Ask Dom:

About NAs - done

About stepwise regression from sleep article

Need to change data and/or descriptions in methods to match the coding of the data set. For instance need to change coding for stress so it indicates 0 for no incidence of the stressor and 1 if it occurs. -done

Also, most measures used 1 for never so need to adjust the totals on the measures or re code so 1 is 0 etc.

Also, Sleep Hygiene has 1 for always and 5 for never.

Results:

The demographic characteristics of the subjects are presented in Table 1, including means and standard error.

Demographic variables for the participants are summarized in Table 1. Out of 203 participants there were 199 complete data sets used for analyses. Counter to methods outline in the original questionnaire research, the SH variable was collected with low scores indicating poorer hygiene practices in order to improve interpretability. Additionally, coding found on the stress factor (1=occurrence of the stressor and 2=NO occurrence of the stressor) was corrected post hoc so that the total stress amount reflected the total number of stressors (changed so that 0=NO occurrence of the stressor).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 1  *Participant demographics.* | |
| Variable | N |
| Participants | 203 |
| Gender |  |
| Female | 159 |
| Male | 44 |
| Age |  |
| 18-19 | 88 |
| 20-21 | 88 |
| 22-25 | 25 |
| 26-30 | 0 |
| 30+ | 2 |
| Ethnicity |  |
| Asian | 10 |
| Black | 40 |
| Hispanic | 23 |
| White (Non-Hispanic) | 121 |
| Biracial/Mixed | 9 |
| Class Standing |  |
| Freshman | 50 |
| Sophomore | 51 |
| Junior | 56 |
| Senior | 44 |
| N/A | 2 |
| *Note.* | |

Do table of demographic means as compared to AE factors. Table 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3  *Pearson product-moment correlations.* | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | AE | Skills | | Emot | Part/int | Perf | Stress | SH | Exercise |
| Total Academic Engagement (AE) | -- | |  |  |  |  | .055 | .254\*\* | .089 |
| Skills |  | | -- |  |  |  | .242\*\* | .349\*\*\* | .072 |
| Emotional |  | |  | -- |  |  | -.066 | .048 | .180! |
| Participation/interaction |  | |  |  | -- |  | -.122 | .097 | .041 |
| Performance |  | |  |  |  | -- | .112 | .212\* | -.113 |
| Stress | -.026 | | -.205\* | .109 | .150! | -.109 | -- | -.306\*\*\* | .113 |
| Sleep Hygiene (SH) | .254\*\* | | .349\*\*\* | .048 | .097 | .212\* | .327\*\*\* | -- | -.055 |
| Exercise | .089 | | .072 | .180! | .041 | -.113 | -.054 | -.055 | -- |
| Mean | 45.92 | | 17.30 | 9.99 | 10.54 | 8.19 | 43.04 | 41.33 | 46.86 |
| *SD* | 7.14 | | 2.99 | 2.51 | 2.86 | 1.42 | 11.53 | 6.09 | 14.83 |
| *Note.* \*p<.01; \*\*p<.001; \*\*\*p<.0001; ! should I report p<.05? – no do Bonferroni adjustment and only use .01 and below; red numbers are the correct ones after correcting the stress data | | | | | | | | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Table 4  *Mediation analyses for effect of sleep as mediator in relationship between stress and AE/factors.* | | | | | |
|  | | β1 | | p-value | β2 | p-value |
| Step 1: Model Y = β0 + β1 Stress + ε | |  | |  |  |  |
| Total Academic Engagement (Y) | | -.006 | | .887 |  |  |
| Skills (Y) | | -.053 | | .003\* |  |  |
| Emotional (Y) | | | .024 | .122 |  |  |
| Participation/interaction (Y) | | | .037 | .033 |  |  |
| Performance (Y) | | | -.013 | .123 |  |  |
| Step 2: Model Sleep = β0 + β1 Stress + ε | | | -.580 | .000009\*\*\* |  |  |
| Step 3: Model Y = β0 + β1 Stress + β2 Sleep + ε | | |  |  |  |  |
| Total Academic Engagement (Y) | | | .045 | .299 | .312 | .000157\*\* |
| Skills (Y) | | | **-.028** | .120 | .155 | .000009\*\*\* |
| Emotional (Y) | | | .030 | .064 | .038 | .210 |
| Participation/interaction (Y) | | | .049 | .007\* | .073 | .032 |
| Performance (Y) | | | **-.006** | .505 | .046 | .007\* |
| *Note.* \*p<.01; \*\*p<.001; \*\*\*p<.0001; ! should I report p<.05? – no do Bonferroni adjustment and only use .01 and below | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 5  *Moderational analyses for effect of exercise as moderator in relationship between stress and AE/factors.* | | | | | |  | | |  |
|  | β1 | | p-value | β2 | p-value | β3 | | p-value | |
| Model Y = β0 + β1 Stress + β2 Exercise + β3 Stress\*Exercise + ε | |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| Total Academic Engagement (Y) | | .226 | .070 | .285 | .020 | -.006 | | .042 | |
| Skills (Y) | | -.034 | .520 | .042 | .426 | -.0005 | | .666 | |
| Emotional (Y) | | .094 | .037 | .105 | .018 | -.002 | | .077 | |
| Participation/interaction (Y) | | .171 | .0008\*\* | .141 | .005\* | -.003 | | .005\* | |
| Performance (Y) | | -.019 | .477 | -.020 | .448 | .0002 | | .733 | |
| *Note.* \*p<.01; \*\*p<.001; \*\*\*p<.0001; ! should I report p<.05? – no do Bonferroni adjustment and only use .01 and below | | | | | | |

Using Bonferroni method to account for multiple tests, and subsequent alpha inflation, set p=.01 or lower would be equivalent to p=.05 with the five iterations of dependent variable (Y).

When stress and exercise both go up participation goes down, but also when stress is low and exercise is low participation is also low. When stress is high (with exer low) it is showing high participation and when exercise is high with stress low it is showing high participation so you would expect an additive effect of the two to make part participation high too but the interaction is showing the opposite effect, when both are high participation is low.

Table 6

*Random Forest Variable Importance*

|  |  | **Academic Eng** | | **Skills** | | **Emotional** | | **Participation** | | **Performance** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Importance Meas.** | **Mean** | **Stdev** | **Mean** | **Stdev** | **Mean** | **Stdev** | **Mean** | **Stdev** | **Mean** | **Stdev** |
| Age | % Increase MSE | 0.50 | 0.32 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.18 | 0.05 | 0.28 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.02 |
| Increase in RSS | 440.05 | 11.39 | 93.02 | 2.37 | 60.65 | 1.71 | 77.96 | 1.94 | 18.81 | 0.52 |
| Class | % Increase MSE | 2.71 | 0.41 | 0.50 | 0.07 | 0.35 | 0.05 | 0.46 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.02 |
| Increase in RSS | 760.20 | 14.79 | **142.97** | 2.82 | 93.96 | 2.02 | 117.82 | 2.57 | 30.56 | 0.71 |
| Ethnicity | % Increase MSE | 2.74 | 0.35 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.95 | 0.08 | 0.17 | 0.02 |
| Increase in RSS | **848.42** | 17.09 | 107.30 | 2.23 | **109.85** | 2.34 | **175.45** | 3.07 | **35.23** | 0.83 |
| Gender | % Increase MSE | 0.42 | 0.23 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.01 |
| Increase in RSS | 242.83 | 8.28 | 49.48 | 1.62 | 33.97 | 1.30 | 43.93 | 1.68 | 10.63 | 0.39 |
| Exercise | % Increase MSE | 1.90 | 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.07 | 0.60 | 0.07 | 0.88 | 0.08 | 0.19 | 0.02 |
| Increase in RSS | **1523.62** | 23.61 | **259.60** | 4.47 | **212.60** | 3.31 | **282.73** | 4.57 | **71.99** | 1.25 |
| Sleep | % Increase MSE | 7.54 | 0.52 | 1.80 | 0.09 | 0.53 | 0.06 | 0.75 | 0.07 | 0.28 | 0.02 |
| Increase in RSS | **1927.24** | 27.16 | **407.73** | 5.93 | **236.59** | 3.60 | **268.94** | 4.21 | **73.51** | 1.18 |
| Stress | % Increase MSE | 2.29 | 0.43 | 1.43 | 0.09 | 0.48 | 0.07 | 0.71 | 0.07 | 0.23 | 0.02 |
| Increase in RSS | **1810.64** | 27.19 | **415.79** | 6.53 | **237.85** | 3.50 | **333.96** | 4.66 | **76.26** | 1.28 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 7  *Random Forest Variable Importance.* | |
| Variable | MSE |
| Total Academic Engagement |  |
| Gender |  |
| Age |  |
| Ethnicity |  |
| Class Standing |  |
| Stress |  |
| Sleep Hygiene |  |
| Exercise |  |
| Skills |  |
| Gender |  |
| Age |  |
| Ethnicity |  |
| Class Standing |  |
| Stress |  |
| Sleep Hygiene |  |
| Exercise |  |
| Skills |  |
| Exercise |  |
| *Note.* |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 8  *Results of hierarchical regression analyses predicting Academic Engagement and its factors.* | |  |
| Variable | β | x |
| Gender |  |  |
| Age |  |  |
| Ethnicity |  |  |
| Class Standing |  |  |
| Stress |  |  |
| Sleep Hygiene |  |  |
| Exercise |  |  |
| *Note.* |  |  |

Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Academic Engagement measure SCEQ:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TABLE 9. |  |  |  | | |  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | | |
| Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Factor Structure of Student Course Engagement Questionnaire | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Factor 1  (Skills) | | | Factor 2  (Emotional) | | | | Factor 3  (Part/int) | | | | | Factor 4  (Performance) | | | | |
| Items | *Orig* | *New* | | *Ori* | | *New* | | *Orig* | *New* | | | | *Orig* | | *New* | | |
| Making sure to study on a regular basis | .64 | .63 | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Putting forth effort | .59 | .54 | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Doing all homework problems | .57 | .61 | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Staying up on the readings | .55 | .55 | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Looking over class notes between classes to  make sure I understand the material | .53 | .51 | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Being organized | .53 | .58 | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Taking good notes in class | .53 | .66 | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Listening carefully in class | .51 | .55 | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Coming to class every day | .47 | .53 | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Finding ways to make the course material  relevant to my life |  |  | | .86 | | .87 | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Applying course material to my life |  |  | | .86 | | .81 | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Finding ways to make the course interesting  to me |  |  | | .54 | | .73 | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Thinking about the course between class  meetings |  |  | | .46 | | .65 | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Really desiring to learn the material |  |  | | .43 | | .52 | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| Raising my hand in class |  |  | |  | |  | | .82 | .97 | | | |  | |  | | |
| Asking questions when I don’t understand  the instructor |  |  | |  | |  | | .64 | 1.02 | | | |  | |  | | |
| Having fun in class |  |  | |  | |  | | .57 | .50 | | | |  | |  | | |
| Participating actively in small-group  discussions |  |  | |  | |  | | .55 | .77 | | | |  | |  | | |
| Going to the professor’s office hours to  review assignments or tests or to ask questions |  |  | |  | |  | | .50 | .60 | | | |  | |  | | |
| Helping fellow students |  |  | |  | |  | | .45 | .41 | | | |  | |  | | |
| Getting good grades |  |  | |  | |  | |  |  | | | | .77 | | .62 | | |
| Doing well on the tests |  |  | |  | |  | |  |  | | | | .68 | | .69 | | |
| Being confident that I can learn and do well  in the class |  |  | |  | |  | |  |  | | | | .64 | | .66 | | |
|  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |  | | | |  | |  | | |
| *Note. Orig = original study, New = new data set*  All factor loadings are significant, *p*< .01. (check this) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | |  |  |  |

*Predictive Model using Random Forest Analyses and Nested Model Comparisons*

In order to determine the variables that would explain the most variance in AE and the factors of AE, a Random Forest approach was utilized. Results of the Random Forest analysis can be found in Table 6, including variable importance measures for all potential predictor variables. Variable importance was measured by the average increase in mean squared error (MSE) across all regression trees when each variable was omitted. Generally(when looking at the RSS measure), the demographic variables showed the least importance, with ethnicity and class variably showing the most among demographic variables. Consequently, the variables used in a final multiple regression model to predict AE were determined through a nested model, forward selection process. Least squared was utilized to whether added variables improved the predictive ability of the model. If the addition of a variable resulted in no significance to the p-value in the comparison that variable and all subsequent variables were left out of the final model. For total AE the best fit model included only sleep hygiene (β=0.286, p-value=0.0002) since the addition of the variable deemed of secondary importance in the Random Forest analysis (stress: β=0.045, p-value=0.299 , should I include this? Probably no) was not significant in adding to the explained variance when comparing the nested model likelihood ratios through an ANOVA (p-value=0.299).

Notably, the model for skills included both stress (β=-0.053, p-value=0.003) and sleep hygiene (ANOVA p-value = 0.000009) before showing no added explanation of variance with the addition of exercise (ANOVA p-value = 0.113). In the final model the estimate for stress changed from β=-0.053 to β=-0.028 and lost significance, while the estimate for sleep was significant at β=0.155, p-value = 0.000009. This effect is likely a result of the relationship between the independent variables of stress and sleep hygiene as outlined in the mediation analysis described above.

For the emotional and participation/interaction factors of AE there was only on variable fit to the final model, with stress (β=-0.024, p-value=0.122) for emotional engagement and also stress (β=-0.037, p-value=0.033) for participation/interaction engagement. Adding sleep hygiene in the emotional model and exercise in the part/int model did not significantly improve fit (explanation of variance).

The performance factor of AE was similar in model specification as found in that of skills engagement. The inclusion of both stress (β=-0.013, p-value=0.123) in the initial model and sleep (β=0.045, p-value=0.007) in the combined model improved the explanation of variance ( ANOVA p-value = 0.007), but the model was not improved by the addition of exercise (ANOVA p-value = 0.156). Notably, the stress variable was not significant in either the stand-alone model (β=-0.013, p-value=0.123) or the final, combined model (β=-0.006, p-value=0.505), while the estimate for sleep was significant.

In order to determine the variables that would explain the most variance in AE, a Random Forest approach was utilized. Results of the Random Forest analysis can be found in Table 6, including variable importance measures for all potential predictor variables. Generally, the demographic variables showed minimal explanation of variance, with age showing the largest, yet still an insignificant beta weight. Consequently, the variables used in a final multiple regression model to predict AE are stress, sleep hygiene, and exercise. The variables included in the final model were stress, sleep hygiene, and exercise, and …..

Likelihood ratio testing of nested models, forward selection,