## SPSS: k Within-Groups ANOVA \& Trend Analyses

Application: To examine the "shape" of the IV-DV relationship (only used when IV conditions are equally spaced)
Research Hypothesis: The researcher hypothesized there would be a negative linear relationship between time in therapy and depression scores

H0: for this analysis: There is no mean differences among mean performance in the different anxiety conditions.

## Analyze $\rightarrow$ General Linear Model $\rightarrow$ Repeated Measures

- enter your name for the IV in the "Within-subject Factor Name" window (MonthTx)
- enter the number of conditions of the IV in the "Number of levels" window (6)
- click the "Add" button
- click the "Define" button to go to the "Repeated Measures" window
- for each IV condition - highlight the variable that is the DV score for that condition and click the arrow
- Click the "Contrasts" - use the drop-down to select "Polynomial" \& click "Change"
- Click the "Profile Plots" - and put the IV into the "Horizontal Axis" box
- Click the "Options" - check that you want "Descriptives"



Here is the SPSS syntax:
GLM dcmo1 dcmo2 dcmo3 dcmo4 dcmo5 dcmo6 WSFACTOR=MonthsTx 6 Polynomial /METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/PRINT=DESCRIPTIVE
/CRITERIA=ALPHA(.05)
WSDESIGN=MonthsTx.


Please note: The Polynomial procedure assumes that the IV conditions are equally spaced. If you have unequal spacing the polynomial tests will be misleading!

## Descriptive Statistics

|  | Mean | Std. Deviation | $N$ |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| dcmo1 | 74.7375 | 6.80240 | 42 |
| demo2 | 73.8750 | 7.40920 | 42 |
| demo3 | 65.3125 | 8.14990 | 42 |
| demo4 | 58.8125 | 7.37120 | 42 |
| demo5 | 54.3250 | 7.71610 | 42 |
| dcmo6 | 54.1125 | 7.22880 | 42 |



Tests of Within-Subjects Effects
Measure:MEASURE_1

| Source |  | Type III Sum <br> of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| MonthsTx | Sphericity Assumed | 18122.182 | 5 | 3624.436 | 63.137 | .000 |
|  | Greenhouse-Geisser | 18122.182 | 4.382 | 4135.408 | 63.137 | .000 |
|  | Huynh-Feldt | 18122.182 | 4.972 | 3645.074 | 63.137 | .000 |
|  | Lower-bound | 18122.182 | 1.000 | 18122.182 | 63.137 | .000 |
| Error(MonthsTx) | SphericityAssumed | 11768.303 | 205 | 57.406 |  |  |
|  | Greenhouse-Geisser | 11768.303 | 179.670 | 65.499 |  |  |
|  | Huynh-Feldt | 11768.303 | 203.839 | 57.733 |  |  |
|  | Lower-bound | 11768.303 | 41.000 | 287.032 |  |  |

Remember, even if the printout shows it, never report $p=.000$, because that would suggest there is no possibility of a Type 1 error. Instead, report "p < .001"

The $p$-value of means that there is less than a $.1 \%$ chance that this result is a Type I error
Use the "Sphericity Assumed" df, Mean Suare Error \& p

The trend analysis results show...
Tests of Within-Subjects Contrasts
Measure:MEASURE_1
Measure:MEASURE_1

|  | Source | MonthsTx | Type III Sum <br> of Squares | df | Mean Square | F |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| MonthsTX | Linear | 16989.885 | 1 | 16989.885 | 252.935 | .000 |
|  | Quadratic | 191.101 | 1 | 191.101 | 3.161 | .083 |
|  | Cubic | 832.318 | 1 | 832.318 | 13.238 | .001 |
| Error(MonthsTx) | Linear | 2754.005 | 41 | 67.171 |  |  |
|  | Quadratic | 2479.013 | 41 | 60.464 |  |  |
|  | Cubic | 2577.781 | 41 | 62.873 |  |  |

A significant linear trend

- Inspection of the means \& plot shows a negative linear trend
- This result supports the RH:
nonsignificant quadratic trend
- This result supports the RH:

A significant cubic trend

- Inspection shows inflection points at 2 \& 5 months
- This result does not support the RH: (of only a negative linear trend)


## Reporting the Results

The mean depression scores for each amount of time in therapy are shown in Table/Figure 1. There was a difference among the group means, $\mathrm{F}(5,205)=63.137, \mathrm{p}<.001$, $\mathrm{Mse}=57.406$. As hypothesized there was a negative linear trend to the data, $F(1,41)=252.935, \mathrm{p}<.001, \mathrm{MSe}=61.171$. Also, there was no quadratic trend, $F(1,41)=3.161$, $p=.083$, Mse $=60.464$, However, contrary to the hypothesis there was also a significant Cubic trend, $F(1,41)=13.238, p$ $=.001$, Mse $=62.876$. In summary, the data show a combined trend including a negative linear and cubic trend such that depression scores changed little from the first to the second session, then decreased consistently through the fifth session and then leveled off.

