The GLIMMIX Procedure

Model Information	
Data Set	WORK.GGO
Response Variable	Value
Response Distribution	Multinomial (ordered)
Link Function	Cumulative Logit
Variance Function	Default
Variance Matrix Blocked By	newID
Estimation Technique	Maximum Likelihood
Likelihood Approximation	Gauss-Hermite Quadrature
Degrees of Freedom Method	Containment

Class Level Information		
Class	Levels	Values
Attribute	6	LLL LLS LUS RLL RML RUL
rater	2	JW VH

Number of Observations Read	1464
Number of Observations Used	1464

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	Value	Total Frequency
1	0	1275
2	1	169
3	2	13
4	3	6
5	10	1

The GLIMMIX procedure is modeling the probabilities of levels of Value having lower Ordered Values in the Response Profile table.

Dimensions	
G-side Cov. Parameters	2
Columns in X	10
Columns in Z per Subject	3
Subjects (Blocks in V)	244
Max Obs per Subject	6

Optimization Information	
Optimization Technique	Dual Quasi-Newton
Parameters in Optimization	11
Lower Boundaries	2
Upper Boundaries	0
Fixed Effects	Not Profiled
Starting From	GLM estimates
Quadrature Points	7

Iteration History					
Iteration	Restarts	Evaluations	Objective Function	Change	Max Gradient
0	0	4	1157.7691525	.	116.2874
1	0	2	1147.6270061	10.14214643	31.71456
2	0	4	1126.9415389	20.68546716	41.34071
3	0	2	1115.7019932	11.23954574	18.39951
4	0	2	1111.529629	4.17236418	14.31417
5	0	2	1109.7571007	1.77252834	5.833595
6	0	2	1107.7383751	2.01872559	13.68659
7	0	2	1104.5566895	3.18168561	1.431787
8	0	3	1103.9518358	0.60485365	2.376364
9	0	2	1103.7777656	0.17407024	4.613528
10	0	4	1103.1750309	0.60273466	1.165994
11	0	3	1102.8943078	0.28072312	0.620919
12	0	3	1102.8815039	0.01280385	0.251195
13	0	3	1102.8749367	0.00656723	0.33329
14	0	2	1102.867365	0.00757174	0.262596
15	0	3	1102.8653749	0.00199006	0.136569
16	0	3	1102.8644202	0.00095472	0.055242
17	0	3	1102.8642492	0.00017101	0.043383

Iteration History					
Iteration	Restarts	Evaluations	Objective Function	Change	Max Gradient
18	0	4	1102.8636976	0.00055157	0.140059
19	0	4	1102.8618574	0.00184022	0.115187
20	0	4	1102.6029253	0.25893209	94.3713
21	0	151	1102.6029253	0.00000000	61.97446
22	0	47	1102.6029253	0.00000000	61.97446
23	0	46	1102.6029253	-0.00000000	61.97446

Convergence criterion (FCONV=2.220446E-16) satisfied.

Estimated G matrix is not positive definite.

Fit Statistics	
-2 Log Likelihood	1102.60
AIC (smaller is better)	1122.60
AICC (smaller is better)	1122.75
BIC (smaller is better)	1157.57
CAIC (smaller is better)	1167.57
HQIC (smaller is better)	1136.69

Fit Statistics for Conditional Distribution	
-2 log L(Value | r. effects)	766.18

Covariance Parameter Estimates			
Cov Parm	Subject	Estimate	Standard Error
Intercept	newID	4.0593	0.8749
rater	newID	1.11E-12	.

Solutions for Fixed Effects							
Effect	Value	Attribute	Estimate	Standard Error	DF	t Value	Pr > |t|
Intercept	0		2.9971	0.2760	0	10.86	.
Intercept	1		6.1231	0.3946	0	15.52	.
Intercept	2		7.2934	0.5146	0	14.17	.
Intercept	3		9.3500	1.0849	0	8.62	.
Attribute		LLL	-0.1874	0.3095	1212	-0.61	0.5449
Attribute		LLS	0.4122	0.3364	1212	1.23	0.2206
Attribute		LUS	0.1067	0.3286	1212	0.32	0.7454
Attribute		RLL	-0.4564	0.2861	1212	-1.60	0.1109
Attribute		RML	0.3861	0.3365	1212	1.15	0.2514
Attribute		RUL	0	.	.	.	.

Type III Tests of Fixed Effects				
Effect	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Attribute	5	1212	2.18	0.0537

Estimates											
Label	Estimate	Standard Error	DF	t Value	Pr > |t|	Alpha	Lower	Upper	Exponentiated Estimate	Exponentiated Lower	Exponentiated Upper
RUL vs. RML	-0.5996	0.3322	1212	-1.81	0.0713	0.05	-1.2514	0.05212	0.5490	0.2861	1.0535
RUL vs. RLL	-0.2942	0.3192	1212	-0.92	0.3570	0.05	-0.9205	0.3322	0.7452	0.3983	1.3940
RUL vs. LUS	0.2690	0.2976	1212	0.90	0.3663	0.05	-0.3149	0.8528	1.3086	0.7299	2.3463
RUL vs. LLS	-0.5736	0.3306	1212	-1.74	0.0830	0.05	-1.2221	0.07496	0.5635	0.2946	1.0778
RUL vs. LLL	-0.1874	0.3095	1212	-0.61	0.5449	0.05	-0.7946	0.4198	0.8291	0.4518	1.5216
RML vs. RLL	0.3055	0.3395	1212	0.90	0.3684	0.05	-0.3605	0.9714	1.3572	0.6973	2.6417
RML vs. LUS	0.8686	0.3243	1212	2.68	0.0075	0.05	0.2322	1.5049	2.3835	1.2614	4.5037
RML vs. LLS	0.02605	0.3485	1212	0.07	0.9404	0.05	-0.6577	0.7098	1.0264	0.5180	2.0336
RML vs. LLL	0.4122	0.3364	1212	1.23	0.2206	0.05	-0.2477	1.0721	1.5101	0.7806	2.9215
RLL vs. LUS	0.5631	0.3086	1212	1.82	0.0683	0.05	-0.04241	1.1686	1.7561	0.9585	3.2176
RLL vs. LLS	-0.2794	0.3397	1212	-0.82	0.4110	0.05	-0.9459	0.3871	0.7562	0.3883	1.4727
RLL vs. LLL	0.1067	0.3286	1212	0.32	0.7454	0.05	-0.5380	0.7515	1.1126	0.5839	2.1201
LUS vs. LLS	-0.8425	0.3218	1212	-2.62	0.0089	0.05	-1.4738	-0.2112	0.4306	0.2290	0.8096
LUS vs. LLL	-0.4564	0.2861	1212	-1.60	0.1109	0.05	-1.0177	0.1050	0.6336	0.3614	1.1107
LLS vs. LLL	0.3861	0.3365	1212	1.15	0.2514	0.05	-0.2740	1.0463	1.4713	0.7603	2.8470

Significant Pairwise Comparisons for ggo

Comparison	P-Value	Exponentiated Estimate (Odds Ratio)
RML vs. LUS	0.0075	2.38351
LUS vs. LLS	0.0089	0.43062