```
> anova(model)
Anova Table (Type 3 tests)

Response: Score
          num Df den Df    MSE      F     ges    Pr(>F)
Condition 2.8203  87.43 24.928 249.04 0.84892 < 2.2e-16 ***
---
Signif. codes:  0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1
```

So we know we have an effect of Condition, but we don’t know where the difference lies…

Let’s do some post hoc tests with Bonferroni corrected *p*-values…

```
> emmeans(model, pairwise ~ Condition, adjust = “Bonferroni")
$emmeans
 Condition   emmean        SE     df lower.CL upper.CL
 Very.Easy 83.50000 0.8861571 122.33 81.74581 85.25419
 Easy      81.62500 0.8861571 122.33 79.87081 83.37919
 Hard      72.37500 0.8861571 122.33 70.62081 74.12919
 Very.Hard 53.96875 0.8861571 122.33 52.21456 55.72294

Confidence level used: 0.95

$contrasts
 contrast              estimate       SE df t.ratio p.value
 Very.Easy - Easy       1.87500 1.210249 93   1.549  0.7483
 Very.Easy - Hard      11.12500 1.210249 93   9.192  <.0001
 Very.Easy - Very.Hard 29.53125 1.210249 93  24.401  <.0001
 Easy - Hard            9.25000 1.210249 93   7.643  <.0001
 Easy - Very.Hard      27.65625 1.210249 93  22.852  <.0001
 Hard - Very.Hard      18.40625 1.210249 93  15.209  <.0001

P value adjustment: bonferroni method for 6 tests
```

- We see each level differs from each other, apart from Very Easy *vs*. Easy (where p = .75).