

A Modified Satterthwaite (1941,1946) Effective Degrees of Freedom Approximation

Matthias von Davier (vondavim@bc.edu)

October 2024

Abstract

This study introduces a correction to the approximation of effective degrees of freedom as proposed by Satterthwaite (1941, 1946), specifically addressing scenarios where component degrees of freedom are small. The correction is grounded in analytical results concerning the moments of standard normal random variables. This modification is applicable to complex variance estimates that involve both small and large degrees of freedom, offering an enhanced approximation of the higher moments required by Satterthwaite's framework. Additionally, this correction extends and partially validates the empirically derived adjustment by Johnson & Rust (1992), as it is based on theoretical foundations rather than simulations used to derive empirical transformation constants.

1 Introduction

This article presents a correction to the approximation of effective degrees of freedom as proposed by Satterthwaite (1941, 1946), specifically for cases where the component degrees of freedom are small. Satterthwaite's original work introduced an equation for estimating effective degrees of freedom in scenarios involving complex variance estimators, which rely on weighted sums of mean squared errors.

The correction developed here is grounded in analytical results related to the moments of standard normal random variables. In instances where the components of complex variance estimators exhibit small degrees of freedom, this correction offers a more accurate approximation of the higher moments required by Satterthwaite's methodology. Furthermore, this correction extends and partially justifies the empirically derived adjustment proposed by Johnson & Rust (1992), as it is based on theoretical results rather than simulations used to derive empirical transformation constants.

While Satterthwaite's approach is widely used, it is recognized that it relies on a number of assumptions. One of these is that the components of the complex variance estimator are (approximately) independent and that the degrees of freedom of each component are at least moderate. If that is not the case, Satterthwaite (1946) noted that the approximation may be poor. The case of dependent variance components was tackled by Nedelman & Jia (1998). Here we address the common case that each of the variance components in a complex estimate of variance has small or even only single degrees of freedom.

The primary objective of this work is to provide a formula for effective degrees of freedom that is applicable beyond the NAEP context, which underpinned Johnson & Rust's simulations. This more general adjustment enables the estimation of effective degrees of freedom in various applications, including analyses of data from surveys and assessment programs that utilize variance estimates based on resampling methods.

2 Sums of Independent Components in Complex Estimates of Variance

Satterthwaite (1941, 1946) discusses complex variance estimates. For this article, we consider the following situation: For $k = 1, \dots, K$, and $i = 1, \dots, n_k$ denote $X_{ik} \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ i.i.d. random variables. Then let $M_k = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} x_{ik}$ denote the mean for sample k , which implies $E(M_k) = \mu$, and let

$$S_k^2 = \frac{n_k}{n_k - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \frac{(x_{ik} - M_k)^2}{n_k}$$

denote the estimate of variance for sample k , with $E(S_k^2) = \sigma^2$ for all k . Let $\nu_k = n_k - 1$ denote the degrees of freedom of the variance estimate S_k^2 . Then we have

$$X_k^2 = \nu_k \frac{S_k^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_{\nu_k}^2$$

and hence $E(X_k^2) = \nu_k$ and $Var(X_k^2) = 2\nu_k$.

For the complex estimate of variance, we consider the sum of the S_k^2 ,

$$S_*^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2.$$

Then we have for the expectation

$$E(S_*^2) = E\left[\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right] = \sum_{k=1}^K E(S_k^2) = K\sigma^2.$$

If the S_k^2 are independent, we can write

$$Var(S_*^2) = Var\left[\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right] = \sum_{k=1}^K Var(S_k^2)$$

3 A Useful Identity

Note that for any chi-square distributed variance estimate

$$S^2 = \frac{\nu + 1}{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^{\nu+1} \frac{(X_i - \bar{X}_*)^2}{\nu + 1}$$

with variance σ_*^2 we have for the variance of the chi-squared

$$Var\left[\nu \frac{S^2}{\sigma^2}\right] = 2\nu$$

so that

$$\frac{\nu^2}{\sigma^4} Var(S^2) = 2\nu \leftrightarrow \frac{Var(S^2)}{\sigma^4} = \frac{2}{\nu} \leftrightarrow \frac{\sigma^4}{Var(S^2)} = \frac{\nu}{2}$$

4 Main Idea of the Satterthwaite Approach

It does not follow automatically that S_*^2 is chi-squared if it is defined as a sum of mean squared differences. However, it is a useful approach to assume the distribution of S_*^2 can be approximated by a chi-square $\chi_{\nu_?}^2$ distribution with unknown degrees of freedom $\nu_?$. To obtain an estimate of this quantity, the idea is to look at the 'useful identity' introduced above, and to use the result

$$\text{Var}(S_*^2) = \frac{2\sigma_*^4}{\nu_?} \leftrightarrow \frac{2(\sigma_*^2)^2}{\text{Var}(S_*^2)} = \nu_?$$

in order to estimate or approximate the unknown degrees of freedom $\nu_?$. For the sake of estimating $\nu_?$, Satterthwaite (1946) assumes that the K components used to estimate the variance S_k^2 are independent. Then, for this independent sum, the 'useful result' is applied to obtain

$$\text{Var}(S_*^2) = \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Var}(S_k^2) = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{2(\sigma_k^2)^2}{\nu_k}.$$

5 An Estimate of the Effective Degrees of Freedom $\nu_?$

The above result can then be applied to obtain

$$\nu_? = \frac{2(\sigma_*^2)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{2(\sigma_k^2)^2}{\nu_k}} = \frac{(\sigma_*^2)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(\sigma_k^2)^2}{\nu_k}}$$

The main idea is to replace the true variance by an estimate of that variance, namely, to approximate

$$(\sigma_Q^2)^2 \approx (S_Q^2)^2$$

for both cases $Q = k$ and $Q = *$. The first step is replacing

$$(\sigma_*^2)^2 \approx (S_*^2)^2$$

and then

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(\sigma_k^2)^2}{\nu_k} \approx \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(S_k^2)^2}{\nu_k}$$

This plugging in of the estimates produces the Satterthwaite (1946) equation

$$\nu_? \approx \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(S_k^2)^2}{\nu_k}}.$$

6 Some Properties of the Approximation

Assume $S_k^2 = S_j^2 = C$ for all $k, j \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. then we have

$$\frac{1}{\nu_?} = \frac{C^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{\nu_k}}{K^2 C^2} = \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{\nu_k}$$

or

$$\frac{K^2}{\nu_\gamma} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{\nu_k}$$

Assume $\nu_k = \nu_j = \nu$. Then we have

$$\nu_\gamma \approx \frac{K^2 C^2}{C^2 \sum_k \frac{1}{\nu_k}} = \frac{K^2}{K \frac{1}{\nu}} = K\nu$$

With special case $\nu = 1$ and all $S_k^2 = S_j^2 = C$ then $\nu_\gamma = K$. If $S_j^2 = C$ and $S_k^2 = 0$ for $k \neq j$ we find

$$\nu_\gamma = \frac{C^2}{\frac{C^2}{\nu_j}} = \nu_j$$

and if $\nu_j = 1$ we have $\nu_\gamma = 1$ in this case.

so we can say if all $\nu_k = 1$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$ we have

$$1 \leq \nu_\gamma \leq K$$

since the function is smooth in the S_k^2 . The maximum is attained if all S_k^2 are the same.

7 Johnson & Rust Correction for Jackknife Based Estimates

Satterthwaite (1941, 1946) mentioned that the approximation is best applied when the ν_k are large, and that for small ν_k , the approximation may not be as stable. Johnson & Rust (1992) developed an adjustment to overcome this limitation, based on a simulation and empirically derived constants for the NAEP assessment program¹. The adjustment proposed in this work is used in a slightly simplified form, until today, in the NAEP analyses. The adjustment formula in the unpublished draft is somewhat different from what is found in the official NAEP documentation (NCES, n.d.) or (AIR, n.d.) . Johnson & Rust (1992) found that, on average, the Satterthwaite approximation underestimates the true DoF when ν_k are small and especially, when we have $\nu_k = 1$ for all k . Prominently, $\nu_k = 1$ is the case in Jackknife variance estimation and balanced repeated replicates (BRR) estimation of the variance. The adjustment suggested by Johnson & Rust (1992) was also studied by Qian (1998) and is given by

$$\lambda_{J\&R} = \left(3.16 - \frac{2.77}{\sqrt{K}} \right)$$

where $K = 62, \sqrt{62} = 7.87$ (and in the Johnson & Rust paper f is used rather than ν). For NAEP ($M =$) $62 = K$ and ($f =$) $1 = \nu$ we have

$$\lambda_{J\&R} \approx 2.808$$

The simulation study reported by Johnson & Rust (1992) produces a table that summarizes the relationship between number of PSUs K , degrees of freedom per term in the complex variance estimator ν , which equals 1 in the case of JRR, and the resulting true DoF $K \times \nu$ and the Satterthwaite approximate effective DoF in terms of median and mean ratio to true DoF for this estimate.

The table provided by Johnson & Rust (1992) is reproduced in the last section of this paper together with results that compare the current NAEP adjustment based on Johnson & Rust (1992) and the newly proposed adjustment based on a better approximation for small K and ν .

¹It is important to note that the author has access to an unpublished draft from the second author (Rust) as the proceedings submission cited as Johnson & Rust (1992) was apparently never completed and is unavailable.

8 A More General Estimate of the Degrees of Freedom

Repeating the replacement of the variance with an estimate requires making certain assumptions that we ignored - or at least not mentioned - above.

A different set of assumptions is needed in the case that ν_k are small or even $\nu_k = 1$, and also for small K . Recall that we obtained

$$\nu_* = \frac{(\sigma_*^2)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(\sigma_k^2)^2}{\nu_k}}$$

We still need to replace the unknown variance $(\sigma_Q^2)^2$ by an expression that uses the S_Q^2 but acknowledges that S_Q^4 has a different expected value $E(S_Q^4)$ for small ν_k

$$(\sigma_Q^2)^2 = \sigma_Q^4 \approx R_Q (S_Q^4)$$

We again require this for both cases $Q = k$ and $Q = *$. For moderately large K , we continue to replace

$$(\sigma_*^2)^2 \approx (S_*^2)^2 = \left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2 \right)^2$$

since the squared expectation of a sum of K independent terms equals the square of the sum of expectations we have

$$\left[E \left(\sum_i X_i^2 \right) \right]^2 = \left[\sum_i E(X_i^2) \right]^2.$$

8.1 A General Plug-In Estimator for σ_k^4

Implied by $Var(Y) \geq 0$ we have

$$E(Y^2) > E(Y)^2$$

Hence, for

$$\frac{S_k^2 \nu_k}{\sigma^2} = X_i^2 \sim \chi_\nu^2$$

we have

$$[E(S_k^2)]^2 < E(S_k^4)$$

Consider our special case, $\nu_k = 1$. With $S_k^2 = Z^2 \sigma^2$ and $Z' \sim N(0, 1)$ standard results tell us that $E(S_k^4) = \sigma^4 E(Z^4)$ and that $E(Z^4) = 3^2$ noting that Z^2 is χ_1^2 distributed. Therefore, Z^4 has a much larger expected value than $(\sigma^2)^2 = \sigma^4 = 1$. This means that for small ν_k we have $E(S_k^4) > \sigma^4$ while $E(S_k^4)$ is a useful approximation of σ^4 for large ν_k according to Satterthwaite (1941, 1946).

The expected value $E(Z^4) = 3$ leads to the proposed replacement for $\nu_k = 1$

$$\sigma_k^4 \approx \frac{1}{3} (S_k^4) = \frac{1}{\lambda_k} (S_k^4).$$

Generalizing this so that $\lambda_k = 3$ for $\nu_k = 1$ and $\lambda_k \rightarrow 1$ as $\nu_k \rightarrow \infty$, we can use the replacement $\lambda_k = \nu_k + 2$.

We obtain an adjusted estimator

²As $Var(Z^2) = E(Z^4) - E(Z^2)^2 = 2$ and $E(Z^2) = 1$ by definition.

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(\sigma_k^2)^2}{\nu_k} \approx \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(S_k^2)^2}{\nu_k + 2}.$$

For $\nu_k = 1$ for all k this yields the following equation

$$\nu_{?} \approx \hat{\nu} = \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(S_k^2)^2}{3}} = 3 \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K (S_k^2)^2}$$

and for general ν_k we note that as $\nu_k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\nu_{?} \approx \hat{\nu} = \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(S_k^2)^2}{\nu_k + 2}} \approx \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(S_k^2)^2}{\nu_k}}$$

since we have $\frac{\nu_k}{\nu_k + 2} \rightarrow 1$. Here $\nu_{?}$ denotes the unknown degrees of freedom, and $\hat{\nu}$ denotes the estimate obtained according to the approximation.

8.2 A General Plug-In Estimator for $(\sigma_*^2)^2$

For the expression $(\sigma_*^2)^2$ we note, similar to the argument above, that if $K = 1$, and $\nu_k = 1$, and with

$$E(S_1^2) = \sigma^2,$$

we have

$$E\left[(S_*^2)^2\right] = E\left((Z^2\sigma^2)^2\right) = E(Z^4)\sigma^4 = 3\sigma^4.$$

For large $K \rightarrow \infty$ and $\nu_k = 1$, and assuming independent S_k^2 , we may write

$$E\left[(S_*^2)^2\right] = E\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right)^2\right] = E\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K Z_k^2\sigma^2\right)^2\right] = \sigma^4 E\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K Z_k^2\right)^2\right] \rightarrow \sigma^4 K^2.$$

If $\nu_k = \nu$ for all k and with ν, K growing we obtain

$$E\left[(S_*^2)^2\right] = E\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right)^2\right] = E\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^{\nu+1} (x_{ik} - M_k)^2\right)^2\right] \rightarrow E\left[(K\sigma^2)^2\right] = \sigma^4 K^2.$$

Finally, if $K = 1$ and $\nu_1 = \nu \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain

$$E\left[(S_*^2)^2\right] = E\left[(S_1^2)^2\right] = E\left[\left(\frac{1}{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^{\nu+1} (x_{i1} - M_1)^2\right)^2\right] = E\left[(\sigma^2)^2\right] = \sigma^4 = \sigma^4 K^2$$

since $K = K^2 = 1$.

The goal to produce a general adjustment is served by proposing

$$\lambda_* = 1 + \frac{2}{\sum_k \nu_k}.$$

For cases where $\nu_k = \nu$ for all k we obtain

$$\lambda_* = 1 + \frac{2}{K\nu}.$$

then we have as $\sum_k \nu_k \rightarrow \infty$ that $1 + \frac{2}{\sum_k \nu_k} \rightarrow 1$ and hence

$$E \left[\frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2 \right)^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{\sum_k \nu_k} \right)} \right] = \sigma^4 K^2$$

which is also the case for $K = 1, \nu_1 = 1$.

8.3 An Adjusted Effective Degrees of Freedom Estimator

With both adjustments derived above to match the expected values, we obtain an expression that is close to the Johnson & Rust (1992) adjustment, but has a theoretical rather than empirical rationale grounded in the expectation of powers of normally distributed variables. The proposed adjustment is more general than the empirical adjustment by Johnson & Rust, which was derived based on a simulation result designed for NAEP. The proposed adjustment also works in cases other than the $\nu_k = 1$ case, and provides a vanishing adjustment as the K, ν_k increase.

The proposed estimator of effective degrees of freedom becomes

$$\nu_{\hat{?}} \approx \hat{\nu} = \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2 \right)^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{\sum_k \nu_k} \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(S_k^2)^2}{\nu_k + 2} \right)}$$

or

$$\nu_{\hat{?}} \approx \hat{\nu} = \frac{(\nu + 2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2 \right)^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{K\nu} \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K (S_k^2)^2 \right)} = \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2 \right)^2}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K (S_k^2)^2 \right)} A(\nu, K) \quad (1)$$

for cases where $\nu_k = \nu$ for all $k = 1, \dots, K$. That is in the case of $\nu_k = 1$ for all k , the proposed adjustment is obtained by multiplying the original estimator by

$$A(\nu, K) = \frac{(\nu + 2)}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{K\nu} \right)}.$$

The results given in the second to last column show how the proposed adjustment removes the downward bias for all $K = M, \nu = f$ cases examined in the Johnson & Rust (1992) simulation, and it provides an estimate that is slightly larger than 1 for small K and ν while it approaches 1.0 for increasing values.

In contrast, the approach used in NAEP (AIR, n.d., NCES, n.d.) based on the Johnson & Rust (1992) simulation was optimized for the NAEP case, and only works appropriately for cases where $\nu = 1$ and overestimates the DoF with growing K and ν .

8.4 Further Exploration and Improvement of the Estimator

Note that for $K = 1$ the proposed adjusted formula results in

$$\nu_\gamma \approx \hat{\nu} = \frac{(S_1^2)^2}{\frac{1}{\nu+2} \left(1 + \frac{2}{K\nu}\right) (S_1^2)^2} = \frac{\nu+2}{1 + \frac{2}{K\nu}} = \frac{\nu+2}{1 + \frac{2}{\nu}}$$

and further

$$\frac{\nu+2}{1 + \frac{2}{\nu}} = \frac{\nu+2}{\frac{1}{\nu}(\nu+2)} = \nu$$

One can argue that $K = 1$ is a trivial case, where the Satterthwaite estimate is not necessary because the result for $K = 1$ is constant ν : Here we do not need an estimate of the effective DoF, we already know the result is $\nu_\gamma = \nu_1 = \nu$. Therefore, we can limit our considerations to cases where $K \geq 2$ since the case $K = 1$ is a trivial case. For $K \geq 2$ we can define

$$\overline{S^2} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2$$

and

$$R_K^2 = \frac{S_k^2}{\overline{S^2}}.$$

Then we have

$$\nu_\gamma \approx \hat{\nu} = \frac{(\nu+2) \left(\overline{S^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{S_k^2}{\overline{S^2}}\right)^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{K\nu}\right) \left(\overline{S^2}^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{S_k^2}{\overline{S^2}}\right)^2\right)} = \frac{(\nu+2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K R_K^2\right)^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{K\nu}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right)}$$

It is easy to show that

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^K R_K^2\right)^2 = \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{S_k^2}{\overline{S^2}}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\overline{S^2}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right]\right)^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\overline{S^2}} [K\overline{S^2}]\right)^2 = K^2.$$

However, for the sum of the squared terms we obtain

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{S_k^2}{\overline{S^2}}\right)^2\right) = \left[\frac{1}{\overline{S^2}}\right]^2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^4\right)$$

for $K = 2$ we have

$$\overline{S^2} = \frac{1}{2} (S_1^2 + S_2^2)$$

so that we obtain

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^2 (R_K^2)^2\right) = \frac{4(S_1^4 + S_2^4)}{(S_1^2 + S_2^2)^2}$$

if $S_1^2 = S_2^2$ we obtain

$$\frac{4(S_1^4 + S_2^4)}{(S_1^2 + S_2^2)^2} = \frac{4(S_1^4 + S_1^4)}{(S_1^2 + S_1^2)^2} = \frac{8S_1^4}{4(S_1^2)^2} = \frac{8}{4} = 2$$

as expected. If either one of them is zero, say $S_1^2 = 0, S_2^2 > 0$, then we have

$$\frac{4(S_1^4 + S_2^4)}{(S_1^2 + S_2^2)^2} = \frac{4(S_2^4)}{(S_2^2)^2} = 4$$

For $\nu = 1$ and $K = 2$ we obtain

$$\hat{\nu} = \frac{(\nu + 2) K^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{K\nu}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right)} = \frac{12}{2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right)} = \frac{6}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right)}$$

if $S_1^2 = 0, S_2^2 > 0$ we have $\left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right) = 4$ so the result is

$$\hat{\nu} = \frac{6}{4} = 1.5 > 1$$

and if $S_1^2 = S_2^2$ we have $\left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right) = 2$ so that

$$\hat{\nu} = \frac{6}{2} = 3 > 2$$

which means that the proposed adjustment given in 1 *over-adjusts* in the case of $K = 2$. Therefore, a modified adjustment is defined with

$$\lambda_* = 1 + \frac{2}{(K-1)\nu}.$$

This adjustment results in

$$\hat{\nu} = \frac{(\nu + 2) K^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{(K-1)\nu}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right)} = \frac{12}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{(2-1)1}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right)} = \frac{4}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right)}$$

With $S_1^2 = 0, S_2^2 > 0$ we have $\left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right) = 4$ so that, as expected,

$$\hat{\nu} = \frac{4}{4} = 1,$$

and with $S_1^2 = S_2^2$ we have $\left(\sum_{k=1}^K (R_K^2)^2\right) = 2$ so that, as expected,

$$\hat{\nu} = \frac{4}{2} = 2 = K.$$

8.5 A Closer Approximation of the Effective DoF

The result derived in the above section leads to a closer approximation of the effective DoF. Given the above result it is proposed to use

$$\lambda_* = 1 + \frac{2}{\left(1 - \frac{1}{K}\right) \sum_k \nu_k}$$

or for cases where all $\nu_k = \nu$, we can write

$$\lambda_* = 1 + \frac{2}{(K-1)\nu}$$

For $K = 2, \nu = 1$ we obtain the largest adjustment

$$\lambda_* = 3$$

and, as before, as either $K \rightarrow \infty$ or $\nu \rightarrow \infty$, we continue to obtain the same limit of

$$\lambda_* = 1$$

so we approach asymptotically the original Satterthwaite (1946) expression as the degrees of freedom per variance component ν_k and the number of components K grow. This closer bound is therefore given by

$$\hat{\nu} = \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right)^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{\left(1-\frac{1}{K}\right)\sum_k \nu_k}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(S_k^2)^2}{\nu_k+2}\right)} \quad (2)$$

or for $\nu_k = \nu$

$$\hat{\nu} = \frac{(\nu + 2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K S_k^2\right)^2}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{(K-1)\nu}\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K (S_k^2)^2\right)} \quad (3)$$

The resulting expected effective degrees of freedom estimated by either 2 or 3 are closely tracking the true degrees of freedom as shown in Table 2. It is therefore suggested to use these adjusted estimates instead of the original Satterthwaite (1941, 1946) formula, or the empirically derived correction by Johnson & Rust. The result presented here has wide application and is not limited to cases where $\nu_k = 1$, and hence applies both to replication based variance estimators as well as other complex (Satterthwaite, 1941) estimates of variance.

References

- American Institutes of Research (n.d.) Analyzing NCES Data Using EdSurvey: A User’s Guide. Section 11.4. Estimation of the Degrees of Freedom. https://naep-research.airprojects.org/portals/0/edsurvey_a_users_guide/_book/methods.html?q=degrees%20of%20freedom#estimation-of-degrees-of-freedom
- Johnson, E. G., & Rust, K. F. (1992). Population Inferences and Variance Estimation for NAEP Data. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 17(2), 175–190. doi:10.2307/1165168
- Johnson, E.G., and Rust, K.F. (1993). Effective Degrees of Freedom for Variance Estimates From a Complex Sample Survey. *American Statistical Association 1993 Proceedings: Survey Research Methods Section*, pp. 863–866.
- Johnson, E. & Rust, K. (1992). Effective Degrees of Freedom for Variance Estimates from a Complex Sample Survey, *Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, American Statistical Association*. (preprint copy obtained from K. Rust, September, 2024).
- NCES (n.d.) NAEP Technical Documentation: Estimation of the Degrees of Freedom. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tdw/analysis/2000_2001/infer_ttest_df.aspx
- Nedelman, J. R. & Jia, X. (1998) An extension of Satterthwaite’s approximation applied to pharmacokinetics. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics*, 8:2, 317-328, doi:10.1080/10543409808835241
- Satterthwaite, F. E. (1941). Synthesis of variance. *Psychometrika*, 6(5), 309-316. doi:10.1007/BF02288586
- Satterthwaite, F. E. (1946). An Approximate Distribution of Estimates of Variance Components. *Biometrics Bulletin*, 2(6), 110–114. doi:10.2307/3002019
- Qian, J. (1998). Estimation of the effective degrees of freedom in T-type tests for complex data. *Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, American Statistical Association*, 704-708.

(K) M	(ν) f	$K\nu$ dftrue	Mean Ratio	Median Ratio	Upper Quartile	Lower Quartile	Proposed Adjustment	NAEP Adjustment
5	1	5	0.51	0.5	0.61	0.4	1.093	0.980
10	1	10	0.43	0.43	0.52	0.35	1.075	0.982
20	1	20	0.39	0.39	0.45	0.32	1.064	0.991
30	1	30	0.38	0.38	0.43	0.32	1.069	1.009
40	1	40	0.37	0.37	0.42	0.32	1.057	1.007
50	1	50	0.36	0.36	0.4	0.31	1.038	0.997
100	1	100	0.35	0.35	0.38	0.31	1.029	1.009
5	2	10	0.64	0.65	0.74	0.54	1.067	1.230
10	2	20	0.57	0.58	0.66	0.5	1.036	1.302
20	2	40	0.55	0.55	0.6	0.48	1.048	1.397
30	2	60	0.53	0.53	0.58	0.48	1.026	1.407
40	2	80	0.52	0.53	0.57	0.48	1.015	1.415
50	2	100	0.52	0.52	0.57	0.48	1.020	1.439
100	2	200	0.51	0.51	0.54	0.48	1.010	1.470
5	3	15	0.72	0.73	0.81	0.63	1.059	1.383
10	3	30	0.66	0.66	0.74	0.59	1.031	1.507
20	3	60	0.63	0.63	0.69	0.57	1.016	1.601
30	3	90	0.62	0.63	0.67	0.58	1.011	1.646
40	3	120	0.62	0.62	0.66	0.58	1.016	1.688
50	3	150	0.61	0.61	0.65	0.57	1.003	1.689
100	3	300	0.61	0.61	0.64	0.58	1.010	1.759
5	4	20	0.76	0.77	0.85	0.68	1.036	1.460
10	4	40	0.71	0.72	0.78	0.65	1.014	1.622
20	4	80	0.7	0.7	0.75	0.65	1.024	1.778
30	4	120	0.69	0.69	0.73	0.65	1.018	1.831
40	4	160	0.68	0.68	0.72	0.65	1.007	1.851
50	4	200	0.68	0.68	0.71	0.65	1.010	1.882
100	4	400	0.67	0.67	0.7	0.65	1.000	1.932
5	5	25	0.79	0.8	0.87	0.72	1.024	1.518
10	5	50	0.76	0.76	0.82	0.7	1.023	1.736
20	5	100	0.73	0.74	0.78	0.69	1.002	1.855
30	5	150	0.73	0.73	0.77	0.69	1.009	1.938
40	5	200	0.73	0.73	0.76	0.7	1.012	1.987
50	5	250	0.72	0.72	0.75	0.69	1.000	1.993
100	5	500	0.72	0.72	0.74	0.7	1.004	2.076
5	10	50	0.87	0.88	0.93	0.83	1.004	1.671
10	10	100	0.85	0.86	0.89	0.82	1.000	1.941
20	10	200	0.85	0.85	0.88	0.82	1.010	2.160
30	10	300	0.84	0.84	0.87	0.82	1.001	2.230
40	10	400	0.84	0.84	0.86	0.82	1.003	2.287
50	10	500	0.84	0.84	0.86	0.82	1.004	2.325
100	10	1000	0.84	0.84	0.85	0.82	1.006	2.422
5	25	125	0.94	0.95	0.97	0.92	0.999	1.806
10	25	250	0.94	0.94	0.96	0.92	1.007	2.147
20	25	500	0.93	0.93	0.95	0.92	1.000	2.363
30	25	750	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.92	1.002	2.468
40	25	1000	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.92	1.002	2.531
50	25	1250	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.92	1.003	2.574
100	25	2500	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.92	1.004	2.681

Table 1: The Johnson & Rust (1992) simulation results for Satterthwaite's (1946) effective degrees of freedom with proposed and current NAEP adjustment.

(K) M	(ν) f	$K\nu$ dftrue	Mean Ratio	Median Ratio	Upper Quartile	Lower Quartile	Improved Adjustment	NAEP Adjustment
5	1	5	0.51	0.5	0.61	0.4	1.020	0.980
10	1	10	0.43	0.43	0.52	0.35	1.055	0.982
20	1	20	0.39	0.39	0.45	0.32	1.059	0.991
30	1	30	0.38	0.38	0.43	0.32	1.066	1.009
40	1	40	0.37	0.37	0.42	0.32	1.056	1.007
50	1	50	0.36	0.36	0.4	0.31	1.038	0.997
100	1	100	0.35	0.35	0.38	0.31	1.029	1.009
5	2	10	0.64	0.65	0.74	0.54	1.024	1.230
10	2	20	0.57	0.58	0.66	0.5	1.026	1.302
20	2	40	0.55	0.55	0.6	0.48	1.045	1.397
30	2	60	0.53	0.53	0.58	0.48	1.025	1.407
40	2	80	0.52	0.53	0.57	0.48	1.014	1.415
50	2	100	0.52	0.52	0.57	0.48	1.019	1.439
100	2	200	0.51	0.51	0.54	0.48	1.010	1.470
5	3	15	0.72	0.73	0.81	0.63	1.029	1.383
10	3	30	0.66	0.66	0.74	0.59	1.024	1.507
20	3	60	0.63	0.63	0.69	0.57	1.014	1.601
30	3	90	0.62	0.63	0.67	0.58	1.010	1.646
40	3	120	0.62	0.62	0.66	0.58	1.016	1.688
50	3	150	0.61	0.61	0.65	0.57	1.003	1.689
100	3	300	0.61	0.61	0.64	0.58	1.010	1.759
5	4	20	0.76	0.77	0.85	0.68	1.013	1.460
10	4	40	0.71	0.72	0.78	0.65	1.009	1.622
20	4	80	0.7	0.7	0.75	0.65	1.023	1.778
30	4	120	0.69	0.69	0.73	0.65	1.017	1.831
40	4	160	0.68	0.68	0.72	0.65	1.007	1.851
50	4	200	0.68	0.68	0.71	0.65	1.010	1.882
100	4	400	0.67	0.67	0.7	0.65	1.000	1.932
5	5	25	0.79	0.8	0.87	0.72	1.005	1.518
10	5	50	0.76	0.76	0.82	0.7	1.019	1.736
20	5	100	0.73	0.74	0.78	0.69	1.001	1.855
30	5	150	0.73	0.73	0.77	0.69	1.008	1.938
40	5	200	0.73	0.73	0.76	0.7	1.012	1.987
50	5	250	0.72	0.72	0.75	0.69	1.000	1.993
100	5	500	0.72	0.72	0.74	0.7	1.004	2.076
5	10	50	0.87	0.88	0.93	0.83	0.994	1.671
10	10	100	0.85	0.86	0.89	0.82	0.998	1.941
20	10	200	0.85	0.85	0.88	0.82	1.009	2.160
30	10	300	0.84	0.84	0.87	0.82	1.001	2.230
40	10	400	0.84	0.84	0.86	0.82	1.003	2.287
50	10	500	0.84	0.84	0.86	0.82	1.004	2.325
100	10	1000	0.84	0.84	0.85	0.82	1.006	2.422
5	25	125	0.94	0.95	0.97	0.92	0.995	1.806
10	25	250	0.94	0.94	0.96	0.92	1.006	2.147
20	25	500	0.93	0.93	0.95	0.92	1.000	2.363
30	25	750	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.92	1.002	2.468
40	25	1000	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.92	1.002	2.531
50	25	1250	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.92	1.003	2.574
100	25	2500	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.92	1.004	2.681

Table 2: The Johnson & Rust (1992) simulation results for Satterthwaite's (1946) effective degrees of freedom with improved approximation and current NAEP adjustment.