anthropometric measurements of participants among 60 students in the three deferent programs (Doctor of Chiropractic (DC), Nutrition and Non Health Related Programs). Female participants Age, Weight in pounds, Height in feet and inches, BMI, WC in inches, WHR, Fat% mean and standard deviations were found 25.40±6.64, 141.60±26.69, 5.39±0.33, 24.06±4.19, 30.83±4.12, 0.78±0.07, and 25.45±6.22. Among 20 students in DC program, the mean and standard deviations of age was 26.30±6.89, weight in pounds 151.42±28.03, height in feet and inches 5.44±0.39 BMI 24.79±5.15, WC 32.45±4.65, WHR 0.78±0.065, and Fat% 25.10± 6.70. Student from Nutrition obtained a mean of age of 28.70±6.70, weight in pounds 129.54±22.54, height in feet and inches 5.26±0.34, BMI 23.17±3.29, WC 30.32±3.53, WHR 0.78±0.07, and fat% 26.19±6.14. The mean age of students from non- health related programs was 21.20±4.10, weight 143.85±25.67, height 5.45±0.23, BMI 24.22 ± 3.98, WC 29.73 ± 3.80, WHR 0.76 ± 0.07, and fat% 25.10 ± 6.10.

Table-2

Comparison of Programs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | P-Value |
| EAT-26 Score | DC | 20 | 7.25 | 8.783 | 1.964 | NS(0.962) |
| Nutrition | 20 | 6.85 | 9.241 | 2.066 |
| Non Health Program | 20 | 7.55 | 5.186 | 1.160 |
| Total | 60 | 7.22 | 7.816 | 1.009 |
| TDS | DC | 20 | 32.40 | 3.393 | 0.759 | NS(0.144) |
| Nutrition | 20 | 31.50 | 3.069 | 0.686 |
| Non Health Program | 20 | 30.30 | 3.496 | 0.782 |
| Total | 60 | 31.40 | 3.381 | 0.436 |
| BMI of Student | DC | 20 | 24.7850 | 5.15050 | 1.15169 | NS(0.472) |
| Nutrition | 20 | 23.1660 | 3.28575 | .73472 |
| Non Health Program | 20 | 24.2150 | 3.97999 | .88995 |
| Total | 60 | 24.0553 | 4.19260 | .54126 |
| WC of Student | DC | 20 | 32.4500 | 4.65069 | 1.03993 | NS(0.088) |
| Nutrition | 20 | 30.3200 | 3.52534 | .78829 |
| Non Health Program | 20 | 29.7300 | 3.79974 | .84965 |
| Total | 60 | 30.8333 | 4.12371 | .53237 |
| WHR of Student | DC | 20 | 0.7785 | .06548 | .01464 | NS(0.716) |
| Nutrition | 20 | 0.7810 | .07297 | .01632 |
| Non Health Program | 20 | 0.7640 | .07358 | .01645 |
| Total | 60 | 0.7745 | .06997 | .00903 |
| Fat % | DC | 20 | 25.0700 | 6.69588 | 1.49724 | NS(0.816) |
| Nutrition | 20 | 26.1900 | 6.14414 | 1.37387 |
| Non Health Program | 20 | 25.1000 | 6.07012 | 1.35732 |
| Total | 60 | 25.4533 | 6.22391 | .80350 |

Table 2 shows the comparison of EAT-26, TDS and body composition measurements between the three programs. Nutrition students had a little lower mean of EAT-26 score (6.85) and a lower mean of BMI (23.1660), and a little higher mean of fat mass percentage (26.1900) than DC and non-health program students. DC students had a little higher mean of TDS than nutrition and non-health program students, but non-health program students showed a little lower mean of WC (29.7300) and WHR (0.7640). However, there were no significant differences between students of the three groups of degrees and the EAT total score (*p* = 0.864), TDS (*p*=0.144) BMI (*p*=0.472), WC (*p*=0.088), WHR(*p*=0.716), and fat mass percentage (*p*=0.816).

Chart-2

Comparison the mean of Eating Attitude Test-26 (EAT-26) scores.

Chart-3

Comparison the mean of Tendency to Diet Scale (TDS) scores.

Table-3

Prevalence of eating disorder (EDs)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EAT-26 Score | DC  %(n) | Nutrition  %(n) | Non Health Programs  %(n) | Total  %(n) | *P*-value |
| EAT < 19 (Normal) | 95%(19) | 90%(18) | 100%(20) | 95%(57) | 0.349(NS) |
| EAT ≥ 20 (Eating disorder) | 5.0%(1) | 10%(2) | 0.0%(0) | 5.0%(3) |
| Total | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(60) |

Table 3 shows the prevalence of EDs among students that randomly selected from three different majors. Although there were no significant differences between students of the three groups of degrees and the EAT total score (*p* = 0.349), 5% of students were identified with EDs from the three programs. Five percent were identified with EDs in DC students, 10% in nutrition students indicated with EDs, while no students were identified with EDs in non-health related majors.

Table-4

Comparison of EAT-26 and TDS scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program | SCORE TYPE | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | P-Value |
| Score | EAT26 | 60 | 7.2167 | 7.81587 | HS(0.000) |
| TDS | 60 | 31.4000 | 3.38090 |
| DC | EAT26 | 20 | 7.2500 | 8.7821 | HS(0.000) |
| TDS | 20 | 32.4000 | 3.3945 |
| Nutrition | EAT26 | 20 | 6.8500 | 9.2411 | HS(0.000) |
| TDS | 20 | 31.5000 | 3.0693 |
| Non-health | EAT26 | 20 | 7.5000 | 5.1858 | HS(0.000) |
| TDS | 20 | 30.3000 | 3.4959 |

\*HS(Highly significant)

Table 4 shows a Comparison of EAT-26 and TDS scores between the three groups of different majors. There was a significant association between EAT-26 and TDS, statically highly significant (p=0.000), which is ˂0.01. The results are indicating that students in all groups were a greater tendency to diet.

Table – 5

Comparison of EAT-26 and TDS between students in different years

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Variable | Year | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | P-Value |
| DC | EAT-26 Score | Year 1 and 2 | 12 | 9.08 | 10.833 | S(0.038) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 8 | 4.50 | 3.251 |
| TDS Score | Year 1 and 2 | 12 | 32.00 | 3.742 | NS(0.863) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 8 | 33.00 | 2.928 |
| Nutrition | EAT-26 Score | Undergraduate | 9 | 1.89 | 1.691 | HS(0.002) |
| Graduate | 11 | 10.91 | 10.940 |
| TDS Score | Undergraduate | 9 | 30.00 | 3.464 | NS(0.414) |
| Graduate | 11 | 32.73 | 2.149 |
| Non-health | EAT-26 Score | Year 1 and 2 | 16 | 7.19 | 5.205 | NS(0.0660) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 4 | 9.00 | 5.598 |
| TDS Score | Year 1 and 2 | 16 | 30.88 | 3.462 | NS(0.514) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 4 | 28.00 | 2.944 |

Table 5 shows a Comparison of EAT-26 and TDS between students in different years of the study. The mean of EAT-26 score in the first and second year DC students (9.08) was significantly higher than third and fourth-year students (P=0.038). However, the mean of TDS scores in the DC student in the different years was not significant (P=0.863). In the nutrition students, the mean of graduate students was highly significant than undergraduate students (p=0.002), while the TDS did not show significant differences between the nutrition students (p=0.414). The mean of EAT-26 and TDS scores in non-health related major students did not show significant differences (p=0.0660, 0.514 respectively). The results indicated that graduate nutrition and the first and second year DC students are at risk of EDs.

Chart-4

Comparison the mean of Eating Attitude Test-26 (EAT-26) scores between DC students.

Chart-5

Comparison the mean of Tendency to Diet Scale (TDS) scores between DC students

Chart-6

Comparison the mean of Eating Attitude Test-26 (EAT-26) scores between undergraduate and graduate nutrition students.

Chart-7

Comparison the mean of Tendency to Diet Scale (TDS) scores between undergraduate and graduate nutrition students.

Chart-8

Comparison the mean of Eating Attitude Test-26 (EAT-26) scores between non –health related major students.

Chart-9

Comparison the mean of Tendency to Diet Scale (TDS) scores between non –health related major students.

Table-6 Classification and comparison of BMI.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| BMI Category | DC  %(n) | Nutrition  %(n) | Non Health Programs  %(n) | Total  %(n) | *P*-value |
| Normal | 65%(13) | 75%(15) | 65%(13) | 68.3%(41) | 0.501(NS) |
| Overweight | 20%(4) | 25%(5) | 20%(4) | 21.7%(13) |
| Obesity | 15%(3) | 0% | 15%(3) | 10%(6) |
| Total | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(60) |

Table 6 shows the comparison of BMI categories between the three majors; DC, Nutrition and non-health related majors. Nutrition students had 75% of normal BMI and no obesity was identified compared to 65% of normal BMI and 15% obesity in DC students and non-health related programs. However, there was no statically significant found between the groups (*P*= 0.501).

Chart-10

Total of BMI Classification of Students in the Three Majors

Table 7 Waistcircumfrence classification and comparison.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Waistcircumfrence | DC  %(n) | Nutrition  %(n) | Non Health Programs  %(n) | Total  %(n) | *P*-value |
| No Risk | 60.0%(12) | 65%(13) | 65%(13) | 63.3%(38) | 0.931(NS) |
| Risk | 40.0%(8) | 35.0%(7) | 35.0%(7) | 36.7%(22) |
| Total | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(60) |

Table 7 shows the classification and comparison of Waist circumference among 60 students between the three majors. The majority of students (63.3%) were not at the risk of central obesity that associated with chronic diseases. Among the groups, 65% of nutrition and non-health related programs, and 60% of DC students were not at the risk of central obesity. However, the results showed no statically significant between the groups (P=0.931).

Chart-11

Total of WC Classification of Students in the Three Majors

Table 8 Waist Hip Ratio classification and comparisons

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Waist Hip Ratio | DC  %(n) | Nutrition  %(n) | Non- Health Programs  %(n) | Total  %(n) | *P*-value |
| Low | 60%(12) | 65.0%(13) | 70%(14) | 65%(39) | 0.908(NS) |
| Moderate | 30%(6) | 20%(4) | 20%(4) | 23.3%(14) |
| High | 10%(2) | 15.0%(3) | 10.0%(2) | 11.7%(7) |
| Total | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(60) |

Table 8 shows the classifications and comparisons of the waist-hip ratio among the three majors. The results show that there were no statically significant was found between the groups (*P*= 0.908). The majority of students (65%) in the groups were in the low category of WHR. Non-health related program students were the majority that had the lowest category (70%) followed by nutrition students were 65% and DC students 60%. Fifteen percent of nutrition students had high WHR compared to 10% of students from the DC and non-health related majors.

Chart-12

Total of WHR Classification of Students in the Three Majors

Table 9 Classification and comparison of Fat Mass percentages

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fat% | DC  %(n) | Nutrition  %(n) | Non -Health Programs  %(n) | Total  %(n) | *P*-value |
| ≤24% | 55%(11) | 50%(10) | 50%(10) | 51.7%(31) | 0. 890 (NS) |
| 25-31% | 30%(6) | 35%(7) | 25%(5) | 30%(18) |
| ≥32% | 15%(3) | 15%(3) | 25%(5) | 18.3%(11) |
| Total | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(20) | 100%(60) |

Table 9 shows a comparison of fat mass percentage between the three programs. Around half of the students in the three programs had ≤24% of fat mass, which indicated that 51.7% students were fitness participants. Among the groups, 50% of nutrition and non-health related major students had ≤24% of fat mass compared to 55% of DC students. Obese students that had ≥32% of fat mass were observed more in non-health related major students (25%) in contrast to DC and nutrition students were 15%. No significant differences were found in fat mass percentage among the three groups, p = 0.890.

Chart-13

Total of Fat% Classification of Students in the Three Majors

Chart-14

Obesity Students in the Three Programs

Table- 10 Relation between body composition and EAT-26.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | | Standardized Coefficients  Beta | T | Sig. |
| EAT-26 | (Constant) |  | -.465 | .644 |
| BMI of Student | .202 | .675 | .502 |
| WC of Student | -.170 | -.570 | .571 |
| WHR of Student | .205 | 1.019 | .313 |
| Fat % | -.109 | -.463 | .645 |

Table9 shows the relation between body composition and EAT-26 between the groups. The results found no significance association between the response of EAT-26 scores and the body composition measurements, BMI (p=0.502), WC (p=0.571), WHR (p=0.313) and fat % (p=0.645).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 11 Relation between body composition and TDS | | | | | |
| Model | | Standardized Coefficients  Beta | t | Sig. |
| TDS | (Constant) |  | 4.616 | .000 |
| BMI of Student | .218 | .759 | .451 |
| WC of Student | .253 | .885 | .380 |
| WHR of Student | -.076 | -.0396 | .694 |
| Fat % | -.132 | -.586 | .560 |

Table 11 shows the relation between body composition and TDS between the groups. The results found no significance association between the response of TDS scores and the body composition measurements, BMI (p=0.451), WC (p=0.380), WHR (p=0.694) and fat % (p=0.560).

Table 12 Correlation between body composition measurements, EAT-26, and TDS scores

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | EAT-26 | P-value | TDS | P-value |
| BMI | 0.13 | NS (0.924) | 0.287 | S(0.026) |
| WC | 0.32 | NS (0.811) | 0.286 | S(0.027) |
| WHR | 0.118 | NS (0.367) | 0.085 | NS (0.520) |
| Fat % | -0.028 | NS (0.834) | 0.199 | NS (0.127) |

Table 12 shows the correlation between body composition measurement, EAT-26, and TDS scores between the participants in the three groups. Although there was no significant correlation between EAT-26 and body composition measurements, there were little correlations were found in BMI (0.13; *p*=0.924), WC (32; *p*=0.811), and WHR (0.118 *p*=0.367). The results showed a significance correlation between TDS and BMI (0.287;*p*=0.026), and in WC (0.286; *p*=0.027). TDS showed a little correlation in fat mass percentage (0.199), but the correlation was not significance (*p*=0.127)

Table 13 comparison of body composition between DC students in different years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DC | Year | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | P-Value |
| BMI of Student | Year 1 and 2 | 12 | 26.4250 | 5.77410 | S(0.049) |
| Year 3 and4 | 8 | 22.3250 | 2.84341 |
| WC of Student | Year 1 and 2 | 12 | 33.6667 | 5.22813 | S(0.05) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 8 | 30.6250 | 3.06769 |
| WHR of Student | Year 1 and 2 | 12 | .7975 | .07238 | NS(0.187) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 8 | .7500 | .04309 |
| Fat % | Year 1 and 2 | 12 | 26.6750 | 7.43115 | NS(0.303) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 8 | 22.6625 | 4.88641 |

Table 13 shows a comparison of body composition between DC students in different years. First and second-year group and third and fourth years group of DC students had a significant association in BMI (*p*=0.049), and in WC (*p*=0.05). The BMI of third and fourth year DC students were normal (=22.3) and lower in WC (=30.6) compared to first and second year of DC students were overweight (=26.4) and higher in WC (=33.6).

Table 14 comparison of body composition between undergraduate and graduate nutrition students.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nutrition | Program levels | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | P-Value |
| BMI of Student | Undergraduate | 9 | 24.4778 | 3.59088 | NS(0.373) |
| Graduate | 11 | 22.0927 | 2.71687 |
| WC of Student | Undergraduate | 9 | 31.5556 | 4.30439 | NS(0.204) |
| Graduate | 11 | 29.3091 | 2.50857 |
| WHR of Student | Undergraduate | 9 | .7678 | .08772 | NS(0.479) |
| Graduate | 11 | .7918 | .06063 |
| Fat % | Undergraduate | 9 | 28.5556 | 7.20141 | NS(0.361) |
| Graduate | 11 | 24.2545 | 4.59138 |

Table 14 shows comparison of body composition between undergraduate and graduate nutrition students. The graduate students had a lower mean of BMI (22), WC (29), and fat% (24) than undergraduate students. However, the results of nutrition students did not show any significant association in body composition measurements between undergraduate and graduate students.

Table 15 comparison of body composition between non-health related majors student in different years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Non-health | Program levels | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | P-Value |
| BMI of Student | Year 1 and 2 | 16 | 24.4688 | 4.36482 | S(0.033) |
| Year 3 and4 | 4 | 23.2000 | 1.82939 |
| WC of Student | Year 1 and 2 | 16 | 29.4125 | 4.10087 | NS(0.112) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 4 | 31.0000 | 2.16025 |
| WHR of Student | Year 1 and 2 | 16 | 0.7513 | .07544 | NS(0.362) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 4 | 0.8150 | .03873 |
| Fat % | Year 1 and 2 | 16 | 25.6250 | 6.23490 | NS(0.764) |
| Year 3 and 4 | 4 | 23.0000 | 5.62494 |

Table 15 comparison of body composition between non-health related majors student in different years. There was a significant association between BMI, and the first and second year and third and fourth-year students from non-health related major (*p*=0.033). The third and fourth-year students from non-health related major students had a lower mean of BMI (=23.2), fat (=23%) than the first and second-year students. Although there no statically significant was found, first and second-year students had a lower mean of WC (=29.4), WHR (=0.75) than third and fourth-year students in non-health related major.

Table 16 ANOVA about the Relation between EAT-26 and TDS Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVA** | | | | | | |
|  | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| TDSQ1 | Between Groups | 1.881 | 3 | .627 | .430 | .732 |
| Within Groups | 84.506 | 58 | 1.457 |  |  |
| Total | 86.387 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ2 | Between Groups | 7.824 | 3 | 2.608 | 3.394 | .024 |
| Within Groups | 44.563 | 58 | .768 |  |  |
| Total | 52.387 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ3 | Between Groups | 3.041 | 3 | 1.014 | 1.491 | .227 |
| Within Groups | 39.427 | 58 | .680 |  |  |
| Total | 42.468 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ4 | Between Groups | 2.822 | 3 | .941 | 1.683 | .181 |
| Within Groups | 32.420 | 58 | .559 |  |  |
| Total | 35.242 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ5 | Between Groups | .852 | 3 | .284 | 2.186 | .099 |
| Within Groups | 7.535 | 58 | .130 |  |  |
| Total | 8.387 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ6 | Between Groups | .046 | 3 | .015 | .956 | .420 |
| Within Groups | .938 | 58 | .016 |  |  |
| Total | .984 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ7 | Between Groups | .906 | 3 | .302 | .524 | .667 |
| Within Groups | 33.432 | 58 | .576 |  |  |
| Total | 34.339 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ8 | Between Groups | .233 | 3 | .078 | .258 | .855 |
| Within Groups | 17.461 | 58 | .301 |  |  |
| Total | 17.694 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ9 | Between Groups | 2.912 | 3 | .971 | 1.619 | .195 |
| Within Groups | 34.766 | 58 | .599 |  |  |
| Total | 37.677 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ10 | Between Groups | 2.368 | 3 | .789 | 1.101 | .356 |
| Within Groups | 41.567 | 58 | .717 |  |  |
| Total | 43.935 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ11 | Between Groups | 1.531 | 3 | .510 | .621 | .604 |
| Within Groups | 47.646 | 58 | .821 |  |  |
| Total | 49.177 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ12 | Between Groups | 1.417 | 3 | .472 | .730 | .538 |
| Within Groups | 37.503 | 58 | .647 |  |  |
| Total | 38.919 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ13 | Between Groups | .774 | 3 | .258 | .261 | .853 |
| Within Groups | 57.419 | 58 | .990 |  |  |
| Total | 58.194 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ14 | Between Groups | .959 | 3 | .320 | .469 | .705 |
| Within Groups | 39.509 | 58 | .681 |  |  |
| Total | 40.468 | 61 |  |  |  |
| TDSQ15 | Between Groups | 5.764 | 3 | 1.921 | 2.476 | .070 |
| Within Groups | 45.011 | 58 | .776 |  |  |
| Total | 50.774 | 61 |  |  |  |

Table 16 based on the results of the ANOVA test that defines about the association between the variables of EAT-26 and all the TDS scores used in the model. The approach of one-way ANOVA is applied in the test as there are only two variables. The output of the ANOVA table explains about the existence of statistically difference between different group means. The results of the ANOVA test explain that there are two values of TDS 2 and TDS 15 that referred as statistically significantly when it comes to the p values in table. The p-values for these scores are 0.024 and 0.07 respectively which is below the standard of 0.05 ultimately referred as the existence of the significant mean difference exist between these groups.

The test of ANOVA based on the proper consideration of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) that is used to identify the existing difference between means of groups to find out the prevailing difference (Vik, 2013).

Table 17 F test about the Association between EAT-26 and TDS Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 13.465 | 15 | .898 | 1.102 | .381b |
| Residual | 37.455 | 46 | .814 |  |  |
| Total | 50.919 | 61 |  |  |  |
| a. Dependent Variable: EATQ26 | | | | | | |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), TDSQ15, TDSQ8, TDSQ2, TDSQ5, TDSQ14, TDSQ3, TDSQ11, TDSQ6, TDSQ10, TDSQ7, TDSQ9, TDSQ1, TDSQ4, TDSQ13, TDSQ12 | | | | | | |

Table 17 is the representation of the results of the F test that is used to determine about the overall fitness of the model. It explains about the overall significance of the regression model. The result of f test in the table explains about the variance of the group means. The value for the F test in 1.102 which is close to 1 that’s why it positively explains about the overall significance of the association. The significant value of p-value with the value of .381 ultimately helps to determine about the value of f test for the model. The overall f-test clearly explains about the overall strength of the relationship between the variables of EAT-26 and all the scores of TDS.

Table 18 Correlation between EAT-26 and TDS Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | | | | | |
|  | | EATQ26 | TDSQ1 | TDSQ2 | TDSQ3 | TDSQ4 | TDSQ5 |
| EATQ26 | Pearson Correlation | 1 | -.135 | -.175 | .059 | -.281\* | -.192 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .295 | .174 | .651 | .027 | .135 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ1 | Pearson Correlation | -.135 | 1 | -.392\*\* | -.005 | .568\*\* | .237 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .295 |  | .002 | .971 | .000 | .063 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ2 | Pearson Correlation | -.175 | -.392\*\* | 1 | .261\* | -.218 | -.066 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .174 | .002 |  | .041 | .089 | .609 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ3 | Pearson Correlation | .059 | -.005 | .261\* | 1 | .000 | -.015 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .651 | .971 | .041 |  | .997 | .906 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ4 | Pearson Correlation | -.281\* | .568\*\* | -.218 | .000 | 1 | .311\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .027 | .000 | .089 | .997 |  | .014 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ5 | Pearson Correlation | -.192 | .237 | -.066 | -.015 | .311\* | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .135 | .063 | .609 | .906 | .014 |  |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| \*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | |

Table 18 explains about the existing correlation between EAT-26 and the particular scores of TDS referred as TDS 1, TDS 2, TDS 3, TDS 4, and TDS 5. The statistical aspect in the form of correlation helps to determine about the existing strength of relationship between the variables. The following table indicate about the existing association between EAT-26 and TDS scores. The significance of p-value for the test determine on 2-tailed with the sample of 62. The value of -.135 determine about the significant association between EAT-26 and TDS 1 as the p-value is below 0.05. The value of -.175 determine about the significant association between EAT-26 and TDS 2 as the p-value is below 0.05. The p-value for TDS 3 is .059 that refer it as insignificant information to reject the null hypothesis. The value of -.281 determine about the significant association between EAT-26 and TDS 4 as the p-value is below 0.05. The results of TDS 5 also explain its strong linear relationship with EAT-26. The value of -.192 determine about the significant association between EAT-26 and TDS 5 as the p-value is below 0.05.

Table 19 Correlation between EAT-26 and TDS Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | | | | | |
|  | | EATQ26 | TDSQ6 | TDSQ7 | TDSQ8 | TDSQ9 | TDSQ10 |
| EATQ26 | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .057 | .068 | .112 | .004 | -.207 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .660 | .598 | .385 | .977 | .106 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ6 | Pearson Correlation | .057 | 1 | -.219 | .274\* | .196 | .005 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .660 |  | .087 | .031 | .127 | .970 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ7 | Pearson Correlation | .068 | -.219 | 1 | -.224 | -.020 | .066 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .598 | .087 |  | .079 | .879 | .612 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ8 | Pearson Correlation | .112 | .274\* | -.224 | 1 | .087 | -.154 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .385 | .031 | .079 |  | .499 | .232 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ9 | Pearson Correlation | .004 | .196 | -.020 | .087 | 1 | .089 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .977 | .127 | .879 | .499 |  | .493 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ10 | Pearson Correlation | -.207 | .005 | .066 | -.154 | .089 | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .106 | .970 | .612 | .232 | .493 |  |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| \*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | |

Table 19 is the explanation of the outcomes of correlation between the variables of EAT-26 and scores of TDS in the form of TDS 6, TDS 7, TDS 8. TDS 9, and TDS 10. The p value for the relationship between EAT-26 and TDS 6 identify as .057 that refer the insignificant association between these two elements. The p-value for TDS 7 is .068 that refer it as insignificant information to reject the null hypothesis. The p-value for TDS 8 is .112 that refer it as insignificant information to reject the null hypothesis. The value of .004 determine about the significant association between EAT-26 and TDS 9 as the p-value is below 0.05. The value of -.207 determine about the significant association between EAT-26 and TDS 10 as the p-value is below 0.05.

Table 20 Correlation between EAT-26 and TDS Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | | | | | |
|  | | EATQ26 | TDSQ11 | TDSQ12 | TDSQ13 | TDSQ14 | TDSQ15 |
| EATQ26 | Pearson Correlation | 1 | -.007 | -.024 | .071 | .082 | -.143 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .958 | .851 | .583 | .526 | .268 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ11 | Pearson Correlation | -.007 | 1 | .678\*\* | .622\*\* | .427\*\* | -.130 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .958 |  | .000 | .000 | .001 | .315 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ12 | Pearson Correlation | -.024 | .678\*\* | 1 | .607\*\* | .673\*\* | -.298\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .851 | .000 |  | .000 | .000 | .019 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ13 | Pearson Correlation | .071 | .622\*\* | .607\*\* | 1 | .704\*\* | -.177 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .583 | .000 | .000 |  | .000 | .169 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ14 | Pearson Correlation | .082 | .427\*\* | .673\*\* | .704\*\* | 1 | -.236 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .526 | .001 | .000 | .000 |  | .065 |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| TDSQ15 | Pearson Correlation | -.143 | -.130 | -.298\* | -.177 | -.236 | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .268 | .315 | .019 | .169 | .065 |  |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | |
| \*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | |

Table 20 is the explanation of the outcomes of correlation between the variables of EAT-26 and scores of TDS in the form of TDS 11, TDS 12, TDS 13, TDS 14, and TDS 15. The p value for the relationship between EAT-26 and TDS 11 identify as -.007 that refer the significant association between these two elements. The p-value for TDS 12 is -.024 that refer it as significant information to identify the existing relationship between EAT-26 and TDS 12. The p-value for TDS 13 is .071 that refer it as insignificant information to reject the null hypothesis. The value of .082 determine the insignificant association between EAT-26 and TDS 14 as the p-value is below 0.05. The value of -.143 determine about the significant association between EAT-26 and TDS 15 as the p-value is below 0.05.
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