Discussion on Multiple Comparisons

To further strengthen the above findings, Bonferroni Post Hoc Comparisons were conducted for all possible pairs of group means. Statistically, this method is one of the most conservative among all post hoc comparison techniques to keep the 'family wise error rate' under check, in the process of conducting multiple comparisons of group means in pairs. The interpretation can then be in terms of whether one group mean is significantly different from another. For a detailed discussion on this, please see San Jose State University Faculty (n.d.) Practically, this may be used as a cross-check of the responses (in pairs) to the questions asked in the questionnaire, based on which higher level of reliability (or otherwise) can be attached to them. The results are discussed below.

Firstly, responses for 'training being worth investment' and 'impact of SOX training on job performance' were compared. Significant mean difference (p value = .016) was reported between 'No impact' of former and 'Substantial impact' of latter and vice-versa. This can be seen as a broad consistency in the responses to two questions. To make this point clear, one instance can be taken. The group of respondents saying that training is NOT worth their investment is different from the group saying that SOX training had substantial impact on their job performance. This is what is logically expected. The test thus provides a means to cross-check responses (to the questions referred above) adding to their credibility.

In a similar way, several other pairs of questions are compared and responses cross-checked. The results are more or less the same as above.

The results corresponding to 'Don't know/No answer category' is ignored for all practical purposes in all multiple comparisons.