Independent t-test Data Analysis for Psychology in R 1

dapR1 Team

Department of Psychology The University of Edinburgh

Learning Objectives

- Understand when to use an independent sample *t*-test
- Understand the null hypothesis for an independent sample *t*-test
- Understand how to calculate the test statistic
- Know how to conduct the test in R
- Understand the assumptions for *t*-tests

Topics for today

- Recording 1: Conceptual background and introduction to our example
- Recording 2: Calculations and R-functions
- Recording 3: Assumptions and effect size

Purpose & Data

- The independent or Student's *t*-test is used when we want to test the difference in mean between two measured groups.
- The groups must be independent:
 - No person can be in both groups.
- Examples:
 - Treatment versus control group in an experimental study.
 - Married versus not married
- Data Requirements
 - A continuously measured variable.
 - A binary variable denoting groups

Hypotheses

• Identical to one-sample, only now we are comparing two measured groups.

• Two-tailed:

$$egin{array}{ll} H_0:ar{x}_1=ar{x}_2\ H_1:ar{x}_1
eqar{x}_2 \end{array}$$

• One-tailed:

$$egin{aligned} H_0: ar{x}_1 &= ar{x}_2 \ H_1: ar{x}_1 &< ar{x}_2 \ H_1: ar{x}_1 &> ar{x}_2 \end{aligned}$$

Example

- Example taken from Howell, D.C. (2010). *Statistical Methods for Psychology, 7th Edition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Data from Aronson, Lustina, Good, Keough, Steele and Brown (1998). Experiment on stereotype threat.
 - Two independent groups college students (n=12 control; n=11 threat condition).
 - Both samples excel in maths.
 - Threat group told certain students usually do better in the test

Data

A tibble: 23 × 2 Group Score ## ## <fct> <dbl> 1 Threat ## 7 2 Threat ## 5 3 Threat ## 6 ## 4 Threat 5 5 Threat 6 ## 6 Threat 5 ## 7 Threat ## 4 ## 8 Threat 7 9 Threat ## 4 ## 10 Threat 3 ## # ... with 13 more rows

Visualizing data

- We spoke earlier in the course about the importance of visualizing our data.
- Here, we want to show the mean and distribution of scores by group.
- So we want a.....

Visualizing data



Hypotheses

- My hypothesis is that the threat group will perform worse than the control group.
 - This is a one-tailed, or directional hypothesis.
- And I will use an lpha=.05

t-statistic

$$t=rac{ar{x}_1-ar{x}_2}{SE(ar{x}_1-ar{x}_2)}$$

- Where
 - $\circ \,\, ar{x}_1$ and $ar{x}_2$ are the sample means in each group
 - $\circ \; SE(ar{x}_1 ar{x}_2)$ is standard error of the difference
- Sampling distribution is a t-distribution with n-2 degrees of freedom.

Standard Error Difference

• First calculate the pooled standard deviation.

$$S_p = \sqrt{rac{(n_1-1)s_1^2+(n_2-1)s_2^2}{n_1+n_2-2}}$$

• Then use this to calculate the SE of the difference.

$$SE(ar{x}_1 - ar{x}_2) = S_p \sqrt{rac{1}{n_1} + rac{1}{n_2}}$$

Time for a break

Welcome Back!

OK, we have done all the concepts, now let's do the calculations.

- Steps in my calculations:
 - Calculate the sample mean in both groups.
 - $\circ~$ Calculate the pooled SD.
 - Check I know my n.
 - Calculate the standard error.
 - \circ Use all this to calculate t.

```
calc <- threat %>%
group_by(Group) %>%
summarise(
   Mean = round(mean(Score),2),
   SD = round(sd(Score),2),
   N = n()
)
```

```
## # A tibble: 2 × 4
## Group Mean SD N
## <fct> <dbl> <dbl> <int>
## 1 Threat 5.27 1.27 11
## 2 Control 9.58 1.51 12
```

A tibble: 2 × 4
Group Mean SD N
<fct> <dbl> <dbl> <int>
1 Threat 5.27 1.27 11
2 Control 9.58 1.51 12

• Calculate pooled standard deviation

$$S_p = \sqrt{rac{(n_1-1)s_1^2 + (n_2-1)s_2^2}{n_1+n_2-2}} = \sqrt{rac{10*1.27^2 + 11*1.51^2}{11+12-2}} = \sqrt{rac{41.21}{21}} = 1.401$$

• Calculate pooled standard deviation

$$S_p = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}} = \sqrt{\frac{10 * 1.27^2 + 11 * 1.51^2}{11 + 12 - 2}} = \sqrt{\frac{41.21}{21}} = 1.401$$

• Calculate the standard error.

$$SE(ar{x}_1 - ar{x}_2) = S_p \sqrt{rac{1}{n_1} + rac{1}{n_2}} = 1.401 \sqrt{rac{1}{11} + rac{1}{12}} = 1.401 * 0.417 = 0.584$$

• Use all this to calculate *t*.

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{SE(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2)} = \frac{5.27 - 9.58}{0.584} = -7.38$$

Note: When doing hand calculations there might be a small amount of rounding error when we compare to t calculated in R.
 In this case, actual value = -7.38

Is my test significant?

- Steps:
 - $\circ~$ Calculate my degrees of freedom n-2=23-2=21
 - Check my value of t against the t-distribution with the appropriate df and make my decision

Is our test significant?



```
tibble(
  LowerCrit = round(qt(0.05, 21),2),
     Exactp = 1-pt(7.3817, 21)
```

##	#	A tibble:	1 × 2
##		LowerCrit	Exactp
##		<dbl></dbl>	<dbl></dbl>
##	1	-1.72	0.000000146

Is my test significant?

- So our critical value is -1.72
 - Our t-statistic is larger than this, -7.38.
 - $\circ~$ So we reject the null hypothesis.
- *t*(21)= -7.38, *p* <.05, one-tailed.

In R

```
res <- t.test(Score ~ Group,</pre>
       var.equal = TRUE,
        alternative = "less",
        data = threat)
##
##
       Two Sample t-test
##
## data: Score by Group
## t = -7.3817, df = 21, p-value = 1.458e-07
## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means between group Threat and group Control is less than 0
## 95 percent confidence interval:
         -Inf -3.305768
##
## sample estimates:
   mean in group Threat mean in group Control
##
##
                5.272727
                                       9.583333
```

Write up

An independent sample *t*-test was used to assess whether the maths score mean of the control group (12) was higher than that of the stereotype threat group (11). There was a significant difference in test score between the control (Mean=9.58; SD=1.51) and threat (Mean=5.27; SD=1.27) groups (t(21)=-7.38, p<.05, one-tailed). Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis. The direction of effect supports our directional hypothesis and indicates that the threat group performed more poorly than the control group.

Time for a break

Welcome Back!

Next up, checking assumptions and calculating effect size.

Assumption checks summary

	Description	One-Sample t- test	Independent Sample t- test	Paired Sample t-test
Normality	Continuous variable (and difference) is normally distributed.	Yes (Population)	Yes (Both groups/ Difference)	Yes (Both groups/ Difference)
Tests:	Descriptive Statistics; Shapiro-Wilks Test; QQ-plot			
Independence	Observations are sampled independently.	Yes	Yes (within and across groups)	Yes (within groups)
Tests:	None. Design issue.			
Homogeneity of variance	Population level standard deviation is the same in both groups.	NA	Yes	Yes
Tests:	F-test			
Matched Pairs in data	For paired sample, each observation must have matched pair.	NA	NA	Yes
Tests:	None. Data structure issue.			

Assumptions

- The independent sample *t*-test has the following assumptions:
 - Independence of observations within and across groups.
 - Continuous variable is approximately normally distribution within both groups.
 - Equivalently, that the difference in means is normally distributed.
 - Homogeneity of variance across groups.

Assumption checks: Normality

- Descriptive statistics:
 - $\circ~$ Skew: No strict cuts for skew.
 - Skew < |1| generally not problematic
 - |1| < skew > |2| slight concern
 - Skew > |2| investigate impact

Histograms

threat %>%
ggplot(., aes(x=Score)) +
geom_histogram(bins = 20) +
facet_wrap(~ Group)



Skew

```
library(moments)
threat %>%
 group_by(Group) %>%
 summarise(
    skew = round(skewness(Score),2)
)
```

```
## # A tibble: 2 × 2
## Group skew
## <fct> <dbl>
## 1 Threat -0.23
## 2 Control -0.08
```

Assumption checks: Normality

- QQ-plots:
 - Plots the sorted quantiles of one data set (distribution) against sorted quantiles of data set (distribution).
 - Quantile = the percent of points falling below a given value.
 - For a normality check, we can compare our own data to data drawn from a normal distribution

QQ-plots



• This looks reasonable in both groups.



Assumption checks: Normality

- Shapiro-Wilks test:
 - Checks properties of the observed data against properties we would expected from normally distributed data.
 - Statistical test of normality.
 - H_0 : data = a normal distribution.
 - $\circ p$ -value $< \alpha$ = reject the null, data are not normal.
 - Sensitive to N as all p-values will be.
 - In very large N, normality should also be checked with QQ-plots alongside statistical test.

Shapiro-Wilks R

```
con <- threat %>% filter(Group == "Control") %>% select(Score)
shapiro.test(con$Score)
```

```
##
## Shapiro-Wilk normality test
##
## data: con$Score
## W = 0.95538, p-value = 0.7164
```

```
thr <- threat %>% filter(Group == "Threat") %>% select(Score)
shapiro.test(thr$Score)
```

```
##
## Shapiro-Wilk normality test
##
## data: thr$Score
## W = 0.93979, p-value = 0.518
```

Assumption checks: Homogeneity of variance

- Levene's test:
 - Statistical test for the equality (or homogeneity) of variances across groups (2+).
 - Test statistic is essentially a ratio of variance estimates calculated based on group means versus grand mean.
- The *F*-test is a related test that compares the variances of two groups.
 - This test is preferable for *t*-test.
 - $\circ~H_0$: Population variances are equal.
 - $\circ p$ -value < lpha = reject the null, the variances differ across groups.

F-test R

var.test(threat\$Score ~ threat\$Group, ratio = 1, conf.level = 0.95)

```
##
## F test to compare two variances
##
## data: threat$Score by threat$Group
## F = 0.71438, num df = 10, denom df = 11, p-value = 0.6038
## alternative hypothesis: true ratio of variances is not equal to 1
## 95 percent confidence interval:
## 0.2026227 2.6181459
## sample estimates:
## ratio of variances
## 0.7143813
```

Violation of homogeneity of variance

- If the variances differ, we can use a Welch test.
- Conceptually very similar, but we do not use a pooled standard deviation.
 - As such our estimate of the SE of the difference changes
 - $\circ~$ As do our degrees of freedom

Welch test

- If the variances differ, we can use a Welch test.
- Test statistic = same
- SE calculation:

$$SE(ar{x}_1-ar{x}_2)=\sqrt{rac{s_1^2}{n_1}+rac{s_2^2}{n_2}}$$

• And degrees of freedom (don't worry, not tested)

$$df = rac{ig(rac{s_1^2}{n_1} + rac{s_2^2}{n_2}ig)^2}{rac{(rac{s_1^2}{n_1})^2}{n_1 - 1} + rac{(rac{s_2^2}{n_2})^2}{n_2 - 1}}$$

Welch in R

```
welch <- t.test(Score ~ Group,
    var.equal = FALSE, #default, only here to highlight difference
    alternative = "less",
    data = threat)
```

Welch in R

welch

```
##
##
      Welch Two Sample t-test
##
## data: Score by Group
## t = -7.4379, df = 20.878, p-value = 1.346e-07
## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means between group Threat and group Control is less than 0
## 95 percent confidence interval:
         -Inf -3.313093
##
## sample estimates:
   mean in group Threat mean in group Control
##
##
                5.272727
                                      9.583333
```

Cohen's D: Independent t

• Independent-sample t-test:

$$D=rac{ar{x}_1-ar{x}_2}{s_p}$$

- \bar{x}_1 = mean group 1
- \bar{x}_2 = mean group 2
- s_p = pooled standard deviation

Cohen's D in R

library(effsize)
cohen.d(threat\$Score, threat\$Group, conf.level = .99)

##
Cohen's d
##
d estimate: -3.081308 (large)
99 percent confidence interval:
lower upper
-4.828153 -1.334463

Summary

- Today we have covered:
 - Basic structure of the independent-sample t-test
 - Calculations
 - Interpretation
 - Assumption checks
 - Effect size measures