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Background Reading
KNNL: Chapter 18
Topic Overview

• ANOVA Diagnostics

• Remedial Measures
Regression vs ANOVA

- Basic assumptions on errors are the same (independence, normality, constancy of variance for errors)
- Recall that for ANOVA we do NOT have the linearity assumption.
- Diagnostics and remedial measures often similar or the same; we will focus only on key differences
Diagnostic Procedure

- Review model diagnostics as early as possible in the analysis
  - First check residual plots
  - If any sign of problems, can use various statistical tests for some confirmation.

- If any serious problems, try appropriate remedial measures
Residuals

- Predicted values are cell means, $\hat{Y}_{ij} = \bar{Y}_i$.
- Residuals are differences between observed values and cell means: $e_{ij} = Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_i$.
- Residual Plots
  - Plot against fitted values (cell means) or factor levels (check constant variance)
  - Sequence Plot (check independence, when sequence is available/reasonable)
  - Normal Probability Plot (check normality)
Non-constant variance

- Since there is generally no ordering to the levels of the predictor variable, it doesn’t make sense to look for a “megaphone”.

- Rather, simply look for large differences in vertical spreads.

- If sample sizes differ greatly between factor levels, use studentized residuals.
Non-constant Variance (2)

• If residual plots indicate potential problems, can use statistical tests to check.
  - $H_0 : \sigma_i^2 = \sigma_i'^2$ for all $i$
  - $H_0 : \sigma_i^2 \neq \sigma_i'^2$ for some $i$

• Brown-Forsythe test. SAS: after the “/” in the MEANS statement use HOVTEST=BF

• Rejecting the null indicates there is evidence that not all of the factor level variances are equal. So, we are looking for a P-value larger than $\alpha$ for the assumption to be met.
Non-constant Variance (3)

- Hartley test – simpler test, but requires equal sample sizes and is quite sensitive to departures from normality. Not available in SAS.

- Levene test – commonly used test for equality of variances. Similar to Brown-Forsythe, but not discussed in book. Use HOVTEST=LEVENE.
Non-constant Variance (4)

- ANOVA F-test only slightly affected by non-constant variance as long as sample sizes are equal.
- Scheffe multiple comparison procedure is also fairly robust to unequal sample variances if cell sizes are equal.
- Other pairwise comparisons CAN BE greatly affected by unequal variances – use equal sample sizes to minimize this effect.
Non-constant Variance (5)

- Easiest remedial measure is usually a transformation (can help both non-constant variance and non-normality)
  - If variance proportional to $\mu_i$ then try $\sqrt{Y}$ (sometimes occurs if $Y$ is a count)
  - If standard deviation proportional to $\mu_i$, try log transformation.
  - If standard deviation proportional to $\mu_i^2$, try $\frac{1}{Y}$
  - If response is a proportion, try arcsine transformation $Y' = 2 \arcsin \sqrt{Y}$
Non-constant Variance (6)

• To check whether one of these is applicable, calculate sample factor level variances ($s_i^2$) and means $Y_i$.

• Create plots:
  \[ Y_i \text{ vs. } s_i^2, \ Y_i \text{ vs. } s_i, \ \text{and } Y_i^2 \text{ vs. } s_i \]

• If any of the previously mentioned trends appear, use the corresponding transformation

• Box Cox can also be used to find transformation
Non-constant Variance (7)

- Weighted Least Squares can also be used as a remedial measure
  - Estimate sample variances
  - Use reciprocals as weights

- See section 18.4 for more information. To do such an analysis in SAS, utilize a WEIGHT statement (and carefully read the SAS help concerning this)
Non-normality

- Use a Normal Probability Plot to check this.
- If unequal variances, then often non-normality will be falsely indicated by using regular residuals; should transform first and then recheck.
- Normality is the least important assumption; almost all of ANOVA procedures robust to minor departures from normality
Non-Independence

- If data obtained in time sequence, plot residuals against time
- If pattern, then may have non-independence.
  - *Positive Serial Correlation* (adjacent residuals tend to have the same sign)
  - *Negative Serial Correlation* (adjacent residuals tend to have opposite signs)
- Non-independence usually has serious effects on inferences (making them invalid)
Outliers

- Can use studentized or studentized deleted residuals as before to classify outliers
- Leverage values: For ANOVA model it can be shown that the leverage of $Y_{ij}$ is $1/n_i$.
- If cell sizes equal, leverage values equal so no one point has more leverage than another (even though it may be outlying in the response).
Cash Offers Example
(cashoffers.sas)

```sas
proc glm data=cash;
class age;
model offer=age;
means age/hovtest=bf;
output out=diag p=pred r=resid rstudent=SDR;
run;

symbol1 v=dot c=blue;
proc gplot data=diag;
plot resid*age;
run;

proc univariate noprint;
var resid;
qqplot resid/normal (L=1 mu=est sigma=est);
run;

proc print data=diag;
var offer age SDR;
run;
```
Residuals vs. Age
Brown and Forsythe's Test for Homogeneity of offer Variance
ANOVA of Absolute Deviations from Group Medians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3889</td>
<td>0.1944</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.8132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.8333</td>
<td>0.9343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- P-value quite large so no evidence of non-constant variance
Normal Probability Plot

![Normal Probability Plot](image)
Cash Offers Example

- Constant variance and normality assumption appear to be satisfied.

- There do not appear to be any outliers.
Winding Speeds Example

- Problem 18.17 in the text.
- SAS code: windingspeed.sas
- Interested in determining the effect of winding speed of thread (slow, normal, fast, maximum) on the number of thread breaks during a production run – the response variable is a “count”, so we should already have some concerns.
- 64 total observations (16 each on four different speeds)
GLM Output

Source    DF    SS    MS    F Value   Pr > F
Model     3    1588    529    47.47    <.0001
Error    60    669    11
Total    63    2257

Grp    Mean    N    speed
A    16.563    16    4_max
B    10.688    16    3_fast
C    5.875    16    2_norm
C    3.563    16    1_slow
Residual Plot
Brown-Forsythe

Brown and Forsythe's Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>37.1823</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>233.8</td>
<td>3.8969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Clearly issues here – variance increases as speed increases
- Typical with count data since true distribution is probably Poisson
Normal Probability Plot

![Normal Probability Plot Image]
Consider Cell Means/Variances

```plaintext
proc means data=ws;
  class speed;
  var breaks;
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1_slow</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.5625</td>
<td>1.0935</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2_norm</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.8750</td>
<td>1.9958</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_fast</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.6875</td>
<td>3.2397</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>17.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4_max</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5625</td>
<td>5.3786</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Plot Est. Means vs. VAR’s

Linear would suggest SQRT transformation
Plot Est. Means vs SD’s

Linear suggests log-transformation
Plot Squared Means vs. SD

Linear would suggest Inverse Transformation
Box Cox

• Use PROC TRANSREG as before – difference is any categorical predictor needs to be prefaced by class(*).

```plaintext
proc transreg data=ws;
    model boxcox(breaks)=class(speed);
    run;
```

• Expecting (from what we just saw) to use a log transformation (lambda = 0)
## Box Cox (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>Log Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-91.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-80.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-71.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-65.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-62.028 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-61.764 &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-64.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-69.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-77.169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - 95% Confidence Interval
+ - Convenient Lambda
< - Best Lambda
Model for $Y' = \log(Y)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-value for BF Test is now 0.96 (so constancy of variance satisfied)
Model for $Y' = \log(Y)$
Model for $Y' = \log(Y)$
Model for $Y' = \log(Y)$

- Previously thought all groups of means were significantly different except 1 and 2, but now see that all of them are different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRP</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.7499</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4_max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.3211</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3_fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.7039</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2_norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.2237</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1_slow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternatively: WLS

- Instead of transforming, try Weighted Least Squares
- Need inverse cell variances for weights (get these from PROC MEANS)

```plaintext
proc means data=ws;
  class speed;
  var breaks;
  output out=al var=variance;

data al; set al; if _type_ = 1;
data ws; merge ws al; by speed;
  weight=1/variance;
```
proc glm data=ws;
  class speed;
  model breaks=speed;
  weight weight;
  means speed /tukey lines;

Weight: weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>153.95</td>
<td>51.32</td>
<td>51.32</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>213.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Notice MSE = 1. This will always be the case when the cell variances are used as the weights.
# Weighted Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>16.563</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4_max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.687</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3_fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.875</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2_norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1_slow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Same results as no transformation.
Residual Plots (1)
Residual Plots (2)
Weighted Analysis

- Did not really help the non-constant variance/normality issue and pairwise comparison results were the same as the original data.
- If normality is an issue, a transformation is generally better than WLS.
- If normality is not an issue, WLS is appropriate.
Upcoming in Lecture 26...

- Two-way ANOVA (Chapter 19)