

# Stat 401, section 10.3 More on Single Factor ANOVA

notes by Tim Pilachowski

First the good news: We're going to skip past "The ANOVA Model" and " $\beta$  for the F Test" as being beyond the scope of what is needed for Stat 401.

For sections 10.1 and 10.2, we had all sample sizes equal, i.e.  $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_I = J$ . But what if all sample sizes are not equal? We can still conduct ANOVA, but with some adjustments to formulas (see below).

When the number of treatments or populations is  $I = 2$ , either a two-sample  $t$  test or ANOVA can be used. However, the two-sample  $t$  test is more flexible than the  $F$  test. First, it is valid without the assumption of equal population variances. Second, it can be used for either a two-tailed test ( $H_a : \mu_1 = \mu_2$ ) or a one-tailed test ( $H_a : \mu_1 < \mu_2, H_a : \mu_1 > \mu_2$ ).

When the number of treatments or populations is  $I \geq 3$ , there is unfortunately no general test procedure known to have good properties without assuming equal variances.

Let  $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_I$  represent the  $I$  sample sizes, and let  $J_1 + J_2 + \dots + J_I = n$  total observations.

Individual sample means will be denoted by random variables  $\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, \dots, \bar{X}_I$ , where  $\bar{X}_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{J_i} X_{i,j}}{J_i}$ .

Note: We'll still use the notation  $x_i = \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} x_{i,j}$ , so that calculated  $\bar{x}_i = \frac{x_i}{J_i}$ .

The average of all  $J_1 + J_2 + \dots + J_I$  observations, the grand mean, is given by  $\bar{X}_{..} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} X_{i,j}}{n}$ .

Note: We'll still use the notation  $x_{..} = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} x_{i,j}$ , so that calculated  $\bar{x}_{..} = \frac{x_{..}}{n}$ .

The hypotheses will be

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \dots = \mu_I \text{ versus}$$

$$H_a : \text{at least two of the } \mu_i \text{'s are different.}$$

We need a random sample from each population or treatment.

Basic assumptions remain the same.

The  $x_{i,j}$ 's within any particular sample are independent (i.e. we have a random sample taken from the  $i$ th population or treatment distribution).

Different samples are independent of one another.

Each of the  $I$  population or treatment distributions is normal, and each has the same variance  $\sigma^2$ .

Preliminary calculations – sums of squares:

$$\text{The total sum of squares (SST)} = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} (x_{i,j} - \bar{x}_{..})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} (x_{i,j})^2 - \frac{1}{n}(x_{..})^2, \quad \text{df} = n - 1.$$

$$\text{The treatment sum of squares (SSTr)} = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_{..})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{1}{J_i} (x_i)^2 - \frac{1}{n}(x_{..})^2, \quad \text{df} = I - 1.$$

$$\text{The error sum of squares (SSE)} = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} (x_{i,j} - \bar{x}_i)^2 = \text{SST} - \text{SSTr}, \quad \text{df} = \sum_{i=1}^I (J_i - 1) = n - I.$$

The **mean square for treatments** (MSTr) =  $\frac{SSTr}{I-1}$ . The **mean square for error** (MSE) =  $\frac{SSE}{n-I}$ .

The test statistic remains the ratio of the two mean squares,  $F = \frac{MSTr}{MSE}$ .

When we have statistical software we will use it to calculate the  $P$ -value. When calculating by hand, we'll use Appendix Table A.9 to determine the critical value  $c$  for  $\alpha = 0.10, 0.05, 0.01,$  and  $0.001$ . A calculated test statistic  $f \geq c$  implies  $p \leq \alpha$ , in which case we will reject the null hypothesis.

When we reject the null hypothesis, a multiple comparison procedure is needed. This text uses a variation of Tukey's Procedure (the  $T$  method) for use when the sample sizes are "reasonably close". In this approach, the

value of each  $w_{i,j}$  depends upon the sizes of the two samples being compared:  $w = Q_{\alpha, I, n-I} \sqrt{\frac{MSE}{2} \left( \frac{1}{J_i} + \frac{1}{J_j} \right)}$ .

As before, list the sample means in increasing order, and underline those pairs that differ by less than  $w_{i,j}$ .

Any pair of sample means not underscored by the same line corresponds to a pair of population or treatment means that are judged significantly different.

Example A. A paper in *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development* (Oct 90, pp. 121–127) discussed a survey instrument called the *Mathematics Anxiety Scale for Children* (MASC). Suppose the MASC was administered to three groups of sixth graders, with each group having been taught using a different method. Test whether the results of the three methods differ ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). Data is as follows.

Group 1	67	50	70	60	55	75		$J_1 =$	$x_{1.} =$	$\bar{x}_{1.} =$
Group 2	49	32	65	39	43			$J_2 =$	$x_{2.} =$	$\bar{x}_{2.} =$
Group 3	40	39	41	60	45	30	28	$J_3 =$	$x_{3.} =$	$\bar{x}_{3.} =$
								$n =$	$x_{..} =$	$\bar{x}_{..} =$

hypotheses:

$I =$

df numerator =

df denominator =

$$\sum \sum (x_{i,j})^2 =$$

SST =

SSTr =

SSE =

MSTr =

MSE =

$f =$

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	<i>f</i>
Treatments				
Error				X X
Total			X X	X X

critical value *c* (from Table A.9) =

ANOVA conclusion:

*T*-method:

$$I = \quad n - I = \quad Q_{\alpha, I, n-I} =$$

*T*-method conclusion: