Data Set

► The table below shows the average numbers of days absent by program type and seems to suggest that program type is a good candidate for predicting the number of days absent, our outcome variable, because the mean value of the outcome appears to vary by prog.

Data Set

- The variances within each level of prog are higher than the means within some of the levels.
- These are the conditional means and variances. These differences suggest that over-dispersion is present and that a Negative Binomial model would be appropriate.

Negative binomial regression analysis

We will use the glm.nb function from the MASS package to estimate a negative binomial regression.

```
summary(m1 <- glm.nb(daysabs ~ math + prog, data = da
##
## Call:
## glm.nb(formula = daysabs ~ math + prog,
       data = dat, init.theta = 1.032713156,
##
      link = log)
##
## Deviance Residuals:
     Min 1Q Median
##
                            3Q
                                    Max
## -2.155 -1.019 -0.369 0.229 2.527
```

```
Coefficients:
             Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>||z|)
(Intercept)
              2.61527
                        0.19746
                                 13.24 < 2e-16
math
             -0.00599 0.00251
                                  -2.39 0.017
progAcademic -0.44076 0.18261 -2.41 0.016
progVocational -1.27865 0.20072
                                 -6.37 1.9e-10
Signif. codes: 0 '*** 0.001 '** 0.01 '* 0.05 '.'
```

##

```
(Dispersion parameter for Negative Binomi
##
       Null deviance: 427.54 on 313
##
                                      degree
## Residual deviance: 358.52 on 310
                                      degree
## AIC: 1741
##
## Number of Fisher Scoring iterations:
##
##
                 Theta: 1.033
##
```

Std. Err.: 0.106

- R first displays the call and the deviance residuals.
- Next, we see the regression coefficients for each of the variables, along with standard errors, z-scores, and p-values.

- ► The variable math has a coefficient of -0.006, which is statistically significant.
- ➤ This means that for each one-unit increase in math, the expected log count of the number of days absent decreases by 0.006. The indicator variable shown as progAcademic is the expected difference in log count between group 2 and the reference group (prog=1).

- ► The expected log count for level 2 of prog is 0.44 lower than the expected log count for level 1.
- The indicator variable for progVocational is the expected difference in log count between group 3 and the reference group.

- ► The expected log count for level 3 of prog is 1.28 lower than the expected log count for level 1.
- ➤ To determine if prog itself, overall, is statistically significant, we can compare a model with and without prog. The reason it is important to fit separate models, is that unless we do, the overdispersion parameter is held constant.

```
m2 <- update(m1, . ~ . - prog)</pre>
anova(m1, m2)
## Likelihood ratio tests of Negative Binomial Models
##
## Response: daysabs
##
        Model theta Resid. df 2 x log-lik.
                                                   Test
       math 0.8559
                          312
                                           -1776
## 2 math + prog 1.0327
                           310
                                           -1731 1 vs 2
      Pr(Chi)
##
## 1
## 2 1.652e-10
```

- ► The two degree-of-freedom chi-square test indicates that prog is a statistically significant predictor of daysabs.
- ► The null deviance is calculated from an intercept-only model with 313 degrees of freedom. Then we see the residual deviance, the deviance from the full model. We are also shown the AIC and 2*log likelihood.

- ► The theta parameter shown is the dispersion parameter.
- Note that R parameterizes this differently from SAS, Stata, and SPSS.
- ► The R parameter (theta) is equal to the inverse of the dispersion parameter (alpha) estimated in these other software packages. Thus, the theta value of 1.033 seen here is equivalent to the 0.968 value seen in the Stata Negative Binomial Data Analysis Example because 1/0.968 = 1.033.

Checking model assumption

- As we mentioned earlier, negative binomial models assume the conditional means are not equal to the conditional variances.
- ► This inequality is captured by estimating a dispersion parameter (not shown in the output) that is held constant in a Poisson model.
- ► Thus, the Poisson model is actually nested in the negative binomial model.
- We can then use a likelihood ratio test to compare these two and test this model assumption.
- ▶ To do this, we will run our model as a Poisson.

- ▶ In this example the associated chi-squared value is 926.03 with one degree of freedom.
- ► This strongly suggests the negative binomial model, estimating the dispersion parameter, is more appropriate than the Poisson model.

We can get the confidence intervals for the coefficients by profiling the likelihood function.

```
(est <- cbind(Estimate = coef(m1), confint(m1)
## Waiting for profiling to be done...
## Estimate 2.5 % 97.5 %
## (Intercept) 2.615265 2.2421 3.012936
## math -0.005993 -0.0109 -0.001067
## progAcademic -0.440760 -0.8101 -0.092643
## progVocational -1.278651 -1.6835 -0.890078</pre>
```

Incidence Rate Ratios

- We might be interested in looking at incident rate ratios rather than coefficients.
- To do this, we can exponentiate our model coefficients. The same applies to the confidence intervals.

```
exp(est)
## Estimate 2.5 % 97.5 %
## (Intercept) 13.6708 9.4127 20.3470
## math 0.9940 0.9892 0.9989
## progAcademic 0.6435 0.4448 0.9115
## progVocational 0.2784 0.1857 0.4106
```

The output above indicates that the incident rate for prog =2 is 0.64 times the incident rate for the reference group (prog =1). Likewise, the incident rate for prog =3 is 0.28 times the incident rate for the reference group holding the other variables constant. The percent change in the incident rate of daysabs is a 1

The form of the model equation for negative binomial regression is the same as that for Poisson regression. The log of the outcome is predicted with a linear combination of the predictors:

$$ln(\widehat{daysabs_i}) = Intercept + b_1(prog_i = 2) + b_2(prog_i = 3) +$$

 $\widehat{daysabs}_i = e^{Intercept + b_1(prog_i = 2) + b_2(prog_i = 3) + b_3 math_i} = e^{Intercept}$

The coefficients have an additive effect in the ln(y) scale and the IRR have a multiplicative effect in the y scale. The dispersion parameter in negative binomial regression does not effect the expected counts, but it does effect the estimated variance of the expected counts.

- More details can be found in the Modern Applied Statistics with S by W.N. Venables and B.D. Ripley (the book companion of the MASS package).
- ► For additional information on the various metrics in which the results can be presented, and the interpretation of such, please see Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata, Second Edition by J. Scott Long and Jeremy Freese (2006).

Predicted values

For assistance in further understanding the model, we can look at predicted counts for various levels of our predictors. Below we create new datasets with values of math and prog and then use the predict command to calculate the predicted number of events.

First, we can look at predicted counts for each value of prog while holding math at its mean. To do this, we create a new dataset with the combinations of prog and math for which we would like to find predicted values, then use the predict command.