

PSYC 5670: Homework 1

J DeVaney

Question 1:

```
ecls <- read_sas("datasets\\eclsk_thirds_combined.sas7bdat")
```

Question 2:

Descriptives:

With Hmisc:

```
ecls.nomiss <- filter(ecls, !is.na(MTH_T))
ecls.nomiss$teacherid <- as.factor(ecls.nomiss$teacherid)

describe(select(ecls.nomiss, MTH_T, SES, teacherid))
```

```
## select(ecls.nomiss, MTH_T, SES, teacherid)
##
## 3 Variables      2961 Observations
## -----
## MTH_T : Math T-Score
##      n missing distinct      Info      Mean      Gmd      .05      .10
##  2961      0      2577      1  52.56    9.73   37.63   41.73
##    .25    .50    .75    .90    .95
##  47.23   52.77   58.33   63.42   66.44
##
## lowest : 18.732 23.192 24.672 24.932 27.026, highest: 76.412 77.793 77.839 78.844 80.691
## -----
## SES : Socioeconomic status composite
##      n missing distinct      Info      Mean      Gmd      .05      .10
##  2705    256    339      1  0.2187    0.823   -0.85   -0.66
##    .25    .50    .75    .90    .95
##  -0.31    0.14    0.72    1.20    1.48
##
## lowest : -2.21 -1.93 -1.89 -1.78 -1.73, highest:  2.24  2.30  2.33  2.43  2.58
## -----
## teacherid
##      n missing distinct
##  2961      0    300
##
## lowest : 0007T41 0011T41 0011T42 0015T43 0020T41
## highest: 6290T41 6290T47 6290T48 7054T44 7151T43
## -----
```

With stargazer:

```
stargazer(as.data.frame(select(ecls.nomiss, MTH_T, SES)), type="html", digits = 2, summary.stat
= c("n", "mean", "sd", "min", "max"))
```

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
MTH_T	2,961	52.56	8.63	18.73	80.69
SES	2,705	0.22	0.73	-2.21	2.58

Average class size:

```
#avg class size = number of obsv / number of distinct teacher IDs
2961 / 300
```

```
## [1] 9.87
```

Question 3:

Baseline Model

```
m1 <- lmer(MTH_T ~ 1 + (1|teacherid), data = ecls.nomiss)
summary(m1)
```

```
## Linear mixed model fit by REML. t-tests use Satterthwaite's method [
## lmerModLmerTest]
## Formula: MTH_T ~ 1 + (1 | teacherid)
## Data: ecls.nomiss
##
## REML criterion at convergence: 20849.5
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -3.9090 -0.6298  0.0164  0.6626  3.7658
##
## Random effects:
## Groups      Name                Variance Std.Dev.
## teacherid (Intercept) 15.76      3.97
## Residual                58.83      7.67
## Number of obs: 2961, groups: teacherid, 300
##
## Fixed effects:
##              Estimate Std. Error      df t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)  52.5068    0.2711 297.4715   193.7   <2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

```
tab_model(m1, show.aic = T, show.r2 = F, show.ci = F, show.se = T)
```

Math T-Score

Predictors	Estimates	std. Error	p
------------	-----------	------------	---

(Intercept)	52.51	0.27	<0.001
-------------	-------	------	------------------

Random Effects

σ^2	58.83
------------	-------

τ_{00} teacherid	15.76
-----------------------	-------

ICC	0.21
-----	------

$N_{\text{teacherid}}$	300
------------------------	-----

Observations	2961
--------------	------

AIC	20855.496
-----	-----------

Gamma00 = **52.51**

Grand mean intercept: Overall intercept of the regression equation

Tau00 = **15.76**

Intercept variance: Deviation between real and predicted cluster intercepts

sigma² = **58.83**

Residual variance: Deviation between real and predicted outcomes within clusters

AIC = **20855.50**ICC = sJPlot report of **0.21** model output manual calc below:

```
15.76 / (15.76 + 58.83)
```

```
## [1] 0.2112884
```

The ICC describes what proportion of variance in the outcome is at the cluster level.

DEFT:

```
# DEFT = sqrt(1 + ICC*(n-1))
sqrt(1 + 0.21*(9.87-1))
```

```
## [1] 1.691952
```

Multilevel modeling would be required, as the DEFT indicates accounting for clustering would produce *correct* standard errors ~69% larger than standard errors calculated using OLS.

Submodels and Reduced FormLevel 1: $Y_{ij} = B_{0j} + r_{ij}$ Level 2: $B_{0j} = \text{Gam00} + \mu_{0j}$ Reduced: $Y_{ij} = 52.51 + \mu_{0j} + r_{ij}$ **Question 4**

```
m2 <- lmer(MTH_T ~ SES_Mean + (1|teacherid), data = ecls.nomiss)
summary(m2)
```

```
## Linear mixed model fit by REML. t-tests use Satterthwaite's method [
## lmerModLmerTest]
## Formula: MTH_T ~ SES_Mean + (1 | teacherid)
## Data: ecls.nomiss
##
## REML criterion at convergence: 20706.4
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -3.7583 -0.6394  0.0268  0.6686  3.9586
##
## Random effects:
## Groups      Name      Variance Std.Dev.
## teacherid (Intercept)  7.349   2.711
## Residual                58.873   7.673
## Number of obs: 2961, groups: teacherid, 300
##
## Fixed effects:
##              Estimate Std. Error      df t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)  51.3857     0.2284 296.9543  225.00  <2e-16 ***
## SES_Mean      5.9221     0.4363 289.3579   13.57  <2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Correlation of Fixed Effects:
##              (Intr)
## SES_Mean -0.364
```

```
tab_model(m2, show.aic = T, show.r2 = F, show.ci = F, show.se = T)
```

Math T-Score			
Predictors	Estimates	std. Error	p
(Intercept)	51.39	0.23	<0.001
Class mean Socioeconomic status composite	5.92	0.44	<0.001
Random Effects			
σ^2	58.87		
τ_{00} teacherid	7.35		
ICC	0.11		
N _{teacherid}	300		
Observations	2961		
AIC	20714.430		

$\text{Gamma}_{01} = 5.92$

With every one unit change in the L2 variable SES_Mean , there is a direct 5.92 unit change in Math T-Score.

$\text{AIC} = 20714.43$

The interpretation of the grand mean intercept

$\text{Tau}_{00} = 7.35$

$\sigma^2 = 58.87$

Intercept variance decreased, while there is no decrease in the residual variance. This is due to the addition of the SES_Mean variable at the cluster level explaining L2 variance, while being unable to explain L1 variance.

ICC = sjPlot report of **0.11** model output manual calc below:

```
7.35 / (7.35 + 58.83)
```

```
## [1] 0.1110607
```

Submodels and Reduced Form

L1: $Y_{ij} = B_{0j} + r_{ij}$

L2: $B_{0j} = \text{Gam}_{00} + \text{Mu}_{0j}$

Reduced: $Y_{ij} = 51.39 + 5.92(W_j) + \text{Mu}_{0j} + r_{ij}$

Question 5

```
m3 <- lmer(MTH_T ~ SES_Mean + SES + (1|teacherid), data = ecls.nomiss)
summary(m3)
```

```
## Linear mixed model fit by REML. t-tests use Satterthwaite's method [
## lmerModLmerTest]
## Formula: MTH_T ~ SES_Mean + SES + (1 | teacherid)
## Data: ecIs.nomiss
##
## REML criterion at convergence: 18814.4
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -4.0151 -0.6366  0.0098  0.6785  3.8427
##
## Random effects:
## Groups      Name                Variance Std.Dev.
## teacherid (Intercept)  7.294      2.701
## Residual                56.484      7.516
## Number of obs: 2705, groups: teacherid, 300
##
## Fixed effects:
##              Estimate Std. Error      df t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)   51.6038     0.2331  309.0632  221.418 < 2e-16 ***
## SES_Mean       2.8597     0.5175  539.3367   5.526 5.12e-08 ***
## SES           2.9925     0.2627 2413.9128  11.390 < 2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Correlation of Fixed Effects:
##              (Intr) SES_Mn
## SES_Mean -0.331
## SES      0.001 -0.508
```

```
tab_model(m3, show.aic = T, show.r2 = F, show.ci = F, show.se = T)
```

Math T-Score			
Predictors	Estimates	std. Error	p
(Intercept)	51.60	0.23	<0.001
Class mean Socioeconomic status composite	2.86	0.52	<0.001
Socioeconomic status composite	2.99	0.26	<0.001
Random Effects			
σ^2	56.48		
τ_{00} teacherid	7.29		
ICC	0.11		
N _{teacherid}	300		
Observations	2705		

AIC

18824.373

Gamma10 = **2.99**

With every one unit change in the L1 variable SES, there is a direct 2.99 unit change in Math T-Score.

AIC = **18824.37**

The interpretation of the grand mean intercept

Tau00 = **7.29**sigma^2 = **56.48**

Both the intercept and residual variance decreased. This was expected as a result of the SES_Mean variable at the cluster level explaining L2 variance, while the individual level variable SES explained L1 variance.

ICC = sJPlot report of **0.11** model output manual calc below:

$$7.29 / (7.29 + 56.48)$$

```
## [1] 0.1143171
```

Submodels and Reduced Form

L1: $Y_{ij} = B_{0j} + B_{1j}(X_{ij}) + r_{ij}$

L2: $B_{0j} = \text{Gam00} + \text{Gam01}(W_j) + \text{Mu0j}$

$$B_{1j} = \text{Gam10} + \text{Mu1j}$$

Reduced: $Y_{ij} = 51.60 + 2.86(W_j) + 2.99(X_{ij}) + \text{Mu0j} + \text{Mu1j}(X_{ij}) + r_{ij}$

Question 6

The third model, with both L1 and L2 SES predictors, best fits the data, as was indicated by the lowest AIC value across the set of those reported.