## INFERENCE FOR ONE-WAY ANOVA

1

To test equality of means for different treatments/levels:

 $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \ldots = \mu_v$ 

Rephrase:

- In terms of effects:
- In terms of differences of effects:
- In terms of contrasts  $\tau_i \overline{\tau}$ , where  $\overline{\tau} = \frac{1}{v} \sum_{i=1}^{v} \tau_i$ :

*Treatment degrees of freedom* = minimum number of equations needed to state the null hypothesis = \_\_\_\_

Alternate hypothesis:

H<sub>a</sub>:

Idea of the test:

## Compare:

ssE under the *full* model (with all parameters)

and

 $ssE_0$  -- the error sum of squares under the *reduced* model -- i.e., the one assuming  $H_0$  is true.

To calculate  $ssE_0$ :

If  $H_0$  is true, let  $\tau$  be the common value of the  $\tau_i$ 's. Then the reduced model is:

- $Y_{it} = \mu + \tau + \varepsilon_{it}^0$
- $\varepsilon_{it}^0 \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$
- the  $\varepsilon_{it}^{0}$ 's are independent,

where  $\varepsilon_{it}^{0}$  denotes the it<sup>th</sup> error in the *reduced* model.

To find  $ssE_0$ : Use least squares to minimize

$$g(m) = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \sum_{t=1}^{r_i} (y_{it} - m)^2 :$$
$$g'(m) = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \sum_{t=1}^{r_i} 2(-1)(y_{it} - m) = 0,$$

which yields the estimate  $\overline{y}$ .. for  $\mu + \tau$ .

i.e., the least squares estimate of  $\mu + \tau$  is

 $(\mu + \tau)^{\wedge} = \overline{y}..$ (By abuse of notation, called  $\hat{\mu} + \hat{\tau}$ ).

So

$$ssE_{0} = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \sum_{t=1}^{r_{i}} (y_{it} - \overline{y}_{i})^{2}$$

which can be shown (proof might be homework) to equal

 $\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \sum_{t=1}^{r_i} y_{it}^2 - n(\overline{y}..)^2$ 

Note that ssE and  $ssE_0$  can be considered as minimizing the same expression, but over different sets:

4

ssE minimizes  $\sum_{i=1}^{t} \sum_{t=1}^{r_i} (y_{it} - m - t_i)^2$  over the set of all v + 1-tuples (m, t<sub>1</sub>, t<sub>2</sub>, ..., t<sub>v</sub>)

 $ssE_0$  can be considered as minimizing the same expression over the subset where all  $t_i$ 's are 0. Therefore  $ssE_0$  must be at least as large as ssE:

 $ssE_0 \ge ssE$ .

If  $H_0$  is true, ssE and ssE<sub>0</sub> should be about the same.

This suggests: Use the ratio  $(ssE_0-ssE)/ssE$  as a test statistic for the null hypothesis:

If  $H_0$  is true, this ratio should be small, so an unusually large ratio would be reason to reject the null hypothesis.

The difference  $ssE_0$ -ssE is called the *sum of squares* for treatment, or treatment sum of squares, denoted ssT.

3

Using the alternate expressions for ssE<sub>0</sub> and ssE:

$$ssT = ssE_{0} - ssE = \sum_{i=1}^{v} \sum_{t=1}^{r_{i}} y_{it}^{2} - n(\bar{y}_{..})^{2} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{v} \sum_{t=1}^{r_{i}} y_{it}^{2} - \sum_{i=1}^{v} r_{i}(\bar{y}_{i},)^{2}\right)$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{v} r_{i}(\bar{y}_{i},)^{2} - n(\bar{y}_{..})^{2}$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{v} \frac{(y_{i},)^{2}}{r_{i}} - \frac{(y_{..})^{2}}{n} \quad \text{(using definitions)}$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{v} r_{i}(\bar{y}_{i}, - \bar{y}_{..})^{2} \quad \text{(possible homework)}$$

This last expression can be considered as a "between treatments" sum of squares --- we are comparing each treatment sample mean  $\overline{y}_{i}$  with the grand (overall) mean  $\overline{y}_{..}$ 

By contrast, our denominator,  $ssE = \sum_{i=1}^{v} \sum_{t=1}^{r_i} (y_{it} - \overline{y}_i)^2$  is a "within treatments" sum of squares: it compares each value with the mean for the treatment group from which the value was obtained.

Using the model assumptions, it can be proved that:

- $ssE/\sigma^2 \sim \chi^2(n v)$
- If  $H_0$  is true, ssT/ $\sigma^2 \sim \chi^2(v 1)$
- If  $H_0$  is true, then ssT and ssE are independent.

Thus,  $\underline{if} H_0$  is true

$$\frac{ssT/\sigma^2(v-1)}{ssE/\sigma^2(n-v)} \sim \mathbf{F}_{v-1,\mathbf{n}-v}.$$

6

Now  $\frac{ssT/\sigma^2(v-1)}{ssE/\sigma^2(n-v)}$  simplifies to  $\frac{ssT/(v-1)}{ssE/(n-v)}$ , which we can calculate from our sample.

We originally wanted to test ssT/ssE, but  $\frac{ssT/(v-1)}{ssE/(n-v)}$  is just a constant multiple of ssT/ssE, so good enough for our purposes:

 $\frac{ssT/(v-1)}{ssE/(n-v)}$  is unusually large exactly when ssT/ssE is unusually large.

Thus, we can use an F test, with test statistic

 $\frac{ssT/(v-1)}{ssE/(n-v)}$ , to test our hypothesis.

*Note*: We can look at ssT/(v-1) and ssE/(n-v) as we did in the equal-variance, two-sample t-test:

- ssE/(n-v) is a pooled estimate of the common variance  $\sigma^2$
- If  $H_0$  is true, then ssT/(v 1) can be regarded as another estimate of  $\sigma^2$ .

## Notation:

ssT/(v-1) is called msT (*mean square for treatment* or *treatment mean square* 

ssE/(n-v) is called msE (*mean square for error* or *error mean square*).

So the test statistic is F = msT/msE.