Discrete Response Model Lecture 4

Subtitle

datascience@berkeley

An Example

The purpose of this data is to determine if the fiber source has an effect on the bloating severity.

- Notice the columns have ordinal levels. (We will take this into account later in this course.) It is instructive in a class setting to analyze the data first without taking the order into account, so that we can see the benefits of taking into account the order later.
- I would expect that each person fits in one and only one cell of the table. Why would this be important to know?
- Given the layout of the data, it is likely that the sample size for each row was fixed. Thus, this would correspond to the multinomial distribution setting.
- Fiber source could actually be analyzed as two separate explanatory variables: bran ("yes" or "no") and gum ("yes" or "no").
- We will analyze this data in a **4x4 contingency table**. (Refer to the text for how this data can be analyzed as two separate explanatory variables through using regression models.)

fiber bloat count

```
diet <- read.csv(file = "C:\\data\\Fiber.csv")
head(diet)</pre>
```

```
1 bran high 0
2 gum high 5
3 both high 2
4 none high 0
5 bran medium 1
6 gum medium 3

# Match order given at DASL
diet$fiber</factor(x = diet$fiber, levels = c("none", "bran", "gum", "both"))
diet$bloat<-lactor(x = diet$bloat levels = c("none", "low", "medium", "high"))
diet.table<-xtabs(formula = count ~ fiber + bloat, data = piet)</pre>
```

```
      fiber
      none
      low
      medium
      high

      none
      6
      4
      2
      0

      bran
      7
      4
      1
      0

      gum
      2
      2
      3
      5

      both
      2
      5
      3
      2
```

```
ind.test<-chisq.test x = diet.table, correct = FALSE)
ind.test
                   Pearson's Chi-squared test
           data: diet.table
           X-squared = 16.9427, df = 9, p-value = 0.04962,
           Warning message:
           In chisq.test(diet.table, correct = FALSE) :
             Chi-squared approximation may be incorrect
library(package = (vcd)
assocstats(x = diet.table)
                                    X^2 df P(> X^2)
               Likelihood Ratio <u>18.880 9 0.026230</u>
                                 16.943 9 0.049621
               Pearson
               Phi-Coefficient : 0.594
               Contingency Coeff.: 0.511
               Cramer's V ....... 0.343
```

Summary

In summary,

- $X^2 = 16.94$
- $-2\log(\Lambda) = 18.88$
- $\chi^2_{0.95,9} = 16.92$
- P-value using X^2 is P(A > 16.94) = 0.0496 where $A \sim \chi_9^2$
- P-value using $-2\log(\Lambda)$ is P(A > 18.88) = 0.0262 where A $\sim \chi_0^2$
- Because the p-value is small, but not extremely so, we would say there is moderate evidence against independence (thus, moderate evidence of dependence).
- Thus, there is moderate evidence that bloating severity is dependent on the fiber source.



Implications of Independence

```
Can we trust the \chi_9^2 approximation?
```

gum 4.25 3.75 2.25 1.75 both 4.25 3.75 2.25 1.75

These only partially satisfy the recommendations given earlier!

For the details of $\chi^2_{(J-1)(J-1)}$ approximation, please refer to the text.

Remarks

- If independence is rejected, we would like to determine why it is rejected.
- For example, perhaps only particular combinations of X and Y are causing the dependence.
- Also, we would like to determine how much dependence exists.
- There are a number of ways to examine a contingency table further to understand the dependence.
- My preference is to generally use statistical models for this purpose, while even using these models to help test for independence.

Berkeley SCHOOL OF INFORMATION