The second DESIGN specification requests the regression effect (X) adjusted for the factor DRUG (Figure 1.17e).

Figure 1.17e

| TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR | Y USING SEQUENTIAL SUMS OF SQUARES | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| SOURCE OF VARIATION | SUM OF SQUARES | DF | MEAN SQUARE | F | SIG. OF F |
| WITHIN+RESIDUAL CONSTANT DRUG X | 417.20260 1872.30000 293.60000 577.89740 | 26 1 2 1 | 16.04625 1872.30000 146.80000 577.89740 | 116.68144 9.14855 36.01447 | 0.0 .001 0.0 |

The regression coefficient can be obtained from the estimate of the parameters for factor X (Figure 1.17f).

Figure 1.17f

| NSTANT | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| PARAMETER | COEFF. | STD. ERR. | T-VALUE | SIG. OF T | LOWER .95 CL | UPPER .95 CL |
| 1 | -2.6957729061 | 1.91108 | -1.41060 | . 170 | -6.62406 | 1.23252 |
| RUG . | | | | | | |
| PARAMETER | COEFF. | STD. ERR. | T-VALUE | SIG. OF T | LOWER .95 CL | UPPER .95 CL |
| 2 3 | -1.1850365374 -1.0760652052 | 1.06082 1.04130 | -1.11709 -1.03339 | .274 .311 | -3.36559 -3.21648 | . 99551 1 . 06435 |
| | | | | | | |
| PARAMETER | COEFF. | STD. ERR. | T-VALUE | SIG. OF T | LOWER .95 CL | UPPER .95 CL |
| 4 | .9871838111 | . 16450 | 6.00121 | .000 | . 64905 | 1.32531 |

From the covariance model given above, it follows that there is a common regression coefficient for the given X. This implies that the within-treatment regression coefficients are homogeneous. The assumption of homogeneity of regression coefficients in the analysis of covariance can be assessed by introducing a treatment by covariate interaction term in the model.

A test for no interaction between DRUG effects and covariate is equivalent to testing the hypothesis that the pooled within-treatment regression coefficient is appropriate. The test for treatment by covariate interaction, which is referred to as the test for regression parallelism, can be obtained in MANOVA as follows:

The analysis of variance table for this DESIGN specification is given in Figure 1.17g.

Since X BY DRUG is not significant, the hypothesis of the homogeneity of the within-

Since X BY DRUG is not significant, the hypothesis of the homogeneity of the within-treatment regression is not rejected.

Figure 1.17g

| TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR | Y USING SEQUENTIAL SUMS OF SQUARES | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| SOURCE OF VARIATION | SUM OF SQUARES | DF | MEAN SQUARE | F | SIG. OF F |
| WITHIN+RESIDUAL CONSTANT X DRUG X BY DRUG | 397.55795 1872.30000 802.94369 68.55371 19.64465 | 24 1 1 2 2 | 16.56491 1872.30000 802.94369 34.27686 9.82232 | 113.02805 48.47255 2.06924 .59296 | 0.0 0.0 .148 .561 |

1.18 Analysis of Covariance with Separate Regression Estimates

Consider a 2×2 (Factors A, B) design with covariate X. The model (using dummy variables) can be written as

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + \beta(X_{ijk} - \overline{X}) + \alpha_1 Z_{ijk} + \alpha_2 U_{ijk} + \alpha_3 Z_{ijk} U_{ijk} + \epsilon_{ijk}$$