

Bayesian ANOVA in the presence of non-normality or outliers

Master's Thesis

Marlyne Bosman

Master's Programme:

Methodology and Statistics for the Behavioural,
Biomedical and Social Sciences, Utrecht University

Supervisor :

Herbert Hoijtink

January 11, 2018

1 Introduction

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a statistical approach for comparing means that is used by many researchers. ANOVA can be validly applied when the data meets certain assumptions. In reality, however, data often violates assumptions. For instance, distributions are rarely normal (Cain, Zhang, & Yuan, 2016; Micceri, 1989). Specifically, distributions can be asymmetric (skewed) or have more observations in the tails (heavy-tailed). Moreover, random sampling can result in an outlier, i.e. an observation that “deviates so much from other observations as to arouse suspicion that it was generated by a different mechanism” (Hawkins, 1980, p. 1).

Even small departures from normality or a small proportion of outliers can seriously affect an ANOVA. Particularly, heavy-tailed distributions and outliers cause increased error variance, thereby leading to reduced power of the statistical test (Wilcox, 2017, p. 2). Furthermore, skewed distributions cause inaccurate confidence intervals around the means (Wilcox, 2017, p. 5). Additionally, outliers result in biased parameter estimates (Ruckstuhl 2014; Wilcox 2017, p. 7). Hence, if an ANOVA is applied to a dataset that contains non-normality or outliers, inference can be highly inaccurate. Unfortunately, heavy-tailed or skewed distributions appear to be quite common. Both Micceri (1989) and Cain et al. (2016) frequently encountered distributions that were skewed or heavy-tailed in their research of real samples.

One obvious way of handling the adverse effects of outliers is to remove them from the dataset. However, whether this is an advisable approach depends on the source of the outliers. Ideally, one wants to keep outliers that are legitimate cases or for which the source is unknown in the data while at the same time minimizing their influence on estimation and hypothesis testing. One manner to achieve that objective is to use robust statistical inference.

Robust statistics are measures of central tendency and spread that are unaffected by slight changes in a distribution (Wilcox, 2017, p. 25). Usually, non-robust statistics, like the mean, μ , and standard deviation, σ , are used to measure central tendency and spread of a distribution. However, in the presence of outliers μ and σ will be inaccurately estimated. Conversely, robust statistics will still give relatively accurate results (Ruckstuhl 2014; Wilcox 2017, pp. 25-31). A simple example of such a robust statistic is the median. Unlike the mean, the value of the median is unaffected by a single outlier.

Robust statistics are mostly discussed in the context of estimation and null hypothesis significance testing, but not in the context of the Bayesian model selection approach. The Bayesian model selection approach (Klugkist, Laudy, & Hoijsink, 2005) uses a Bayes factor (BF) to directly evaluate scientific expectations, stated as informative hypotheses. In the context of an ANOVA, an informative hypothesis can be used to state an expected

ordering of means, for example,

$$H_1 : \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3, \quad (1)$$

where μ_j represents the mean of Group $j = 1, 2, 3$. With the Bayes factor, the relative support in the data can be calculated for an informative hypothesis, H_i , compared with its complement, H_c (van Rossum, van de Schoot, & Hoijtink, 2013), an unconstrained hypothesis, H_u , or another informative hypothesis, H'_i . For example, H_1 , as stated in Equation 1, can be compared with another informative hypothesis,

$$H_2 : \mu_1 < \mu_2 = \mu_3. \quad (2)$$

Finding a BF_{12} of 5 indicates that the support in the data for hypothesis H_1 is five times larger than the support for hypothesis H_2 .

Recently, Gu, Mulder, & Hoijtink (2017) developed the approximate adjusted fractional Bayes factor (AAFBBF). With the AAFBBF, informative hypotheses can be evaluated for virtually any statistical model. Additionally, the AAFBBF is implemented in an easy-to-use software package called BAIN. For the calculation, only the estimates and covariance matrix of the parameters of the statistical model at hand are needed.

In the ANOVA context, the parameter estimates of interest are the group means. In a regular ANOVA, these are estimated by means of the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimator. However, as previously stated, parameter estimates can be seriously affected by outliers in the data. Hence, the expectation is that the AAFBBF resulting from these estimates is also negatively affected by outliers. However, to our knowledge, this has never been formally investigated.

This paper aims to investigate to what extent the AAFBBF based on the regular OLS estimates (AAFBBF_{OLS}) is affected by outliers. Additionally, it aims to investigate to what extent replacing the OLS estimates as input for the AAFBBF with robust estimates (AAFBBF_{ROB}) results in a decreased effect of outliers. The paper is organized as follows. Section ?? introduces a robust estimator suitable for the ANOVA context. A simulation study is set up to show and compare the effect of outliers on the OLS estimator and the robust estimator and equally for the AAFBBF_{OLS} and AAFBBF_{ROB}. Sections ?? and ?? describe its set-up and results. Finally, in Section ?? the results, implications and limitations of the research are discussed.

References

- Cain, M. K., Zhang, Z., & Yuan, K.-H. (2016). Univariate and Multivariate Skewness and Kurtosis for Measuring Nonnormality: Prevalence, Influence and Estimation. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(5), 1716–1735. doi: 10.3758/s13428-016-0814-1

- Gu, X., Mulder, J., & Hoijsink, H. (2017). Approximated Adjusted Fractional Bayes factors: A General Method for Testing Informative Hypotheses. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*. doi: 10.1111/bmsp.12110
- Hawkins, D. M. (1980). *Identification of Outliers* (11th ed.). London: Chapman and Hall.
- Klugkist, I., Laudy, O., & Hoijsink, H. (2005). Inequality Constrained Analysis of Variance: A Bayesian Approach. *Psychological Methods*, 10(4), 477–493. doi: 10.1037/1082-989x.10.4.477
- Micceri, T. (1989). The Unicorn, the Normal Curve, and Other Improbable Creatures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105(1), 156–166. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.105.1.156
- Ruckstuhl, A. (2014). Robust Fitting of Parametric Models Based on M-Estimation. Retrieved from https://stat.ethz.ch/wbl/wbl4/WBL4_robstat14E.pdf
- van Rossum, M., van de Schoot, R., & Hoijsink, H. (2013). “Is the Hypothesis Correct” or “Is it Not”. *Methodology*, 9(1), 13–22. doi: 10.1027/1614-2241/a000050
- Wilcox, R. R. (2017). *Introduction to Robust Estimation and Hypothesis Testing* (4th ed.). New York: Academic Press.