

# W203 Lab 3

*Mohammad Jawad Habib*

*April 3, 2016*

## Part 1: Multiple Choice

Q1 : b (Natural Experiment) Q2 : b, c Q3 : b Q4 : c Q5 : d, needs research Q6 : a, confirm wording of question Q7 : b Q8 : b

## Part 2: Test Selection

Q9 : e, Chi-square test Q10: d, ANOVA Q11: a, t-test Q12: b, Pearson correlation Q13: d, Chi-square test

## Part 3: Data Analysis and Short Answer

```
# setwd("W203 Week 12/Lab 3")
load("GSS.Rdata")
```

### 14. Task 1: Chi-Square Test on Marital Status and Political Orientation

#### A. Null and Alternative Hypothesis

H0: marital status and political orientation are independent H1: marital status and political orientation are not independent (that is, knowing about marital status can help predict the political orientation).

We can assume that the various marital statuses are independent of each other i.e. one person is not married and widowed at the same time. We can assume independence for political categorization as well.

We will also see below that none of the expected frequencies are below 5.

```
mp <- data.frame(GSS$marital, GSS$politics)

# remove the value coded as "NA" from "marital"
mp$GSS.marital[mp$GSS.marital == "NA"] <- NA

# remove "NA" as a factor from marital
mp$GSS.marital <- factor(mp$GSS.marital,
                        c("married", "widowed", "divorced", "separated", "never married"))

# remove all rows that have NA for "marital" or "politics"
mp <- mp[complete.cases(mp),]

# run the Chi Square test
mpcs <- chisq.test(table(mp))

# see that no expected frequencies are below 5
mpcs$expected
```

```
##                GSS.politics
## GSS.marital      Liberal    Tend Lib  Moderate  Tend Cons  Conservative
##   married        102.391123 102.924411 281.04230 132.255201 150.386963
##   widowed         19.839112 19.942441 54.45423 25.625520 29.138696
##   divorced        27.162275 27.303745 74.55479 35.084605 39.894591
##   separated        5.192788 5.219834 14.25312 6.707351 7.626907
##   never married    37.414702 37.609570 102.69556 48.327323 54.952843
```

## B. Test Statistics and p-value

We get a test statistic and p-value as follows:

```
# test statistic
mpcs$statistic
```

```
## X-squared
## 44.2255
```

```
# p-value
mpcs$p.value
```

```
## [1] 0.0001822704
```

Given the p-value above we can reject the null hypothesis. We can say that marital status does seem to be related to political orientation.

## C. Effect Size Calculation

We will use Cramer's V for the effect size.

```
cv <- sqrt(mpcs$statistic / (length(mp$GSS.marital)*min(nrow(mpcs$observed) - 1, ncol(mpcs$observed) - 1))
names(cv) <- "Cramer's V"
cv
```

```
## Cramer's V
## 0.08756363
```

## D. Interpretation

Our Chi-Square test reveals that “politics” is significantly related to “marital” status:

$$\chi^2(16) = 44.225, p < 0.01$$

. The contingency table is shown below.

```
mpcs$observed
```

```
##                GSS.politics
## GSS.marital    Liberal Tend Lib Moderate Tend Cons Conservative
## married        93      92    271      140      173
## widowed        15      16     57       24       37
## divorced       22      36     79       38       29
## separated       7       3     22        6        1
## never married  55      46     98       40       42
```

We can also see from the standardized residuals which ones are significant outside of  $\pm 1.96$  ( $p < 0.05$ ).

```
mpcs$stdres > 1.96 | mpcs$stdres < -1.96
```

```
##                GSS.politics
## GSS.marital    Liberal Tend Lib Moderate Tend Cons Conservative
## married        FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  TRUE
## widowed        FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  FALSE
## divorced       FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  TRUE
## separated       FALSE  FALSE  TRUE   FALSE  FALSE  TRUE
## never married  TRUE   FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  FALSE  TRUE
```

Being “married” is significantly related with “Conservative” political view. “widowed” is not significantly related with any political view. “divorced” is significantly related with “Conservative”. “separated” is significantly related with “Moderate” and “Conservative”. “never married” is significantly related with “Liberal” and “Conservative”.

## 15. Task 2: Pearson Correlation on Age when Married and Hours of TV watched

### A. Null and Alternative Hypothesis

H0: there is no relationship between `agedwed` and `tvhours` ( $r = 0$ ) H1: there is a positive or negative relationship between `agedwed` and `tvhours`

### B. Test Statistics and p-value

GSS website is not very clear on how missing values in `agedwed` and `tvhours` are coded. For `agedwed` let's assume that 0 and 99 are dummy values. for `tvhours` we can assume that anything greater than 24 is a dummy value because there are only 24 hours in the day.

Note: our sample size is large so we can assume normality of our sampling distribution. This assumption is required for establishing whether correlation coefficient is significant.

```
at <- data.frame(GSS$agedwed, GSS$tvhours)
at <- at[!(at$GSS.agedwed %in% c(0, 99)) & at$GSS.tvhours <= 24,]

library(Hmisc)

atpc <- rcorr(as.matrix(at))
atpc
```

```
##                GSS.agedwed GSS.tvhours
## GSS.agedwed      1.00      -0.03
```

```
## GSS.tvhours      -0.03      1.00
##
## n= 1194
##
##
## P
##           GSS.agewed GSS.tvhours
## GSS.agewed           0.3009
## GSS.tvhours 0.3009
```

```
cor.test(at$GSS.agewed, at$GSS.tvhours)
```

```
##
## Pearson's product-moment correlation
##
## data:  at$GSS.agewed and at$GSS.tvhours
## t = -1.0349, df = 1192, p-value = 0.3009
## alternative hypothesis: true correlation is not equal to 0
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  -0.08654554  0.02681630
## sample estimates:
##           cor
## -0.02996096
```

From the above, we get a test statistic ( $r$ ) of -0.03 and a p-value of 0.3009. And we get a 95% confidence interval that passes through zero (-0.087, 0.027)

### C. Interpretation

The results indicate that agewed is not correlated with tvhours. We also get

$$r^2 = 9e - 04$$

which means that only 0.09% of variance is shared between agewed and tvhours.