



[Course](#) > [Week 4...](#) > [Week 4...](#) > [Week 4...](#)

## Week 4 Quiz

### Q1

1/1 point (graded)

When analyzing binary choice data, why can't we use regression analysis where the binary (0/1) choice is the dependent variable and the x's are independent variables?

- ☐ Regression predictions could be outside the  $[0, 1]$  interval
- ☐ Wrong statistical inference/tests
- ☒ All of the above (a and b) ✓
- ☐ None of the above

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

### Q2

1/1 point (graded)

In binary choice modeling, why do we set the utility of one of the alternatives (e.g., utility from not buying) to zero?

- ☒ Utility is relative ✓
- ☐ Utility is cardinal

☐ None of the above

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

### Q3

1/1 point (graded)

Let  $p1 = \exp(a)/(\exp(a) + \exp(b) + \exp(c))$  and  $p2 = \exp(a-c) / (\exp(a-c) + \exp(b-c) + 1)$ . Which statement most accurately describes the relationship between  $p1$  and  $p2$ ?

☒  $p1 = p2$  ✓

☐  $p1$  is less than or equal to  $p2$

☐  $p1$  is greater than or equal to  $p2$

☐ None of the above

#### Explanation

Multiply  $p1$  by  $\exp(-c)/\exp(-c)=1$ :

$p1 = p1 * \exp(-c)/\exp(-c) =$

$\exp(a)/(\exp(a) + \exp(b) + \exp(c)) * \exp(-c)/\exp(-c) =$

$(\exp(a)\exp(-c)) / (\exp(a)\exp(-c) + \exp(b)\exp(-c) + \exp(c)\exp(-c)) =$

$\exp(a-c) / (\exp(a-c) + \exp(b-c) + \exp(c-c)) =$

$\exp(a-c) / (\exp(a-c) + \exp(b-c) + 1) = p2$

The last equality holds because  $\exp(0)=1$

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

### Q4

1/1 point (graded)

If the utility from buying is estimated to be equal to one for a consumer ( $V=1$ ), and the utility from not buying is normalized to zero, what is the probability of buying for this consumer?

☐ 22.9%

☐ 50%

☒ 73.1% ✓

☐ 100%

### Explanation

$$p = \exp(V)/(1+\exp(V))=e/(1+e)=73.1\%$$

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

## Q5

1/1 point (graded)

If the utility from buying is estimated to be equal to one for a consumer ( $V=1$ ), and the utility from not buying is normalized to zero, what are the odds of buying for this consumer?

☐ 1.0

☐ 0.3678

☒ 2.718 ✓

☐ Infinity

### Explanation

Odds =  $(\exp(1)/(\exp(1)+1)) / (1/(\exp(1)+1)) = \exp(1) / 1 = \exp(1) = e = 2.718$

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

## Q6

1/1 point (graded)

In a logistic regression output, we obtained a chi-square (likelihood ratio) statistics of 101.1 and a p-value of 0.0001. Recall, the reference in the test is the intercept-only model. How do you interpret this result?

- ☐ Our independent variables significantly impact the binary outcome. The probability of observing a chi-square value as low as 101.1 is 0.0001 if the null hypothesis (no relationship between the independent variables and the binary outcome) is not true.
- ☐ Our independent variables do not significantly impact the binary outcome. The model has only 0.0001 chance to be true.
- ☒ Our independent variables significantly impact the binary outcome. The probability of observing a chi-square value as large as 101.1 is 0.0001 if the null hypothesis (no relationship between the independent variables and the binary outcome) is true. ✓
- ☐ Our independent variables do not significantly impact the binary outcome. The probability of such an event is  $1 - \text{p-value} = 0.9999$ .

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

Use this logistic regression output to answer questions 7, 8, 9.

## Logistic Regression Output

	Beta	SE	Zval.	Prob(> Z )	exp(beta)
Intercept	-0.847	0.691	-1.226	0.22	0.429
Gender [Male=0]	1.695	0.701	2.418	0.031	5.447

To clarify, we use dummy coding for Gender variable: Male=0, Female=1.

### Q7

1/1 point (graded)

In the logistic regression output above, the dependent variable is buy (=1) and no-buy (=0). The independent variable is Gender (Male=0; Female=1). What is the utility from buying for a female consumer?

☐ 1.695

☐ -0.847

☒ 0.848 ✓

☐ None of the above

### Explanation

$1.695 - 0.847 = 0.848$

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

### Q8

1/1 point (graded)

In the logistic regression output above, the dependent variable is buy (=1) and no-buy (=0). The independent variable is Gender (Male=0; Female=1). How would you interpret the  $\exp(\beta) = 5.447$  value for gender?

- ☐ The odds of buying for a female consumer are 5.018 ( $=5.447-0.429$ ) times higher than those of male consumer.
- ☒ The odds of buying for a female consumer are 5.447 times higher than those of a male consumer. ✓
- ☐ The odds of buying for a male consumer are 5.447 times higher than those of a female consumer.
- ☐ None of the above

### Explanation

See lecture on output interpretation for logistic regression.

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

### Q9

1/1 point (graded)

In the logistic regression output above, what is the probability of purchase for a male consumer?

☒ 0.3 ✓

☐ 0.7

☐ 0.16

☐ None of the above

**Explanation**

$$\exp(-0.847) / (\exp(-0.847) + 1) = 0.3$$

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

**Q10**

1/1 point (graded)

In a dataset of buy/no buy, we obtained a hit rate of 91%. If the proportion of buyers in the sample is 90.9%, how would you assess the value of such a hit rate?

- ☐ Excellent hit rate. The max hit rate is 1, so 91% is really good.
- ☐ Hit rate is OK. Very close to 100%.
- ☒ Poor hit rate since we can assign all the consumers as buyers and get a hit rate of 90.9%. This value is no different than the hit rate of 91%. ✓
- ☐ None of the above.

Submit

You have used 1 of 1 attempt

**i** Answers are displayed within the problem

[Learn About Verified Certificates](#)

© All Rights Reserved