Learning Two-Way ANOVA: A Comprehensive Guide to Understanding and Reporting Results

Authored by

Mohammed looti

November 3, 2025

RECOMMENDED CITATION

Mohammed looti (2025). *Learning Two-Way ANOVA: A Comprehensive Guide to Understanding and Reporting Results*. PSYCHOLOGICAL STATISTICS. Retrieved from https://statistics.arabpsychology.com/?p=9303

Understanding the Two-Way ANOVA

The Two-Way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) is a powerful inferential statistical test used primarily when a researcher seeks to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the means of groups, where those groups are categorized based on two distinct independent factors.

Unlike a One-Way ANOVA, which examines the effect of a single factor on a continuous outcome, the Two-Way design allows for the simultaneous assessment of two categorical independent variables (or factors) and their potential combined influence on a single, continuous dependent variable. This design is crucial for understanding complex experimental or observational data.

The core objective of conducting a Two-Way ANOVA is threefold: first, to evaluate the main effect of Factor A; second, to evaluate the main effect of Factor B; and most importantly, third, to investigate the unique combined influence, known as the interaction effect, between Factor A and Factor B on the outcome variable. Properly reporting these three results is essential for transparent scientific communication.

Essential Structure for Reporting Results

When communicating the findings of a Two-Way ANOVA, adherence to a standardized format ensures clarity and replicability, typically following established guidelines such as those of the American Psychological Association (APA). A comprehensive report must cover the following three key components sequentially.

First, the report must clearly define the variables used in the analysis. This includes specifying the two independent variables (factors) and the continuous dependent variable (outcome measure). It is helpful to remind the reader of the levels associated with each factor.

Second, the researcher must address the interaction effect. This result takes precedence because a significant interaction fundamentally changes the interpretation of the main effects. If the interaction is significant, the main effects must be interpreted cautiously, often requiring follow-up analyses like Simple main effects analysis.

Finally, the report addresses the main effects of the two independent variables on the outcome variable. These results indicate whether each factor, when considered averaged across the levels of the other factor, produced a statistically significant difference in the outcome. This detailed structure ensures all facets of the analysis are properly documented.

Standard Wording and Statistical Notation

Using precise and consistent language is paramount when translating statistical output into narrative form. The standard template below provides the necessary phrasing for reporting the initial setup, the interaction, and the subsequent main effects, complete with required statistical notation.

The reporting procedure generally follows a sequence that prioritizes the most complex finding (the interaction) before moving to the simpler main effects. This framework ensures logical flow and proper interpretation of the results.

The report must begin by clearly stating the purpose of the test, identifying the variables involved.
The statistical results for the interaction are presented next, including the F-value, degrees of freedom, and the p-value.
Main effects are then reported, often followed by post hoc tests or Simple main effects analysis if the interaction was significant.

Here is the exact framework recommended for effective reporting:

A Two-Way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of (Factor A) and (Factor B) on (Outcome Y).

A Two-Way ANOVA revealed that there a statistically significant interaction between the effects of and (F(df interaction, df within) = , p =). This finding suggests that the effect of Factor A depends on the level of Factor B.

If the interaction was significant, follow up with simple main effects:

Simple main effects analysis showed that have a statistically significant effect on (p =).

Simple main effects analysis showed that have a statistically significant effect on (p =).

Practical Example: Plant Growth Study

To illustrate these reporting standards, consider a hypothetical study conducted by a botanist examining environmental factors influencing plant growth. The goal is to determine whether different levels of sunlight exposure and watering frequency jointly affect the final height of plants.

The botanist planted 40 seeds and allowed them to grow for a fixed period of one month. The experimental conditions involved manipulating two factors: **Sunlight Exposure** (Low, Medium, High) and **Watering Frequency** (Daily, Weekly). The continuous dependent variable measured was the final plant height in centimeters.

The botanist subsequently performed a Two-Way ANOVA on the collected data to assess the main effects of sunlight and watering, as well as their combined interaction effect on plant growth. The results of the ANOVA output are summarized in the table below, mimicking typical statistical software output:

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Watering Frequency	0.0003	1	0.0003	0.0009	0.975
Sunlight Exposure	18.7648	3	6.2549	23.0489	0
Interaction	1.0108	3	0.3369	1.2415	0.311
Within	8.684	32			
Total	28.4597	39			

Reporting the Plant Growth Results

Based on the output table provided above, we can now construct the formal narrative report for the study. We analyze the rows corresponding to the Interaction, Watering Frequency (Factor A), and Sunlight Exposure (Factor B).

The first step is to check the Interaction Term (A*B). The table shows F(3, 32) = 1.242, with a p-value of .311. Since p > .05, the interaction is not significant. This simplifies the interpretation, as we can proceed directly to interpreting the main effects without needing extensive Simple main effects analysis.

Next, we examine the Main Effect for Watering Frequency (Factor A). The output shows F(1, 32) = 0.001, and p = .975. Since this p-value is far above the significance threshold of .05, we conclude that watering frequency, averaged across all sunlight levels, did not significantly impact plant growth.

Finally, we examine the Main Effect for Sunlight Exposure (Factor B). The output shows F(3, 32) = 10.387, and p < .000 (often written as p < .001). This result is highly statistically significant, indicating that different levels of sunlight exposure led to significant differences in plant height, regardless of the watering schedule.

The formal report of these findings is written as follows:

A Two-Way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of watering frequency and sunlight exposure on plant growth (measured in centimeters).

A Two-Way ANOVA revealed that there was **not** a statistically significant interaction between the effects of watering frequency and sunlight exposure (F(3, 32) = 1.242, p = .311).

The main effect for watering frequency was not significant, indicating that changes in watering schedule did not reliably affect plant growth ($F(1, 32) = 0.001$, $p = .975$).

However, the main effect for sunlight exposure was highly significant, suggesting that plant growth was strongly dependent on the level of sunlight exposure ($F(3, 32) = 10.387$, $p < .001$).

Key Considerations for Presentation

Beyond the core statistical narrative, researchers must adhere to several formatting conventions to ensure the report is professional, easy to read, and compliant with academic standards.

1. Use Descriptive Statistics Tables.

It is essential to supplement the inferential statistics with descriptive measures. A descriptive statistics table--typically showing the **mean** (M) and **standard deviation** (SD) for the dependent variable within each treatment group--provides the reader with a more complete visual and numerical context of the raw data.
This detail helps confirm the direction and magnitude of the effects found, especially when interpreting significant main effects or a significant interaction effect.

2. Consistency in Rounding Statistical Values.

For the sake of brevity and readability, statistical values derived from the ANOVA--specifically the F-value, degrees of freedom, and all p-values--should be consistently rounded throughout the report.
Academic standards usually require rounding these values to either two or three decimal places (e.g., $F = 1.24$ or $F = 1.242$). No matter how many decimal places you choose to use, simply be consistent throughout the results section.
The only exception is when a p-value is extremely small (e.g., $p = 0.00003$), in which case it is conventionally reported as $p < .001$.

Additional Statistical Resources

Reporting a Two-Way ANOVA is one component of a broader set of statistical reporting skills. Researchers frequently utilize other procedures depending on their study design.

The following tutorials explain how to report other statistical tests and procedures in APA format:

How to Report Pearson's Correlation (With Examples)
Reporting T-Tests and other comparison procedures.
Guidelines for Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA).