

```

> 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  $p = .75$ ).