## Multiple Regression

Three tables are presented. The first table is an example of a four-step hierarchical regression, which involves the interaction between two continuous scores. In this example, structural (or demographic) variables are entered at Step 1 (Model 1), age (centered) is added at Step 2 (Model 2), depression (centered) is added at Step 3 (Model 3), and the interaction between the centered age and centered depression scores is added at Step 4 (Model 4).

The second table is an example of a hierarchical regression that involves the interaction between a categorical score and a continuous score. In this example, structural (or demographic) variables are entered at Step 1 (Model 1), three dummy variables representing information about number of divorces is added at Step 2 (Model 2), depression is added at Step 3 (Model 3), and the interaction between each of the dummy variables and depression is added at Step 4 (Model 4).

Table 3 is an example of a simple regression performed separately for husbands and for wives.
For all regression analyses, some report of effect size should be given for the overall model (such as $R^{2}$ ) as well as for the individual predictors (such as converting the $F$ ratios or $t$ ratios associated with each predictor in the final equation to an effect-size $r$ ). We recommend reporting both the unstandardized B and the standardized $\beta$. Additional measures of strength of effects such as squared semipartial correlations might also be reported. See

Rosenthal, R. (1994). Parametric measures of effect size. In H. Cooper \& L. V. Hedges (Eds.), The handbook of research synthesis (pp. 231 - 244). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

These tables were prepared so that they would be clear to reviewers. If a manuscript is accepted for publication, the author may be asked to submit a version following APA guidelines on spacing and margins.

Table 1
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Wives' Marital Quality $(\mathbb{N}=538)$

| Variable | Model 1 |  |  | Model 2 |  |  | Model 3 |  |  | Model 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B | SE B | $\beta$ | B | SE B | $\beta$ | B | SE B | $\beta$ | B | $S E(B)$ | $\beta$ |
| Education | 0.58 | 0.27 | .10* | -0.99 | 0.59 | -. 08 | -1.67 | 0.54 | -.13** | -1.66 | 0.55 | -. 13 ** |
| Income | -1.16 | 0.59 | -. 10 | 0.33 | 0.28 | . 06 | 0.12 | 0.25 | . 02 | 0.12 | 0.25 | . 02 |
| Age |  |  |  | 0.22 | 0.07 | .13** | 0.14 | 0.06 | .08* | 0.13 | 0.07 | .08* |
| Depression |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-0.71$ | 0.06 | -.41 ** | -0.71 | 0.07 | $-.41^{* *}$ |
| Age $\times$ Depression |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.01 | 0.01 | -. 01 |
| $R^{2}$ |  | . 01 |  |  | . 16 |  |  | . 43 |  |  | . 43 |  |
| $F$ for change in $R^{2}$ |  | 2.87 |  |  | 8.94** |  |  | 105.79** |  |  | 0.18 |  |

Note: Age and depression were centered at their means.
${ }^{*} p<.05 . * * p<.01$.

Table 2

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Wives' Marital Quality $(\mathrm{N}=538)$

| Variable | Model 1 |  |  | Model 2 |  |  | Model 3 |  |  | Model 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B | SE B | $\beta$ | B | SE B | $\beta$ | B | SE B | $\beta$ | $B$ | $S E(B)$ | $\beta$ |
| Age | 0.25 | 0.08 | .13** | 0.22 | 0.10 | .12* | 0.12 | 0.09 | . 07 | 0.12 | 0.09 | . 06 |
| Education | -0.95 | 0.60 | -. 07 | -0.88 | 0.65 | -. 07 | $-1.47$ | 0.59 | $-.12 * *$ | $-1.56$ | 0.59 | $-.12 * *$ |
| Income | 0.27 | 0.28 | . 04 | 0.27 | 0.28 | . 04 | 0.02 | 0.26 | . 00 | 0.01 | 0.26 | . 00 |
| Number of divorces |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 versus 0 |  |  |  | 1.40 | 1.64 | . 04 | 1.43 | 1.50 | . 04 | 3.84 | 2.06 | . 12 |
| 2 versus 0 |  |  |  | -0.13 | 2.68 | . 00 | 0.40 | 2.44 | . 00 | 3.16 | 3.43 | . 05 |
| >2 versus 0 |  |  |  | -0.45 | 3.07 | . 00 | 1.41 | 2.80 | . 02 | -0.46 | 4.07 | -. 01 |
| Depression |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.72 | 0.06 | $-.42 * *$ | -0.65 | 0.08 | $-.37^{* *}$ |
| Number of divorces $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depression |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 versus 0 x Depression |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.28 | 0.16 | -. 11 |
| 2 versus 0 x Depression |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.31 | 0.28 | -. 06 |
| $>2$ versus $0 \times$ Depression |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.16 | 0.28 | . 03 |
| $R^{2}$ |  | . 02 |  |  | . 02 |  |  | . 19 |  |  | . 20 |  |
| $F$ for change in $R^{2}$ |  | 4.66** |  |  | 0.36 |  |  | 106.76** |  |  | 1.54 |  |

Note: Number of divorces was represented as three dummy variables with 0 divorces serving as the reference group.
${ }^{*} p<.05 .{ }^{* *} p<.01$.

Table 3
Summary of Simple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Wives' Marital Quality and Husbands' Marital Quality ( $\mathrm{N}=155$ )

|  | Wives |  |  | Husbands |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | $B$ | $S E B$ | $\beta$ | $B$ | $S E B$ | $\beta$ |  |
| Neuroticism | -0.34 | 0.16 | $-.17^{*}$ | 0.20 | 0.21 | .09 |  |
| Extraversion | 0.08 | 0.19 | .03 | 0.28 | 0.25 | .11 |  |
| Openness | 0.07 | 0.19 | .02 | -0.14 | 0.18 | -.07 |  |
| Agreeableness | 0.74 | 0.24 | $.24^{* *}$ | 0.48 | 0.24 | $.17^{*}$ |  |
| Conscientiousness | 0.17 | 0.21 | .06 | 0.45 | 0.23 | $.17^{*}$ |  |
| $R^{2}$ |  |  | .15 |  |  | .07 |  |
| $F$ |  | $5.48^{* *}$ |  |  | $2.42^{*}$ |  |  |

$* p<.05 . * * p<.01$.
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