The model is statistically significant for the quality predictors ($F = 5.46$, $p < .0001$). The quality predictors explain thirty-three percent of the variance in satisfaction ($R^2 = .33$, adjusted $R^2 = .30$). The individual quality predictors of smoothness (.36**), task function (.39**) and interaction satisfaction (.50**) are statistically significant. The block of quantity predictors is not statistically significant but explains four percent of the variance beyond the quality predictors. When all ten predictors are entered as a single group—including PRR versus LDR—they predict thirty-nine percent of the variance ($F = 4.69$, $p < .0001$).

Research Question 2

Research question 2a asks: in CMC, which quality predictors relate to romantic relationship intimacy? Research question 2b asks: in CMC, which quantity predictors relate to romantic relationship intimacy?

As in research question 1, ascertaining the unique variance from the two quantity predictor variables requires entering them in the second block in the regression equation. The model is not statistically significant for the quality predictors, which explain twelve percent of the

Comment [ltd1]: A major concern I have in the reporting of data in this chapter is that the discussion focuses on the multiple regression results, while the tables presented are at the bivariate correlation level only. The Results section does not discuss the correlation results that you present in the tables. Why aren't the multiple regression results reported in tabular form? They are the most interesting results, because they show results for each outcome variable while controlling for the effects of each predictor variable. The most important results of the study are the multivariate analyses. There should be tables reporting the bivariate results and then tables with the multiple regression results, and results for each type of analysis should be discussed in the text, first in a section on bivariate results and then in a section on results for multiple regression. Each should have its own heading.

Deleted: y

Comment [ltd2]: P values should be given, not asterisks, e.g., p < .01 instead of **

Comment [ltd3]: You need to state that these are Beta coefficients.

Deleted: ;

Deleted: .

Deleted: ;

Deleted: .

variance in intimacy. The individual quality predictors of smoothness (.23*) and interaction satisfaction (.27*) are statistically significant.

The block of quantity predictors is statistically significant (F = 3.77, p < .028). These predictors explained a further eight percent of the variance in intimacy. The individual quantity predictor of length of interaction is statistically significant in a negative direction(-.25*). When all ten predictors are entered as a single group they predict twenty-two percent of the variance (F = 2.04, p < .0411).

Comment [ltd4]: The p values should be given, e.g., p < .05, rather than asterisks