

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Used to test if there is a difference between MEDIANS for treatment groups

Use for NON-NORMAL distributions

Assumptions:

- 1) Completely Randomized Design (CRD)
- 2) Treatment populations have approximately the same shape and spread

Based on RANKING ALL SAMPLES from smallest to largest. Then take MEDIANS (Md)

H_0 : $Md_1 = Md_2 = Md_3 \dots = Md_k$;

H_a : At least ONE of the Md's is \neq

test statistic:
$$H = \frac{12}{N(N+1)} * \left[\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(Tr_i)^2}{n_i} \right] - (3(N + 1))$$

k = # of treatment groups

$N = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$ (Total number of all samples)

Rejection Region: Reject H_0 if $H > X^2_{\alpha; (k-1)}$ (**chi-squared distribution**)

Steps:

- 1) Rank all observations from smallest to largest (easiest if you can order them within a treatment group)
- 2) If two or more observations are "tied" create and assign a fractional rank for them, i.e.

Scores = 2 5 6 6 6 10 12

Initial Rank = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (3+4+5)/3 = 4

Final Rank = 1 2 4 4 4 6 7

- 3) Sum all the ranks: i.e.

Tr _A	66	73	74	75	78	82	87	97	
RANK	15	20	21.5	23	25.5	29	31	32	Tr _A = 197
Tr _B	51	59	62	63	64	72	74	78	
RANK	1	5	10	11.5	13	19	21.5	25.5	Tr _B = 106.5
Tr _C	55	57	60	60	61	70	71	81	
RANK	2	3	6.5	6.5	8.5	17	18	28	Tr _C = 89.5
Tr _D	58	61	63	65	69	76	80	84	
RANK	4	8.5	11.5	14	16	24	27	30	Tr _D = 135
							Total		528

4) Check THE RANKING total: $\sum_{i=1}^k Tr_i$ *should* = $\frac{N*(N+1)}{2} = 32(33)/2 = 528$

5) Calculate the test statistic:

$$H = \frac{12}{N(N+1)} * \left[\frac{197^2}{8} + \frac{106.5^2}{8} + \frac{89.5^2}{8} + \frac{135^2}{8} \right] - (3(32 + 1)) = 9.50355136$$

6) Compare to Chi-squared value:

$$X^2_{\alpha;(k-1)} = X^2_{0.10;(3)} = 6.25139$$

7) Write Conclusion:

Since $H = 9.50355136 > X^2_{\alpha;(k-1)} = 6.25139$ we can reject H_0 and conclude that at a 10% level of significance there are differences between the treatments.

Dunn's procedure – Test which treatment groups differ, based on MEDIANS

Assumptions:

Calculate $\binom{k}{2}$ pairs of $|\bar{R}_i - \bar{R}_j|$

H_0 : $Md_i = Md_j$; where $i, j = 1:k$ and $i \neq j$

H_a : $Md_i \neq Md_j$; where $i, j = 1:k$ and $i \neq j$

$k = \#$ of treatment groups; $R_i = \frac{Tr_i}{n_i}$;

$N = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$ (Total number of all samples)

$$\text{Critical region, } CR = Z \frac{\alpha}{k(k-1)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{N(N+1)}{12} * \left(\frac{1}{n_i} + \frac{1}{n_j} \right)} \right)$$

Reject H_0 ($Md_i = Md_j$) if $|\bar{R}_i - \bar{R}_j| > CR$

eg. if $\alpha = 0.1$ and $k = 4$, then $\frac{\alpha}{k(k-1)} = \frac{0.1}{4(3)} = 0.00833333$

Look in NORMAL tables (Area Under The Normal Curve) in textbook:

1 - 0.0083333 = 0.9916667 ← look up this number

In tables, $Z(2.39) = 0.9916$ and $Z(2.4) = .9918$ so use $Z = 2.395$

Steps:

1) Calculate \bar{R}_i for each Treatment: $\bar{R}_i = \frac{Tr_i}{n_i}$ i.e.:

$$\bar{R}_1 = \frac{63.5}{6} = 10.583$$

$$\bar{R}_2 = \frac{89}{7} = 12.7142$$

$$\bar{R}_3 = \frac{45.5}{6} = 7.5833$$

$$\bar{R}_4 = \frac{78}{4} = 19.5$$

2) Calculate pairs of $|\bar{R}_i - \bar{R}_j|$ eg:

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{R}_1 - \bar{R}_2| &= 2.13 && \not> 9.037 \\ |\bar{R}_1 - \bar{R}_3| &= 2.999 && \not> 9.3782 \\ |\bar{R}_1 - \bar{R}_4| &= 8.9167 && \not> 10.4852 \\ |\bar{R}_2 - \bar{R}_3| &= 5.13095 && \not> 9.037 \\ |\bar{R}_2 - \bar{R}_4| &= 6.7857 && \not> 10.81265 \\ |\bar{R}_3 - \bar{R}_4| &= 11.9166 && > 10.4851 \end{aligned}$$

3) Calculate Critical region for EVERY PAIR, **unless $n_i = n_j$ for all**

$$CR = Z_{\frac{\alpha}{k(k-1)}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{N(N+1)}{12} * \left(\frac{1}{n_i} + \frac{1}{n_j} \right)} \right)$$

4) Compare EACH pair value against the CR (see #2 above)

5) REJECT H_0 if Pair value > CR

6) WRITE CONCLUSION:

There is evidence to suggest that at a 10% level of significance there are differences between Treatments 3 and 4.

(There is NO SAS program equivalent for this – so no need to compare to SAS output)

NOTES:

Non-Parametric tests are more powerful (greater probability of rejecting a false H_0) than the F-Test, IF the assumptions of the F-Test are violated (i.e. NON-NORMALITY). HOWEVER, if F-Test assumptions are REASONABLY SATISFIED, the F-Test is better than non-parametric tests at detecting small but significant differences between treatment means.