Government 10: Quantitative Political Analysis

Sean Westwood

Statistical Significance

So far:

So far:

▶ Focus on findings and computing differences.

So far:

- Focus on findings and computing differences.
- but do these differences matter?

So far:

- Focus on findings and computing differences.
- but do these differences matter?
 - ► How would we know?

So far:

- Focus on findings and computing differences.
- but do these differences matter?
 - ► How would we know?

Today:

So far:

- Focus on findings and computing differences.
- but do these differences matter?
 - ► How would we know?

Today:

Systematic approach for understanding which differences are meaningful and which are not.

What is Statistical Significance?

Statistical significance is a measure that helps us determine whether the observed results in a study are likely due to chance or if they reflect a true effect.

What is Statistical Significance?

Statistical significance is a measure that helps us determine whether the observed results in a study are likely due to chance or if they reflect a true effect.

It helps researchers decide if their findings are reliable and can be generalized to a larger population.

1. Statistical significance does not imply practical significance

- 1. Statistical significance does not imply practical significance
- 2. Large differences are not always (or even often) significant

- 1. Statistical significance does not imply practical significance
- 2. Large differences are not always (or even often) significant
- 3. Larger samples provide more reliable results

- 1. Statistical significance does not imply practical significance
- 2. Large differences are not always (or even often) significant
- 3. Larger samples provide more reliable results
- 4. Larger samples can make EVERYTHING significant

- 1. Statistical significance does not imply practical significance
- 2. Large differences are not always (or even often) significant
- 3. Larger samples provide more reliable results
- 4. Larger samples can make EVERYTHING significant
- 5. Significance does not imply causation

In the Chechnya example, we can reframe our study as a *hypothesis* test.

In the Chechnya example, we can reframe our study as a *hypothesis* test.

Possible Hypothesis:

In the Chechnya example, we can reframe our study as a *hypothesis* test.

Possible Hypothesis:

- "Artillery attacks decrease rebel activity by 5"

In the Chechnya example, we can reframe our study as a *hypothesis* test.

Possible Hypothesis:

- "Artillery attacks decrease rebel activity by 5"

But we need a formal framework to evaluate this hypothesis:

In the Chechnya example, we can reframe our study as a hypothesis test.

Possible Hypothesis:

- "Artillery attacks decrease rebel activity by 5"

But we need a formal framework to evaluate this hypothesis:

We call our starting hypothesis the null hypothesis (H_0)

In the Chechnya example, we can reframe our study as a hypothesis test.

Possible Hypothesis:

- "Artillery attacks decrease rebel activity by 5"

But we need a formal framework to evaluate this hypothesis:

We call our starting hypothesis the null hypothesis (H_0)

usually framed in the negative

In the Chechnya example, we can reframe our study as a *hypothesis* test.

Possible Hypothesis:

- "Artillery attacks decrease rebel activity by 5"

But we need a formal framework to evaluate this hypothesis:

We call our starting hypothesis the null hypothesis (H_0)

- usually framed in the negative
- determine whether we can reject it based on our data.

In the Chechnya example, we can reframe our study as a hypothesis test.

Possible Hypothesis:

- "Artillery attacks decrease rebel activity by 5"

But we need a formal framework to evaluate this hypothesis:

We call our starting hypothesis the null hypothesis (H_0)

- usually framed in the negative
- b determine whether we can reject it based on our data.

Here it would be:

-"Artillery attacks have no effect on rebel activity"

Notation:

Notation:

What we expect:

 $H_a({\sf Alternative\ Hypothesis})$

Notation:

What we expect:

 $H_a({\sf Alternative\ Hypothesis})$

What we test:

 $H_0({\rm Null\ Hypothesis})$

Directional and broad hypotheses are possible

Directional and broad hypotheses are possible

Examples:

Directional and broad hypotheses are possible

Examples:

"Artillery attacks decreased rebel activity"

Directional and broad hypotheses are possible

Examples:

- "Artillery attacks decreased rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks increase rebel activity"

Directional and broad hypotheses are possible

Examples:

- "Artillery attacks decreased rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks increase rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks changed rebel activity"

Directional and broad hypotheses are possible

Examples:

- "Artillery attacks decreased rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks increase rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks changed rebel activity"

Corresponding nulls:

Directional and broad hypotheses are possible

Examples:

- "Artillery attacks decreased rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks increase rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks changed rebel activity"

Corresponding nulls:

"Artillery attacks increased/had no effect on rebel activity"

Directional and broad hypotheses are possible

Examples:

- "Artillery attacks decreased rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks increase rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks changed rebel activity"

Corresponding nulls:

- "Artillery attacks increased/had no effect on rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks decreased/had no effect on rebel activity"

Directional and broad hypotheses are possible

Examples:

- "Artillery attacks decreased rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks increase rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks changed rebel activity"

Corresponding nulls:

- "Artillery attacks increased/had no effect on rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks decreased/had no effect on rebel activity"
- "Artillery attacks had no effect on rebel activity"

What do we do with a null hypothesis?

Our data will allow us to say if we have evidence to support our hypotheses or not.

Our data will allow us to say if we have evidence to support our hypotheses or not.

If we find significant evidence for a relationship and we are predicting a relationship, then we can reject the null hypothesis of no relationship.

We can never say:

We can never say:

1. Our hypothesis is true/correct.

We can never say:

- 1. Our hypothesis is true/correct.
- 2. The null hypothesis is false.

We can never say:

- 1. Our hypothesis is true/correct.
- 2. The null hypothesis is false.

Instead, we can say:

We can never say:

- 1. Our hypothesis is true/correct.
- 2. The null hypothesis is false.

Instead, we can say:

1. There is (is not) significant evidence to support our hypothesis.

We can never say:

- 1. Our hypothesis is true/correct.
- 2. The null hypothesis is false.

Instead, we can say:

- 1. There is (is not) significant evidence to support our hypothesis.
- 2. We can reject (fail to reject) the null hypothesis

So, we either

So, we either

▶ Reject the null and find evidence supporting the alternative hypothesis

So, we either

▶ Reject the null and find evidence supporting the alternative hypothesis

OR

So, we either

▶ Reject the null and find evidence supporting the alternative hypothesis

OR

 Fail to reject the null and do not find evidence supporting the alternative hypothesis

How do we know what to make of our hypothesis and the null hypothesis?

How do we know what to make of our hypothesis and the null hypothesis?

We have already looked at p-values in regression, but what do they mean?

How do we know what to make of our hypothesis and the null hypothesis?

We have already looked at p-values in regression, but what do they mean?

A p-value (or probability value) is a statistical metric used to evaluate the strength of evidence against a null hypothesis in hypothesis testing.

How do we know what to make of our hypothesis and the null hypothesis?

We have already looked at p-values in regression, but what do they mean?

A p-value (or probability value) is a statistical metric used to evaluate the strength of evidence against a null hypothesis in hypothesis testing.

Specifically, the p-value represents the probability of obtaining test results at least as extreme as the observed results, assuming that the null hypothesis is true.

How do we know if p-value indicates significance or not?

How do we know if p-value indicates significance or not?

That is, how do we know if a result is worth taking seriously?

How do we know if p-value indicates significance or not?

That is, how do we know if a result is worth taking seriously?

We impose a threshold.

How do we know if p-value indicates significance or not?

That is, how do we know if a result is worth taking seriously?

We impose a threshold.

It is arbitrary, but consistent

How do we know if p-value indicates significance or not?

That is, how do we know if a result is worth taking seriously?

We impose a threshold.

It is arbitrary, but consistent

If the result of the statistical test meets the established threshold:

How do we know if p-value indicates significance or not?

That is, how do we know if a result is worth taking seriously?

We impose a threshold.

It is arbitrary, but consistent

If the result of the statistical test meets the established threshold:

then we have significance

How do we know if p-value indicates significance or not?

That is, how do we know if a result is worth taking seriously?

We impose a threshold.

It is arbitrary, but consistent

If the result of the statistical test meets the established threshold:

then we have significance

If the result of the statistical test does not meet the established threshold:

How do we know if p-value indicates significance or not?

That is, how do we know if a result is worth taking seriously?

We impose a threshold.

It is arbitrary, but consistent

If the result of the statistical test meets the established threshold:

then we have significance

If the result of the statistical test does not meet the established threshold:

then we do not have significance

Sir Ronald A. Fisher

Fisher recognized that real-world data comes with natural variability

Sir Ronald A. Fisher

Fisher recognized that real-world data comes with natural variability

Differences in outcomes could be due to either random variation or a true effect of one variable on another.

Sir Ronald A. Fisher

Fisher recognized that real-world data comes with natural variability

Differences in outcomes could be due to either random variation or a true effect of one variable on another.

To differentiate between the two, he needed a way to quantify the likelihood of observed data under a given assumption.

Sir Ronald A. Fisher

Fisher recognized that real-world data comes with natural variability

Differences in outcomes could be due to either random variation or a true effect of one variable on another.

To differentiate between the two, he needed a way to quantify the likelihood of observed data under a given assumption.

Created the p-value

▶ Originally a "rough guide" for the strength of evidence

- ▶ Originally a "rough guide" for the strength of evidence
- ▶ Jerzy Neyman and Egon Pearson introduced fixed significance levels (0.05, 0.01, etc.)

- ▶ Originally a "rough guide" for the strength of evidence
- ▶ Jerzy Neyman and Egon Pearson introduced fixed significance levels (0.05, 0.01, etc.)
- Honestly, very arbitrary.

- ▶ Originally a "rough guide" for the strength of evidence
- ▶ Jerzy Neyman and Egon Pearson introduced fixed significance levels (0.05, 0.01, etc.)
- Honestly, very arbitrary.
 - We use a .05 threshold

- ▶ Originally a "rough guide" for the strength of evidence
- ▶ Jerzy Neyman and Egon Pearson introduced fixed significance levels (0.05, 0.01, etc.)
- Honestly, very arbitrary.
 - ▶ We use a .05 threshold
 - Physicists use a .0005 threshold

- Originally a "rough guide" for the strength of evidence
- ▶ Jerzy Neyman and Egon Pearson introduced fixed significance levels (0.05, 0.01, etc.)
- ► Honestly, very arbitrary.
 - We use a .05 threshold
 - Physicists use a .0005 threshold

We use a higher threshold because of sample size limitations and cost concerns.

How do we know if something is significant?

► Three "signs" of significance

How do we know if something is significant?

- ► Three "signs" of significance
- ▶ All are equivalent at the 5% threshold

How do we know if something is significant?

- ► Three "signs" of significance
- ▶ All are equivalent at the 5% threshold
- 1. T-statistic > 1.96 or t-statistic < -1.96

How do we know if something is significant?

- ► Three "signs" of significance
- ► All are equivalent at the 5% threshold
- 1. T-statistic > 1.96 or t-statistic < -1.96
- 2. P-value < .05

How do we know if something is significant?

- ► Three "signs" of significance
- ► All are equivalent at the 5% threshold
- 1. T-statistic > 1.96 or t-statistic < -1.96
- 2. P-value < .05
- 3. 95% confidence intervals do *not* include 0

How do we know if something is significant?

- ► Three "signs" of significance
- ► All are equivalent at the 5% threshold
- 1. T-statistic > 1.96 or t-statistic < -1.96
- 2. P-value < .05
- 3. 95% confidence intervals do *not* include 0

These ideas are all connected

▶ A p-value is computed from a t-statistic

These ideas are all connected

- ▶ A p-value is computed from a t-statistic
- ▶ 95% confidence intervals are computed from (indirectly) t-statistics

These ideas are all connected

- ▶ A p-value is computed from a t-statistic
- ▶ 95% confidence intervals are computed from (indirectly) t-statistics

What do they mean?

A statistic to evaluate a mean or a difference in means when hypothesis testing

A statistic to evaluate a mean or a difference in means when hypothesis testing

▶ Provides information on if what we observed matches what we expected

A statistic to evaluate a mean or a difference in means when hypothesis testing

Provides information on if what we observed matches what we expected

Significant: If the t-statistic is large (positive or negative), it means the difference between the groups is unlikely to have happened by random chance.

A statistic to evaluate a mean or a difference in means when hypothesis testing

Provides information on if what we observed matches what we expected

Significant: If the t-statistic is large (positive or negative), it means the difference between the groups is unlikely to have happened by random chance.

Not significant: If the t-statistic is small, it means the difference could easily be due to random variation.

P-values

Significant: A low p-value (<=.05) indicates we should reject the null hypothesis—there might be a real effect or difference.

P-values

Significant: A low p-value (<=.05) indicates we should reject the null hypothesis—there might be a real effect or difference.

Not significant: A high p-value (>.05) suggests that there's not enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, and any observed difference might be due to random chance.

Assume we can not measure attitudes or features of everyone and that we will rely on a sample.

Assume we can not measure attitudes or features of everyone and that we will rely on a sample.

With a sample we can be wrong!

Assume we can not measure attitudes or features of everyone and that we will rely on a sample.

- With a sample we can be wrong!
- There will be error.

Assume we can not measure attitudes or features of everyone and that we will rely on a sample.

- With a sample we can be wrong!
- There will be error.
- ▶ But how close did we get?

Assume we can not measure attitudes or features of everyone and that we will rely on a sample.

- With a sample we can be wrong!
- There will be error.
- But how close did we get?

A 95% confidence interval gives a range of values that, if we were to repeat the sampling process many times, would contain the true value of the parameter we are estimating in 95% of those intervals.

How to think about a confidence interval

Assume we can repeat a survey 100 times.

How to think about a confidence interval

- Assume we can repeat a survey 100 times.
- Assume we compute a confidence interval for each survey

How to think about a confidence interval

- Assume we can repeat a survey 100 times.
- Assume we compute a confidence interval for each survey
- ▶ 95% of those intervals would contain the true population mean.

Two components:

Two components:

1. A mean, coefficient, or mean difference

Two components:

- 1. A mean, coefficient, or mean difference
- 2. A measure of error

Two components:

- 1. A mean, coefficient, or mean difference
- 2. A measure of error

The confidence interval is computed by adding and subtracting the measure of error (and a standard value).

Two components:

- 1. A mean, coefficient, or mean difference
- 2. A measure of error

The confidence interval is computed by adding and subtracting the measure of error (and a standard value).

So, let's estimate heights of sixth grade students.

Two components:

- 1. A mean, coefficient, or mean difference
- 2. A measure of error

The confidence interval is computed by adding and subtracting the measure of error (and a standard value).

So, let's estimate heights of sixth grade students.

We observe a mean of 50in with a standard error of 5in. We would have the following CI:

Two components:

- 1. A mean, coefficient, or mean difference
- 2. A measure of error

The confidence interval is computed by adding and subtracting the measure of error (and a standard value).

So, let's estimate heights of sixth grade students.

We observe a mean of 50in with a standard error of 5in. We would have the following CI:

Upper CI =
$$50 + 1.96 * 5 = 59.8$$

Lower CI = $50 - 1.96 * 5 = 40.2$

Two components:

- 1. A mean, coefficient, or mean difference
- 2. A measure of error

The confidence interval is computed by adding and subtracting the measure of error (and a standard value).

So, let's estimate heights of sixth grade students.

We observe a mean of 50in with a standard error of 5in. We would have the following CI:

Upper CI =
$$50 + 1.96 * 5 = 59.8$$

Lower CI = $50 - 1.96 * 5 = 40.2$

We would write this as "95% CI [40.2, 59.8]"

▶ We can be 95% confident that the true average height of students is between 40.2in and 59.8in.

- ▶ We can be 95% confident that the true average height of students is between 40.2in and 59.8in.
- This is **not absolute certainty**.

- We can be 95% confident that the true average height of students is between 40.2in and 59.8in.
- This is **not absolute certainty**.

A 95% confidence interval is a way to estimate the true value of a population parameter (what we are trying to estiamte from a sample).

- We can be 95% confident that the true average height of students is between 40.2in and 59.8in.
- This is **not absolute certainty**.

A 95% confidence interval is a way to estimate the true value of a population parameter (what we are trying to estiamte from a sample).

It provides a range that likely includes the true value based on sample data.

Testing the impact of a college degree on voting behavior.

Testing the impact of a college degree on voting behavior.

Hypotheses:

Testing the impact of a college degree on voting behavior.

Hypotheses:

 H_a : Holding a college degree increase voter turnout.

Testing the impact of a college degree on voting behavior.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Holding a college degree increase voter turnout. ${\cal H}_0$: Holding a college degree has no effect on voter turnout.

Testing the impact of a college degree on voting behavior.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Holding a college degree increase voter turnout. ${\cal H}_0$: Holding a college degree has no effect on voter turnout.

Results:

Testing the impact of a college degree on voting behavior.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Holding a college degree increase voter turnout. ${\cal H}_0$: Holding a college degree has no effect on voter turnout.

Results:

Difference: 20% increase in voter turnout.

Testing the impact of a college degree on voting behavior.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Holding a college degree increase voter turnout. ${\cal H}_0$: Holding a college degree has no effect on voter turnout.

Results:

Difference: 20% increase in voter turnout. p-value: 0.04; t-statistic: 5.23; 95%

Confidence Interval: [17.23, 22.14]

Testing the impact of a college degree on voting behavior.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Holding a college degree increase voter turnout. ${\cal H}_0$: Holding a college degree has no effect on voter turnout.

Results:

Difference: 20% increase in voter turnout. p-value: 0.04; t-statistic: 5.23; 95%

Confidence Interval: [17.23, 22.14]

Conclusion:

Testing the impact of a college degree on voting behavior.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Holding a college degree increase voter turnout. ${\cal H}_0$: Holding a college degree has no effect on voter turnout.

Results:

Difference: 20% increase in voter turnout. p-value: 0.04; t-statistic: 5.23; 95%

Confidence Interval: [17.23, 22.14]

Conclusion:

A college degree increases voting by 20% (95% CI [17.23, 22.14]). This is a statistically significant effect.

Testing the relationship between anger and support for violence

Testing the relationship between anger and support for violence Hypotheses:

Testing the relationship between anger and support for violence

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Anger decreases support for violence.

Testing the relationship between anger and support for violence

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Anger decreases support for violence. ${\cal H}_0$: Anger has no effect on support for violence.

Testing the relationship between anger and support for violence

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Anger decreases support for violence. ${\cal H}_0$: Anger has no effect on support for violence.

Control Group Support: 15%.

Testing the relationship between anger and support for violence

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Anger decreases support for violence. ${\cal H}_0$: Anger has no effect on support for violence.

- Control Group Support: 15%.
- ► Angry Group Support: 72%.

Testing the relationship between anger and support for violence

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Anger decreases support for violence. ${\cal H}_0$: Anger has no effect on support for violence.

- Control Group Support: 15%.
- ► Angry Group Support: 72%.
- Difference: 57%

Testing the relationship between anger and support for violence

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Anger decreases support for violence. ${\cal H}_0$: Anger has no effect on support for violence.

- Control Group Support: 15%.
- ► Angry Group Support: 72%.
- Difference: 57%

P-Value < 0.001; t-statistic: 19.23; 95% Confidence Interval: [53.7, 60.3]

Testing the relationship between anger and support for violence

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: Anger decreases support for violence. ${\cal H}_0$: Anger has no effect on support for violence.

- Control Group Support: 15%.
- ► Angry Group Support: 72%.
- Difference: 57%

P-Value < 0.001; t-statistic: 19.23; 95% Confidence Interval: [53.7, 60.3]

Conclusion: Anger increases support for violence 15% (95% CI [53.7, 60.3]). This is a statistically significant effect.

Testing the relationship between SAT scores and college graduation rates.

Testing the relationship between SAT scores and college graduation rates.

Hypotheses:

Testing the relationship between SAT scores and college graduation rates.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: SAT scores increase college graduation rates.

Testing the relationship between SAT scores and college graduation rates.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: SAT scores increase college graduation rates. ${\cal H}_0$: SAT scores have no effect on college graduation rates.

Testing the relationship between SAT scores and college graduation rates.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: SAT scores increase college graduation rates. ${\cal H}_0$: SAT scores have no effect on college graduation rates.

LOW SAT Group: 70%

Testing the relationship between SAT scores and college graduation rates.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a$: SAT scores increase college graduation rates. ${\cal H}_0$: SAT scores have no effect on college graduation rates.

- ► LOW SAT Group: 70%
- ► High SAT Group: 73%

Testing the relationship between SAT scores and college graduation rates.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a \!\!: {\rm SAT}$ scores increase college graduation rates. ${\cal H}_0 \!\!: {\rm SAT}$ scores have no effect on college graduation rates.

- ► LOW SAT Group: 70%
- ► High SAT Group: 73%
- Difference: 3%

Testing the relationship between SAT scores and college graduation rates.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a{:}$ SAT scores increase college graduation rates. ${\cal H}_0{:}$ SAT scores have no effect on college graduation rates.

- ► LOW SAT Group: 70%
- ► High SAT Group: 73%
- Difference: 3%

p-value: 0.04; t-statistic: 1.45; 95% Confidence Interval: [-1.2, 7.2]

Testing the relationship between SAT scores and college graduation rates.

Hypotheses:

 ${\cal H}_a \!\!: {\rm SAT}$ scores increase college graduation rates. ${\cal H}_0 \!\!: {\rm SAT}$ scores have no effect on college graduation rates.

LOW SAT Group: 70%

► High SAT Group: 73%

Difference: 3%

p-value: 0.04; t-statistic: 1.45; 95% Confidence Interval: [-1.2, 7.2]

Conclusion: SAT scores are not significantly related to college graduation rates, with a difference in graduation rates of 3% (95% CI [-1.2, 7.2]). This is a statistically significant effect.

What kind of comparions might we want to test?

► Mean differences (ATEs)

What kind of comparions might we want to test?

- ► Mean differences (ATEs)
- ► Regression coefficients

What kind of comparions might we want to test?

- ► Mean differences (ATEs)
- ► Regression coefficients
- ▶ Differences in proportions (not covered in this class)

Differences in means

What is a t-test?

Differences in means

What is a t-test?

A statistical test used to determine if there is a significant difference between the means of two groups.

Differences in means

What is a t-test?

- A statistical test used to determine if there is a significant difference between the means of two groups.
- ▶ Often used when sample sizes are small, and the population standard deviation is unknown.

William Sealy Gosset (1876-1937)

William Sealy Gosset (1876-1937)

Developed the t-test in the early 1900s.

William Sealy Gosset (1876-1937)

- Developed the t-test in the early 1900s.
- Worked as a chemist and statistician at the Guinness Brewery in Dublin, Ireland.

William Sealy Gosset (1876-1937)

- Developed the t-test in the early 1900s.
- ▶ Worked as a chemist and statistician at the Guinness Brewery in Dublin, Ireland.
- ▶ Published under the pseudonym "Student," hence the name "Student's t-test."

Problem at Guinness: Gosset needed a way to conduct small-sample experiments for quality control (e.g., barley quality, yeast consistency).

Problem at Guinness: Gosset needed a way to conduct small-sample experiments for quality control (e.g., barley quality, yeast consistency).

Limitations:

Problem at Guinness: Gosset needed a way to conduct small-sample experiments for quality control (e.g., barley quality, yeast consistency).

Limitations:

▶ Small sample sizes made it challenging to use standard statistical methods.

Problem at Guinness: Gosset needed a way to conduct small-sample experiments for quality control (e.g., barley quality, yeast consistency).

Limitations:

- ▶ Small sample sizes made it challenging to use standard statistical methods.
- Large sample sizes were impractical due to costs and time.

Problem at Guinness: Gosset needed a way to conduct small-sample experiments for quality control (e.g., barley quality, yeast consistency).

Limitations:

- ▶ Small sample sizes made it challenging to use standard statistical methods.
- Large sample sizes were impractical due to costs and time.

Assumptions:

Assumptions:

▶ Data should be approximately normally distributed (especially for small samples).

Assumptions:

- Data should be approximately normally distributed (especially for small samples).
- ▶ Samples should have similar variances (especially for independent t-tests).

Assumptions:

- ▶ Data should be approximately normally distributed (especially for small samples).
- ▶ Samples should have similar variances (especially for independent t-tests).

Limitations:

Assumptions:

- ▶ Data should be approximately normally distributed (especially for small samples).
- Samples should have similar variances (especially for independent t-tests).

Limitations:

Sensitive to outliers.

Assumptions:

- ▶ Data should be approximately normally distributed (especially for small samples).
- ▶ Samples should have similar variances (especially for independent t-tests).

Limitations:

- Sensitive to outliers.
- May not be reliable if assumptions are significantly violated.

Assumptions:

- ▶ Data should be approximately normally distributed (especially for small samples).
- ▶ Samples should have similar variances (especially for independent t-tests).

Limitations:

- Sensitive to outliers.
- May not be reliable if assumptions are significantly violated.