Statistiek II

John Nerbonne using reworkings by Hartmut Fitz and Wilbert Heeringa

Dept of Information Science
 j.nerbonne@rug.nl

February 13, 2014



< ≣ >

æ

John Nerbonne using reworkings by Hartmut Fitz and Wilbert Statistiek II

- 1 One-way ANOVA.
- 2 Factorial ANOVA.
- 3 Repeated measures ANOVA.
- 4 Correlation and regression.
- 5 Multiple regression.
- 6 Logistic regression.
- 7 Hierarchical, or "mixed" models

Today: One-way ANOVA

- 1 General motivation
- 2 F-test and F-distribution
- 3 ANOVA example
- 4 The logic of ANOVA

Short break

- 5 ANOVA calculations
- 6 Post-hoc tests

What's ANalysis Of VAriance (ANOVA)?

- Most popular statistical test for numerical data
- Generalized t-test
- Compares means of more than two groups
- Fairly robust
- Based on F-distribution
- compares variances (between groups and within groups)
- Two basic versions:
 - a One-way (or single) ANOVA: compare groups along one dimension, e.g., grade point average by school class
 - b N-way (or factorial) ANOVA: compare groups along ≥ 2 dimensions, e.g., grade point average by school class and gender

One-way ANOVA:

Compare time needed for lexical recognition in

- 1. healthy adults
- 2. patients with Wernicke's aphasia
- 3. patients with Broca's aphasia
- ► Factorial ANOVA:

Compare lexical recognition time in male and female in the same three groups

- For two groups: use t-test
- Note: testing for p-value of 0.05 shows significance 1 time in 20 if there is no difference in population mean (effect of chance)
- But suppose there are 7 groups, i.e., we test ⁷₂ = 21 pairs of groups
- Caution: several tests (on the same data) run the risk of finding significance through sheer chance

Multiple comparison problem

Example: Suppose you run k = 3 tests, always seeking a result significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

 \Rightarrow probability of getting at least one false positive is given by:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \alpha_{FW} &=& 1 - P(\text{zero false positive results}) \\ &=& 1 - (1 - \alpha)^k \\ &=& 1 - (1 - 0.05)^3 \\ &=& 1 - (0.95)^3 \\ &=& 0.143 \end{array}$$

Hence, with only 3 pairwise tests, the chance of committing type I error almost 15% (and 66% for 21 tests!)

個 と く ヨ と く ヨ と …

 α_{FW} called Bonferroni family-wise α -level

To guarantee a **family-wise** α -level of 0.05, divide α by number of tests.

Example: 0.05/3 (= $\alpha/\#$ tests) = 0.017 (note: $0.983^3 \approx 0.95$) \Rightarrow set $\alpha = 0.017$ (= Bonferroni-corrected α -level)

- If p-value is less than the Bonferroni-corrected target α: reject the null hypothesis.
- If p-value greater than the Bonferroni-corrected target α: do not reject the null hypothesis.

Analysis of variance

- ANOVA automatically corrects for looking at several relationships (like Bonferroni correction)
- ► Based on *F*-distribution: Moore & McCabe, §7.3, pp. 435–445
- Measures the difference between two variances (variance σ^2)

$$F = \frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2}$$

- always positive since variances are positive
- two degrees of freedom interesting, one for s_1 , one for s_2

F-test vs. F-distribution

F-value:
$$F = \frac{s_1}{s_2}$$

- F-values used in F-test (Fisher's test)
 H₀: samples are from same distribution (s₁ = s₂)
 H_a: samples are from different distributions (s₁ ≠ s₂)
 - value near 1 indicates same variance
 - value near 0 or $+\infty$ indicates difference in variance
- F-test very sensitive to deviations from normal
- ANOVA uses F-distribution, but is different: ANOVA \u03c4 F-test!

F-distribution

Critical area for *F*-distribution at p = 0.05 (df: 12,10)



< ロ > < 同 > < 三 >

< ≣ >

(because $y < x \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{y} > \frac{1}{x}$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$)

Example: height

group	sample	mean	standard
	size		deviation
boys	16	180cm	бст
girls	9	168cm	4cm

Is the difference in standard deviation significant?

<ロ> (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

æ

Examine
$$F = \frac{s_{\text{boys}}^2}{s_{\text{girls}}^2}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{Degrees of freedom:} & \text{df}_{\text{boys}} &=& 16-1 \\ & \text{df}_{\text{girls}} &=& 9-1 \end{array}$$

F-test critical area (for two-tailed test with $\alpha = 0.05$)

Reject H_0 if F < 0.31 or F > 4.1Here, $F = \frac{6^2}{4^2} = 2.25$ (hence no evidence of difference in distributions)

 \Leftrightarrow

 \Leftrightarrow

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) most popular statistical test for numerical data

- several types
 - single, "one-way"
 - factorial, "two-, three-,..., n-way"
 - single/factorial repeated measures
- examines variation
 - "between-groups"—gender, age, etc.
 - "within-groups" —overall
- automatically corrects for looking at several relationships (like Bonferroni correction)

▲圖 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ …

2

uses F-distribution, where F(n, m) fixes n typically at the number of groups (minus 1), m at the number of subjects, i.e., data points (minus number of groups)

Detailed example: one-way ANOVA

Question: Are exam grades of **four** groups of foreign students "Nederlands voor anderstaligen" the same? More exactly, are the four averages the same?

 $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4$ $H_a: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \text{ or } \mu_1 \neq \mu_3 \dots \text{ or } \mu_3 \neq \mu_4$

Alternative hypothesis: at least one group has a different mean

For the question of whether any particular pair is different, the *t*-test is appropriate.

For testing whether all language groups are the same, pairwise *t*-tests *exaggerate* differences (increase the chance of type I error)

We therefore want to apply one-way ANOVA

Four groups of ten students each:

	Group				
	Europe	America	Africa	Asia	
	10	33	26	26	
	19	21	25	21	
	÷	÷	÷	÷	
	31	20	15	21	
Mean	25.0	21.9	23.1	21.3	
Samp. SD	8.14	6.61	5.92	6.90	
Samp. Variance	66.22	43.66	34.99	47.57	

∃ >

ANOVA assumptions:

- Normal distribution per subgroup
- Same variance in subgroups: least SD > one-half of largest SD
- independent observations: watch out for test-retest situations!

Check differences in SD's! (some SPSS computing)

		Valid	
Variable	Std Dev	N	Label
Europa	8.14	10	
America	6.61	10	
Africa	5.92	10	
Azie	6.90	10	

Assumption: normal distribution **per group**, check with normal quantile plot, e.g., for Europeans below (repeat for every group)

Normal Q-Q plot of toets.nl voor anderstalige



Is there a significant difference in the means (of the groups being contrasted)?



Take care that boxplots sketch medians not means.

Sketch of ANOVA

Group						
1	2	3	4			
Eur.	Amer.	Africa	Asia			
÷	÷	÷	÷			
x_{1j}	x _{2j}	x _{3j}	X _{4j}			
÷	÷	:	:			
\overline{x}_1	\overline{x}_2	\overline{x}_3	\overline{x}_4			

Notation:

Group index: $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ Sample index: $j \in N_i$ = size of group iData point x_{ij} : *i*th group, *j*th observation Number of groups: I = 4Total mean: \overline{x} Group mean: \overline{x}_i

For any data point x_{ij} :

$$(x_{ij} - \overline{x}) = (\overline{x}_i - \overline{x}) + (x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i)$$

cotal residue = group diff. + "error"

ANOVA question: does group membership influence the response variable?

Reminder of high school algebra: $(a + b)^2 = a^2 + b^2 + 2ab$

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

3



Two variances

Data point *x_{ij}*:

$$(x_{ij}-\overline{x}) = (\overline{x}_i-\overline{x}) + (x_{ij}-\overline{x}_i)$$

Want sum of squared deviates for each group:

$$(x_{ij}-\overline{x})^2 = (\overline{x}_i-\overline{x})^2 + (x_{ij}-\overline{x}_i)^2 + 2(\overline{x}_i-\overline{x})(x_{ij}-\overline{x}_i)$$

Sum over elements in *i*th group:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x})^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} 2(\bar{x}_i - \bar{x})(x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)$$

A ■

John Nerbonne using reworkings by Hartmut Fitz and Wilbert Statistiek II

Note that this term must be zero:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} 2(\overline{x}_i - \overline{x})(x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i)$$

Because:

(a)
$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} 2(\overline{x}_i - \overline{x})(x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i) = 2(\overline{x}_i - \overline{x}) \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i)}_{0}$$

(b)
$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \overline{x}_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} x_{ij}}{N_i}$$

・ロン ・四と ・日と ・日と

æ

John Nerbonne using reworkings by Hartmut Fitz and Wilbert Statistiek II

Two variances

So we have:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x})^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (\overline{x}_i - \overline{x})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i)^2
onumber \ (+ \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} 2(\overline{x}_i - \overline{x})(x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i) = 0)$$

Therefore:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x})^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (\overline{x}_i - \overline{x})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i)^2$$

And finally we can sum over all groups:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (\overline{x}_i - \overline{x})^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i)^2$$

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

æ

ANOVA terminology

$(x_{ij}-\overline{x})$ total residue	=	$(\overline{x}_i - \overline{x})$ group diff.	+ +	$(x_{ij}-\overline{x}_i)$ "error"
$\sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x})^2$ SST	=	$\sum_{i=1}^{l} N_i (\overline{x}_i - \overline{x})^2$ SSG	+	$\sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i)^2$ SSE
Total Sum of Squares	=	Group Sum of Squares	+	Error Sum of Squares
(n 1)		(1 1)		(n 1)
(n-1) DFT	=	(7-1) DFG	Ŧ	(n-1) DFE
Total Degrees of Freedom	=	Group Degrees of Freedom	+	Error Degrees of Freedom
			< • • •	@> < ≣> < ≣> ≣ -900

John Nerbonne using reworkings by Hartmut Fitz and Wilbert Statistiek II

Note that

SST/DFT: $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x})^2}{n-1}$ is a variance, and likewise SSG/DFG: labelled **MSG** ("Mean square between groups"), and SSE/DFE: labelled **MSE** ("Mean square error" or sometimes "Mean square within groups")

In ANOVA, we compare MSG (variance between groups) and MSE (variance within groups), i.e. we measure

$$F = \frac{MSG}{MSE}$$

If this *F*-value is large, differences between groups overshadow differences within groups.

1) Estimate the pooled variance of the population (MSE):

$$\mathsf{MSE} = \frac{\mathsf{SSE}}{\mathsf{DFE}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (x_{ij} - \overline{x}_i)^2}{n-I} \stackrel{\mathsf{equiv}}{=} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I} \mathsf{DF}_i \cdot s_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{I} \mathsf{DF}_i}$$

In our example (Nederlands for anderstaligen):

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathsf{DF}_{i} \cdot s_{i}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathsf{DF}_{i}} = \frac{(N_{1} - 1)s_{1}^{2} + (N_{3} - 1)s_{2}^{2} + (N_{3} - 1)s_{3}^{2} + (N_{4} - 1)s_{4}^{2}}{(N_{1} - 1) + (N_{3} - 1) + (N_{3} - 1) + (N_{4} - 1)}$$

$$= \frac{9 \cdot 66.22 + 9 \cdot 43.66 + 9 \cdot 34.99 + 9 \cdot 47.57}{9 + 9 + 9 + 9}$$

$$= \frac{595.98 + 392.94 + 314.91 + 428.13}{36} = 48.11$$

Estimates the variance in groups (using DF), aka **within-groups** estimate of variance

2) Estimate the **between-groups** variance of the population (MSG):

$$\mathsf{MSG} = \frac{\mathsf{SSG}}{\mathsf{DFG}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I} N_i (\overline{x}_i - \overline{x})^2}{I - 1}$$

In our example (Nederlands for anderstaligen):

We had 4 group means: 25.0, 21.9, 23.1, 21.3, grand mean: 22.8 $MSG = \frac{10 \cdot ((25 - 22.8)^2 + (21.9 - 22.8)^2 + (23.1 - 22.8)^2 + (21.3 - 22.8)^2)}{4 - 1} = 26.6$

The **between-groups** variance (MSG) is an aggregate estimate of the degree to which the four sample means differ from one another

Interpreting estimates with F-scores

If H_0 is true, then we have two variances:

- Between-groups estimate: $s_{bg}^2 = 26.62$ and
- Within-groups estimate: $s_{Wg}^2 = 48.11$

and their ratio $\frac{s_{\text{bg}}^2}{s_{\text{wg}}^2}$ follows an *F*-distribution with:

$$(\# \text{ groups} - 1) = 3$$
 degrees of freedom for s_{bg}^2 and
 $(\# \text{ observations} - \# \text{ groups}) = 36$ degrees of freedom for s_{Wg}^2

In our example: $F(3, 36) = \frac{26.62}{48.11} = 0.55$ P(F(3, 40) > 2.84) = 0.05 (see tables), so there is no evidence of non-uniform behavior

SPSS summary

- - - - - O N E W A Y - - - - -

Variable NL_NIVO toets nl. voor anderstalige By Variable GROUP gebied van afkomst

Analysis of Variance

イロン イボン イヨン イヨン 三日

		Sum of	Mean	F	F
Source	D.F.	Squares	Squares	Ratio	Prob.
Between Groups	3	79.9	26.6	.55	.65
Within Groups	36	1731.9	48.1		
Total	39	1811.8			

No evidence of non-uniform behavior

ANOVA $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \ldots = \mu_n$

But sometimes particular **contrasts** are important—e.g., are Europeans better (in learning Dutch)?

Distinguish (in reporting results):

- prior contrasts questions asked before data is collected and analyzed
- post hoc (posterior) questions questions asked after data collection and analysis "data-snooping" is exploratory, cannot contribute to hypothesis testing

米部 シネヨシネヨシ 三日

Questions asked **before** data collection and analysis—e.g., are Europeans better (in learning Dutch)?

Another way of putting this:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{\text{Eur}} = \frac{1}{3}(\mu_{\text{Am}} + \mu_{\text{Afr}} + \mu_{\text{Asia}})$$
$$H_a: \ \mu_{\text{Eur}} \neq \frac{1}{3}(\mu_{\text{Am}} + \mu_{\text{Afr}} + \mu_{\text{Asia}})$$

Reformulation (SPSS requires this):

$$H_0: 0 = -\mu_{\mathsf{Eur}} + 0.33\mu_{\mathsf{Am}} + 0.33\mu_{\mathsf{Afr}} + 0.33\mu_{\mathsf{Asia}}$$

Prior contrasts in SPSS

- Mean of every group gets a coefficient
- Sum of coefficients is 0
- A t-test is carried out and two-tailed p-value is reported (as usual):

		Eur 1	Am.	Afr.	Azie		
Contrast	1	-1.0	.3	.3	.3		
			Po	oled V	ariance E	stimate	
		Value	s.	Error	T Valu	e D.F.	T Prob.
Contrast	1	-2.9	2	.53	-1.15	36	.260

No significant difference here (of course)

Note: prior contrasts are legitimate as hypothesis tests as long as they are formulated **before** data collection and analysis Assume H_0 is rejected: which means are distinct?

Data-snooping problem: in a large set, **some** distinctions are **likely** to be statistically significant

But we can still look (we just cannot claim to have **tested** the hypothesis)

We are asking whether $m_i - m_j$ is significantly larger, we apply a variant of the *t*-test

The relevant sd is $\sqrt{\frac{MSE}{n}}$ (differences among scores), but there is a correction since we're looking at a proportion of the scores in any one comparison

Standard deviation (among differences in groups *i* and *j*):

$$sd = \sqrt{MSE \times \frac{N_i + N_j}{N}} = \sqrt{48.1 \times \frac{10 + 10}{40}} = 4.9$$
$$t = \frac{\overline{x}_i - \overline{x}_j}{sd \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_i} + \frac{1}{N_j}}}$$

The critical *t*-value is calculated as $\frac{p}{c}$ where *p* is the desired significance level and *c* is the number of comparisons.

For pairwise comparisons: $c = \binom{l}{2}$

SPSS post-hoc 'Bonferroni'-searches among **all** groupings for statistically significant ones

---- ONEWAY -----

イロン イヨン イヨン イヨン

2

Variable NL_NIVO toets nl. voor anderstalige By Variable GROUP gebied van afkomst

Multiple Range Tests: Modified LSD (Bonferroni) test w. signif. level .05

The difference between two means is significant if
 MEAN(J)-MEAN(I) >= 4.9045 * RANGE * SQRT(1/N(I) + 1/N(J))
 with the following value(s) for RANGE: 3.95
- No two groups significantly different at .05 level
 Homogeneous Subsets (highest \& lowest means not sig. diff.)

Group Azie America Africa Europa Mean 21.3 21.9 23.1 25.0

But in this case there are none (of course)

Note the ways in which the *F*-ratio increases (i.e., becomes more significant):

$$F = \frac{MSG}{MSE}$$

1. MSG increases: differences in means between groups grow larger

2. MSE decreases: overall variation within groups grows smaller

Two models for grouped data

$$\begin{aligned} x_{ij} &= \mu + \epsilon_{ij} \\ x_{ij} &= \mu + \alpha_i + \epsilon_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

First model:

- no group effect
- each data point represents error (ϵ) around a mean (μ)

Second model:

- real group effect
- each data point represents error (ε) around an overall mean (μ), combined with a group adjustment (α_i)

ANOVA asks: is there sufficient evidence for α_i ?

Suppose some cells are non-normal, or some standard deviations too large

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

æ

Suppose some cells are non-normal, or some standard deviations too large

- ▶ Kruskal-Wallis, non-parametric comparison of > 2 medians;
- apply (monotonic) transformation to reduce SD, perhaps improve fit to normality;
- trim most extreme 1% (or 5%) of data

Always report transformations or "trimming"!

Next week: factorial ANOVA

John Nerbonne using reworkings by Hartmut Fitz and Wilbert Statistiek II

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆臣 > ◆臣 > ○

æ