

# ordinal logistic regression model demo

高嘉好

2024-10-10

## Table of contents

read data . . . . .	1
cumulative logit model . . . . .	2
cumulative logit model without proportional odds . . . . .	3
cumulative logit model without proportional odds . . . . .	4
Adjacent-Categories logits . . . . .	5
sequential logits . . . . .	5

## read data

```
library(table1)
```

Attaching package: 'table1'

The following objects are masked from 'package:base':

```
units, units<-
```

```
#grouped data file
```

```
Polviews <- read.table("http://www.stat.ufl.edu/~aa/cat/data/Polviews.dat",header=TRUE)
```

```
#ungrouped data file
```

```
Polviews2 <- read.table("http://www.stat.ufl.edu/~aa/cat/data/Polviews2.dat",header=TRUE)
```

```
table1(~gender+party|ideology,data=Polviews2)
```

Warning in table1.formula(~gender + party | ideology, data = Polviews2): Terms to the right of '|' in formula 'x' define table columns and are expected to be factors with meaningful labels.

	1	2	3	4	5	Overall
	(N=45)	(N=184)	(N=158)	(N=203)	(N=71)	(N=661)
<b>gender</b>						
female	25 (55.6%)	110 (59.8%)	101 (63.9%)	111 (54.7%)	36 (50.7%)	383 (57.9%)
male	20 (44.4%)	74 (40.2%)	57 (36.1%)	92 (45.3%)	35 (49.3%)	278 (42.1%)
<b>party</b>						
dem	45 (100%)	178 (96.7%)	129 (81.6%)	48 (23.6%)	7 (9.9%)	407 (61.6%)
repub	0 (0%)	6 (3.3%)	29 (18.4%)	155 (76.4%)	64 (90.1%)	254 (38.4%)

## cumulative logit model

```
library(VGAM)
```

```
Loading required package: stats4
```

```
Loading required package: splines
```

```
fit <- vglm(cbind(y1,y2,y3,y4,y5)~party+gender,family=cumulative(parallel=TRUE),data=Polviews)
summary(fit)
```

Call:

```
vglm(formula = cbind(y1, y2, y3, y4, y5) ~ party + gender, family = cumulative(parallel = TRUE),
     data = Polviews)
```

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(> z )
(Intercept):1	-2.12233	0.16875	-12.577	<2e-16 ***
(Intercept):2	0.16892	0.11481	1.471	0.141
(Intercept):3	1.85716	0.15103	12.297	<2e-16 ***
(Intercept):4	4.65005	0.23496	19.791	<2e-16 ***
partyrepub	-3.63366	0.21785	-16.680	<2e-16 ***
gendermale	0.04731	0.14955	0.316	0.752

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Names of linear predictors: logitlink(P[Y<=1]), logitlink(P[Y<=2]),  
logitlink(P[Y<=3]), logitlink(P[Y<=4])

Residual deviance: 9.8072 on 10 degrees of freedom

Log-likelihood: -35.2032 on 10 degrees of freedom

Number of Fisher scoring iterations: 4

No Hauck-Donner effect found in any of the estimates

Exponentiated coefficients:

```
partyrepub gendermale
0.02641936 1.04844945
```

For any fixed  $j$ , the estimated odds that a Republican's response is in the liberal direction rather than the conservation direction equal  $\exp(\beta_1) = \exp(-3.634) = 0.0026$  times the estimated odds for Democrats. In other words, The estimated odds that a Republican's response is in the conservative direction rather than the liberal direction equal  $\exp(-\beta_1) = \exp(3.634) = 37.9$  times the estimated odds for Democrats. We can conclude that strong Republicans tend to be much more conservative than strong Democrats.

```
attach(Polviews)
gendername <- c("female","male","female","male")
partyname <- c("dem","rep","dem","rep")
data.frame(gendername,partyname,fitted(fit))
```

	gendername	partyname	y1	y2	y3	y4	y5
1	female	dem	0.106945695	0.43518307	0.3228363	0.1255644	0.009470552
2	male	rep	0.003153813	0.02717842	0.1144033	0.5895341	0.265730342

```
3      female      dem 0.111549168 0.44229817 0.3165490 0.1205668 0.009036867
4      male      rep 0.003306108 0.02844904 0.1189361 0.5927070 0.256601745
```

The data frame can help us to understand the effects of the explanatory variables. For each political party affiliation, the estimated distributions are very similar for females and males. The most common response is ‘slightly liberal’ for Democrats, who are very likely to be in category 3 or below, and ‘slightly conservative’ for Republicans, who are very likely to be in category 4 or 5.

## cumulative logit model without proportional odds

```
fit2 <- vglm(cbind(y1,y2,y3,y4,y5)~party+gender,family=cumulative,data=Polviews)
summary(fit2)
```

Call:

```
vglm(formula = cbind(y1, y2, y3, y4, y5) ~ party + gender, family = cumulative,
     data = Polviews)
```

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(> z )
(Intercept):1	-2.17521	0.20941	-10.387	< 2e-16 ***
(Intercept):2	0.12173	0.12476	0.976	0.329
(Intercept):3	1.88810	0.17043	11.078	< 2e-16 ***
(Intercept):4	4.10365	0.39770	10.318	< 2e-16 ***
partyrepub:1	-20.76294	3458.04727	NA	NA
partyrepub:2	-3.94288	0.42696	-9.235	< 2e-16 ***
partyrepub:3	-3.68095	0.23285	-15.808	< 2e-16 ***
partyrepub:4	-2.94499	0.40785	-7.221	5.17e-13 ***
gendermale:1	0.21835	0.31762	0.687	0.492
gendermale:2	0.18343	0.19352	0.948	0.343
gendermale:3	-0.08638	0.22198	-0.389	0.697
gendermale:4	-0.14633	0.26939	-0.543	0.587

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Names of linear predictors: logitlink(P[Y<=1]), logitlink(P[Y<=2]),  
logitlink(P[Y<=3]), logitlink(P[Y<=4])

Residual deviance: 3.5861 on 4 degrees of freedom

Log-likelihood: -32.0927 on 4 degrees of freedom

Number of Fisher scoring iterations: 17

Warning: Hauck-Donner effect detected in the following estimate(s):

'(Intercept):4', 'partyrepub:1', 'partyrepub:2'

Exponentiated coefficients:

```
partyrepub:1 partyrepub:2 partyrepub:3 partyrepub:4 gendermale:1 gendermale:2
9.611007e-10 1.939224e-02 2.519906e-02 5.260246e-02 1.244018e+00 1.201330e+00
gendermale:3 gendermale:4
9.172418e-01 8.638714e-01
```

The data frame can help us to understand the effects of the explanatory variables. For each political party affiliation,

the estimated distributions are very similar for females and males. The most common response is 'slightly liberal' for Democrats, who are very likely to be in category 3 or below, and 'slightly conservative' for Republicans, who are very likely to be in category 4 or 5.

## cumulative logit model without proportional odds

```
fit2 <- vglm(cbind(y1,y2,y3,y4,y5)~party+gender,family=cumulative,data=Polviews)
summary(fit2)
```

Call:

```
vglm(formula = cbind(y1, y2, y3, y4, y5) ~ party + gender, family = cumulative,
     data = Polviews)
```

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(> z )
(Intercept):1	-2.17521	0.20941	-10.387	< 2e-16 ***
(Intercept):2	0.12173	0.12476	0.976	0.329
(Intercept):3	1.88810	0.17043	11.078	< 2e-16 ***
(Intercept):4	4.10365	0.39770	10.318	< 2e-16 ***
partyrepub:1	-20.76294	3458.04727	NA	NA
partyrepub:2	-3.94288	0.42696	-9.235	< 2e-16 ***
partyrepub:3	-3.68095	0.23285	-15.808	< 2e-16 ***
partyrepub:4	-2.94499	0.40785	-7.221	5.17e-13 ***
gendermale:1	0.21835	0.31762	0.687	0.492
gendermale:2	0.18343	0.19352	0.948	0.343
gendermale:3	-0.08638	0.22198	-0.389	0.697
gendermale:4	-0.14633	0.26939	-0.543	0.587

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Names of linear predictors: logitlink(P[Y<=1]), logitlink(P[Y<=2]),  
logitlink(P[Y<=3]), logitlink(P[Y<=4])

Residual deviance: 3.5861 on 4 degrees of freedom

Log-likelihood: -32.0927 on 4 degrees of freedom

Number of Fisher scoring iterations: 17

Warning: Hauck-Donner effect detected in the following estimate(s):  
'(Intercept):4', 'partyrepub:1', 'partyrepub:2'

Exponentiated coefficients:

```
partyrepub:1 partyrepub:2 partyrepub:3 partyrepub:4 gendermale:1 gendermale:2
9.611007e-10 1.939224e-02 2.519906e-02 5.260246e-02 1.244018e+00 1.201330e+00
gendermale:3 gendermale:4
9.172418e-01 8.638714e-01
```

The political party estimate of  $\beta_1\hat{=}$  2.03 means that for the normal latent variable model, with higher  $y^*$  values representing greater conservatism, the estimated mean political ideology for Republicans is 2.03 higher than the estimated mean for Democrats. This difference is relative to a residual standard deviation of 1.0 for the normal latent response. With an arbitrary standard deviation, we estimate that the two groups have means that differ by 2.03 standard deviations,

This is an extremely large effect.

## Adjacent-Categories logits

```
fit_acat <- vglm(cbind(y1,y2,y3,y4,y5)~party+gender,family=acat(parallel=TRUE,reverse=TRUE),data=Polviews)
summary(fit_acat)
```

Call:

```
vglm(formula = cbind(y1, y2, y3, y4, y5) ~ party + gender, family = acat(parallel = TRUE,
reverse = TRUE), data = Polviews)
```

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(> z )
(Intercept):1	-1.38707	0.17079	-8.121	4.61e-16 ***
(Intercept):2	0.36218	0.11749	3.083	0.00205 **
(Intercept):3	0.77529	0.14720	5.267	1.39e-07 ***
(Intercept):4	2.99240	0.23132	12.936	< 2e-16 ***
partyrepub	-2.23478	0.16841	-13.270	< 2e-16 ***
gendermale	0.01212	0.09661	0.125	0.90016

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Names of linear predictors: loglink(P[Y=1]/P[Y=2]), loglink(P[Y=2]/P[Y=3]),  
loglink(P[Y=3]/P[Y=4]), loglink(P[Y=4]/P[Y=5])

Residual deviance: 13.4665 on 10 degrees of freedom

Log-likelihood: -37.0329 on 10 degrees of freedom

Number of Fisher scoring iterations: 4

Warning: Hauck-Donner effect detected in the following estimate(s):  
'partyrepub'

Exponentiated coefficients:

partyrepub	gendermale
0.1070151	1.0121943

The estimated odds that a Democrats's political ideology is in category j instead of j+1 are  $\exp(-\beta_1)=9.34$  times the estimated odds for Republicans.

## sequential logits

```
fit_sratio <- vglm(cbind(y1,y2,y3,y4,y5)~party+gender,family=sratio(parallel=TRUE),data=Polviews)
summary(fit_sratio)
```

Call:

```
vglm(formula = cbind(y1, y2, y3, y4, y5) ~ party + gender, family = sratio(parallel = TRUE),
data = Polviews)
```

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(> z )
(Intercept):1	-2.12723	0.16537	-12.863	< 2e-16 ***
(Intercept):2	-0.09593	0.11297	-0.849	0.396
(Intercept):3	0.88414	0.15341	5.763	8.25e-09 ***
(Intercept):4	3.71958	0.24101	15.433	< 2e-16 ***
partyrepub	-2.96103	0.19164	-15.451	< 2e-16 ***
gendermale	0.00667	0.12793	0.052	0.958

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Names of linear predictors: logitlink(P[Y=1|Y>=1]), logitlink(P[Y=2|Y>=2]),  
logitlink(P[Y=3|Y>=3]), logitlink(P[Y=4|Y>=4])

Residual deviance: 25.9331 on 10 degrees of freedom

Log-likelihood: -43.2662 on 10 degrees of freedom

Number of Fisher scoring iterations: 5

No Hauck-Donner effect found in any of the estimates

Exponentiated coefficients:

partyrepub gendermale  
0.05176572 1.00669183

For any fixed j, the estimated odds that a Republican's response is in category j rather than higher categories is  $\exp(\beta_1)=0.052$  times the estimated odds for Democrats.