

1986

# Interpreting Experimental Results

D. M. Marshall  
*South Dakota State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://openprairie.sdstate.edu/sd\\_beefreport\\_1986](http://openprairie.sdstate.edu/sd_beefreport_1986)

---

## Recommended Citation

Marshall, D. M., "Interpreting Experimental Results" (1986). *South Dakota Beef Report, 1986*. Paper 2.  
[http://openprairie.sdstate.edu/sd\\_beefreport\\_1986/2](http://openprairie.sdstate.edu/sd_beefreport_1986/2)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Animal Science Reports at Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in South Dakota Beef Report, 1986 by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact [michael.biondo@sdstate.edu](mailto:michael.biondo@sdstate.edu).



---

## INTERPRETING EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

D. M. Marshall  
Department of Animal and Range Sciences

### CATTLE 86-1

---

A typical experimental format involves evaluating the response caused by application of different treatments to experimental subjects (animals, carcasses, pens, pastures, etc.). The effect of a given treatment might be evaluated by comparison to a control group or to one or more other treatment groups. However, a problem with animal research (and other types as well) is that variation not due to treatments often exists among experimental subjects.

For example, suppose that animals receiving ration A grow faster than animals receiving ration B. Was the observed difference in growth rates actually due to differences in the rations or to other factors (i.e., genetics, age, sex, etc.) or some of each? Statistical analyses evaluate the amount of variation between treatment groups relative to the amount of variation within treatment groups. In addition, variation caused by factors other than treatments can sometimes be eliminated by the statistical analysis.

The statement "the difference was statistically significant ( $P < .05$ )" indicates the probability of a difference of that magnitude occurring from chance rather than from the research treatment is less than 5%.

A correlation coefficient provides an indication of the relationship between two factors and can range from  $-1$  to  $+1$ . A strong, positive correlation (close to  $1$ ) indicates that as one factor increases the other factor tends to increase, also. For example, several studies have shown a positive correlation between cow milk yield and calf weaning weight. A strong negative correlation (close to  $-1$ ) indicates that as one factor increases the other factor tends to decrease. A correlation near zero indicates the two factors are unrelated.

Means (averages), correlations and other statistics presented in research results are sometimes followed by  $\pm$  some figure known as the standard error. The standard error provides an indication of the possible error with which the statistic was measured. The size of the standard error of a treatment mean depends on the animal to animal variation within a treatment group and on the number of animals in the group.

All other factors being equal, the greater the amount of animals and (or) replications per treatment, the smaller the difference required to achieve a given value for probability of significance. Stated another way, increasing the number of animals or replications increases the likelihood of detecting differences due to treatments when such differences do indeed exist.

Several of the research reports in this publication contain statistical terminology. Although such terms might be unfamiliar to some readers, the statistical analyses allow for more appropriate interpretation of results and make the reports more useful.