

Multiple Comparisons

Maxwell & Delaney

Both the one-way ANOVA and the Welch's F test tell us whether there are 'differences' among the groups.

Null Hypothesis

Marital status is not a significant predictor of hours spent watching television (tvhours).

$$H_0: \mu_{\text{Never}} = \mu_{\text{Divorced}} = \mu_{\text{Married}}$$

Alternative Hypothesis

Marital status is a significant predictor of hours spent watching television (tvhours).

H_1 : Any Difference among Population Means.

These overall tests do not tell us exactly which groups differ. As a result of the ambiguity in rejecting the null hypothesis of the ANOVA, **pairwise comparisons** are conducted in conjunction with an ANOVA.

Pairwise Comparisons for the Marital Status Example:

Pairwise Comparisons

- Pairwise comparisons are additional hypothesis tests that conducted to determine which mean differences are significant and which are not.
- If there are only two groups, pairwise comparisons are not needed. Pairwise comparisons are needed with three or more groups.
- There is a risk of making a Type I error with each pairwise comparison. The more comparisons you test, the greater the **familywise error rate (a.k.a., experimentwise alpha for a one-way ANOVA design)**. Typically, the familywise alpha levels are substantially greater than the value of alpha used for any one of the individual comparisons.

The number of pairwise comparisons needed is determined by the number of groups.

$$\# \text{ of Pairwise Comparisons} = \frac{\# \text{ of groups}(\# \text{ of groups} - 1)}{2} = \frac{a(a - 1)}{2}$$

_____ comparisons would be needed to compare 3 groups.

_____ comparisons would be needed to compare 5 groups.

_____ comparisons would be needed to compare 7 groups.

_____ comparisons would be needed to compare 9 groups.

- The accepted practice is to use a familywise alpha of .05 with the understanding that the alpha for a specific pairwise comparison will be lower.
- If a one-way ANOVA is conducted, the researcher would use a pairwise comparison procedure that assumes equal population variances; the most commonly used are listed below.
 - Tukey HSD procedure
 - Scheffe procedure
 - Bonferroni (Dunn) procedure
 - Sidak (Dunn-Sidak) procedure
 - See page 7 in the notes for additional procedures and my comments about the procedures.
- If a Welch ANOVA is conducted, the researcher would use a pairwise comparison procedure that does not assume equal population variances.
 - Games-Howell procedure
 - Dunnett's T3 procedure
 - Tamhane's T2 procedure
 - Dunnett's C procedure
 - *Bonferroni (Dunn) procedure
 - *Sidak (Dunn-Sidak) procedure
 - *Brown-Forsythe procedure
 - See page 13 in the notes for a description of the procedures.

*Not a point-and-click option on SPSS

Conducting Pairwise Comparisons by Hand
Equal Population Variances Assumed

Note. I doubled the sample size for the example (from the previous chapter) to increase the power. See previous chapter for example on conducting a one-way ANOVA by hand.

SPSS Instructions

→Analyze→Compare Means→One-Way ANOVA

Dependent List: TVHOURS

Factor: MARITALSTATUS

→Options

√ Descriptives

Oneway

Descriptives

tvhours

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Never	10	10.0000	4.05518	1.28236	7.0991	12.9009	5.00	16.00
Divorced	10	12.0000	2.00000	.63246	10.5693	13.4307	10.00	15.00
Married	10	17.0000	6.21825	1.96638	12.5517	21.4483	11.00	26.00
Total	30	13.0000	5.22593	.95412	11.0486	14.9514	5.00	26.00

ANOVA

tvhours

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	260.000	2	130.000	6.598	.005
Within Groups	532.000	27	19.704		
Total	792.000	29			

First, calculate the F value for each pairwise comparison.

Second, compare the F values to an F critical value. The choice of critical value you use determines whether the procedure would be called Bonferroni, Tukey, Scheffe, etc.

1. Never vs. Divorced

$$F_{\psi} = \frac{\hat{\psi}^2}{\frac{C_1^2}{n_1}MSE + \frac{C_2^2}{n_2}MSE + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a}MSE} = \frac{(\bar{Y}_{Never} - \bar{Y}_{Divorced})^2}{\frac{MSE}{n_{Never}} + \frac{MSE}{n_{Divorced}}}$$

2. Never vs. Married

$$F_{\psi} = \frac{\hat{\psi}^2}{\frac{C_1^2}{n_1}MSE + \frac{C_2^2}{n_2}MSE + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a}MSE} = \frac{(\bar{Y}_{Never} - \bar{Y}_{Married})^2}{\frac{MSE}{n_{Never}} + \frac{MSE}{n_{Married}}}$$

3. Divorced vs. Married

$$F_{\psi} = \frac{\hat{\psi}^2}{\frac{C_1^2}{n_1}MSE + \frac{C_2^2}{n_2}MSE + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a}MSE} = \frac{(\bar{Y}_{Divorced} - \bar{Y}_{Married})^2}{\frac{MSE}{n_{Divorced}} + \frac{MSE}{n_{Married}}}$$

Using the Bonferroni (Dunn) Critical Value Table

We conducted _____ pairwise comparisons.

The denominator $df = N - a =$

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Never vs. Divorced			
Never vs. Married			
Divorced vs. Married			

Using the Sidak Critical Value Table

We conducted _____ pairwise comparisons.

The denominator $df = N - a =$

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Never vs. Divorced			
Never vs. Married			
Divorced vs. Married			

Using the Tukey (Studentized Range) Critical Value Table

The factor has _____ levels.

The denominator $df = N - a =$

The q critical value is:

The F critical value $= \frac{q^2}{2}$, which is:

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Never vs. Divorced			
Never vs. Married			
Divorced vs. Married			

Converting the ANOVA Critical Value Table to a Scheffe Critical Value

The factor has _____ levels so the numerator $df = a - 1 =$ _____.

The denominator $df = N - a =$ _____.

The ANOVA F critical value is:

The Scheffe F critical value = $(a - 1) * ANOVA F Critical Value =$ _____.

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Never vs. Divorced			
Never vs. Married			
Divorced vs. Married			

The relative power of the procedures can be observed by comparing the critical values. Smaller critical values are easier to exceed...which translates to more powerful procedures.

Procedure	Critical Value	Power Ranking
Bonferroni		
Sidak		
Tukey		
Scheffe		

The relative power of the procedures are influenced by the number of groups, the number of comparisons, the denominator degrees of freedom, etc. The most powerful procedure for one design may not be the most powerful procedure for another design.

Note. SPSS, SAS, etc. sometimes report the comparisons as F tests and at other times as t tests. Taking the square root of the F we calculated and the square root of the F critical value would convert them to t tests.

Excerpted from SPSS documentation. These procedures assume equal population variances. My comments are in bold.

- LSD. Uses t tests to perform all pairwise comparisons between group means. No adjustment is made to the error rate for multiple comparisons. **NOT RECOMMENDED.**
- Bonferroni. Uses t tests to perform pairwise comparisons between group means, but controls overall error rate by setting the error rate for each test to the experimentwise error rate divided by the total number of tests. Hence, the observed significance level is adjusted for the fact that multiple comparisons are being made.
- Sidak. Pairwise multiple comparison test based on a t statistic. Sidak adjusts the significance level for multiple comparisons and provides tighter bounds than Bonferroni.
- Scheffe. Performs simultaneous joint pairwise comparisons for all possible pairwise combinations of means. Uses the F sampling distribution. Can be used to examine all possible linear combinations of group means, not just pairwise comparisons.
- R-E-G-W F. Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch multiple stepdown procedure based on an F test. **NOT RECOMMENDED.**
- R-E-G-W Q. Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch multiple stepdown procedure based on the Studentized range. **The Ryan procedure is always more powerful than Tukey's procedure, but it is more involved to calculate. Recently, it has fallen out of favor because it does not allow you to determine which group is significantly higher, only which groups are similar to each other (i.e., subsets).**
- S-N-K. Makes all pairwise comparisons between means using the Studentized range distribution. With equal sample sizes, it also compares pairs of means within homogeneous subsets, using a stepwise procedure. Means are ordered from highest to lowest, and extreme differences are tested first. **NOT RECOMMENDED.**
- Tukey. Uses the Studentized range statistic to make all of the pairwise comparisons between groups. Sets the experimentwise error rate at the error rate for the collection for all pairwise comparisons.
- Tukey's b. Uses the Studentized range distribution to make pairwise comparisons between groups. The critical value is the average of the corresponding value for the Tukey's honestly significant difference test and the Student-Newman-Keuls. **NOT RECOMMENDED.**
- Duncan. Makes pairwise comparisons using a stepwise order of comparisons identical to the order used by the Student-Newman-Keuls test, but sets a protection level for the error rate for the collection of tests, rather than an error rate for individual tests. Uses the Studentized range statistic. **NOT RECOMMENDED.**
- Hochberg's GT2. Multiple comparison and range test that uses the Studentized maximum modulus. Similar to Tukey's honestly significant difference test.
- Gabriel. Pairwise comparison test that used the Studentized maximum modulus and is generally more powerful than Hochberg's GT2 when the cell sizes are unequal. Gabriel's test may become liberal when the cell sizes vary greatly. **IF UNEQUAL SAMPLE SIZES, DO NOT USE ASSUME EQUAL POPULATION VARIANCES.**
- Waller-Duncan. Multiple comparison test based on a t statistic; uses a Bayesian approach.
- Dunnett. Pairwise multiple comparison t test that compares a set of treatments against a single control mean. The last category is the default control category. Alternatively, you can choose the first category. 2-sided tests that the mean at any level (except the control category) of the factor is not equal to that of the control category. < Control tests if the mean at any level of the factor is smaller than that of the control category. > Control tests if the mean at any level of the factor is greater than that of the control category.

SPSS Instructions

→Analyze→Compare Means→One-Way ANOVA
 Dependent List: TVHOURS
 Factor: MARITALSTATUS
 →Options
 √ Descriptives
 →Post Hoc
 √ Tukey ...or another procedure

Oneway**Descriptives**

tvhours

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Never	10	10.0000	4.05518	1.28236	7.0991	12.9009	5.00	16.00
Divorced	10	12.0000	2.00000	.63246	10.5693	13.4307	10.00	15.00
Married	10	17.0000	6.21825	1.96638	12.5517	21.4483	11.00	26.00
Total	30	13.0000	5.22593	.95412	11.0486	14.9514	5.00	26.00

ANOVA

tvhours

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	260.000	2	130.000	6.598	.005
Within Groups	532.000	27	19.704		
Total	792.000	29			

General Guidelines for Interpreting the Pairwise Comparison Results.

- You should only select one pairwise comparison procedure (e.g., Tukey).
- There are redundancies in the pairwise comparison output. For example, the comparison of Never vs. Married and the comparison of Married vs. Never.
- An easy way to eliminate the redundancy is to delete (i.e., cross-out) the negative differences. If you interpret the positive differences that are significant, then you know the group on the left is significantly higher than the group on the right.
- The APA results section would have a table containing all of the pairwise comparisons (e.g., Tukey) whether they are significant or not. Mention the significant comparisons in the text.

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:tvhours

	(I) MaritalStatus	(J) MaritalStatus	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	Never	Divorced	-2.00000	1.98513	.579	-6.9220	2.9220
		Married	-7.00000*	1.98513	.004	-11.9220	-2.0780
	Divorced	Never	2.00000	1.98513	.579	-2.9220	6.9220
		Married	-5.00000*	1.98513	.046	-9.9220	-.0780
	Married	Never	7.00000*	1.98513	.004	2.0780	11.9220
		Divorced	5.00000*	1.98513	.046	.0780	9.9220
Scheffe	Never	Divorced	-2.00000	1.98513	.608	-7.1415	3.1415
		Married	-7.00000*	1.98513	.006	-12.1415	-1.8585
	Divorced	Never	2.00000	1.98513	.608	-3.1415	7.1415
		Married	-5.00000	1.98513	.058	-10.1415	.1415
	Married	Never	7.00000*	1.98513	.006	1.8585	12.1415
		Divorced	5.00000	1.98513	.058	-.1415	10.1415
Bonferroni	Never	Divorced	-2.00000	1.98513	.968	-7.0670	3.0670
		Married	-7.00000*	1.98513	.005	-12.0670	-1.9330
	Divorced	Never	2.00000	1.98513	.968	-3.0670	7.0670
		Married	-5.00000	1.98513	.054	-10.0670	.0670
	Married	Never	7.00000*	1.98513	.005	1.9330	12.0670
		Divorced	5.00000	1.98513	.054	-.0670	10.0670
Sidak	Never	Divorced	-2.00000	1.98513	.689	-7.0523	3.0523
		Married	-7.00000*	1.98513	.005	-12.0523	-1.9477
	Divorced	Never	2.00000	1.98513	.689	-3.0523	7.0523
		Married	-5.00000	1.98513	.053	-10.0523	.0523
	Married	Never	7.00000*	1.98513	.005	1.9477	12.0523
		Divorced	5.00000	1.98513	.053	-.0523	10.0523

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Conducting Pairwise Comparisons by Hand
Equal Population Variances Were NOT Assumed

Note. I deleted a few observations from the previous example.

SPSS Instructions

→Analyze→Compare Means→One-Way ANOVA

Dependent List: TVHOURS

Factor: MARITALSTATUS

→Options

√ Descriptives

√ Welch

Oneway

Descriptives

tvhours

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Never	15	10.0000	3.98210	1.02817	7.7948	12.2052	5.00	16.00
Divorced	13	12.0769	2.01914	.56001	10.8568	13.2971	10.00	15.00
Married	14	17.2857	6.23179	1.66552	13.6876	20.8838	11.00	26.00
Total	42	13.0714	5.36198	.82737	11.4005	14.7423	5.00	26.00

ANOVA

tvhours

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	403.005	2	201.503	10.130	.000
Within Groups	775.780	39	19.892		
Total	1178.786	41			

Robust Tests of Equality of Means

tvhours

	Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	6.733	2	22.861	.005

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

First, calculate the F value for each pairwise comparison.

Second, compare the F values to an F critical value. The choice of critical value you use determines whether the procedure would be called Bonferroni, Games-Howell, Brown-Forsythe, etc.

1. Never vs. Divorced

$$F_{\psi} = \frac{\hat{\psi}^2}{\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \frac{C_2^2}{n_2} S_2^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2} = \frac{(\bar{Y}_{Never} - \bar{Y}_{Divorced})^2}{\frac{S_{Never}^2}{n_{Never}} + \frac{S_{Divorced}^2}{n_{Divorced}}}$$

$$df_{\text{Denominator}} = \frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 \right]^2 + \dots + \left[\frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2} = \frac{\left[\frac{S_{Never}^2}{n_{Never}} + \frac{S_{Divorced}^2}{n_{Divorced}} \right]^2}{\left[\frac{S_{Never}^2}{n_{Never}} \right]^2 + \left[\frac{S_{Divorced}^2}{n_{Divorced}} \right]^2}$$

$$df_{\text{Denominator}} = \frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{\frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 \right]^2}{n_1 - 1} + \dots + \frac{\left[\frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{n_a - 1}} = \frac{\left[\frac{S_{Never}^2}{n_{Never}} \right]^2}{n_{Never} - 1} + \frac{\left[\frac{S_{Divorced}^2}{n_{Divorced}} \right]^2}{n_{Divorced} - 1}$$

2. Never vs. Married

$$F_{\psi} = \frac{\hat{\psi}^2}{\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \frac{C_2^2}{n_2} S_2^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2} = \frac{(\bar{Y}_{Never} - \bar{Y}_{Married})^2}{\frac{S_{Never}^2}{n_{Never}} + \frac{S_{Married}^2}{n_{Married}}}$$

$$df_{\text{Denominator}} = \frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 \right]^2 + \dots + \left[\frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2} = \frac{\left[\frac{S_{Never}^2}{n_{Never}} + \frac{S_{Married}^2}{n_{Married}} \right]^2}{\left[\frac{S_{Never}^2}{n_{Never}} \right]^2 + \left[\frac{S_{Married}^2}{n_{Married}} \right]^2}$$

$$df_{\text{Denominator}} = \frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{\frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 \right]^2}{n_1 - 1} + \dots + \frac{\left[\frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{n_a - 1}} = \frac{\left[\frac{S_{Never}^2}{n_{Never}} \right]^2}{n_{Never} - 1} + \frac{\left[\frac{S_{Married}^2}{n_{Married}} \right]^2}{n_{Married} - 1}$$

3. Divorced vs. Married

$$F_{\psi} = \frac{\hat{\psi}^2}{\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \frac{C_2^2}{n_2} S_2^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2} = \frac{(\bar{Y}_{Divorced} - \bar{Y}_{Married})^2}{\frac{S_{Divorced}^2}{n_{Divorced}} + \frac{S_{Married}^2}{n_{Married}}}$$

$$df_{\text{Denominator}} = \frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 \right]^2 + \dots + \left[\frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2} = \frac{\left[\frac{S_{Divorced}^2}{n_{Divorced}} + \frac{S_{Married}^2}{n_{Married}} \right]^2}{\left[\frac{S_{Divorced}^2}{n_{Divorced}} \right]^2 + \left[\frac{S_{Married}^2}{n_{Married}} \right]^2}$$

$$df_{\text{Denominator}} = \frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{\frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 \right]^2}{n_1 - 1} + \dots + \frac{\left[\frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{n_a - 1}} = \frac{\left[\frac{S_{Divorced}^2}{n_{Divorced}} \right]^2}{n_{Divorced} - 1} + \frac{\left[\frac{S_{Married}^2}{n_{Married}} \right]^2}{n_{Married} - 1}$$

Using the Bonferroni (Dunn) Critical Value Table

We conducted _____ pairwise comparisons.
The denominator df varies for each comparison.

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Never vs. Divorced <i>den. df = 21.4 = 21</i>	3.15		
Never vs. Married <i>den. df = 21.9 = 22</i>	13.85		
Divorced vs. Married <i>den. df = 15.9 = 16</i>	8.76		

Using the Sidak Critical Value Table

We conducted _____ pairwise comparisons.
The denominator df varies for each comparison.

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Never vs. Divorced <i>den. df = 21.4 = 21</i>	3.15		
Never vs. Married <i>den. df = 21.9 = 22</i>	13.85		
Divorced vs. Married <i>den. df = 15.9 = 16</i>	8.76		

Using the Games-Howell (Studentized Range/Tukey) Critical Value Table

The factor has _____ levels.
The denominator df varies for each comparison.

Find the q critical value(s).

Convert the q critical values to F critical values = $\frac{q^2}{2}$.

Comparison	F we calculated	q	F Critical Value	Result
Never vs. Divorced <i>den. df = 21.4 = 21</i>	3.15			
Never vs. Married <i>den. df = 21.9 = 22</i>	13.85			
Divorced vs. Married <i>den. df = 15.9 = 16</i>	8.76			

Converting the ANOVA Critical Value Table to a Brown-Forsythe Critical Value

The factor has _____ levels so the numerator $df = a - 1 =$ _____.
The denominator df varies for each comparison.

Find the ANOVA F critical values.

The Scheffe F critical values = $(a - 1) * ANOVA F Critical Value$

Comparison	F we calculated	ANOVA Critical Value	Scheffe Critical Value	Result
Never vs. Divorced <i>den. df = 21.4 = 21</i>	3.15			
Never vs. Married <i>den. df = 21.9 = 22</i>	13.85			
Divorced vs. Married <i>den. df = 15.9 = 16</i>	8.76			

Excerpted from SPSS documentation. These procedures do NOT assume equal population variances. My comments are in bold.

- Tamhane's T2. Conservative pairwise comparisons test based on a t test. This test is appropriate when the variances are unequal.
- Dunnett's T3. Pairwise comparison test based on the Studentized maximum modulus. This test is appropriate when the variances are unequal.
- Games-Howell. Pairwise comparison test that is sometimes liberal . This test is appropriate when the variances are unequal. **Only slightly liberal; okay to use.**
- Dunnett's C. Pairwise comparison test based on the Studentized range. This test is appropriate when the variances are unequal.

SPSS Instructions
 →Analyze→Compare Means→One-Way ANOVA
 Dependent List: TVHOURS
 Factor: MARITALSTATUS
 →Options
 √ Descriptives
 √ Welch
 →Post Hoc
 √ Games-Howell...or another procedure

Oneway

Descriptives

tvhours

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Never	15	10.0000	3.98210	1.02817	7.7948	12.2052	5.00	16.00
Divorced	13	12.0769	2.01914	.56001	10.8568	13.2971	10.00	15.00
Married	14	17.2857	6.23179	1.66552	13.6876	20.8838	11.00	26.00
Total	42	13.0714	5.36198	.82737	11.4005	14.7423	5.00	26.00

ANOVA

tvhours

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	403.005	2	201.503	10.130	.000
Within Groups	775.780	39	19.892		
Total	1178.786	41			

Robust Tests of Equality of Means

tvhours

	Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	6.733	2	22.861	.005

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:tvhours

	(I) MaritalStatus	(J) MaritalStatus	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tamhane	Never	Divorced	-2.07692	1.17079	.247	-5.1093	.9554
		Married	-7.28571*	1.95732	.004	-12.3453	-2.2261
	Divorced	Never	2.07692	1.17079	.247	-.9554	5.1093
		Married	-5.20879*	1.75714	.027	-9.8949	-.5226
	Married	Never	7.28571*	1.95732	.004	2.2261	12.3453
		Divorced	5.20879*	1.75714	.027	.5226	9.8949
Dunnnett T3	Never	Divorced	-2.07692	1.17079	.241	-5.0979	.9441
		Married	-7.28571*	1.95732	.004	-12.3270	-2.2444
	Divorced	Never	2.07692	1.17079	.241	-.9441	5.0979
		Married	-5.20879*	1.75714	.027	-9.8688	-.5487
	Married	Never	7.28571*	1.95732	.004	2.2444	12.3270
		Divorced	5.20879*	1.75714	.027	.5487	9.8688
Games-Howell	Never	Divorced	-2.07692	1.17079	.202	-5.0244	.8706
		Married	-7.28571*	1.95732	.003	-12.2050	-2.3664
	Divorced	Never	2.07692	1.17079	.202	-.8706	5.0244
		Married	-5.20879*	1.75714	.024	-9.7460	-.6715
	Married	Never	7.28571*	1.95732	.003	2.3664	12.2050
		Divorced	5.20879*	1.75714	.024	.6715	9.7460
Dunnnett C	Never	Divorced	-2.07692	1.17079		-5.1548	1.0009
		Married	-7.28571*	1.95732		-12.4414	-2.1301
	Divorced	Never	2.07692	1.17079		-1.0009	5.1548
		Married	-5.20879*	1.75714		-9.8533	-.5643
	Married	Never	7.28571*	1.95732		2.1301	12.4414
		Divorced	5.20879*	1.75714		.5643	9.8533

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Complex Comparisons

Two methods of instruction: Lecture or Group Projects

Third Group: Combination of two methods.

Oneway

Descriptives

Quiz

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
					Lecture	16		
Projects	16	14.0000	2.30940	.57735	12.7694	15.2306	11.00	17.00
Combo	16	17.0000	1.63299	.40825	16.1298	17.8702	15.00	19.00
Total	48	14.6667	2.77783	.40094	13.8601	15.4733	10.00	19.00

ANOVA

Quiz

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	138.667	2	69.333	13.929	.000
Within Groups	224.000	45	4.978		
Total	362.667	47			

- A **linear combination** is of the form: $c_1\mu_1 + c_2\mu_2 + c_3\mu_3 = 0$ where the c_j are the weights chosen by the researcher.
- The sum of the coefficients are restricted to add up to zero for this to be a **contrast**. That is,

$$\sum_{j=1}^a c_j = 0.$$
- However**, not all of the c_j may equal zero. You have to have at least two non-zero weights for it to be a contrast.

Is the combined method equivalent to the average of the other two methods?

1. Write the Null Hypothesis in Symbols.

2. Move all the terms in the Null Hypothesis to the left side of the equal sign and set it equal to zero.

3. If necessary, multiply the equation by a constant to eliminate all fractions.

After step 3, you should have the Null Hypothesis in the form of a ψ contrast. The coefficients (C_j) are the numbers adjacent to the population means.

4. Calculate a sample-based version of ψ using the sample means.

$$\hat{\psi} =$$

5. Test the Null Hypothesis ($\psi = 0$)...**EQUAL VARIANCES ASSUMED.**

$$F_{\psi} = \frac{\hat{\psi}^2}{\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} MSE + \frac{C_2^2}{n_2} MSE + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} MSE} =$$

$$df_{Denominator} = N - a$$

6. Compare the F calculated in step 5 to **an appropriate critical value** to determine significance (choices include Bonferroni, Sidak, Scheffe; see next page).

7. Interpret the results.

The average reaction time for the pink group ($M = 15.04$, $SD = 1.09$, $n = 15$) was not significantly different than the combined average of the red ($M = 14.17$, $SD = 3.12$, $n = 15$) and white ($M = 16.17$, $SD = 2.28$, $n = 15$) groups, $F = 1.27$, $MSE = 2.45$, $p > \alpha$.

Using the Bonferroni (Dunn) Critical Value Table

We conducted _____ comparisons.

The denominator $df = N - a =$

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Lecture vs. Projects	1.61		
Lecture vs. Combo	25.71		
Projects vs. Combo	14.46		
1/2(L&P) = Combo?	26.25		

Using the Sidak Critical Value Table

We conducted _____ comparisons.

The denominator $df = N - a =$

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Lecture vs. Projects	1.61		
Lecture vs. Combo	25.71		
Projects vs. Combo	14.46		
1/2(L&P) = Combo?	26.25		

Converting the ANOVA Critical Value Table to a Scheffe Critical Value

The factor has _____ levels so the numerator $df = a - 1 =$ _____.

The denominator $df = N - a =$

The ANOVA F critical value is:

The Scheffe F critical value = $(a - 1) * ANOVA F Critical Value =$

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Lecture vs. Projects	1.61		
Lecture vs. Combo	25.71		
Projects vs. Combo	14.46		
1/2(L&P) = Combo?	26.25		

SPSS Instructions

→Analyze→Compare Means→One-Way ANOVA
 Dependent List: QUIZ
 Factor: METHOD
 →Options
 √ Descriptives
 →Contrasts
 Coefficients: 1 →Add -1 →Add 0 →Add →NEXT
 Coefficients: 1 →Add 0 →Add -1 →Add →NEXT
 Coefficients: 0 →Add 1 →Add -1 →Add →NEXT
 Coefficients: 1 →Add 1 →Add -2 →Add →CONTINUE

Oneway

--descriptives omitted for brevity--

ANOVA

Quiz

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	138.667	2	69.333	13.929	.000
Within Groups	224.000	45	4.978		
Total	362.667	47			

Contrast Coefficients

Contrast	Method		
	Lecture	Projects	Combo
1	1	-1	0
2	1	0	-1
3	0	1	-1
4	1	1	-2

Contrast Tests

	Contrast	Value of Contrast	Std. Error	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Quiz	Assume equal variances	1	-1.0000	.78881	-1.268	45	.211
		2	-4.0000	.78881	-5.071	45	.000
		3	-3.0000	.78881	-3.803	45	.000
		4	-7.0000	1.36626	-5.123	45	.000
	Does not assume equal variances	1	-1.0000	.87560	-1.142	29.498	.263
		2	-4.0000	.77460	-5.164	25.052	.000
		3	-3.0000	.70711	-4.243	27.000	.000
		4	-7.0000	1.19722	-5.847	41.457	.000

Is the combined method equivalent to the average of the other two methods?

1. Write the Null Hypothesis in Symbols.

2. Move all the terms in the Null Hypothesis to the left side of the equal sign and set it equal to zero.

3. If necessary, multiply the equation by a constant to eliminate all fractions.

After step 3, you should have the Null Hypothesis in the form of a ψ contrast. The coefficients (C_j) are the numbers adjacent to the population means.

4. Calculate a sample-based version of ψ using the sample means.

$$\hat{\psi} =$$

5. Test the Null Hypothesis ($\psi = 0$)...Equal Variances NOT Assumed.

$$F_{\psi} = \frac{\hat{\psi}^2}{\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \frac{C_2^2}{n_2} S_2^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2}$$

$$df_{\text{Denominator}} = \frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 + \dots + \frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{\frac{\left[\frac{C_1^2}{n_1} S_1^2 \right]^2}{n_1 - 1} + \dots + \frac{\left[\frac{C_a^2}{n_a} S_a^2 \right]^2}{n_a - 1}}$$

6. Compare the F calculated in step 5 to **an appropriate critical value** to determine significance (choices include Bonferroni, Sidak, Brown-Forsythe).

7. Interpret the results.

The average reaction time for the pink group ($M = 15.04$, $SD = 1.09$, $n = 15$) was/was not significantly different than the combined average of the red ($M = 14.17$, $SD = 3.12$, $n = 10$) and white ($M = 16.17$, $SD = 2.28$, $n = 12$) groups, $F = 1.27$, $p > \alpha$.

Using the Bonferroni (Dunn) Critical Value Table

We conducted _____ comparisons.

The denominator df varies for each comparison.

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Lecture vs. Projects <i>den. $df = 20.9 = 21$</i>	1.25		
Lecture vs. Combo <i>den. $df = 16.0$</i>	26.55		
Projects vs. Combo <i>den. $df = 23.09 = 23$</i>	19.81		
1/2(L&P) = Combo? <i>den. $df = 35.9 = 36$</i>	36.68		

Using the Sidak Critical Value Table

We conducted _____ comparisons.

The denominator df varies for each comparison.

Comparison	F we calculated	F Critical Value	Result
Lecture vs. Projects <i>den. $df = 20.9 = 21$</i>	1.25		
Lecture vs. Combo <i>den. $df = 16.0$</i>	26.55		
Projects vs. Combo <i>den. $df = 23.09 = 23$</i>	19.81		
1/2(L&P) = Combo? <i>den. $df = 35.9 = 36$</i>	36.68		

Converting the ANOVA Critical Value Table to a Brown-Forsythe Critical Value

The factor has _____ levels so the numerator $df = a - 1 =$ _____.

The denominator df varies for each comparison.

Find the ANOVA F critical values.

The Scheffe F critical values = $(a - 1) * ANOVA F Critical Value$

Comparison	F we calculated	ANOVA Critical Value	Scheffe Critical Value	Result
Lecture vs. Projects <i>den. $df = 20.9 = 21$</i>	1.25			
Lecture vs. Combo <i>den. $df = 16.0$</i>	26.55			
Projects vs. Combo <i>den. $df = 23.09 = 23$</i>	19.81			
1/2(L&P) = Combo? <i>den. $df = 35.9 = 36$</i>	36.68			

SPSS Instructions
 →Analyze→Compare Means→One-Way ANOVA
 Dependent List: QUIZ
 Factor: METHOD
 →Options
 √ Descriptives
 √ Welch
 →Contrasts
 Coefficients: 1 →Add -1 →Add 0 →Add →NEXT
 Coefficients: 1 →Add 0 →Add -1 →Add →NEXT
 Coefficients: 0 →Add 1 →Add -1 →Add →NEXT
 Coefficients: 1 →Add 1 →Add -2 →Add →CONTINUE

Oneway

Descriptives

Quiz

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Lecture	11	12.6364	2.46060	.74190	10.9833	14.2894	10.00	17.00
Projects	14	13.7143	2.30146	.61509	12.3855	15.0431	11.00	17.00
Combo	16	17.0000	1.63299	.40825	16.1298	17.8702	15.00	19.00
Total	41	14.7073	2.80396	.43791	13.8223	15.5924	10.00	19.00

ANOVA

Quiz

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	145.085	2	72.543	16.273	.000
Within Groups	169.403	38	4.458		
Total	314.488	40			

Robust Tests of Equality of Means

Quiz

	Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	17.823	2	21.617	.000

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

Contrast Coefficients

Contrast	Method		
	Lecture	Projects	Combo
1	1	-1	0
2	1	0	-1
3	0	1	-1
4	1	1	-2

Contrast Tests

			Value of Contrast	Std. Error	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Quiz	Assume equal variances	1	-1.0779	.85070	-1.267	38	.213
		2	-4.3636	.82698	-5.277	38	.000
		3	-3.2857	.77269	-4.252	38	.000
		4	-7.6494	1.35580	-5.642	38	.000
	Does not assume equal variances	1	-1.0779	.96372	-1.119	20.883	.276
		2	-4.3636	.84681	-5.153	15.995	.000
		3	-3.2857	.73824	-4.451	23.093	.000
		4	-7.6494	1.26310	-6.056	35.883	.000

Alternatively, you could use a hybrid approach. Set the alpha = .04 for the Games-Howell comparisons. Create the complex contrast and use an alpha = .01, so the familywise alpha = .05.

SPSS Instructions

→Analyze→Compare Means→One-Way ANOVA

Dependent List: QUIZ

Factor: METHOD

→Options

Descriptives

Welch

→Post-Hoc

Games-Howell

Significance Level: .04

→Contrast

Coefficients: 1 →Add 1 →Add -2 →Add →CONTINUE

Oneway

Descriptives

Quiz

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Lecture	11	12.6364	2.46060	.74190	10.9833	14.2894	10.00	17.00
Projects	14	13.7143	2.30146	.61509	12.3855	15.0431	11.00	17.00
Combo	16	17.0000	1.63299	.40825	16.1298	17.8702	15.00	19.00
Total	41	14.7073	2.80396	.43791	13.8223	15.5924	10.00	19.00

ANOVA

Quiz

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	145.085	2	72.543	16.273	.000
Within Groups	169.403	38	4.458		
Total	314.488	40			

Robust Tests of Equality of Means

Quiz

	Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	17.823	2	21.617	.000

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

Contrast Coefficients

Contrast	Method		
	Lecture	Projects	Combo
1	1	1	-2

Contrast Tests

	Contrast	Value of Contrast	Std. Error	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Quiz	Assume equal variances 1	-7.6494	1.35580	-5.642	38	.000
	Does not assume equal variances 1	-7.6494	1.26310	-6.056	35.883	.000

Determine significance of the above t test using an alpha = .01.

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Quiz

Games-Howell

(I) Method	(J) Method	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	96% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Lecture	Projects	-1.07792	.96372	.514	-3.6119	1.4560
	Combo	-4.36364	.84681	.000	-6.6462	-2.0811
Projects	Lecture	1.07792	.96372	.514	-1.4560	3.6119
	Combo	-3.28571	.73824	.001	-5.2119	-1.3595
Combo	Lecture	4.36364	.84681	.000	2.0811	6.6462
	Projects	3.28571	.73824	.001	1.3595	5.2119

*. The mean difference is significant at the .04 level.

The familywise alpha = .05 for the multiple comparisons.

Familywise Error Rate = the probability of at least one type I error among a set of contrasts.

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(\text{at least one Type I Error}) &= 1 - \Pr(\text{no Type I Errors}) \\ &= 1 - (1 - \alpha_{PC})^{\# \text{ of Comparisons}}\end{aligned}$$

Per Comparison Error Rate = the probability that a single comparison will be falsely declared significant.

$$\alpha_{PC} = 1 - \sqrt[C]{1 - \alpha_{Family}} \quad \text{where } C = \text{number of comparisons}$$

$$\text{Expected Number of Type I Errors} = (\# \text{ of Comparisons})(\alpha_{PC})$$

A researcher conducted pairwise comparisons for $a = 6$ groups using an alpha of .05 per comparison.

- How many comparisons were performed?
- What is the familywise error rate?
- What is the per comparison error rate?
- What is the expected number of Type I errors?

A researcher conducted pairwise comparisons for $a = 4$ groups using an alpha of .05 per comparison. Further, they conducted pairwise comparisons on 20 dependent variables.

- How many comparisons were performed per dependent variable?
- What is the familywise error rate per dependent variable?
- What is the expected number of Type I errors for the research study?

A researcher conducted pairwise comparisons for $a = 4$ groups using a familywise alpha of .05

- How many comparisons were performed?
- What is the per comparison error rate per?
- What is the expected number of Type I errors for the research study?

More Info about the Bonferroni and Sidak Procedures
--

Dunn (a.k.a., Bonferroni) procedure: $\alpha_{PC} = \frac{\alpha_{Family}}{\#Comparisons}$

Sidak (a.k.a., Dunn-Sidak) procedure: $\alpha_{PC} = 1 - \sqrt[c]{1 - \alpha_{Family}}$