

PLSC 502 – Autumn 2016

Measures of Association

Ordinal Variables

November 3, 2016

- Key issue: *how to retain the information present in the ordering of the categories without giving the numerical values assigned to them cardinal content.*
- Key concept: **Concordance**

For a pair of values on two observations $i = \{1, 2\}$ and two variables X and Y , a *concordant pair* has:

$$\text{sign}(X_2 - X_1) = \text{sign}(Y_2 - Y_1)$$

and a *discordant pair* has:

$$\text{sign}(X_2 - X_1) = -\text{sign}(Y_2 - Y_1).$$

A(nother) Contingency Table

Consider:

		X			
		1	2	3	
Y	1	n_{11}	n_{12}	n_{13}	n_{1X}
	2	n_{21}	n_{22}	n_{23}	n_{2X}
	3	n_{31}	n_{32}	n_{33}	n_{3X}
		n_{Y1}	n_{Y2}	n_{Y3}	N

Concordant and Discordant Pairs

Concordance with $\{1, 1\}$ observations:

		X			
		1	2	3	
Y	1	n_{11}	n_{12}	n_{13}	n_{1X}
	2	n_{21}	n_{22}	n_{23}	n_{2X}
	3	n_{31}	n_{32}	n_{33}	n_{3X}
		n_{Y1}	n_{Y2}	n_{Y3}	N

Concordant and Discordant Pairs

Concordance with $\{1, 2\}$ observations:

		X			
		1	2	3	
Y	1	n_{11}	n_{12}	n_{13}	n_{1X}
	2	n_{21}	n_{22}	n_{23}	n_{2X}
	3	n_{31}	n_{32}	n_{33}	n_{3X}
		n_{Y1}	n_{Y2}	n_{Y3}	N

Concordant and Discordant Pairs

Discordance with $\{1, 2\}$ observations:

		X			
		1	2	3	
Y	1	n_{11}	n_{12}	n_{13}	n_{1X}
	2	n_{21}	n_{22}	n_{23}	n_{2X}
	3	n_{31}	n_{32}	n_{33}	n_{3X}
		n_{Y1}	n_{Y2}	n_{Y3}	N

Concordant and Discordant Pairs

Discordance with $\{1, 3\}$ observations:

		X			
		1	2	3	
Y	1	n_{11}	n_{12}	n_{13}	n_{1X}
	2	n_{21}	n_{22}	n_{23}	n_{2X}
	3	n_{31}	n_{32}	n_{33}	n_{3X}
		n_{Y1}	n_{Y2}	n_{Y3}	N

Concordant and Discordant Pairs

For a 3×3 table, the total number of *concordant pairs* is:

$$N_c = n_{11}(n_{22} + n_{23} + n_{32} + n_{33}) + n_{12}(n_{23} + n_{33}) + n_{21}(n_{32} + n_{33}) + n_{22}(n_{33})$$

and the total number of *discordant pairs* is:

$$N_d = n_{13}(n_{21} + n_{22} + n_{31} + n_{32}) + n_{12}(n_{21} + n_{31}) + n_{23}(n_{31} + n_{32}) + n_{22}(n_{31}).$$

This extends to a table of arbitrary size $M \times N$ straightforwardly...

Gamma (γ) is the normed difference between the number of concordant and discordant pairs in the data:

$$\gamma = \frac{N_c - N_d}{N_c + N_d}$$

Equivalently:

$$\gamma = \frac{N_c}{N_c + N_d} - \frac{N_d}{N_c + N_d}$$

Gamma:

- does not count “ties.”
- $\gamma \in [-1, 1]$.
- $\gamma = 0 \leftrightarrow$ no association between X and Y , though it can also happen whenever $N_c = N_d$. That is, $\gamma = 0$ is necessary but not sufficient for statistical independence.
- Higher absolute values of γ correspond to stronger associations between X and Y .
- $\gamma = \pm 1.0$ under conditions of (at least) *weak monotonicity* (e.g., γ will equal 1.0 whenever, as X increases, Y only increases or stays the same).

Can be shown that:

$$\hat{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(\gamma, \sigma_{\gamma}^2)$$

where

$$\sigma_{\gamma}^2 = \frac{N_c + N_d}{N(1 - \hat{\gamma}^2)}$$

So

$$z = (\hat{\gamma} - \gamma) \sqrt{\frac{N_c + N_d}{N(1 - \hat{\gamma}^2)}}.$$

“Tau-a”:

$$\tau_a = \frac{N_c - N_d}{\frac{1}{2}N(N-1)}$$

“Tau-b”:

$$\tau_b = \frac{N_c - N_d}{\sqrt{[(N_c + N_d + N_{Y*})(N_c + N_d + N_{X*})]}}$$

where N_{Y*} and N_{X*} are the number of pairs *not tied* on Y and X , respectively.

“Tau-c”:

$$\tau_c = (N_c - N_d) \times \left\{ \frac{2m}{[N^2 2(m-1)]} \right\}$$

where m is the number of rows or columns, whichever is smaller.

- All have $\tau_{(\cdot)} \in [-1, 1]$
- For all τ s, the numerator signs the statistic.
- Like γ , τ_a doesn't do "ties"
- $|\tau_b| = 1.0$ only under *strict monotonicity*
- $\tau_b \rightarrow$ "square" tables
- $\tau_c \rightarrow$ "rectangular" (asymmetrical) tables
- $\gamma \geq \tau \forall \tau_{(\cdot)}$



Example: Sarah Palin Support...

September 2008 “Battleground” Poll in PA:

```
> summary(MamaGriz)
      caseid      female      palin
Min.   :    2  Female:2370  Very Unfavorable   :1200
1st Qu.:30034  Male  :2221  Somewhat Unfavorable: 739
Median :31831                      Somewhat Favorable  :1132
Mean   :36776                      Very Favorable      :1520
3rd Qu.:60674
Max.   :62125
      pid
Democrat   :1709
Independent:1391
GOP         :1491
```

Gamma: The Gamma.2 Function

```
Gamma2.f<-function(x, pr=0.95)
{
  # x is a matrix of counts.  You can use output of crosstabs or xtabs in R.
  # A matrix of counts can be formed from a data frame by using design.table.

  # Confidence interval calculation and output from Greg Rodd

  # Check for using S-PLUS and output is from crosstabs (needs >= S-PLUS 6.0)
  if(is.null(version$language) && inherits(x, "crosstabs")) { oldClass(x)<-NULL;
attr(x, "marginals")<-NULL}

  n <- nrow(x)
  m <- ncol(x)
  pi.c<-pi.d<-matrix(0,nr=n,nc=m)

  row.x<-row(x)
  col.x<-col(x)

  for(i in 1:(n)){
    for(j in 1:(m)){
      pi.c[i, j]<-sum(x[row.x<i & col.x<j]) + sum(x[row.x>i & col.x>j])
      pi.d[i, j]<-sum(x[row.x<i & col.x>j]) + sum(x[row.x>i & col.x<j])
    }
  }

  C <- sum(pi.c*x)/2
  D <- sum(pi.d*x)/2

  psi<-2*(D*pi.c-C*pi.d)/(C+D)^2
  sigma2<-sum(x*psi^2)-sum(x*psi)^2

  gamma <- (C - D)/(C + D)
  pr2 <- 1 - (1 - pr)/2
  CIa <- qnorm(pr2) * sqrt(sigma2) * c(-1, 1) + gamma

  list(gamma = gamma, C = C, D = D, sigma = sqrt(sigma2), Level = paste(
    100 * pr, "%", sep = ""), CI = paste(c("[" , max(CIa[1], -1),
    " , ", min(CIa[2], 1), "]" ), collapse = ""))
}
```



```
> Gamma2.f(palimpsest)
```

```
$gamma
```

```
[1] 0.73376
```

```
$C
```

```
[1] 4824989
```

```
$D
```

```
[1] 740927
```

```
$sigma
```

```
[1] 0.0094232
```

```
$Level
```

```
[1] "95%"
```

```
$CI
```

```
[1] "[0.715293551681856, 0.752232009250073]"
```

```
> with(MamaGriz, cor.test(PID,Palin,method="kendall"))
```

Kendall's rank correlation tau

data: PID and Palin

z = 43.5, p-value <2e-16

alternative hypothesis: true tau is not equal to 0

sample estimates:

tau

0.55453

Men vs. Women on Palin

```
> palinfemale<-with(MamaGriz, xtabs(~palin+female))  
> addmargins(palinfemale)
```

	female		
palin	Female	Male	Sum
Very Unfavorable	692	508	1200
Somewhat Unfavorable	411	328	739
Somewhat Favorable	557	575	1132
Very Favorable	710	810	1520
Sum	2370	2221	4591

Men vs. Women on Palin

```
> Gamma2.f(palinfemale)
```

```
$gamma
```

```
[1] 0.13641
```

```
$sigma
```

```
[1] 0.021992
```

```
$Level
```

```
[1] "95%"
```

```
$CI
```

```
[1] "[0.0933060117469164, 0.17951420622549]"
```

```
> MamaGriz$Female <- with(MamaGriz, 1 - (as.integer(female)-1))
```

```
> with(MamaGriz, cor.test(Female,Palin,method="kendall"))
```

Kendall's rank correlation tau

data: Female and Palin

z = -6.13, p-value = 8.9e-10

alternative hypothesis: true tau is not equal to 0

sample estimates:

tau

-0.082912