Formative Assessment #1

Fall 2025 PSQF 6272: Clustered Multilevel Models

If patients from a single hospital clinic (seen by the same physician) are randomly assigned to one of two groups (treatment or control), how many *levels* of a model would you need to predict patient outcomes?

If patients from a single hospital clinic (seen by the same physician) are randomly assigned to one of two groups (treatment or control), how many *levels* of a model would you need to predict patient outcomes?

- One level: similar to fit a one-source ANOVA model or a simple linear regression model.
- Why? Patients were randomly assigned to treatment or control group within a **single clinic**, so there should be no additional variation after accounting for the fixed effects of the groups.

What if the previous study were extended to 50 hospitals, in which 25 hospitals were treatment sites and 25 hospitals were control sites — then how many *levels* of a model would be needed to predict patient outcomes?

What if the previous study were extended to 50 hospitals, in which 25 hospitals were treatment sites and 25 hospitals were control sites — then how many *levels* of a model would be needed to predict patient outcomes?

- Two levels: patients (level 1) nested within hospitals (level 2).
- Treatment would be a level 2 predictor.

What is the common underlying feature of general linear models (e.g., regression, ANOVA, and ANCOVA) or generalized linear models (e.g., logistic, ordinal, count regression) that makes them insufficient for multilevel data?

What is the common underlying feature of general linear models (e.g., regression, ANOVA, and ANCOVA) or generalized linear models (e.g., logistic, ordinal, count regression) that makes them insufficient for multilevel data?

 They assume independence of observations, which is violated in hierarchical data where observations are nested within higher-level units (e.g., patients within hospitals), leading to correlated residuals, biased standard errors, and *smushed* fixed effects.

How is **ICC1** computed?

How is **ICC1** computed?

ICC1 is computed as the proportion of total outcome variance that is attributable to differences between clusters:

$$\frac{\tau_{U_0}^2}{\tau_{U_0}^2 + \sigma_e^2}$$

where $au_{U_0}^2$ is the between-cluster variance and σ_e^2 is the within-cluster variance.

What are three interpretations of ICC1?

What are three interpretations of ICC1?

- Proportion of total variance that is between clusters.
- 2 Average correlation of persons from same cluster.
- Selfect size for constant cluster dependency.

How does ICC2 differ from ICC1?

How does ICC2 differ from ICC1?

ICC2 is computed similarly to ICC1 but focuses on the reliability of the cluster means:

$$ICC2 = \frac{\tau_{U_0}^2}{\tau_{U_0}^2 + (\sigma_e^2/L1n)}$$

where L1n is the number of individuals per cluster.

What is an important caveat in thinking about ICC2 as a measure of reliability?

What is an important caveat in thinking about ICC2 as a measure of reliability?

An important caveat is *how much* variation in the outcome is attributable to between-cluster mean differences.

Thank You!

Questions?