**APA REPORTING EXAMPLES**

**Spearman’s Rho**

The relationship between [variable 1] and [variable 2] was investigated using Spearman’s rho Correlation. There was a strong, positive correlation between the two variables [r=\_\_\_, n=\_\_\_, p<.05] with high [variable 1] associated with high [variable 2].

**Cronbach’s Alpha**

Using SPSS software, Cronbach's alpha statistic was estimated to test the reliability of the scales. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale including the \_\_\_ questions was \_\_\_. Scale Inter-item Correlation indicated that question \_\_\_ had negative correlation values with all other questions. Question \_\_\_ was deleted and Cronbach's alpha became \_\_\_ indicating an excellent level of internal consistency of the scale.

**Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation**

The relationship between [variable 1] and [variable 2] was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a strong, positive correlation between the two variables [r=\_\_\_, n=\_\_\_, p<.05] with high [variable 1] associated with high [variable 2].

**Partial Correlation**

Partial correlation was used to explore the relationship between \_\_\_ and \_\_\_, while controlling for \_\_\_. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a strong, positive, partial correlation between \_\_\_ and \_\_\_[r=\_\_\_, n=\_\_\_, p<.05] with high levels of \_\_\_ associated with higher levels of \_\_\_. An inspection of the zero order correlation (r=\_\_\_) suggested that controlling for \_\_\_ had little effect on the strength of the relationship between these two variables.

**Simple Linear Regression**

A simple linear regression was calculated to predict [dependent variable] based on [independent variable]. A significant regression equation was found (F(\_,\_\_)= \_\_.\_\_\_, p < .05), with an R2 of .\_\_\_\_. Participants’ predicted [dependent variable] is equal to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_+\_\_\_\_\_\_ [independent variable measure] [dependent variable] when [independent variable] is measured in [unit of measure]. [Dependent variable] increased \_\_\_\_\_ for each [unit of measure] of [independent variable].

**Multiple Linear Regression**

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict [dependent variable] based on [independent variable 1] and [independent variable 2]. A significant regression equation was found (F(\_,\_\_) = \_\_\_.\_\_\_, p < .05), with an R2 of .\_\_\_. Participants’ predicted [dependent variable] is equal to \_\_.\_\_\_ + \_\_.\_\_\_ [independent variable 1] + \_.\_\_\_ [independent variable 2], where [independent variable 1] is coded **or** measured as [1=\_\_\_,2=\_\_\_ or unit **or** measure], and [independent variable 2] is coded **or** measured as [1=\_\_\_, 2=\_\_\_**or** unit of measure]. Object of measurement increased \_.\_\_ [dependent variable unit of measure] for each [independent variable 1 unit of measure] and \_.\_\_ for each [independent variable 2 unit of measure]. Both [independent variable 1] and [independent variable 2] were significant predictors of [dependent variable].

**Principal Component Analysis PCA**

A PCA with subsequent rotation (Varimax) was conducted on \_\_\_ items of a questionnaire. Many correlations were in excess of 0.3 and both KMO and Bartlett’s tests produced criteria that supported the application of PCA. Communalities varied from \_\_\_ to \_\_\_. Applying Kaiser’s rule and the scree test, three factors were deemed important.

Following rotation, Factor one was loaded on \_\_\_ items that reflecting \_\_\_ and accounted for \_\_\_% of the variance exemplified by the highest loading items, [item] and [item]. Factor two was loaded on \_\_\_ items and accounted for \_\_\_% of the variance. It was labelled \_\_\_ and was presented by [item] and [item]. The third factor accounted for \_\_\_% of the variance and was loading on \_\_\_ items suggesting it was measuring \_\_\_, namely, [item], [item] and [item].

**Independent samples t-tests**

An independent t-test was conducted to compare the [dependent variable] scores for [independent variable level or condition 1] and [independent variable level or condition 2]. There was a significant difference in scores for [independent variable level or condition 1] (N=\_\_\_, M=\_\_\_, SD=\_\_\_) and [independent variable level or condition 2] (N=\_\_\_, M=\_\_\_, SD=\_\_\_); t(\_\_\_)=\_\_\_, p<.05). The magnitude of the differences in the means measured by Eta2 =\_\_\_.

**One way analysis of variance**

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to explore the effect of [name of effect (independent variable)] on the [dependent variable].

The subjects were divided into \_\_\_ groups according to their [independent variable] (Group 1:\_\_\_ [independent variable level]; Group 2:\_\_\_ [independent variable level]; Group 3:\_\_\_ [independent variable level]). There was a statistically significant difference at P<.05 level in the [dependent variable] for the \_\_\_ [independent variable] groups [F (\_\_\_, \_\_\_) =\_\_\_, p<.05]. The actual difference in mean scores was \_\_\_ as calculated using eta2. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Group 1(M=\_\_\_, SD=\_\_\_) was significantly different from Group 2(M=\_\_\_, SD=\_\_\_) and Group 3 (M=\_\_\_, SD=\_\_\_). Group 2 did not differ significantly from Group 3.

**Kruskal Wallis**

There was a statistically significant difference between the [dependent variable] by different [independent variable levels] (2(\_\_\_) =\_\_\_, p =<.05), with a mean rank of \_\_\_ for [independent variable level 1], \_\_\_ for [independent variable level 2], and \_\_\_ for [independent variable level 3].

**Mann Whitney U**

A Mann-Whitney test indicated that the [dependent variable] was greater for [independent variable level 1] (mean rank = \_\_\_) than for [independent variable level 2] (mean rank = \_\_\_), U= \_\_\_, p<.05.

Normality table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Group1 | Group2 | Group3 | Group4 | Group5 | Group6 |
| Skewness |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Histogram |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q-Q Plot |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SW, KS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean-median |  |  |  |  |  |  |