

A question was asked in class as to how to do Exercise 5.2.

Displays for Statistics 5303
Lecture 10
September 25, 2002

You are given means $\bar{y}_{i\cdot} = 3.2892, 10.256, 8.1157, 8.1825$ and 7.5622 as results of a completely randomized design with $g = 5$ treatments and $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_5 = 4$. You are also told $MSE = 4.012$.

Christopher Bingham, Instructor

(a) Construct an ANOVA table for this experiment and test the null hypothesis that all treatments have the same mean.

612-625-7023 (St. Paul)
612-625-1024 (Minneapolis)

Without the original data, there is no way to use `anova()` to do this. You have to fall back on formulas for SS_{trt} and SS_E .

Class Web Page

<http://www.stat.umn.edu/~kb/classes/5303>

© 2002 by Christopher Bingham

By an equation on p. 46

$$SS_{\text{trt}} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq g} n_i (\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{\cdot\cdot})^2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{y}_{\cdot\cdot} &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq g} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n_i} y_{ij} / N = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq g} n_i \bar{y}_{i\cdot} / N \\ N &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq g} n_i \end{aligned}$$

Here's one way you could find the various quantities needed for an ANOVA table.

```
Cmd> ybars <- vector(3.2892,10.256,8.1157,8.1825,7.5622)
Cmd> n <- rep(4,5) # or vector(4,4,4,4,4), sample sizes
Cmd> N <- sum(n) # total number of cases
Cmd> g <- 5 # number of treatments
Cmd> df_trt <- g-1 # treatment DF
Cmd> df_error <- N - g # error DF
Cmd> grandmean <- sum(n*ybars)/N # from formula above
Cmd> ss_trt <- sum(n*(ybars - grandmean)^2) #from formula above
Cmd> ms_trt <- s_trt/df_trt
Cmd> ms_error <- 4.012 # given as MSE; = ss_error/df_error
Cmd> ss_error <- df_error * ms_error
Cmd> fstat <- ms_trt/ms_error # ratio of mean squares
Cmd> p_value <- 1 - cumF(fstat,df_trt,df_error)
```

3

You can now print out `ss_trt`, `ss_error`, `df_trt`, `df_error`, `ms_trt`, `ms_error`, `fstat` and `p_value` and arrange them in a table

(b) Test the null hypothesis that the average response in treatments 1 and 2 is the same as the average response in treatments 3, 4 and 5.

As always you need to express this symbolically. You are asked to test

$$H_0: (\mu_1 + \mu_2)/2 - (\mu_3 + \mu_4 + \mu_5)/3 = 0$$

This is a contrast in the group means with weights

$$\{w_i\} = \{1/2, 1/2, -1/3, -1/3, -1/3\}$$

To do the test you need a t-statistic of the form

$t = \text{estimate}/(\text{standard error of estimate})$
The estimate is $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq g} w_i \bar{y}_{i\cdot}$. With esti-

mated standard error (see p. 68)

$$\hat{SE}[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq g} w_i \bar{y}_{i\cdot}] = s_p \sqrt{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq g} w_i^2 / n_i}, \quad s_p^2 = MS_E$$

4

To do this in MacAnova you need to translate formulas into MacAnova commands:

```
Cmd> w <- vector(1/2,1/2,-1/3,-1/3,-1/3) #contrast weights
Cmd> sum(w) # sum is zero so it's a contrast
(1) 1.1102e-16
Cmd> estimate <- sum(w*ybars) # estimated contrast
Cmd> std_error <- sqrt(ms_error*sum(w^2/n))
Cmd> tstat <- estimate/std_error # t-statistic
Cmd> pval <- twotailt(tstat,df_error) # p-value
```

You can now use the P-value to decide whether you can reject H_0 .

It would be a lot easier with all the data, since then you could do something like:

```
Cmd> anova("y = treat", fstat:T)
Cmd> result <- contrast(treat,w)
Cmd> tstat <- result$estimate/result$se
Cmd> pval <- twotailt(tstat,DF[3])
```

Here `DF[3]` is the third element of variable `DF` created by `anova()` and containing the `DF` column from the ANOVA table.

More on multiple comparisons

Several multiple comparison methods are based on the distribution of the **Studentized Range**.

Mathematically, the Studentized range distribution is defined as follows:

- Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k be a random sample from $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$
- Let S^2 be an estimate of σ^2 distributed as $\sigma^2 X_{df}^2 / df$ independent of $\{X_i\}$.

$Q = \text{Range}(\{X_i\}) / S = (\max(\{X_i\}) - \min(\{X_i\})) / S$ has the **Studentized range distribution**.

Comment: S^2 is an unbiased estimate of σ^2 , that is $\mu_{S^2} = \sigma^2$.

Note that all the X_i 's must have the same variance.

The distribution of Q is characterized by

- K = number of observations in range
- df = degrees of freedom associated with S^2

The distribution does not depend on σ or on μ .

Table D.8 on Oehlert p. 633-634 has upper 5% and 1% critical values for Q for $K = 1, 2, \dots, 10, 15, 20, 30,$ and 50 and degrees of freedom $df = \nu = 1, 2, \dots, 30, 35, 40, 50, 100$ and ∞ .

$\nu = \infty$ corresponds to the case when σ^2 is known and the ratio is

$$Q = (\max(\{X_i\}) - \min(\{X_i\})) / \sigma,$$

that is the actual value of σ is used instead of an estimate.

Table D.8: Percent points for the Studentized range

ν	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	15	20	30	50
1	18.0	27.0	32.8	37.1	40.4	43.1	45.4	47.4	49.1	55.4	59.6	65.1	71.7
2	6.09	8.33	9.80	10.9	11.7	12.4	13.0	13.5	14.0	15.7	16.8	18.3	20.1
3	4.50	5.91	6.82	7.50	8.04	8.48	8.85	9.18	9.46	10.5	11.2	12.2	13.4
4	3.93	5.04	5.76	6.29	6.71	7.05	7.35	7.60	7.83	8.66	9.23	10.0	10.9
5	3.64	4.60	5.22	5.67	6.03	6.33	6.58	6.80	6.99	7.72	8.21	8.87	9.67
6	3.46	4.34	4.90	5.31	5.63	5.90	6.12	6.32	6.49	7.14	7.59	8.19	8.91
7	3.34	4.17	4.68	5.06	5.36	5.61	5.82	6.00	6.16	6.76	7.17	7.73	8.40
8	3.26	4.04	4.53	4.89	5.17	5.40	5.60	5.77	5.92	6.48	6.87	7.40	8.03
9	3.20	3.95	4.42	4.76	5.02	5.24	5.43	5.59	5.74	6.28	6.64	7.14	7.75
10	3.15	3.88	4.33	4.65	4.91	5.12	5.30	5.46	5.60	6.11	6.47	6.95	7.53
11	3.11	3.82	4.26	4.57	4.82	5.03	5.20	5.35	5.49	5.98	6.33	6.79	7.35
12	3.08	3.77	4.20	4.51	4.75	4.95	5.12	5.27	5.39	5.88	6.21	6.66	7.21
13	3.06	3.73	4.15	4.45	4.69	4.88	5.05	5.19	5.32	5.79	6.11	6.55	7.08
14	3.03	3.70	4.11	4.41	4.64	4.83	4.99	5.13	5.25	5.71	6.03	6.46	6.98
15	3.01	3.67	4.08	4.37	4.59	4.78	4.94	5.08	5.20	5.65	5.96	6.38	6.89
16	3.00	3.65	4.05	4.33	4.56	4.74	4.90	5.03	5.15	5.59	5.90	6.31	6.81
17	2.98	3.63	4.02	4.30	4.52	4.70	4.86	4.99	5.11	5.54	5.84	6.25	6.74
18	2.97	3.61	4.00	4.28	4.49	4.67	4.82	4.96	5.07	5.50	5.79	6.20	6.68
19	2.96	3.59	3.98	4.25	4.47	4.65	4.79	4.92	5.04	5.46	5.75	6.15	6.63
20	2.95	3.58	3.96	4.23	4.45	4.62	4.77	4.90	5.01	5.43	5.71	6.10	6.58
21	2.94	3.56	3.94	4.21	4.42	4.60	4.74	4.87	4.98	5.40	5.68	6.07	6.53
22	2.93	3.55	3.93	4.20	4.41	4.58	4.72	4.85	4.96	5.37	5.65	6.03	6.49
23	2.93	3.54	3.91	4.18	4.39	4.56	4.70	4.83	4.94	5.34	5.62	6.00	6.46
24	2.92	3.53	3.90	4.17	4.37	4.54	4.68	4.81	4.92	5.32	5.59	5.97	6.42
25	2.91	3.52	3.89	4.15	4.36	4.53	4.67	4.79	4.90	5.30	5.57	5.94	6.39
26	2.91	3.51	3.88	4.14	4.35	4.51	4.65	4.77	4.88	5.28	5.55	5.92	6.36
27	2.90	3.51	3.87	4.13	4.33	4.50	4.64	4.76	4.86	5.26	5.53	5.89	6.34
28	2.90	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.32	4.49	4.62	4.74	4.85	5.24	5.51	5.87	6.31
29	2.89	3.49	3.85	4.11	4.31	4.47	4.61	4.73	4.84	5.23	5.49	5.85	6.29
30	2.89	3.49	3.85	4.10	4.30	4.46	4.60	4.72	4.82	5.21	5.48	5.83	6.27
35	2.87	3.46	3.81	4.07	4.26	4.42	4.56	4.67	4.77	5.15	5.41	5.76	6.18
40	2.86	3.44	3.79	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.52	4.63	4.73	5.11	5.36	5.70	6.11
45	2.85	3.43	3.77	4.02	4.21	4.36	4.49	4.61	4.71	5.07	5.32	5.66	6.06
50	2.84	3.42	3.76	4.00	4.19	4.34	4.47	4.58	4.68	5.04	5.29	5.62	6.02
100	2.81	3.36	3.70	3.93	4.11	4.26	4.38	4.48	4.58	4.92	5.15	5.46	5.83
∞	2.77	3.31	3.63	3.86	4.03	4.17	4.29	4.39	4.47	4.80	5.01	5.30	5.65



You can compute critical values (upper percent points) in MacAnova using

`invstuding()`:

```
Cmd> invstuding(1 - .05, 5, 11)
(1) 4.5737 Upper 5% point of Q
```

You can get an upper tail probability (P-value) using `cumstuding()`:

```
Cmd> q_obs <- 5.123; 1 - cumstuding(q_obs, 5, 11)
(1) 0.026489 P(Q ≥ 5.123)
```

In the multiple comparison situation,

when $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \dots = \mu_g = \mu$ is true, and

$n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_g = n$ (equal sample sizes)

- $y_{1.}, y_{2.}, \dots, y_{g.}$ are independent $N(\mu, \sigma^2/n)$
- $MS_E/n = s_p^2/n = \hat{\sigma}^2/n$ is independent of $\{\bar{y}_{i.}\}$ with distribution $(\sigma^2/n)\chi_{N-g}^2/(N-g)$

Identifying $\bar{y}_{i.}$ with X_i and s_p^2/n with S^2

$$Q = \{\max(\bar{y}_{i.}) - \min(\bar{y}_{i.})\}/(s/\sqrt{n})$$

has the Studentized range distribution with $K = g$ and $df = N-g$. The "range" is the range of sample means.

This provides an alternative way (to an F statistic) to test $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \dots = \mu_g$ when the sample sizes are equal:

Reject H_0 : when $Q \geq q_{\alpha}(g, N-g)$

```
Cmd> data33 <- read("pr3.3", quiet:T) # Problem 3.3 data
Read from file "TP1:Stat5303:Data:Oech03.dat"
Cmd> treat <- factor(data33[,1]) # create treatment factor
Cmd> longevity <- vector(data33[,2]) # create response vector
Cmd> anova("longevity=treat", fstat:T)
Model used is longevity=treat
          DF      SS      MS      F      P-value
CONSTANT  1  2782.4  2782.4  1349.49826  < 1e-08
treat     4   243.16   60.79   29.48371  5.9878e-07
ERROR1    15   30.928   2.0618
Cmd> dfe <- DF[3]; mse <- SS[3]/dfe # mse = 30.928/15
Cmd> vector(mse, dfe) # same as in ERROR1 line of table
ERROR1    ERROR1    15
2.0618
Cmd> ybars <- tabs(longevity, treat, means:T); ybars#sample means
(1)      18      12      11.975      9      8
Cmd> tabs(longevity, treat, count:T) # sample sizes
(1)      4      4      4      4      4
Cmd> n <- 4 # common value of sample sizes
Cmd> g <- 5 # number of groups
Cmd> q <- (max(ybars) - min(ybars))/sqrt(mse/n); q
(1)      13.928 Studentized range Q
Cmd> invstuding(1 - .01, 5, dfe) # Critical value
(1)      5.5563 Q = 13.928 >> 5.5563; reject at 1% level
Cmd> 1 - cumstuding(q, 5, dfe) # P-value
(1)      1.3828e-05 Very small P-value => Reject H0
```

When is Q significant? When the range of $\bar{y}_{i\cdot}$'s is large enough. Specifically, when

$$\max(\bar{y}_{i\cdot}) - \min(\bar{y}_{i\cdot}) \geq \text{HSD}$$

where the **Honestly Significant Difference** HSD is defined to be

$$\text{HSD} = q_{\alpha}(g, N-g) s_p / \sqrt{n}$$

Now $\hat{S}E[\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}] = \sqrt{\{2 \times s_p^2 / n\}} = \sqrt{2} \times s_p / \sqrt{n}$ so another expression for the HSD is

$$\text{HSD} = q_{\alpha}(g, N-g) \times \hat{S}E[\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}] / \sqrt{2}.$$

Note the quantity $\sqrt{2}$ in the denominator.

Obviously, if any $|\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}| > \text{HSD}$, then

$$\max(\bar{y}_{i\cdot}) - \min(\bar{y}_{i\cdot}) > \text{HSD}$$

so another way to test H_0 is reject H_0 if

$$|\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}| > \text{HSD for any } i \neq j.$$

The nice thing about this is that when you reject H_0 you have information about which means are different. Specifically, for any $i \neq j$, when $|\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}| > \text{HSD}$ you reject $H_{0ij}: \mu_i = \mu_j$.

This procedure is the basis of the **HSD multiple comparisons method**, also known as the **Tukey method** and the **Studentized range method**.

Tukey named it the *Honestly significance difference* because he believed the most widely used method, the LSD or Least Significant Difference method, often found more significant differences than was really supported by the data and thus was not quite "honest".

The **(protected) LSD method** is the oldest multiple comparisons method. It was first formalized by R. A. Fisher.

Suppose your sample sizes are equal $n_1 =$

$$n_2 = \dots = n_g = n.$$

Then the naive method rejects $H_{0ij}: \mu_i = \mu_j$ when $|t_{ij}| \geq t_{\alpha/2, N-g}$, where t_{ij} is a t-statistic defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} t_{ij} &= (\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}) / \hat{SE}[\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}] \\ &= (\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}) / \sqrt{(2s_p^2/n)} \end{aligned}$$

$$s_p^2 = MS_E \text{ from ANOVA}$$

This is the same as rejecting H_{0ij} when $|\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}| \geq \text{LSD} = t_{\alpha/2, N-g} \times \sqrt{(2s_p^2/n)}$ the Least Significant Difference.

Thus you might call this the **naive LSD method**. Its per comparison error is α but its experimentwise error rate can be very high.

13

The *protected* LSD method has 2 steps.

1. Do an ANOVA. If F is not significant at level α then you are done; there is no evidence that any means differ.
2. Only if F is significant, compute the LSD and reject H_{0ij} if $|\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}| > \text{LSD}$

With this procedure, the only way you can make a type I error is if you get to step 2 and then find $|\bar{y}_{i\cdot} - \bar{y}_{j\cdot}| > \text{LSD}$, and even then it may not be a type I error.

When all the means are equal,

$$P(\text{get to step 2}) = P(F > F_{\alpha}) = \alpha,$$

so

$$P(\text{any type I error}) \leq \alpha,$$

This means the experimentwise error rate cannot be greater than α . However, the strong experimentwise error rate can be much bigger.

14

The practical application of the LSD method, HSD method as well as other methods starts with ordering the means from smallest to largest, say

$$\bar{y}_{(1)\bullet} \leq \bar{y}_{(2)\bullet} \leq \dots \leq \bar{y}_{(g)\bullet}$$

corresponding to means $\mu_{(1)}$, $\mu_{(2)}$, ..., $\mu_{(g)}$.

You need to keep track of which treatment $\bar{y}_{(i)\bullet}$ and $\mu_{(i)}$ go with.

You first find all means $\bar{y}_{(i)\bullet}$, if any, that are not significantly from $\bar{y}_{(1)\bullet}$. These are all the means such that treatments such that $\bar{y}_{(i)\bullet} < \bar{y}_{(1)\bullet} + \text{LSD}$. Often a line is drawn under these. Then all means $\bar{y}_{(i)\bullet}$ with $i > 2$ such that $\bar{y}_{(i)\bullet} < \bar{y}_{(2)\bullet} + \text{LSD}$ are considered not significantly different from $\mu_{(2)}$, and a line drawn under them, and so on. If a line is completely under another line it is not drawn.

```
Cmd> lsd <- sqrt(2*mse/n)*invstuf(1 - .05/2, dfe); lsd
(1) 2.1641 5% Least Significant Difference
Cmd> sort(ybars) # ordered means
(1) 8 9 11.975 12 18
```

```
Cmd> sort(ybars)[1-5] + lsd
(1) 10.164 11.164 14.139 14.164
```

A line connects the first two means because $8 + 2.164 = 10.164 > 9$ and $10.164 < 11.975$. Since $9 + 2.164 = 11.164 < 11.975$ no line is drawn connecting the 2nd and 3rd mean. And so on.

You can use `grade(ybars)` to recover the treatment numbers of each mean.

```
Cmd> grade(ybars)
(1) 5 4 3 2 1
```

`Macro pairwise()` provides a black box way to do the comparison, orienting things vertically rather than horizontally.

```
Cmd> pairwise("treat", .05, lsd:T)
      |          lsd:T directs that the lsd
      |          method be used
      |
      | 5          4          3          2          1
      | -3.79     -2.79     0.18     6.21
      | 3          2          1
```

The first column of numbers are treatment numbers and the last column are effects $\hat{\alpha}_i$, not sample means.


```
Cmd> ybars ~ sum(ybars)/5 # alpha_hats
(1) 6.205 0.205 0.18 -2.795 -3.795
```

The HSD method is done the same using HSD instead of LSD

```
Cmd> hsd <- invstudng(1 - .05, 5, dfe)*sqrt(mse/n); hsd
(1) 3.1354 5% Honestly significant difference

Cmd> sort(ybars)[-5] + hsd # ordered means + HSD
(1) 11.135 12.135 15.11 15.135

Cmd> sort(ybars) # ordered means
(1) 8 9 11.975 12 18
```

Now a line is drawn under the 2nd, 3rd and 4th means because $9 + \text{HSD} = 9 + 3.135 = 12.135 > 12$.

```
Cmd> pairwise("treat", .05, hsd:T)
|
5 -3.79
4 -2.79
3 0.18
2 0.205
1 6.21
```

The Bonferroni method as applied to multiple comparisons can also be expressed in terms a significant difference, BSD = **Bonferroni significant difference**.

BSD is like the LSD except a *Bonferronized* student's t critical value $t_{\alpha/K, N-g}$ is used, taking account of there being $K = g(g-1)/2$ different comparisons.

```
Cmd> bsd <- invstu(1 - .025/10, dfe)*sqrt(2*mse/n); bsd
(1) 3.3364 5% Bonferroni significant difference

Cmd> sort(ybars)[-5] + bsd
(1) 11.336 12.336 15.311 15.336

Cmd> sort(ybars) # ordered means
(1) 8 9 11.975 12 18
```

```
Cmd> pairwise("treat", .05, bsd:T)
|
5 -3.79
4 -2.79
3 0.18
2 0.205
1 6.21
```