

Assessing the Assumption of Equal Variances - A Revisit

Up to this point we have considered using either Levene's test for assessing the assumption of equal variances or a plot of the residuals versus the treatment levels. It is now time to introduce SAS Proc Mixed, which performs the computations for ANOVA, but also allows one to assess the structure of the variance and covariance among factor levels. The syntax structure of Proc Mixed is similar to that of Proc GLM, but there are differences.

For example, consider the following problem which was previously discussed (page 17, 18):

Seventy-eight (78) male workers were assigned at random to six different groups so that 13 were in each group. After training in a specific task, the pulse rate was measured for 20 seconds. Unfortunately, some (10) individuals withdrew from the experiment before their training was complete. The data from this experiment, along with some summary statistics are reproduced in the following table:

						Group
1	2	3	4	5	6	
27	29	34	34	28	28	
31	28	36	34	28	26	
26	37	34	43	26	29	
32	24	41	44	35	25	
39	35	30	40	31	35	
37	40	44	47	30	34	
38	40	44	34	34	37	
39	31	32	31	34	28	
30	30	32	45	26	21	
28	25	31	28	20	28	
27	29			41	26	
27	25			21		
34						

The analysis outlined on page 18 indicated that the assumption of equal variance was satisfied by Levene's test ($P = 0.6688$). In addition, the plot of the residuals versus the treatment groups showed no particular deviation either.

Letting "Group" represent the treatment factor (levels 1 through 6) and Replicate represent the individuals from each group (1 through 13 for group 1, 1 through 12 for group 2, etc.) the SAS Proc GLM Code for analyzing these data would be:

```
Proc GLM data = Task;  
  Class Group Replicate;  
  Model Response = Group;  
run;
```

This analysis would produce the usual ANOVA table for assessing the global null hypothesis of no difference among the Group means. To analyze these data using Proc Mixed the following code might be used:

```
Proc Mixed data = Task;
Class Group Replicate;
Model Response = Treatment;
Repeated / type = un(1) subject = Replicate r;
run;
```

Aside from the change in procedure used, the only difference is the use of the “Repeated” statement. This statement invokes a method for allowing the “subject” variable to have a variance (and correlation) structure which differs from the usual assumption of equal variances and no correlation between observations.

The “Repeated” statement shown above “*Repeated / type = un(1) subject = Replicate r;*” allows for a covariance structure of type “*un(1)*”. The “un” stands for unstructured covariance matrix and the 1 in parentheses indicates that only the variances are allowed to differ, but that there is no covariance or correlation between treatments. SAS Proc Mixed allows for many different structure for the covariance matrix. These include auto-regressive, spatial, compound symmetric and unstructured types. In stead of listing the possible structures it would be best of you reviewed the Proc Mixed syntax in the online SAS help menu. The “*r*” at the end of the statement tells SAS to print the covariance structure for review.

The analysis of the Pulse data using Proc Mixed with unequal variances is as follows:

```
options pageno = 1;
title "Analysis of Pulse Rate for 6 Treatment Groups";
data task;
input Pulse Group Replicate @@;
cards;
27 1 1 29 2 1 34 3 1 34 4 1 28 5 1 28 6 1
31 1 2 28 2 2 36 3 2 34 4 2 28 5 2 26 6 2
26 1 3 37 2 3 34 3 3 43 4 3 26 5 3 29 6 3
32 1 4 24 2 4 41 3 4 44 4 4 35 5 4 25 6 4
39 1 5 35 2 5 30 3 5 40 4 5 31 5 5 35 6 5
37 1 6 40 2 6 44 3 6 47 4 6 30 5 6 34 6 6
38 1 7 40 2 7 44 3 7 34 4 7 34 5 7 37 6 7
39 1 8 31 2 8 32 3 8 31 4 8 34 5 8 28 6 8
30 1 9 30 2 9 32 3 9 45 4 9 26 5 9 21 6 9
28 1 10 25 2 10 31 3 10 28 4 10 20 5 10 28 6 10
27 1 11 29 2 11 41 5 11 26 6 11
27 1 12 25 2 12 21 5 12
34 1 13
;
proc print data = task;
run;
title2 "Analysis of Variance for Using Proc Mixed";
Proc Mixed data = task;
Class Group Replicate;
Model Pulse = Group;
Repeated / type = un(1) subject = Replicate r;
run;
```

The resulting analysis is, in part, as follows:

Analysis of Pulse Rate for 6 Treatment Groups
Analysis of Variance for Using Proc Mixed

1

10:44 Friday, March 21, 2008

The Mixed Procedure

Model Information

Data Set	WORK.TASK
Dependent Variable	Pulse
Covariance Structure	Unstructured
Subject Effect	Replicate
Estimation Method	REML
Residual Variance Method	None
Fixed Effects SE Method	Model-Based
Degrees of Freedom Method	Between-Within

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
Group	6	1 2 3 4 5 6
Replicate	13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13

Dimensions

Covariance Parameters	21
Columns in X	7
Columns in Z	0
Subjects	13
Max Obs Per Subject	6

Number of Observations

Number of Observations Read	68
Number of Observations Used	68
Number of Observations Not Used	0

Iteration History

Iteration	Evaluations	-2 Res Log Like	Criterion
0	1	403.20202450	
1	2	401.06974384	0.00000003
2	1	401.06974010	0.00000000

Convergence criteria met.

The Mixed Procedure

Estimated R Matrix for Replicate 1

Row	Col1	Col2	Col3	Col4	Col5	Col6
1	24.5769					
2		32.0833				
3			42.0717			
4				40.2824		
5					21.1050	
6						23.9840

The Mixed Procedure

Null Model Likelihood Ratio Test

DF	Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
5	2.13	0.8306

Type 3 Tests of Fixed Effects

Effect	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Group	5	50	4.05	0.0036

Above are the estimated covariance matrix for the six (6) treatment Groups, the test of the covariance matrix differing from the usual assumption of equal variances and the test of the null hypothesis of equal means for the six groups. The estimated variances for each Group are shown on the diagonal of the covariance matrix and range from a low of 21.1050 in Group 5 to a high of 42.0717 in Group 3. The “Null Model Likelihood Ratio Test” is an assessment of the null hypothesis that the variances are all equal versus the alternative hypothesis that the variance structure determined by the “Type = un(1)” statement is a better fit. In this case, the null hypothesis is not rejected (P = 0.8305). The “Type 3 Tests fo Fixed Effects” presents the test of the null hypothesis that the Group means are all equal versus the alternative hypothesis that at least one of the Group means differ, while adjusting for the variances being different.. In this case, the null hypothesis is rejected (P = 0.0035).