

## Random Effects in CRD

Design of Experiments - Montgomery  
Section 12-1

7

## Random Effects vs Fixed Effects

- Consider factor with numerous possible levels
- Want to draw inference **on population of levels**
- Not concerned with any specific levels
- Example of difference (1=fixed, 2=random)
  1. Compare reading ability of 10 2nd grade classes in NY
  2. Compare variability **among all** 2nd grade classes in NY
    1. Select  $a = 10$  specific classes of interest. Randomly choose  $n$  students from each classroom. Want to compare  $\tau_i$  (class-specific effects).
    2. **Randomly choose**  $a = 10$  classes from large number of classes. Randomly choose  $n$  students from each classroom. Want to assess  $\sigma_r^2$  (class to class variability).
- Inference broader in random effects case
- Levels chosen randomly  $\rightarrow$  inference on population

7-1

## Random Effects Model (CRD)

- Same model as in the fixed case

$$y_{ij} = \mu + \tau_i + \epsilon_{ij} \quad \begin{cases} i = 1, 2, \dots, a \\ j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i \end{cases}$$

$\mu$  - grand mean

$\tau_i$  -  $i$ th treatment effect

$$\epsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$$

But view number of treatment levels as infinite

- Instead of  $\sum \tau_i = 0$ , assume

$$\tau_i \sim N(0, \sigma_r^2)$$

$\{\tau_i\}$  and  $\{\epsilon_{ij}\}$  independent

- $\text{Var}(y_{ij}) = \sigma_r^2 + \sigma^2$  (HW #1 Problem 8)

7-2

## Random Effects Model

- The hypotheses are:

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \sigma_r^2 = 0 \\ H_1 &: \sigma_r^2 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

- Partitioning of Total Sum of Squares identical

$$E(\text{MS}_E) = \sigma^2$$

$$E(\text{MS}_{\text{Treatment}}) = \sigma^2 + n\sigma_r^2$$

- Under  $H_0$ ,  $F_0 \sim F_{\alpha, a-1, N-a}$

- Same test as before
- Direct comparison of variabilities (between vs within)
- Conclusions, however, pertain to entire population

7-3

## Model Estimates

- Usually interested in estimating variances
- Use mean squares (known as ANOVA method)

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = MS_E$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_\tau^2 = (MS_{\text{Treatment}} - MS_E)/n$$

If unbalanced, replace  $n$  with

$$n_0 = ((\sum n_i)^2 - \sum n_i^2) / ((a-1) \sum n_i)$$

- Estimate of  $\sigma_\tau^2$  can be negative
  - Supports  $H_0$ ? Use zero as estimate?
  - Validity of model? Nonlinear?
  - Bayesian approach (nonnegative prior)

7-4

## Confidence intervals

- $\sigma^2$ : Same as fixed case

$$\frac{(N-a)MS_E}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_{N-a}^2$$

$$\frac{(N-a)MS_E}{\chi_{\alpha/2, N-a}^2} \leq \sigma^2 \leq \frac{(N-a)MS_E}{\chi_{1-\alpha/2, N-a}^2}$$

- $\sigma_\tau^2$ : Linear combination of  $\chi^2$

$$\frac{(a-1)MS_{\text{Trt}}}{\sigma^2 + n\sigma_\tau^2} \sim \chi_{a-1}^2$$

so

$$f(\sigma_\tau^2) = \frac{\sigma^2 + n\sigma_\tau^2}{n(a-1)} \chi_{a-1}^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{n(N-a)} \chi_{N-a}^2$$

No closed form expression for this distribution

Approximations available (Section 12-7)

7-5

- Proportion of  $\sigma_\tau^2$  in  $\text{Var}(y_{ij})$

Common estimate if goal is to reduce variance

Uses ratio of two  $\chi^2$  distributions (i.e.,  $F$  dist)

Instead of

$$\frac{L}{L+1} \leq \frac{\sigma_\tau^2}{\sigma^2 + \sigma_\tau^2} \leq \frac{U}{U+1}$$

$$L = \frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{MS_{\text{Trt}}}{MS_E F_{\alpha/2, a-1, N-a}} - 1 \right)$$

$$U = \frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{MS_{\text{Trt}}}{MS_E F_{1-\alpha/2, a-1, N-a}} - 1 \right)$$

Consider

$$\frac{F_0 - F_{\alpha/2, a-1, N-a}}{F_0 + (n-1)F_{\alpha/2, a-1, N-a}} \leq \frac{\sigma_\tau^2}{\sigma^2 + \sigma_\tau^2} \leq \frac{F_0 - F_{1-\alpha/2, a-1, N-a}}{F_0 + (n-1)F_{1-\alpha/2, a-1, N-a}}$$

- Grand mean  $-\mu$

**Example:** Average reading ability of 2nd grade class. Unit is the class, selection of students is subsampling.

$$\bar{y}_{..} = \frac{1}{a} (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \dots + \bar{y}_a)$$

$\bar{y}_i$  iid Normal but what is variance?

$$\text{CI for } \mu : \bar{y}_{..} \pm t \sqrt{\text{Var}(\bar{y}_{..})}$$

7-6

## Example

A supplier delivers several hundred batches of raw material to a company each year. The company is interested in a high yield from each batch of raw material (percent usable). Therefore, to investigate the consistency of this supplier, an experiment is done where five batches were selected at random and three yield determinations were made on each batch.

		Batch				
		1	2	3	4	5
	74	68	75	72	79	
	76	71	77	74	81	
	75	72	77	73	79	

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	$F_0$
Between	147.73	4	36.93	20.5
Within	18.00	10	1.80	
Total	165.73	14		

Highly significant result ( $F_{0.05, 4, 10} = 3.48$ )

$$\hat{\sigma}_\tau^2 = (36.93 - 1.80)/3 = 11.71$$

86.7% ( $=11.71/(11.71+1.80)$ ) is attributable to batch differences

Time to improve consistency of the batches

7-7

## Using SAS

### Example

#### Confidence Intervals

- 95% CI for  $\sigma^2$

$$\frac{SSE}{\chi^2_{0.025,10}} \leq \sigma^2 \leq \frac{SSE}{\chi^2_{0.975,10}} = (18.00/20.48, 18.00/3.25) = (0.879, 5.538)$$

- 95% CI for Intraclass Correlation

$$\left( \frac{20.52-4.47}{20.52+(3-1)4.47}, \frac{20.52-(1/8.84)}{20.52+(3-1)(1/8.84)} \right) = (0.545, 0.984)$$

using property that

$$F_{1-\alpha/2, v_1, v_2} = 1/F_{\alpha/2, v_2, v_1}$$

7-8

```
options nocenter ps=35 ls=72;
```

```
data example;
  input batch percent;
  cards;
  1 74
  1 76
  1 75
  2 68
  .
  5 79
  ;
```

```
proc glm;
  class batch;
  model percent=batch;
  random batch;
  output out=diag r=res p=pred;
```

```
proc plot;
  plot res*pred;
```

```
proc varcomp method = typel;
  class batch;
  model percent = batch;
```

```
proc mixed cl;
  class batch;
  model percent = ;
  random batch;
run;
```

7-9

Dependent Variable: PERCENT

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	4	147.73333	36.93333	20.52	0.0001
Error	10	18.00000	1.80000		
Corrected Total	14	165.73333			

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
BATCH	4	147.73333	36.93333	20.52	0.0001

Source	Type III	Expected Mean Square
BATCH	Var(Error) + 3 Var(BATCH)	

Variance Components Estimation Procedure

Dependent Variable: PERCENT

Source	DF	Type I SS	Type I MS
BATCH	4	147.7333333	36.9333333
Error	10	18.0000000	1.8000000
Corrected Total	14	165.7333333	

Source	Expected Mean Square
BATCH	Var(Error) + 3 Var(BATCH)
Error	Var(Error)

Variance Component	Estimate
Var(BATCH)	11.7111111
Var(Error)	1.8000000

7-10

The MIXED Procedure

Class	Levels	Values
BATCH	5	1 2 3 4 5

REML Estimation Iteration History

Iteration	Evaluations	Objective	Criterion
0	1	51.30656858	
1	1	37.02237479	0.00000000

Convergence criteria met.

Covariance Parameter Estimates (REML)

Cov Parm	Estimate	Alpha	Lower	Upper
BATCH	11.7111111	0.05	4.0450	114.2090
Residual	1.8000000	0.05	0.8788	5.5436

Model Fitting Information for PERCENT

Description	Value
Observations	15.0000
Res Log Likelihood	-31.3763
Akaike's Information Criterion	-33.3763
Schwarz's Bayesian Criterion	-34.0154
-2 Res Log Likelihood	62.7527

7-11

# Negative $\sigma^2_\tau$ Estimate Example

options nocenter ps=39 ls=64;

```
data new;
input class subj score @@;
cards;
1 1 74.62 1 2 73.90 1 3 72.27 1 4 71.60 1 5 73.80
1 6 77.42 1 7 72.16 1 8 76.69 1 9 75.84 1 10 70.35
2 1 72.55 2 2 71.44 2 3 72.67 2 4 72.59 2 5 71.25
2 6 68.99 2 7 69.61 2 8 77.44 2 9 73.99 2 10 73.90
3 1 76.66 3 2 74.76 3 3 70.47 3 4 75.38 3 5 68.32
3 6 76.69 3 7 73.34 3 8 68.24 3 9 69.33 3 10 78.22
;

proc glm;
class class;
model score = class;
random class / test;

proc varcomp method = typ1;
class class;
model score = class;

proc varcomp method = reml;
class class;
model score = class;

proc mixed cl;
class class;
model score = ;
random class;
run;
```

## General Linear Models Procedure

Dependent Variable: SCORE

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	F Value	Pr > F
Model	2	10.11154667	0.60	0.5557
Error	27	227.34895000		
Corrected Total	29	237.46049667		

  

	R-Square	C.V.	SCORE Mean
	0.042582	3.966909	73.1496667

Source	DF	Type I SS	F Value	Pr > F
CLASS	2	10.11154667	0.60	0.5557

  

Source	DF	Type III SS	F Value	Pr > F
CLASS	2	10.11154667	0.60	0.5557

## General Linear Models Procedure

Source	Type III Expected Mean Square
CLASS	Var(Error) + 10 Var(CLASS)

## Tests of Hypotheses for Random Model Analysis of Variance

Source: CLASS  
Error: MS(Error)

DF	Type III MS	Denominator		F Value	Pr > F
		DF	MS		
2	5.055773333	27	8.4203314815	0.6004	0.5557

## Variance Components Estimation Procedure

Class	Levels	Values
CLASS	3	1 2 3

Number of observations in data set = 30

## Variance Components Estimation Procedure

Dependent Variable: SCORE

Source	DF	Type I SS	Type I MS
CLASS	2	10.11154667	5.05577333
Error	27	227.34895000	8.42033148
Corrected Total	29	237.46049667	

Source	Expected Mean Square
CLASS	Var(Error) + 10 Var(CLASS)
Error	Var(Error)

Variance Component	Estimate
Var(CLASS)	-0.33645581
Var(Error)	8.42033148

## REML Procedure

Dependent Variable: SCORE

Iteration	Objective	Var(CLASS)	Var(Error)
0	60.97845805	0	8.18829299
1	60.97845805	0	8.18829299

Convergence criteria met.

## Asymptotic Covariance Matrix of Estimates

	Var(CLASS)	Var(Error)
Var(CLASS)	0	0
Var(Error)	0	4.6240097976

## The MIXED Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
CLASS	3	1 2 3

## REML Estimation Iteration History

Iteration	Evaluations	Objective	Criterion
0	1	93.37965543	
1	1	93.37965543	0.00000000

Convergence criteria met.

## Covariance Parameter Estimates (REML)

Cov Parm	Estimate	Alpha	Lower	Upper
CLASS	0.00000000	.	.	.
Residual	8.18829299	0.05	5.1935	14.7977

## Model Fitting Information for SCORE

Description	Value
Observations	30.0000
Res Log Likelihood	-73.3390
Akaike's Information Criterion	-75.3390
Schwarz's Bayesian Criterion	-76.7063
-2 Res Log Likelihood	146.6781