\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Model = 4

Y = Gossip

X = Age

M = Mate\_Val

Sample size

81

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Outcome: Mate\_Val

Model Summary

R R-sq F df1 df2 p

.3815 .1455 13.4522 1.0000 79.0000 .0004

Model

coeff se t p

constant 3.7981 .2366 16.0558 .0000

Age -.0266 .0073 -3.6677 .0004

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Outcome: Gossip

Model Summary

R R-sq F df1 df2 p

.4614 .2129 10.5468 2.0000 78.0000 .0001

Model

coeff se t p

constant 1.1963 .5495 2.1771 .0325

Mate\_Val .4546 .1266 3.5921 .0006

Age -.0113 .0088 -1.2753 .2060

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* TOTAL EFFECT MODEL \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Outcome: Gossip

Model Summary

R R-sq F df1 df2 p

.2875 .0827 7.1180 1.0000 79.0000 .0093

Model

coeff se t p

constant 2.9230 .2855 10.2397 .0000

Age -.0234 .0088 -2.6680 .0093

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* TOTAL, DIRECT, AND INDIRECT EFFECTS \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Total effect of X on Y

Effect SE t p

-.0234 .0088 -2.6680 .0093

Direct effect of X on Y

Effect SE t p

-.0113 .0088 -1.2753 .2060

Indirect effect of X on Y

Effect Boot SE BootLLCI BootULCI

Mate\_Val -.0121 .0056 -.0276 -.0037

Partially standardized indirect effect of X on Y

Effect Boot SE BootLLCI BootULCI

Mate\_Val -.0122 .0052 -.0254 -.0040

Completely standardized indirect effect of X on Y

Effect Boot SE BootLLCI BootULCI

Mate\_Val -.1489 .0632 -.3044 -.0480

Ratio of indirect to total effect of X on Y

Effect Boot SE BootLLCI BootULCI

Mate\_Val .5179 .9902 .1568 1.6690

Ratio of indirect to direct effect of X on Y

Effect Boot SE BootLLCI BootULCI

Mate\_Val 1.0744 31.7645 -1.9585 32.7968

R-squared mediation effect size (R-sq\_med)

Effect Boot SE BootLLCI BootULCI

Mate\_Val .0662 .0388 .0122 .1759

Preacher and Kelley (2011) Kappa-squared

Effect Boot SE BootLLCI BootULCI

Mate\_Val .1458 .0599 .0464 .2843

Normal theory tests for indirect effect

Effect se Z p

-.0121 .0048 -2.5190 .0118

**Results**

Treatment condition for housing (either treated or control group) was used to predict days in housing, with housing contacts expected to mediate the relationship between treatment condition and days in housing. Data were screened for multivariate outliers, leverage and influence and two cases were removed as outliers and influential data points. All other assumptions of regression were checked and appeared satisfactory.

See Figure 1 for visual diagram of the mediated relationship. First, using steps described by Baron and Kenny (1986), treatment was a significant predictor of days in housing (the *c* pathway), as shown in Table 1. The treatment condition showed a higher number of days in housing than the control condition, *t*(105) = 2.72, *p* = .01, *pr2* = .07. Second, treatment condition was used to predict the mediator variable of housing contacts (the *a* pathway), which showed that treatment condition was positively related to housing contacts, *t*(105) = 2.98, *p* = .01, *pr2* = .08. Third, the relationship between the mediator housing contacts and days in housing was examined controlling for the treatment condition (the *b* pathway). Number of housing contacts was positively related to the number of days in housing, *t*(104) = 4.96, *p* <.001, *pr2* = .19. Lastly, the mediated relationship between treatment condition and days in housing was examined for a drop in prediction when the mediator was added to the model (the *c’* pathway). Full mediation was found, showing that the relationship between treatment condition and days in housing was no longer significant after controlling for housing contacts, *t*(104) = 1.50, *p* = .14, *pr2* = .02. The Sobel test was used to determine that the *ab* effect was significantly greater than zero, *Z* = 2.55, *p* = .01.

|  |
| --- |
| *b* 1.74  *a* 1.89  Housing Contacts  *c'* 3.55  *c* 6.82  Days in Housing  Treatment Condition |

*Figure 1.* Mediated relationship between treatment condition and days in housing with housing contacts as the mediator.

Table 1

*Model Summaries for Mediation Analysis.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | *F* | *p* | *R2* |
| Treatment Condition predicting Days in Housing | (1, 105) = 7.38 | <.01 | .07 |
| Treatment Condition predicting Housing Contacts | (1, 105) = 8.87 | <.01 | .08 |
| Treatment Condition and Housing Contacts predicting Days in Housing | (1, 104) = 16.82 | <.001 | .24 |

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*  
Model = 1  
    Y = Aggressi  
    X = Vid\_Game  
    M = CaUnTs  
  
Sample size  
        442  
  
\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*  
Outcome: Aggressi  
  
Model Summary  
          R       R-sq          F        df1        df2          p  
      .6142      .3773    90.5311     3.0000   438.0000      .0000  
  
Model  
              coeff         se          t          p       LLCI       ULCI  
constant    39.9671      .4750    84.1365      .0000    39.0335    40.9007  
CaUnTs        .7601      .0466    16.3042      .0000      .6685      .8517  
Vid\_Game      .1696      .0759     2.2343      .0260      .0204      .3188  
int\_1         .0271      .0073     3.7051      .0002      .0127      .0414  
  
Interactions:  
  
 int\_1    Vid\_Game    X     CaUnTs  
  
\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*  
  
Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):  
     CaUnTs     Effect         se          t          p       LLCI       ULCI  
    -9.6177     -.0907      .1058     -.8568      .3920     -.2986      .1173  
      .0000      .1696      .0759     2.2343      .0260      .0204      .3188  
     9.6177      .4299      .1010     4.2562      .0000      .2314      .6284  
  
Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean.  
Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.  
  
\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* JOHNSON-NEYMAN TECHNIQUE \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*  
Moderator value(s) defining Johnson-Neyman significance region(s):  
      Value    % below    % above  
   -17.1002     1.3575    98.6425  
     -.7232    48.8688    51.1312  
  
Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator (M)  
     CaUnTs     Effect         se          t          p       LLCI       ULCI  
   -18.5950     -.3336      .1587    -2.1027      .0361     -.6454     -.0218  
   -17.1002     -.2931      .1492    -1.9654      .0500     -.5863      .0000  
   -16.4450     -.2754      .1451    -1.8987      .0583     -.5605      .0097  
   -14.2950     -.2172      .1319    -1.6467      .1003     -.4765      .0420  
   -12.1450     -.1590      .1194    -1.3319      .1836     -.3937      .0756  
    -9.9950     -.1009      .1077     -.9361      .3497     -.3126      .1109  
    -7.8450     -.0427      .0972     -.4390      .6609     -.2338      .1484  
    -5.6950      .0155      .0882      .1757      .8606     -.1579      .1889  
    -3.5450      .0737      .0813      .9059      .3655     -.0862      .2336  
    -1.3950      .1319      .0771     1.7111      .0878     -.0196      .2833  
     -.7232      .1501      .0763     1.9654      .0500      .0000      .3001  
      .7550      .1901      .0759     2.5053      .0126      .0410      .3392  
     2.9050      .2482      .0779     3.1878      .0015      .0952      .4013  
     5.0550      .3064      .0829     3.6980      .0002      .1436      .4693  
     7.2050      .3646      .0903     4.0360      .0001      .1871      .5422  
     9.3550      .4228      .0997     4.2386      .0000      .2267      .6188  
    11.5050      .4810      .1106     4.3490      .0000      .2636      .6983  
    13.6550      .5392      .1225     4.4013      .0000      .2984      .7799  
    15.8050      .5973      .1352     4.4188      .0000      .3317      .8630  
    17.9550      .6555      .1484     4.4160      .0000      .3638      .9473  
    20.1050      .7137      .1621     4.4017      .0000      .3950     1.0324  
    22.2550      .7719      .1762     4.3814      .0000      .4256     1.1181  
    24.4050      .8301      .1905     4.3580      .0000      .4557     1.2044  
  
\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*  
Data for visualizing conditional effect of X of Y:  
   Vid\_Game     CaUnTs       yhat  
    -6.9622    -9.6177    33.2879  
      .0000    -9.6177    32.6568  
     6.9622    -9.6177    32.0256  
    -6.9622      .0000    38.7861  
      .0000      .0000    39.9671  
     6.9622      .0000    41.1481  
    -6.9622     9.6177    44.2844  
      .0000     9.6177    47.2774  
     6.9622     9.6177    50.2705

**Results**

Attendance and number of books read during a semester were used to predict final class grade. Data were checked for outliers and assumptions of regression, and no violations were found. The PROCESS plug-in for SPSS was used to analyze the interaction between attendance and books read in a semester (Hayes, 2013). The main effects of attendance and books were significant predictors of grades, *F*(3,37)=9.06, *p*=.001, R2 = .33. As a person attended more classes, their course grade increased significantly, β =.33, *t*(37) = 2.20, *p*=.04, *pr2*=.11. Students could also increase their course grades by reading more books throughout the semester, β=.35, *t*(37) = 2.30, *p*=.03, *pr2*=.12. Course grades were also predicted by the interaction between books read and attendance in the course. Figure 1 shows the interaction between our predictors. For average attendance, there was a significant increase in grades when reading more books, β=.36, *t*(36) = 2.48, *p*=.02, *pr*2 = .15. For low attendance, there was a non-significant difference in scores when reading more books, β=-.80, *t*(36) = -1.42, *p*=.16, *pr*2 = .05. Finally, high attending participants showed the largest increase when reading more books, β=1.51, *t*(36) = 2.64, *p*=.01, *pr*2 =.16.

[include SPSS figure]