# IDS 702: Module 4.6

# MULTILEVEL/HIERARCHICAL LOGISTIC MODELS (ILLUSTRATION)

Dr. Olanrewaju Michael Akande



## 1988 ELECTIONS ANALYSIS RECAP

2193 observations from one of eight CBS News surveys.

Variable	Description
org	cbsnyt = CBS/NYT
bush	1 = preference for Bush Sr., 0 = otherwise
state	1-51: 50 states including DC (number 9)
edu	education: 1=No HS, 2=HS, 3=Some College, 4=College Grad
age	1=18-29, 2=30-44, 3=45-64, 4=65+
female	1=female, 0=male
black	1=black, 0=otherwise
region	1=NE, 2=S, 3=N, 4=W, 5=DC
v_prev	average Republican vote share in the three previous elections (adjusted for homestate and home-region effects in the previous elections)

The data is in the file polls\_subset.txt on Sakai.

### 1988 ELECTIONS ANALYSIS RECAP

I will not do any substantial EDA here.

2 232 283 223 116

3 141 205 99 54

4 119 285 125 62

- I expect you to be able to do this yourself.
- Let's just take a look at the amount of data we have for "bush" and the age:edu interaction.

```
###### Exploratory data analysis
table(polls_subset$bush) #well split by the two values

##
## 0 1
## 891 1124

table(polls_subset$edu,polls_subset$age)

##
## 1 2 3 4
## 1 44 42 67 96
```



##

##

 As a start, we will consider a simple model with fixed effects of race and sex and a random effect for state (50 states + the District of Columbia).

$$egin{aligned} ext{bush}_i | oldsymbol{x}_i &\sim ext{Bernoulli}(\pi_i); \quad i=1,\ldots,n; \quad j=1,\ldots,J=51; \ \log\left(rac{\pi_i}{1-\pi_i}
ight) = eta_0 + \gamma_{0j[i]} + eta_1 ext{female}_i + eta_2 ext{black}_i; \ \gamma_{0j} &\sim N(0,\sigma_{ ext{state}}^2). \end{aligned}$$

We can also write

$$egin{aligned} ext{bush}_i | oldsymbol{x}_i &\sim ext{Bernoulli}(\pi_i); \quad i=1,\ldots,n; \quad j=1,\ldots,J=51; \ \log\left(rac{\pi_i}{1-\pi_i}
ight) &= eta_0 + \gamma_{0j[i]}^{ ext{state}} + eta_{ ext{female}} ext{female}_i + eta_{ ext{black}} ext{black}_i; \ \gamma_{0j} &\sim N(0,\sigma_{ ext{state}}^2). \end{aligned}$$

■ In R, we have

```
library(lme4)
model1 <- glmer(bush ~ black+female+(1|state_label),family=binomial(link="logit"),
data=polls_subset)
summary(model1)</pre>
```

```
## Generalized linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood (Laplace
    Approximation) [glmerMod]
## Family: binomial ( logit )
## Formula: bush ~ black + female + (1 | state label)
     Data: polls subset
##
##
       AIC
               BIC logLik deviance df.resid
##
##
    2666.7
            2689.1 -1329.3 2658.7
                                         2011
##
## Scaled residuals:
      Min
              10 Median
                              30
                                     Max
## -1.7276 -1.0871 0.6673 0.8422 2.5271
##
## Random effects:
## Groups
                         Variance Std.Dev.
               Name
## state label (Intercept) 0.1692 0.4113
## Number of obs: 2015, groups: state label, 49
##
## Fixed effects:
##
              Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
## (Intercept) 0.44523 0.10139 4.391 1.13e-05 ***
## black -1.74161 0.20954 -8.312 < 2e-16 ***
## female
         -0.09705 0.09511 -1.020 0.308
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Correlation of Fixed Effects:
         (Intr) black
## black -0.119
## female -0.551 -0.005
```

Looks like we dropped some NAs.

```
c(sum(complete.cases(polls_subset)),sum(!complete.cases(polls_subset)))
## [1] 2015 178
```

- Not ideal; we'll learn about methods for dealing with missing data soon.
- Interpretation of results:
  - For a fixed state (or across all states), a non-black male respondent has odds of  $e^{0.45}=1.57$  of supporting Bush.
  - For a fixed state and sex, a black respondent as  $e^{-1.74}=0.18$  times (an 82% decrease) the odds of supporting Bush as a non-black respondent; you are much less likely to support Bush if your race is black compared to being non-black.
  - For a given state and race, a female respondent has  $e^{-0.10}=0.91$  (a 9% decrease) times the odds of supporting Bush as a male respondent. However, this effect is not actually statistically significant!

- The state-level standard deviation is estimated at 0.41, so that the states do vary some, but not so much.
- We no longer have a term for residual standard deviation (residual standard error). Why is that?
- I expect that you will be able to interpret the corresponding confidence intervals.

```
## Computing profile confidence intervals ...

## 2.5 % 97.5 %

## .sig01 0.2608567 0.60403428

## (Intercept) 0.2452467 0.64871247

## black -2.1666001 -1.34322366

## female -0.2837100 0.08919986
```

- Let's fit a more sophisticated model that includes other relevant survey factors, such as
  - region
  - prior vote history (note that this is a state-level predictor),
  - age, education, and the interaction between them.
- In R, we have

Why do we have a rank deficient model?

- Also, it looks like we have a convergence issue. This can happen when dealing with multilevel models. We have so many parameters to estimate from the interaction terms edu\_label:age\_label (16 actually), and it looks like that's causing a problem.
- Could be that we have too many  $bush_i = 1$  or 0 values for certain combinations. You should check!
- Let's treat those as varying effects instead. That is,

```
egin{aligned} 	ext{logit}\left(\Pr[	ext{bush}_i=1]
ight) &= eta_0 + \gamma_{0m[i]}^{	ext{region}} + \gamma_{0j[i]}^{	ext{state}} + \gamma_{0k[i],l[i]}^{	ext{age.edu}} \ &+ eta_{	ext{f}} 	ext{female}_i + eta_{	ext{b}} 	ext{black}_i + eta_{	ext{v\_prev}} 	ext{v\_prev} 	ext{v\_prev}_{j[i]}; \ &\gamma_{0m} \sim N(0,\sigma_{	ext{region}}^2), \quad \gamma_{0j} \sim N(0,\sigma_{	ext{state}}^2), \quad \gamma_{0k,l} \sim N(0,\sigma_{	ext{age.edu}}^2). \end{aligned}
```

■ In R, we have

■ This seems to run fine; we are able to borrow information which helps.



```
## Generalized linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood (Laplace
    Approximation) [glmerMod]
## Family: binomial (logit)
## Formula:
## bush ~ black + female + v prev + (1 | state label) + (1 | region label) +
##
       (1 | edu label:age label)
##
     Data: polls subset
##
                    logLik deviance df.resid
##
       AIC
             2683.3 -1315.0
                              2630.0
##
     2644.0
                                           2008
##
  Scaled residuals:
      Min
               10 Median
                                30
                                      Max
  -1.8404 -1.0430 0.6478 0.8405 2.7528
##
## Random effects:
## Groups
                       Name
                                   Variance Std.Dev.
## state label
                       (Intercept) 0.03768 0.1941
## edu label:age label (Intercept) 0.02993 0.1730
## region label
                       (Intercept) 0.02792 0.1671
## Number of obs: 2015, groups:
## state label, 49; edu label:age label, 16; region label, 5
##
## Fixed effects:
              Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
## (Intercept) -3.50658
                         1.03365 -3.392 0.000693 ***
## black
              -1.74530
                         0.21090 -8.275 < 2e-16 ***
## female
              -0.09956
                          0.09558 -1.042 0.297575
## v_prev
               0.07076
                           0.01853 3.820 0.000134 ***
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Correlation of Fixed Effects:
          (Intr) black female
## black -0.036
## female -0.049 -0.004
## v_prev -0.992 0.027 -0.006
```

- Remember that in the first model, the state-level standard deviation was estimated as 0.41. Looks like we are now able to separate that (for the most part) into state and region effects.
- Interpretation of results:
  - For a fixed state, education and age bracket, a non-black male respondent with zero prior average Republican vote share, has odds of  $e^{-3.51}=0.03$  of supporting Bush (no one really has 0 value for  $v_{prev}$ ).
  - For a fixed state, sex, education level, age bracket and zero prior average Republican vote share, a black respondent has  $e^{-1.75}=0.17$  times (an 83% decrease) the odds of supporting Bush as a non-black respondent, which is about the same as before.
  - For each percentage point increase in prior average Republican vote share, residents of a given state, race, sex, education level age bracket have  $e^{0.07}=1.07$  times the odds of supporting Bush.

- Due to the number of categories, the inference in the frequentist model is not entirely reliable as
  - it does not fully account for uncertainty in the estimated variance parameters, and
  - it uses an approximation for inference.
- We can fit the model under the Bayesian paradigm in the brms package, using mildly informative priors and quantify uncertainty based on the posterior samples.
- Windows users: install Rtools for windows, then the rstan package in R.
- Mac users: install Xcode, open it to accept the license agreement, then open R/RStudio and install the rstan package.
- In-class analysis: move to the R script here.

# WHAT'S NEXT?

MOVE ON TO THE READINGS FOR THE NEXT MODULE!

