

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT**ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT**

Jeremy Gillentine

Department of Counselor Education and Supervision, Liberty University

COUC745 Advanced Multivariate Statistics and Quantitative Research

Dr. Fredrick Volk

April 15, 2024

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

Email: Jeremy Gillentine—jgillentine@liberty.edu

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

Independent Samples t-test

For the t-test, I will look at the question: Within the past 6 months, how many times have you intentionally viewed pornography online? This will be compared between males and females with the hypothesis that the males will use at a much higher rate than the females. When I pulled the data from the Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) Data Set provided by Dr. Volk, it indicates I should reject the null hypothesis because the research using this data set indicates men in fact do view pornography at a higher rate than women (Male, N=4168; M=3.91; SD=1.364; Females, N=3967; M=2.91; SD=1.513). Using the Leven's Test for equality of variances, the lower t-score (31.152) and the degrees of freedom (7948.858) indicates equal variances are not assumed.

Table 1

Group Statistics					
	What is your gender?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Within the past six months, how many times have you intentionally viewed pornography online?	Male	4168	3.91	1.364	.021
	Female	3967	2.91	1.513	.024

Additionally, I ran the t-test using: Within the past 6 months, how many times have you intentionally viewed pornography online? I then used the God 10 Loving variable and used the break point 8. My hypothesis is the more loving a person sees God to be the lower their

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

pornography use will be. I reject the null hypothesis because there is variance (though it is a minimal variance) between those who see God as having higher or lower levels of being loving. Also, the research fails to reject my hypothesis indicating that those who see God as having lower levels of being loving are using pornography at slightly higher rates (God is Loving ≥ 8 ; $N=863$; $M=3.32$; $SD=1.463$; < 8 ; $N=687$; $M=3.37$; $SD=1.326$). Using the Leven's Test for equality of variances, we see the lower t-score (-.642) and the degrees of freedom (1522.395) indicates the equal variances are not assumed. Though significant, the findings indicate the levels of use are indeed different but similar and would be a great area of further research to help achieve a better understanding of the data.

Table2

Group Statistics					
	GOD10-Loving	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Within the past six months, how many times have you intentionally viewed pornography online?	≥ 8.00	863	3.32	1.463	.050
	< 8.00	687	3.37	1.326	.051

Repeated measures t-test

The repeated measures t-test (paired samples t-test SPSS) was preformed using the data from the Tests Of Self Conscience Affect; TOSCA-Shame, TOSCA-GUILT, and TOSCA-Blaming Others. When shame and guilt were paired, there was a significant difference between shame ($M=36.7515$; $SD=8.24352$) and guilt ($M=44.4380$; $SD=7.52492$) with guilt being significantly higher. When shame and blaming others were paired, there was a significant difference between

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

shame ($M=36.7835$; $SD=8.23149$) and blaming others ($M=28.9072$; $SD=10.18429$) with blaming others being significantly lower. When guilt and blaming others were paired, there was a significant difference between guilt ($M=44.4365$; $SD=7.52923$) and blaming others ($M=28.9006$; $SD=10.18974$) with blaming others being significantly lower. The data indicates that guilt has the highest levels of the three areas with shame and then blaming others following in statistical significance. The data indicates that we should reject the null hypotheses for all three variations of the TOSCA data sets.

Table 3

		Paired Samples Statistics			
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	TOSCA-Shame	36.7515	7336	8.24352	.09625
	TOSCA-Guilt	44.4380	7336	7.52492	.08786
Pair 2	TOSCA-Shame	36.7835	7394	8.23149	.09573
	TOSCA-Blaming Others	28.9072	7394	10.18429	.11844
Pair 3	TOSCA-Guilt	44.4365	7373	7.52923	.08769
	TOSCA-Blaming Others	28.9006	7373	10.18974	.11867

Table 4

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Significance	
				One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
Pair 1	TOSCA-Shame & TOSCA-Guilt	7336	.392	<.001	<.001
Pair 2	TOSCA-Shame & TOSCA-Blaming Others	7394	.378	<.001	<.001
Pair 3	TOSCA-Guilt & TOSCA-Blaming Others	7373	-.202	<.001	<.001

A one-way between subjects ANOVA.

I performed a one-way ANOVA between 'God' (belief in God) and 'Do you think of pornography when engaging in sexual activity with your spouse?' I also ran a Post Hoc Bonferroni and an LSD. Under 'Options' in SPSS, I selected Statistic Descriptive. I hypothesized that those with higher levels of belief in God will have lower levels of thoughts of pornography while engaging in sexual activities with their spouse. The data demonstrates that I should reject the null hypothesis. Further, the data demonstrates support for my hypothesis. There is a significant difference of .57 between the believe and do not believe groups indicating the lower the levels of belief that God is loving the higher the thoughts of pornography while engaged in sexual activities with their spouse (those who believe there is a God (M=2.73); sometimes believe (M=2.67); used to believe (M=3.06); and do not believe (M=3.30)). The ANOVA demonstrated statistical significance (<.001), with the effect size having an Eta-Squared estimate of .032. There was statistical significance supported for all groups in the LSD analysis except for

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

the 'I sometimes believe there is a God' category (.120). The same held true and was demonstrated with the Bonferroni analysis (.720).

Table 5 **Descriptives**
Do you think of pornography when engaging in sexual activity with your spouse?

N
Mean
Std. Deviation
Std. Error
95% Confidence Interval for Mean

Lower Bound
Upper Bound
I believe there is a God.
2328
2.73
1.06
.02
2.69
2.77
I sometimes believe there is a God.

Table 6

ANOVA

Do you think of pornography when engaging in sexual activity with your spouse?

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	127.750	3	42.583	42.248	<.001
Within Groups	3883.614	3853	1.008		
Total	4011.364	3856			

Two-way between subjects ANOVA

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

My hypothesis is that males will think about pornography at a much higher rate than females when engaged in sexual activities with their spouse. I performed a two-way ANOVA between 'God' (belief in God), Gender, and 'Do you think or pornography when engaging in sexual activity with your spouse?' I set the data select cases to Gender <3. I then went to the Analyze, General Linear Model, Univariate, with Fixed Factors of God (belief in God) and Gender, and the dependent variable of P_Spouse_Pres (Do you think or pornography when engaging in sexual activity with your spouse?). I used the model full factorial, Post Hoc test for God and Gender, the univariate estimates marginal means of Gender, God, and Gender*God and the compare main effects was also selected. Under options I selected Descriptive Statistics and Estimates of effect size. The means are almost identical for all categories of males and females with females having slightly higher levels of thinking about pornography while engaging in sexual activities with their spouse. Males who believe in God (M=2.61); sometimes believe (M=2.53); used to believe (M=2.91); do not believe in God (M=3.25). Females who believe in God (M=2.87); sometimes believe (M=2.85); used to believe (M=3.24); do not believe in God (M=3.37). As with the one-way ANOVA, we see the lower the level of belief the higher the thoughts of pornography while engaged in sexual activities with their spouse. The research indicates I should reject the null hypothesis. The research also indicates I should reject my hypothesis because men and women had almost identical levels of pornography thoughts with women being slightly higher. The significance is <.001 for all categories in the Test of Between Subjects Effects with the exception of the God-Gender being .383. On the Pairwise Comparison all areas demonstrated significance with the exception of the 'I sometimes believe there is a God' category showing a .210 for significance.

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable:

Do you think of pornography when engaging in sexual activity with your spouse?

What is your gender?	Please choose the answer that best describes your belief in God.	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	I believe there is a God.	2.61	1.063	1261
	I sometimes believe there is a God.	2.53	.967	512
	I used to believe there was a God but do not anymore.	2.91	.896	182
	I do not believe there is a God and I cannot say that I have ever believed in a God.	3.25	.752	171
	Total	2.67	1.023	2126
Female	I believe there is a God.	2.87	1.029	1062
	I sometimes believe there is a God.	2.85	1.013	376
	I used to believe there was a God but do not anymore.	3.24	.738	140
	I do not believe there is a God and I cannot say that I have ever believed in a God.	3.37	.734	139
	Total	2.94	.997	1717
Total	I believe there is a God.	2.73	1.055	2323
	I sometimes believe there is a God.	2.66	.999	888
	I used to believe there was a God but do not anymore.	3.05	.847	322

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

I do not believe there is a God and I cannot say that I have ever believed in a God.	3.30	.745	310
Total	2.79	1.020	3843

Table 8

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Do you think of pornography when engaging in sexual activity with your spouse?

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	197.755 ^a	7	28.251	28.495	<.001	.049
Intercept	17428.106	1	17428.106	17578.776	<.001	.821
Gender	33.503	1	33.503	33.792	<.001	.009
God	122.458	3	40.819	41.172	<.001	.031
Gender * God	3.028	3	1.009	1.018	.383	.001
Error	3802.130	3835	.991			
Total	33853.000	3843				
Corrected Total	3999.885	3842				

a. R Squared = .049 (Adjusted R Squared = .048)

ANCOVA

My hypothesis is that those with lower belief in God as loving will have a higher level of thinking about pornography when engaged in sexual activities with their spouse. I set the data

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

select cases to Gender <3. I then went to the Analyze, General Linear Model, Univariate, with Fixed Factors of God (belief in God), the dependent variable of P_Spouse_Pres (Do you think or pornography when engaging in sexual activity with your spouse?), and the covariates of age and TOSCASHA (shame). The univariate estimates marginal means of 'God' was selected as well as compare main effects. Under options I selected Descriptive Statistics and Estimates of effect size. The research indicates that we should reject the null hypothesis and supports the hypothesis that those with lower belief in God will have a higher level of thinking about pornography when engaged in sexual activities with their spouse. The Descriptive Statistics shows those who believe (M=2.62; SD=1.045); sometimes believe (M=2.57; SD=1.000); sometimes believe (M=2.95; SD=.873); and do not believe (M=3.2; SD=.741). The Test of Between Subjects Effects showed significance for all areas except age (.241). The Pairwise Comparison also demonstrated significances for all areas with the exceptions of 'I sometimes believe' with no significance (.501) and 'I do not believe' (.053) barely demonstrating significant.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Do you think of pornography when engaging in sexual activity with your spouse?

Please choose the answer that best describes your belief in God.	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I believe there is a God.	2.62	1.045	1906
I sometimes believe there is a God.	2.57	1.000	741
I used to believe there was a God but do not anymore.	2.95	.873	218

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

I do not believe there is a God and I cannot say that I have ever believed in a God.	3.21	.741	196
Total	2.67	1.020	3061

Evaluation of a correlation matrix between subgroups or theoretical framework

Sexual Shame (Partner) as corelated with God (belief in God) has significance for both males ($r=-.217^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=-.127^{**}$, $p=.004$) and each are negatively correlated.

Sexual Shame (Self) as corelated with God (belief in God) has significance for both males ($r=.233^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=-.137^{**}$, $p=.002$) with males being positively and females being negatively correlated.

Sexual Shame (Self) as corelated with Sexual Shame (Partner) has significance for both males ($r=.952^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.940^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

SexSat1 as corelated with God (belief in God) was negatively corelated for males and barely had significance ($r=-.080$, $p=.051$); where Females did not have significance ($r=-.031$, $p=.473$).

SexSat1 as corelated with Sexual Shame (Partner) was not significant for males ($r=-.013$, $p=.755$); where Females has significant and is positively corelated ($r=-.094^{*}$, $p=.031$).

SexSat1 as corelated with Sexual Shame (Self) was not significant for either males ($r=.002$, $p=.958$); or Females ($r=-.066$, $p=.131$).

TOSCA-Shame as corelated with God (belief in God) has no significance for males ($r=-.057$, $p=.163$); and borderline significance for Females with a positive correlation ($r=.086^{*}$, $p=.048$).

TOSCA-Shame as corelated with Sexual Shame (Partner) has significance for both males ($r=.536^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.251^{**}$, $p<.001$) and are each positively correlated.

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

TOSCA-Shame as correlated with Sexual Shame (Partner) has significance for both males ($r=.549^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.255^{**}$, $p<.001$) and are each positively correlated.

TOSCA-Shame as correlated with SexSat1 does not have significance for either males ($r=-.068$, $p=.097$); or Females ($r=-.076$, $p=.081$).

RCI-Personal as correlated with God (belief in God) has significance for both males ($r=-.529^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=-.522^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being negatively correlated.

RCI-Personal as correlated with Sexual Shame (Partner) has significance for both males ($r=.605^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.395^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

RCI-Personal as correlated with Sexual Shame (Self) has significance for both males ($r=.630^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.410^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

RCI-Personal as correlated with SexSat1 has significance for both males ($r=.157^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.157^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

RCI-Personal as correlated with TOSCA-Shame has significance for males and is positively correlated ($r=.299^{**}$, $p<.001$); but no significance for Females ($r=-.010$, $p=.827$).

KISS9-Sexual Shame as correlated with God (belief in God) has significance for both males ($r=-.208^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=-.123^{**}$, $p=.005$) with each being negatively correlated.

KISS9-Sexual Shame as correlated with Sexual Shame (Partner) has significance for both males ($r=.899^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.863^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

KISS9-Sexual Shame as correlated with Sexual Shame (Self) has significance for both males ($r=.911^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.879^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

KISS9-Sexual Shame as correlated with SexSat1 does not have significance for either males ($r=.015$, $p=.705$); or Females ($r=-.076$, $p=.084$).

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

KISS9-Sexual Shame as correlated with TOSCA-Shame has significance for both males ($r=.574^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.279^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

KISS9-Sexual Shame as correlated with RCI-Personal has significance for both males ($r=.577^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.352^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

Fre_Use1 as correlated with God (belief in God) has significance for males and is positively correlated ($r=.149^{**}$, $p<.001$); but no significance for Females ($r=.078$, $p=.076$).

Fre_Use1 as correlated with Sexual Shame (Partner) has significance for both males ($r=.161^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.333^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

Fre_Use1 as correlated with Sexual Shame (Self) has significance for both males ($r=.175^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.333^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

Fre_Use1 as correlated with SexSat1 has significance for males with a negative correlation ($r=-.110^{**}$, $p=.007$); but no significance for Females ($r=.042$, $p=.334$) with each being positively correlated.

Fre_Use1 as correlated with TOSCA-Shame has significance for both males ($r=.205^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.119^{**}$, $p=.006$) with each being positively correlated.

Fre_Use1 as correlated with RCI-Personal has significance for both males ($r=-.116^{**}$, $p=.004$); and Females ($r=.106^{*}$, $p=.016$) with males being negatively correlated and females being positively correlated.

Fre_Use1 as correlated with KISS9-Sexual Shame has significance for both males ($r=.212^{**}$, $p<.001$); and Females ($r=.325^{**}$, $p<.001$) with each being positively correlated.

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

Most every grouping had significance with the exceptions that follow. The KISS9-Sexual Shame and SexSat1 did not indicate significance for male or females, where I would have anticipated their being significances but negatively correlated. Significances was also not present between Sexual Shame-Partner and SexSat1 for both males and females. Significances was also not present between Sexual Shame-Self and SexSat1 for males, but significance was present for females. I would have predicted significance but with a negative correlation. Significances was not present for TOSCA-Shame and God (belief in God) for men but was significant for women. The last note is there was no significance found between Fre_Use1 and SexSat1 for the women but significance was indicated for males. I would have expected significance with a negative correlation, meaning viewing pornography harms the SexSat1 findings. This is what was indicated for the males.

Table 10

Pearson Correlations^{a,d} male

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Please choose the answer that best describes your belief in	Pearson Correlation	--							

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

Sexual Shame Scale-Partner	Pearson Correlation	-.217**	--						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001							
Sexual Shame Scale-Self	Pearson Correlation	-.233**	.952**	--					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001						
Over the past two months, how sexually satisfied have you been with your partner?	Pearson Correlation	-.080	-.013	.002	--				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.051	.755	.958					
TOSCA-Shame	Pearson Correlation	-.057	.536**	.549**	-.068	--			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.163	<.001	<.001	.097				
RCI-Personal	Pearson Correlation	-.529**	.605**	.630**	.157*	.299**	--		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001			
KISS9-Sexual Shame	Pearson Correlation	-.208**	.899**	.911**	-.015	.574**	.577**	--	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	.705	<.001	<.001		
Within the past month, how many times have you intentionally viewed pornography online?	Pearson Correlation	.149**	.161**	.175**	-.110**	.205**	-.116**	.212**	--
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	.007	<.001	.004	<.001	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

a. What is your gender? = Male

c. Listwise N=601

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

Table 11

Pearson Correlations^{a,d} Female

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Please choose the answer that best describes your belief in God.	Pearson Correlation	--							
Sexual Shame Scale-Partner	Pearson Correlation	-.12 7**	--						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004							
Sexual Shame Scale-Self	Pearson Correlation	-.13 7**	.940 **	--					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	<.00 1						
Over the past two months, how sexually satisfied have you been with your partner?	Pearson Correlation	-.03 1	-.09 4*	-.06 6	--				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.473	.031	.131					
TOSCA-Shame	Pearson Correlation	.086 *	.251 **	.255 **	-.07 6	--			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.048	<.00 1	<.00 1	.081				
RCI-Personal	Pearson Correlation	-.52 2**	.395 **	.410 **	.157 **	-.01 0	--		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.00 1	<.00 1	<.00 1	<.00 1	.827			
KISS9-Sexual Shame	Pearson Correlation	-.12 3**	.863 **	.879 **	-.07 6	.279 **	.352 **	--	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	<.00 1	<.00 1	.084	<.00 1	<.00 1		

ANALYSIS PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENT

Within the past month, how many times have you intentionally viewed pornography online?	Pearson Correlation	.078	.333 **	.333 **	.042	.119 **	.106 *	.325 **	--
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.076	<.001	<.001	.334	.006	.016	<.001	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

a. What is your gender? = Female

d. Listwise N=524