A ROBUST COMPARISON POWERS OF FOUR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TESTS

Appolus E.E. and Okoli C.N.

Department of Statistics, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Citation: Appolus E.E. and Okoli C.N. (2022) A Robust Comparison Powers of Four Multivariate Analysis of Variance Tests, *European Journal of Statistics and Probability*, Vol.10, No.1, pp., 11-20

ABSTRACT: This paper compared the powers of four test statistics of Multivariate Analysis of Variance and test statistics include Lawley-Hotelling , Pillai's trace, Roy's largest root and Wilks' lambda. The R Statistics was employed to simulate the data used to compare the four test statistics under the Multivariate Gamma and Multivariate Normal distributions. The sample sizes utilized were 10, 20, 30, 40, 100, 200, 300, 400, 600, 700, 800 and 1000); Number of variables (p = 2, 3, and 4) equal and unequal samples and variance co-variance matrix were also used. The comparison were done at two levels of significance ($\alpha = 0.01$ and 0.05) using power of the test. The results obtained indicated that the Roy's largest Root test statistic is better than all other test statistic considered when p = g = 2 because it has the least powers. The result of the analysis further showed that when p = g = 3 and p = g = 4 the Wilks' lambda proved better than all other test statistics both for small and large sample sizes. The results equally showed that when the data are multivariate normal and Gamma with g = 2 and p = 2the power of the four test statistics from best to least is Roy's largest root, followed Lawley's trace = Pillae's trace and the least is Wilks' Lambda at significant levels of 0.01 and 0.05 for equal and unequal samples. More so, when data are multivariate normal as well as gamma and p = g = 3 and p = g = 4, the power of the four statistics ranked from best to least is Wilks' Lambda , Pillae's trace = Lawley's trace and Roy's largest root respectively. From the findings, it is evidently obvious that Roy's largest root should be applied when p=g=2 while Wilks' Lambda be used when p=g=3 and p=g=4. This study will help researchers to plan studies with controlled probabilities of detecting a meaningful effect thereby giving conclusive results with *maximum efficiency*.

KEYWORDS: Power of test, MANOVA Statistic Tests, Stimulated data, Multivariate Gamma distribution, Multivariate Normal.

INTRODUCTION

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is a statistical tool in which the single response variable is replaced by several variables. These variables might be substantively different from each other (height, weight); or they might be the same substantive item measured at a number of different times. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) technique is similar to univariate analysis of variance and main distinguishing feature is that multiple dependent variables are used for MANOVA while a single variable is used for univariate (Rencher, 2015).

European Journal of Statistics and Probability Vol.10, No.1, pp.,11-20, 2022 Print ISSN: 2055-0154(Print), Online ISSN 2055-0162(Online)

MANOVA has three basic assumptions that are fundamental to the statistical theory which include Independence, Multivariate normality and equality of variance-covariance matrices. A statistical test procedure is said to be insensitive if departures from these assumptions do not greatly affect the significance level or power of the test. But violations in assumptions of multivariate normality and homogeneity of covariance may affect the power of the test and type I error rate of multivariate analysis of variance (Finch, 2005; and Fouladi and Yockey, 2002). This research work will compare powers of four test statistics of MANOVA with objectives of identifying the robustness of the powers of the test statistics of multivariate analysis of variance , determining if datasets will require specific test statistic and ascertaining the test statistic that is better than others.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cohen, J. (1973) stressed the importance for researchers to carry out more research on power calculations. He stated that power analysis is a powerful, in fact the only rational, guide to planning the relevant details of the research. In his book, Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, Cohen developed several power calculations by providing readily assessable tables as well explained in details the small, medium and large effect sizes. Prior to this time, there have been substantial contemplations on the estimation and comparison of power in uni-variate analysis of variance (Brewer, J. K. (1972); Tversky&Kahneman, 1971).Brewer, J. K. (1972) stated that educational researchers all over the globe have accepted that the power of a statistical test is important and should be substantial. However, what they have not universally accepted or known is that power can compared for every standard statistical test. He also reiterated that many studies in educational and psychological research lack power calculations in terms of comparison, estimation, etc., and this neglect of power by researchers has protracted and lingered for several years.

Timm, N. H. (1975) and Morrison, D. F. (1967) provided instances to illustrate the comparison of power for two-group MANOVA case, for Hotelling's T^2 . However, none of them relates estimation or comparison of power in MANOVA to Cohen's (1973) notion of effect size in univariate. Additionally, they didn't provide any indication of how much power a researcher would have with small or moderate sample sizes for the kind of effect sizes one frequently encounters in social science research.

Ito, K. (1962). In his paper attempted to compare the powers of Hotelling's T test and Wilks's likelihood ratio W test for moderately large samples .He concluded that the Hotelling's T test and Wilks's likelihood ratio test tend to be identical in distribution as n approaches infinity. He argued that this partly provides clarity on the question in terms of choice, when choosing which of them to use in real life applications or practice. He further stressed that as long as n is very large from the standpoint of power there is no advantage of Hotelling's T test over Wilks's likelihood ratio test.

Sheehan-Holt, J. K. (1998) carried out study which indicated that the performance of the MANOVA test statistics compared in his research work can be significantly compromised when violations are introduced in the assumption of equality of covariance matrices.

Fouladi &Yockey(2002) emphasized that the results of all these prior studies all point to one direction and no one of the four MANOVA test statistics is clearly optimal under all situations when the assumptions are violated.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Method of data collection

The sample sizes utilized were 10, 20, 30, 40, 100, 200, 300, 400, 600, 700, 800 and 1000); number of variables (p = 2, 3, and 4); equal and unequal sample, and variance co-variance matrix. The comparisons were done at two levels of significance ($\alpha = 0.01$ and 0.05) using power of the test.

METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Simulation Using R Statistics

This study made use of a simulation using R statistics to compare the power of the four test multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test statistics.

This simulation was conducted in each of the two different scenarios

- When the null hypothesis (Ho)is true
- When the dataset is normal or not.
- When the equality of variance co-variance matrix hold or not.
- Additionally, three factors were varied in the simulation: They include
- The number of groups (g)
- The number of variables (p)
- Significance levels (α).

Test Statistic of MANOVA

Wilks' lambda

$$\Lambda = \frac{|E|}{|H+E|}$$

$$a = N - g - \frac{p - g + 2}{2}$$

$$b = \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p^2(g-1) - 4}{p^2 + (g-1)^2 - 5}}; \quad if \ p^2 + (g-1) - 5 > 0 \right.$$
Pillai Trace

$$V = trace \left(H(H + E)^{-1} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{1 + \lambda_i} \right)$$
here

$$F = \left(\frac{2u + s + 1}{2t + s + 1} \right) \left(\frac{V}{s - V} \right) \sim F_{s(2t + s + 1), s(2u + s + 1)}$$

$$U = \frac{N - g - p - 1}{2}$$
Roy's largest Root;

$$\theta = \left(HE^{-1} \right) = \frac{\lambda_1}{1 + \lambda_1} \qquad su + 1$$

$$F = \left(\frac{2U + 2}{2t + 2} \right) \phi_{max} \sim F_{(2t + 2), (2u + 2)}$$
Where $s = \min(p, g - 1)$

$$\phi_i = \frac{\theta_i}{1 - \theta_i} = \frac{1 - \lambda_i}{\lambda_i}$$

$$\lambda_i = 1 - \theta_i$$

RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

					Power of	the Test for	' Multivari	ate Normal			
				α=0.0	1		a=0.05				
			Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy	Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy	
		10,10	0.014	0.013	0.014	0.013	0.058	0.057	0.058	0.058	
	$= n_2$	100,100	0.104	0.103	0.104	0.101	0.438	0.436	0.438	0.422	
	n1 =	1000,1000	0.459	0.459	0.459	0.455	0.248	0.248	0.248	0.248	
		10,20	0.053	0.051	0.053	0.047	0.130	0.127	0.130	0.123	
1	$: n_2$	100,200	0.065	0.064	0.065	0.064	0.853	0.851	0.853	0.825	
ł	$n_1 \neq$	600,1000	0.264	0.263	0.264	0.262	0.567	0.567	0.567	0.564	

Table 1: Multivariate Normal When Variance Co-variance Matrix Are Equal
able 1: Multivariate Normal when variance co-variance matrix are equal

 Table 2: Multivariate Normal When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Not Equal

Table 2. Multiversiate N	Jormal when	varianaa aa x	anianaa mat	wiv and not ague	a l
Table 2: Multivariate r	vormai when	variance co-v	аглансе ша	rix are not equa	11

				1	Power of t	ne Test for	r Multiva	riate Norma	1			
				α=0.	01			α=0.05				
			Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy	Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy		
		10,10	0.018	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.175	0.167	0.175	0.152		
8 	= n ₂	100,100	0.133	0.132	0.133	0.128	0.058	0.058	0.058	0.058		
l d	n1 =	1000,1000	0.087	0.087	0.087	0.087	0.503	0.503	0.503	0.501		
and		10.20	0.042	0.040	0.042	0.039	0.068	0.067	0.068	0.068		
± Σ ₂	$\neq n_2$	100,200	0.053	0.053	0.053	0.053	0.313	0.312	0.313	0.308		
Σ 1 -	n_1 :	600,1000	0.148	0.148	0.148	0.148	0.134	0.134	0.134	0.134		

Vol.10, No.1, pp.,11-20, 2022

Print ISSN: 2055-0154(Print),

Online ISSN 2055-0162(Online)

Table 3: Multivariate Gamma When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Equal

Table	Table 3: Multivariate gamma when variance co-variance matrix are equal												
				Р	ower of the	Test for M	Multivaria	ite Gamma					
				α=0.0	1	α=0.05							
			Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy	Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy			
		10,10	0.025	0.024	0.025	0.024	0.065	0.065	0.066	0.065			
= 2	$= n_2$	100,100	0.320	0.318	0.320	0.298	0.117	0.116	0.117	0.116			
b = d	n_1	1000,1000	0.569	0.569	0.569	0.564	0.816	0.816	0.816	0.812			
and		10,20	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.080	0.078	0.080	0.079			
= Σ 2	$\neq n_2$	100,200	0.111	0.111	0.111	0.109	0.387	0.386	0.387	0.379			
Σ_1	n_1	600,1000	0.237	0.236	0.237	0.235	0.840	0.839	0.840	0.834			

 Table 4: Multivariate Gamma When Variance Co-variance Matrix Are Not Equal

 Table 4: Multivariate gamma when variance co –variance matrix are not equal

 Power of the Test for Multivariate Gamma

					rower of t	ne 1 est 10	r Multiva	riate Gamma	ı			
				α=0.0)1		α=0.05					
			Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy	Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy		
		10,10	0.043	0.040	0.043	0.037	0.072	0.070	0.072	0.071		
;= 2	= n ₂	100,100	0.111	0.111	0.111	0.108	0.112	0.111	0.112	0.111		
b = 6	n1 =	1000,1000	0.891	0.891	0.891	0.885	0.975	0.975	0.975	0.973		
and		10,20	0.161	0.154	0.161	0.116	0.086	0.084	0.086	0.084		
Σ_2	≠ n ₂	100,200	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.099	0.121	0.121	0.121	0.120		
Σ 1 ⊭	n1 -	600,1000	0.394	0.394	0.394	0.390	0.840	0.840	0.840	0.835		

Table 5: Multivariate Normal When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Equal

.

				Po	wer of th	e Test for	Multivar	iate Normal	l		
				α=0.01				α=0.05			
		10,10,10	Wilk 0.013	Lawley 0.016	Pillai 0.017	Roy 0.051	Wilk 0.054	Lawley 0.060	Pillai 0.061	Roy 0.093	
= 3	= n ₂	100,100,100	0.021	0.028	0.028	0.152	0.081	0.100	0.100	0.325	
p = g	n_1 :	1000,1000,1000	0.056	0.094	0.093	0.651	0.134	0.185	0.185	0.578	
and		10,20,30	0.012	0.017	0.017	0.062	0.085	0.152	0.154	0.434	
$= \Sigma_2$	$\neq n_2$	100,200,300	0.017	0.026	0.026	0.084	0.204	0.407	0.399	0.959	
Σ^1	n_1	600,800,1000	0.037	0.067	0.068	0.267	0.109	0.160	0.160	0.392	

Multivariate Normal When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Not Equal

Table (6: Multiva	riate normal when var	iance co-v	ariance ma	trix are no	ot equal						
				Po	ower of th	e Test for	Multivar	iate Norma	l			
				α=0.01				α=0.05				
			Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy	Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy		
~		10,10,10	0.013	0.018	0.018	0.060	0.076	0.104	0.102	0.305		
ii bu	= u ²	100,100,100	0.020	0.026	0.026	0.141	0.060	0.065	0.065	0.126		
= d	n_1	1000,1000,1000	0.016	0.020	0.020	0.063	0.059	0.063	0.063	0.122		
and		10,20,30	0.013	0.018	0.018	0.071	0.066	0.093	0.092	0.293		
± Σ ₂	≠ n²	100,200,300	0.013	0.017	0.017	0.063	0.072	0.099	0.099	0.329		
Σ 1 ∃	n_1	600,800,1000	0.013	0.016	0.016	0.059	0.067	0.080	0.080	0.213		
Tab	le 7											

Multivariate Gamma When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Equal

Table 7: Multivariate gamma when variance co -variance matrix are equal

				Po	ower of th	e Test for	Multivari	ate Gamma		
				α=0.	01		α=0.05			
		10,10,10	Wilk 0.024	Lawley 0.048	Pillai 0.044	Roy 0.194	Wilk 0.057	Lawley 0.063	Pillai 0.065	Roy 0.098
= 3	= n 2	100,100,100	0.035	0.055	0.054	0.375	0.109	0.145	0.146	0.345
b = g	n_1 =	1000,1000,1000	0.232	0.416	0.411	0.994	0.140	0.196	0.196	0.738
Tabl	le 8	10,20,30	0.014	0.021	0.022	0.057	0.062	0.081	0.081	0.218
$= \Sigma_2$	$\neq n_2$	100,200,300	0.017	0.027	0.027	0.157	0.120	0.212	0.212	0.595
Σ_1	n_1	600,800,1000	0.234	0.500	0.492	0.998	0.219	0.372	0.370	0.958

Multivariate Gamma When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Not Equal Table 8: Multivariate gamma when variance co-variance matrix are not equal

				1	Power of th	e Test for	Multivaria	ate Gamma					
				α=0.	01			α=0.05					
			Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy	Wilk	Lawley	Pillai	Roy			
		10,10,10	0.016	0.024	0.026	0.071	0.078	0.106	0.111	0.259			
н Ш	= n ₂	100,100,100	0.020	0.027	0.027	0.114	0.077	0.093	0.093	0.300			
= d	n1 =	1000,1000,1000	0.186	0.338	0.335	0.984	0.219	0324	0.323	0.925			
and		10,20,30	0.014	0.022	0.022	0.092	0.092	0.167	0.170	0.449			
$\neq \Sigma_2$	$\neq n_2$	100,200,300	0.022	0.039	0.038	0.272	0.107	0.181	0.180	0.624			
Σ^1	n1	600,800,1000	0.099	0.218	0.216	0.926	0.356	0.587	0.583	0.996			

European Journal of Statistics and Probability

Vol.10, No.1, pp.,11-20, 2022

Print ISSN: 2055-0154(Print),

Online ISSN 2055-0162(Online)

Table 9: Multivariate Gamma When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Not Equal Table 9: Multivariate gamma when variance co -variance matrix are not equal

1 abic	abit 9, shufurvariate gamma when variance co-variance matrix are not equal												
				Po	wer of the	e Test for l	Multivaria	ite Normal					
				α=0.01					α=0.05				
			Wilk	Lawle	Pillai	Roy	Wilk	Lawle	Pillai	Roy			
		10,10,10,10	0.011	0.013	0.014	0.073	0.052	0.060	0.061	0.163			
= 4	= n ₂	100,100,100,100	0.015	0.022	0.022	0.230	0.073	0.103	0.103	0.663			
- g = q	n1 =	1000,1000,1000,1000	0.016	0.024	0.024	0.433	0.145	0.279	0.277	0.999			
and		10,20,30,40	0.011	0.015	0.015	0.078	0.054	0.073	0.074	0.392			
$\Sigma_1 \neq \Sigma_2$	$\neq n_2$	100,200,300,400	0.014	0.028	0.028	0.351	0.059	0.085	0.056	0.434			
	n_1	600,700,800,1000	0.029	0.079	0.078	0.970	0.102	0.200	0.199	0.987			

Table 10 : Multivariate Normal When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Not Equal Table 10: Multivariate normal when variance co-variance matrix are not equal

				P	ower of th	e Test for	Multivaria	te Normal			
			a=0.01				a=0.05				
			Wilk	Lawle	Pillai	Roy	Wilk	Lawle	Pillai	Roy	
		10,10,10,10	0.013	0.023	0.022	0.231	0.057	0.078	0.077	0.401	
4	= n ₂	100,100,100,100	0.016	0.026	0.026	0.479	0.066	0.087	0.087	0.591	
b = 6	<i>n</i> ₁ =	1000,1000,1000,1000	0.021	0.038	0.038	0.714	0.078	0.113	0.113	0.774	
and		10,20,30,40	0.012	0.019	0.019	0.269	0.058	0.099	0.098	0.597	
Σ_2	± n2	100,200,300,400	0.012	0.017	0.017	0.164	0.055	0.069	0.069	0.245	
Σ ₁ ∍	n₁ ∍	600,700,800,1000	0.019	0.039	0.039	0.519	0.068	0.096	0.096	0.637	

Table 11: Multivariate Gamma When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Equal

Table 11: Multivariate gamma when variance co –variance matrix are equal

			Power of the Test for Multivariate Gamma									
			α=0.01					a=0.05				
		10,10,10,10	Wilk 0.011	Lawl 0.015	Pillai 0.015	Roy 0.105	Wilk 0.056	Lawle 0.075	Pillai 0.076	Roy 0.369		
g = 4	$= n_2$	100,100,100,100	0.013	0.018	0.018	0.142	0.063	0.079	0.079	0.382		
$\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $p =$	n1	1000,1000,1000,1000	0.017	0.027	0.027	0.481	0.059	0.070	0.070	0.301		
	$_1 \neq n_2$	10,20,30,40	0.012	0.022	0.022	0.267	0.053	0.069	0.069	0.368		
		100,200,300,400	0.013	0.020	0.020	0.310	0.061	0.093	0.093	0.487		
	u	600,700,800,1000	0.013	0.018	0.018	0.226	0.066	0.093	0.093	0.465		

			Power of the Test for Multivariate Gamma								
			α=0.01				α=0.05				
4		10,10,10,10	Wilk 0.011	Lawle 0.015	Pillai 0.015	Roy 0.078	Wilk 0.059	Lawle 0.085	Pillai 0.087	Roy 0.394	
90 	$n_1 = n_2$	100,100,100,100	0.014	0.019	0.019	0.187	0.079	0.119	0.118	0.813	
d p		1000,1000,1000,1000	0.016	0.025	0.025	0.376	0.070	0.092	0.092	0.645	
Σ2 an		10,20,30,40	0.011	0.017	0.017	0.160	0.055	0.082	0.082	0.467	
	± n	100,200,300,400	0.014	0.027	0.027	0.379	0.069	0.129	0.129	0.883	
[∗] Ω	n_1	600,700,800,1000	0.012	0.015	0.015	0.150	0.067	0.095	0.095	0.534	

Multivariate Gamma When Variance Covariance Matrix Are Not Equal

CONCLUSION

This study examined the powers of four test statistics of Multivariate Analysis of Variance. The four compared test statistics include Lawley-Hotelling trace, Pillai's trace, Roy's largest Root and Wilks' lambda. The data was simulated to compare the four test statistics under two different distributions (multivariate Gamma and multivariate normal), sample sizes (10, 20, 30, 40, 100, 200, 300, 400, 600, 700, 800 and 1000), number of variables (p = 2, 3, 4), equal and unequal sample and variance co-variance matrix. The comparisons were done at two levels of significance ($\alpha = 0.01$ and 0.05) using power of the test.

From all the result of the analysis, it is clear that when the levels of significance (α) increases, the power of the four test statistics also increases. Further indicated that when the assumption of equality of variance co-variance matrix is altered or violated, it affects the power of the four test statistics, as long as p and g = 2 and the sample sizes are very small. Also showed that when p = g = 2 and p = g = 3, the power of the four test statistics are significantly affected when variance co-variance matrix are unequal and data are multivariate gamma. More so, when p and g = 4 unequal variance co-variance matrix and multivariate gamma does not have any effect on the power of the four test statistics. It is obviously shown when p and g = 2 and null hypothesis is true, Roy's largest root is better than the three other test statistics, while Wilks' Lambda is better than others when p = g = 3 and p = g = 4.

This study will help researchers to plan studies with controlled probabilities of detecting a meaningful effect thereby giving conclusive results with maximum efficiency. More research is also required to be done featuring more sample sizes, other multivariate tests statistics and other criteria.

REFERENCES

Brewer, J. K. (1972). On the power of statistical tests in the American Educational Research Journal. American Educational Research Journal, 9(3), 391-401.

European Journal of Statistics and Probability

Vol.10, No.1, pp.,11-20, 2022

Print ISSN: 2055-0154(Print),

Online ISSN 2055-0162(Online)

- Cohen, J. (1973). Brief Notes: Statistical power analysis and research results. American Educational Research Journal, 10(3), 225-229.
- Finch, H. (2005). Performance of Monte Carlo permutation and approximation tests for multivariate means comparisons with small sample sizes when parametric assumptions are violated. *Methodology* (2019) 5:60–70.doi: 10.1027/1614-2241.5.2.60
- Fouladi, R. T., & Yockey, R. D. (2002). Type I error control of two-group multivariate tests on means under conditions of heterogeneous correlation structure and varied multivariate distributions. Communications in Statistics-Simulation and computation, 31(3), 375-400.
- Hotelling, H. (2011): A generalized T-test and Measure of Multivariate Dispersion. Proceedings of Second Berkely Symposium on Mathematics and Statistics, 23-41
- Ito, K. (1962). A comparison of the powers of two multivariate analysis of variance tests. Biometrika, 49(3/4), 455-462.
- Morrison, D. F. (1967). Multivariate statistical analysis. New York.
- Rencher, A. C. (2015): Methods of multivariate analysis. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Sheehan-Holt, J. K. (1998). MANOVA simultaneous test procedures: The power and robustness of restricted multivariate contrasts. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 58(6), 861-881.
- Timm, N. H. (1975). Multivariate Analysis; With applications in education and psychology (No. 04; QA278, T5.).
- Tversky, A., &Kahneman, D. (1971).Belief in the law of small numbers. Psychological bulletin, 76(2), 105.