

# 1-Way Fixed Effects ANOVA

James H. Steiger

Department of Psychology and Human Development  
Vanderbilt University

# 1-Way Fixed Effects ANOVA

- 1 Introduction
- 2 An Introductory Example
- 3 The Basic Idea behind ANOVA
- 4 The ANOVA Structural Model
- 5 Computations
  - Computational Formulas
  - Calculation in R
- 6 Distribution of the  $F$  Statistic
- 7 Measures of Overall Fit
  - $\omega^2$  and  $f$
- 8 Some Class Participation Questions

# Introduction

- In this module, we introduce the single-factor completely randomized analysis of variance design.
- We discover that there are several ways to conceptualize the design.
- For example, we can see the design as a generalization of the 2-sample  $t$ -test on independent groups.
- Or, we can see the design as a special case of multiple regression with fixed regressors.

# Introduction

- We will investigate several key aspects of any design we investigate:
  - ① Understanding the major hypotheses the design can test;
  - ② Measures of effect size we can extract from the statistical analysis;
  - ③ Relationships between power, precision, sample size, and effect size, and how we exploit them in planning our experiments;
  - ④ Statistical assumptions, restrictions, and robustness properties.

## An Introductory Example

MWL present data from a hypothetical study of memory in their Table 8.1.

40 participants were divided randomly into 4 groups.

Each participant studied a list of 20 words and was tested for recall a day later.

Each of the 3 experimental groups was instructed to use a different special memorization strategy.

A 4th group was simply told to try to memorize the list.

Data are shown in Table 8.1 (MWL, p. 171). (There is an error in the Table:  $\bar{Y}_{\bullet j} = 9.95$  should be  $\bar{Y}_{\bullet\bullet} = 9.95$ .)

## An Introductory Example

**Table 8.1** Recall scores from a hypothetical memory study

	Control	Loci	Image	Rhyme	
	11	10	13	16	
	4	18	16	9	
	8	6	3	7	
	3	20	6	10	
	11	15	13	9	
	8	9	10	14	
	2	8	13	16	
	5	11	9	3	
	8	12	5	9	
	5	12	19	12	
$\bar{Y}_j =$	6.5	12.1	10.7	10.5	$\bar{Y}_j = 9.95$
$s_j^2 =$	10.056	19.433	25.567	16.722	

## The Basic Idea behind ANOVA

As we saw in detail in Psychology 310, at its foundation, ANOVA attempts to assess whether a group of means are all the same.

It does this by comparing the variability of the sample means to what it *should be* if the population means are all the same.

If the population means are all the same, the sample sizes are all the same ( $n$  per group), and the populations all have the same variance  $\sigma^2$ , then the variance of the sample means should be approximately  $\sigma^2/n$ .

On the other hand, if the population means are not all the same, then the variance of the sample means should be larger than  $\sigma^2/n$ , because the spread of the means reflects more than sampling variability.

# The Basic Idea behind ANOVA

As a consequence of this, and a lot of statistical machinery, we arrive at an  $F$  statistic that may be written, for  $a$  groups,

$$F_{a-1, a(n-1)} = \frac{s_{\bar{X}}^2}{\hat{\sigma}^2/n} = \frac{ns_{\bar{X}}^2}{\hat{\sigma}^2} \quad (1)$$

We simply compute the sample variance of the sample means, and divide by an estimate of  $\sigma^2/n$ . With equal sample sizes,  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  is simply the mean of the group variances.



# The Basic Idea behind ANOVA

Here are the calculations in R.

```
> memory.data <- read.csv("Table 8_1 Memory Data.csv")
> means <- with(memory.data, aggregate(Score, by = list(Method), FUN = mean))
> var.xbars <- var(means)
> variances <- with(memory.data, aggregate(Score, by = list(Method), FUN =
> var.e <- mean(variances)
> n <- 10
> MS.A <- n * var.xbars
> MS.e <- var.e
> F <- MS.A/MS.e
> c(MS.A, MS.e, F)

[1] 57.966667 17.944444 3.230341
```

# The ANOVA Structural Model

An alternative way of conceptualizing ANOVA begins with a *structural model* that includes extensive assumptions and restrictions.

Following the notation in RDASA3, we shall assume a balanced design with  $n$  subjects per cell, and  $a$  cells.

Let  $Y_{ij}$  be the score for the  $i$ th person in the  $j$ th cell. Then

$$Y_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_j + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (2)$$

where

- ①  $\mu$  is the “grand mean” or overall population mean,
- ②  $\alpha_j = \mu_j - \mu$  is the difference between the mean of population  $j$  and the overall mean,
- ③  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  is independent, normal error. The  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  are i.i.d.  $N(0, \sigma_e^2)$ .

These assumptions imply that the observations in each group are normally distributed, and that group variances are equal.

MWL summarize the model assumptions in their Box 8.1.

# The ANOVA Structural Model

## Box 8.1 Parameter Definitions and Assumptions

1. *The parent population mean,  $\mu$ .* This is the grand mean of the treatment populations selected for this study and is a constant component of all scores in the  $a$  populations. It is the average of the treatment population means:

$$\mu = \sum_{j=1}^a \mu_j / a$$

2. The effect of treatment  $A_j$ ,  $\alpha_j$ . This equals  $\mu_j - \mu$  and is a constant component of all scores obtained under  $A_j$  but may vary over treatments (levels of  $j$ ).

2.1 Because the deviation of all scores about their mean is zero,  $\sum_j \alpha_j = 0$ .

2.2 If the null hypothesis is true, all  $\alpha_j = 0$ .

2.3 The population variance of the treatment effects is  $\sigma_A^2 = \sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j^2 / a$ .

3. *The error,  $\varepsilon_{ij}$ .* This is the deviation of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  score in group  $j$  from  $\mu_j$  and reflects uncontrolled, or chance, variability. It is the only source of variation within the  $j^{\text{th}}$  group, and if the null hypothesis is true, the only source of variation within the data set. We assume that

3.1 The  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  are independently distributed; i.e., the probability of sampling some value of  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  does not depend on other values of  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  in the sample.

3.2 The  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  are normally distributed in each of the  $a$  treatment populations. Also, because  $\varepsilon_{ij} = Y_{ij} - \mu_j$ , the mean of each population of errors is zero; i.e.,  $E(\varepsilon_{ij}) = 0$ .

3.3 The distribution of the  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  has variance  $\sigma_e^2$  (error variance) in each of the  $a$  treatment populations; i.e.,  $\sigma_1^2 = \dots = \sigma_j^2 = \dots = \sigma_a^2$ . This is the assumption of *homogeneity of variance*. The error variance is the average squared error;  $\sigma_e^2 = E(\varepsilon_{ij}^2)$ .

# Computations

## Computational Formulas

**Table 8.3** The analysis of variance for the one-factor between-subjects design

(a) General form of the ANOVA

Source	<i>df</i>	SS	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>
Total	$an - 1$	$\sum_{j=1}^a \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_{..})^2$		
<i>A</i>	$a - 1$	$n \sum_{j=1}^a (\bar{Y}_{.j} - \bar{Y}_{..})^2$	$SS_A / df_A$	$MS_A / MS_{S/A}$
<i>S/A</i>	$a(n - 1)$	$\sum_{j=1}^a \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_{.j})^2$	$SS_{S/A} / df_{S/A}$	

(b) ANOVA of the data of Table 8.1

Source	Sum of squares	<i>df</i>	Mean square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i> -value
Method	173.90	3	57.967	3.230	.034
Error	646.00	36	17.944		
Total	819.90	39			

# Computations

## Calculation in R

Let's load in the data from Table 8.1.

```
> memory.data <- read.csv("Table 8_1 Memory Data.csv")
```

```
> head(memory.data)
```

	Method	Score
1	Control	11
2	Control	4
3	Control	8
4	Control	3
5	Control	11
6	Control	8

```
> str(memory.data)
```

```
'data.frame': 40 obs. of 2 variables:
```

```
$ Method: Factor w/ 4 levels "Control","Image",...: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
```

```
$ Score : int 11 4 8 3 11 8 2 5 8 5 ...
```

# Computations

## Calculation in R

We see from the above that `memory.data` has two variables, one of which is an integer variable, the other a “factor.”

It is vitally important that the factor variables are typed as factors.

In this case, we are ready to go.

```
> summary(aov(Score ~ Method, data = memory.data))
```

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Method	3	173.9	57.97	3.23	0.0336 *
Residuals	36	646.0	17.94		

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

## Distribution of the $F$ Statistic

The  $F$  statistic with  $a - 1$  and  $a(n - 1)$  degrees of freedom has a noncentral  $F$  distribution with noncentrality parameter

$$\lambda = n \sum_{j=1}^a \left( \frac{\alpha_j}{\sigma} \right)^2 \quad (3)$$

Just as we had standardized measures of fit in the  $t$  test situation, we have related measures in ANOVA.

A widely-used measure in the population is

$$\omega^2 = \frac{\sigma_A^2}{\sigma_A^2 + \sigma_e^2} \quad (4)$$

where

$$\sigma_A^2 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^a (\mu_j - \mu)^2}{a} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^a \alpha_j^2}{a} \quad (5)$$

Note the similarity between this measure and  $R^2$ .

A related measure is  $f$ , which compares the standard deviation of effects to  $\sigma_e$ .

$$f = \frac{\sigma_A}{\sigma_e} \quad (6)$$

## The RMSSE



## Measures of Overall Fit

$\omega^2$  and  $f$

The Root Mean Square Standardized Effect (RMSSE) (Steiger & Fouladi, 1997) averages the sum of squared standardized effects by  $a - 1$  instead of  $a$ , then takes the square root to return to the original metric.

$$RMSSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^a (\alpha_j / \sigma)^2}{a - 1}} \quad (7)$$

## Measures of Overall Fit

$\omega^2$  and  $f$

A primary reason for dividing by  $a - 1$  instead of  $a$  is that actually only  $a - 1$  standardized effects are free to vary.

Consider the very simple special case of a two-group experiment involving a treatment group and a placebo control. Suppose the population standard deviation is 1, and the control group has a population mean of 0, the experimental group has a population mean of 2.

In this case, there is one standardized experimental effect, and it is 2 standard deviations in size. On the other hand, the analysis of variance defines two effects, and they are  $\alpha_1 = -1$  and  $\alpha_2 = +1$ , respectively. So, if we average the sum of squared ANOVA effects, we come up with an average squared effect of 1. Clearly, this is misleading, an artifact of the way ANOVA effects are defined.

# Measures of Overall Fit

$\omega^2$  and  $f$

There seems to be no simple, universally acceptable solution to this problem. However, averaging with  $a$  appears to underestimate effect levels consistently.

Consequently, we propose to average by the number of independent effects, that is,  $a - 1$ . With this stipulation, and in view of Equation 3, the root mean square standardized effect can be written as

$$RMSSE = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n(a-1)}} \quad (8)$$

## Some Class Participation Questions

Suppose you have 4 groups with  $n = 12$  per group.

If the population RMSSE is 0.60, what would be the power of the  $F$ -test?

In the same situation you observe an  $F$  statistic of 3.29. Construct a 90% confidence interval for  $\lambda$ .

Construct a 90% confidence interval for the population RMSSE.

Can you construct a 90% confidence interval for what the actual power was in your experiment?