Analysis of Variance: repeated measures

## Logic behind ANOVA:

ANOVA compares the amount of systematic variation (from our experimental manipulations) to the amount of random variation (from the participants themselves) to produce an $F$-ratio:


Tests for comparing three or more groups or conditions:
(a) Nonparametric tests:

Independent measures: Kruskal-Wallis.
Repeated measures: Friedman's.
(b) Parametric tests:

One-way independent-measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

One-way repeated-measures ANOVA.
$F=\quad$ systematic variation
random variation ("error")

Large value of $F$ : a lot of the overall variation in scores is due to the experimental manipulation, rather than to random variation between participants.

Small value of $F$ : the variation in scores produced by the experimental manipulation is small, compared to random variation between participants.

ANOVA is based on the variance of the scores.
The variance is the standard deviation squared:

$$
\text { variance }=\frac{\sum(X-\bar{X})^{2}}{N}
$$

In practice, we use only the top line of the variance formula (the "Sum of Squares", or "SS"):

$$
\text { sum of squares }=\sum(X-\bar{X})^{2}
$$

We divide this by the appropriate "degrees of freedom" (usually the number of groups or participants minus 1).

## One-way Repeated-Measures ANOVA:

Use this where you have:
(a) one independent variable (with 2 or more levels);
(b) one dependent variable;
(c) each participant participates in every condition in the experiment (repeated measures).

A one-way repeated-measures ANOVA is equivalent to a repeated-measures $t$-test, except that you have more than two conditions in the study.

## Effects of sleep-deprivation on vigilance

 in air-traffic controllers:No deprivation vs. 12 hours' deprivation:
One Independent Variable, 2 levels - use repeated-measures $t$-test.


No deprivation vs. 12 hours vs. 24 hours:

One Independent Variable, 3 levels (differing quantitatively) use one-way repeated-measures ANOVA


Effects of sleep deprivation on vigilance:
Independent Variable: length of sleep deprivation ( 0,12 hours and 24 hours). Dependent Variable: 1 hour vigilance test (number of planes missed).
Each participant does all 3 conditions, in a random order.

| Participant | 0 hours | 12 hours | 24 hours |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 3 | 12 | 13 |
| 2 | 5 | 15 | 14 |
| 3 | 6 | 16 | 16 |
| 4 | 4 | 11 | 12 |
| 5 | 7 | 12 | 11 |
| 6 | 3 | 13 | 14 |
| 7 | 4 | 17 | 16 |
| 8 | 5 | 11 | 12 |
| 9 | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| 10 | 3 | 13 | 14 |

hours:
Mean $=4.6$
standard deviation $=1.43$.

12 hours:
Mean = 13.0
standard deviation $=2.31$.

24 hours:
Mean = 13.3
standard deviation $=1.83$.

## "Partitioning the variance" in a one-way repeated-measures ANOVA:

| Total SS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Subjects SS | Within Subjects |  |
|  | SS |  |
|  | $1$ |  |
| (usually | SS Experimental | SS Error |
| uninteresting: if | (systematic | (unsystematic |
| it's large, it just | within-subjects | within-subjects |
| shows that | variation that | variation that's |
| subjects differ | reflects our | not due to our |
| from each other | experimental | experimental |
| overall) | manipulation) | manipulation) |


|  | The ANOVA summary table: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | SS |  |  |  |
| Source: | df | MS | F |  |
| Between subjects | 48.97 | 9 | 5.44 |  |
| Within subjects | 534.53 | 20 |  |  |
| Experimental | 487.00 | 2 | 243.90 | 92.36 |
| Error | 47.53 | 18 | 2.64 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Total SS: reflects the total amount of variation amongst all the scores.
Between subjects SS: a measure of the amount of unsystematic variation between the subjects.

Within subjects SS
Experimental SS: a measure of the amount of systematic variation within the subjects. (This is due to our experimental manipulation).

Error SS: a measure of the amount of unsystematic variation within each participant's set of scores.

Total SS = Between subjects SS + Within subjects SS

## Another look at the table: Effects of sleep deprivation on vigilance

| between subjects within subjects variability / variability |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Participant | 0 nours |  | 24 | 0 hours: |
| 1 | 3 | 12 | 13 | Mean $=4.6$ |
| 2 | 5 | 15 |  | standard deviation $=1.43$. |
| 3 | 6 | 16 | 16 |  |
| 4 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 12 hours: |
| 5 | 7 | 12 | 11 | Mean = 13.0 |
| 6 | 3 | 13 | 14 | standard deviation $=2.31$. |
| 7 | 4 | 17 | 16 |  |
| 8 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 24 hours: |
| 9 | 6 | 10 | 11 | Mean = 13.3 |
| 10 | 3 | 13 | 14 | standard deviation $=1.83$. |

Assessing the significance of the F-ratio (by hand): The bigger the F-ratio, the less likely it is to have arisen merely by chance.

Use the between-subjects and within-subjects degrees of freedom to find the critical value of $F$.

Your $F$ is significant if it is equal to or larger than the critical value in the table.

| Here, look up the critical $F$ value for 2 and 18 degrees of freedom | 1 |  | 23 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 161.448 | 199.5 | 215.707 |
|  | 2 | 18.513 | 19 | 19.164 |
|  | 3 | 10.128 | 9.552 | 9.277 |
| Columns correspond to | 4 | 7.709 | 6.944 | 6.591 |
| EXPERIMENTAL degrees of | 5 | 6.608 | 5.786 | 5.409 |
| freedom | 6 | 5.987 | 5.143 | 4.757 |
|  | 7 | 5.591 | 4.737 | 4.347 |
| Rows correspond to ERROR | 8 | 5.318 | 4.459 | 4.066 |
| degrees of freedom | 9 | 5.117 | 4.256 | 3.863 |
|  | 10 | 4.965 | 4.103 | 3.708 |
|  | 11 | 4.844 | 3.982 | 3.587 |
| Here, go along 2 and down 18: | 12 | 4.747 | 3.885 | 3.49 |
| critical $F$ is at the intersection | 13 | 4.667 | 3.806 | 3.411 |
|  | 14 | 4.6 | 3.739 | 3.344 |
|  | 15 | 4.543 | 3.682 | 3.287 |
| Our obtained F, 92.36, is bigger | 16 | 4.494 | 3.634 | 3.239 |
| than 3.55; it is therefore | 17 | 4.451 | 3.592 | 3.197 |
| significant at $\boldsymbol{p}<$.05. (Actually | 18 | 4.414 | 3.555 | 3.16 |
| it's bigger than the critical | 19 | 4.381 | 3.522 | 3.127 |
| value for a $p$ of 0.0001 ) | 20 | 4.351 | 3.493 | 3.098 |

## Interpreting the Results:

A significant F-ratio merely tells us that there is a statistically-significant difference between our experimental conditions; it does not say where the difference comes from.

In our example, it tells us that sleep deprivation affects vigilance performance.

## To pinpoint the source of the difference:

(a) planned comparisons - comparisons between groups which you decide to make in advance of collecting the data.
(b) post hoc tests - comparisons between groups which you decide to make after collecting the data: Many different types - e.g. Newman-Keuls, Scheffé, Bonferroni.

Using SPSS for a one-way repeated-measures ANOVA on effects of fatigue on vigilance

```
Data $0% Untilled1 [DataSet0] - SPSS Data Editor
```




## Go to: Analyze > General Linear Model > Repeated Measures. .

| 11: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VAR00003 | VAR00004 | VAR00005 | VAR00006 |
| 1 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 12.00 | 13.00 |
| 2 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 15.00 | 14.00 |
| 3 | 3.00 | 6.00 | 16.00 | 16.00 |
| 4 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 11.00 | 12.00 |
| 5 | 5.00 | 7.00 | 12.00 | 11.00 |
| 6 | 6.00 | 3.00 | 13.00 | 14.00 |
| 7 | 7.00 | 4.00 | 17.00 | 16.00 |
| 8 | 8.00 | 5.00 | 11.00 | 12.00 |
| 9 | 9.00 | 6.00 | 10.00 | 11.00 |
| 10 | 10.00 | 3.00 | 13.00 | 14.00 |

Tell SPSS about your within-subjects Independent Variable (i.e. number of levels; and which columns the levels of the independent variable are in):



## Then click continue and OK

The SPSS output (ignore everything except what's shown here!):


## SPSS ANOVA results:

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

| Measure: MEASURE_1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source |  | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| deprivation | Sphericity Assumed | 487.800 | 2 | 243.900 | 92.360 | . 000 |
|  | Greenhouse-Geisser | 487.800 | 1.181 | 413.186 | 92.360 | . 000 |
|  | Huynh-Feldt | 487.800 | 1.254 | 388.985 | 92.360 | . 000 |
|  | Lower-bound | 487.800 | 1.000 | 487.800 | 92.360 | 000 |
| Error(deprivation) | Sphericity Assumed | 47.533 | 18 | 2.641 |  |  |
|  | Greenhouse-Geisser | 47.533 | 10.625 | 4.474 |  |  |
|  | Huynh-Feldt | 47.533 | 11.286 | 4.212 |  |  |
|  | Lower-bound | 47.533 | 9.000 | 5.281 |  |  |

Use Sphericity Assumed F-ratio if Mauchly's test was NOT significant. Significant effect of sleep deprivation ( $F 2,18=92.36, p<.0001$ )
OR, (if Mauchly's test was significant) use Greenhouse-Geisser (F 1.18, $10.63=92.36, \mathrm{p}<.0001$ ).


