

# STA 312f2012 Quiz 9

1. (5 points) Mid-level executives at large corporations are classified by sex, and as either married or not, resulting in a  $2 \times 2$  table of Sex by Marital Status.

- (a) Write a linear regression model for  $\log \mu_{ij}$ , including the interaction of Sex ~~of Dog~~ by Sex ~~of Owner~~. *by marital status*

$$\log \mu_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 s + \beta_2 m + \beta_3 sm$$

- (b) Make a table with 4 rows showing how your dummy variables are defined. There will be a column for each dummy variable. Use effect coding (the scheme with the -1s). Make as many extra columns as necessary to show the product term(s) corresponding to the interaction(s). Add a last column showing  $\log \mu_{ij}$  in terms of the  $\beta$  parameters.

Sex	Mar	$s$	$m$	$sm$	$\log \mu_{ij}$
M	Mar	1	1	1	$\beta_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3$
M	Sin	1	-1	-1	$\beta_0 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3$
F	Mar	-1	1	-1	$\beta_0 - \beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3$
F	Sin	-1	-1	1	$\beta_0 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3$

- (c) Make a  $2 \times 2$  table showing  $\mu_{ij}$  (not  $\log \mu_{ij}$ ) in each cell.

	Married	Single
M	$E\{ \exp \{ \beta_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 \} \}$	$E\{ \exp \{ \beta_0 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 \} \}$
F	$E\{ \exp \{ \beta_0 - \beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 \} \}$	$E\{ \exp \{ \beta_0 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 \} \}$

- (d) Using your table, show that the odds ratio  $\theta$  equals <sup>one</sup>~~zero~~ if and only if all interaction terms equal zero.

$$\theta = \frac{\text{Exp} \{ 2\beta_0 + 2\beta_3 \}}{\text{Exp} \{ 2\beta_0 - 2\beta_3 \}} = e^{4\beta_3}$$

So  $\theta = 1$  iff  $\beta_3 = 0$

2. (5 points) In your analysis of the Heart Attack Data, you fit a model with just age, cholesterol level, and family history of heart disease. Consider the test of Cholesterol level controlling for Age and Family history of heart disease.

- (a) Give the value of  $G^2$ ; the answer is a number from your printout.

$$G^2 = 4.67$$

- (b) Give the Degrees of freedom. The answer is a number on your printout.

$$df = 2$$

- (c) Give the  $p$ -value; the answer is a number from your printout.

$$p = 0.0966$$

- (d) In plain, non-statistical language, what do you conclude from this test?

Allowing for age and family history of heart disease, there is no clear evidence of a link between cholesterol level and heart attack outcome

Attach your printout for Question 2 (Homework Question 1c). Make sure your name is written on the printout.

## Quiz 9 Printout

```
> attack =
read.table("http://www.utstat.toronto.edu/~brunner/312f12/code_n_data/attack.data")
> head(attack)
  age diastol cholest ncigs height weight famhist school outcome
1  40       70     321    0  68.8   190     Yes PostSec  Alive10
2  49       87     246   60  72.2   204      No      HS  Alive10
3  43       89     262    0  69.0   162      No      HS DiedFirst
4  50      105     275   15  62.5   152     Yes GradeSch  Alive10
5  50       88     261   30  68.0   142      No GradeSch  Dead10
6  47       79     372   30  67.0   193      No      HS  Alive10
> attach(attack)
>
> # Make an mlogit data frame
> longjohn = mlogit.data(attack, shape="wide", choice="outcome")
>
> model1 = mlogit(outcome ~ 0 | age+cholest+famhist, data=longjohn)
>
> summary(model1)
```

Call:

```
mlogit(formula = outcome ~ 0 | age + cholest + famhist, data = longjohn,
       method = "nr", print.level = 0)
```

Frequencies of alternatives:

Alive10	Dead10	DiedFirst
0.53846	0.12500	0.33654

nr method

5 iterations, 0h:0m:0s

$g'(-H)^{-1}g = 5.32E-05$

successive fonction values within tolerance limits

Coefficients :

	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr(> t )
Dead10:(intercept)	-9.2358517	4.5775569	-2.0176	0.04363 *
DiedFirst:(intercept)	-3.1529671	3.0567050	-1.0315	0.30231
Dead10:age	0.1634238	0.0895093	1.8258	0.06788 .
DiedFirst:age	0.1077304	0.0595888	1.8079	0.07062 .
Dead10:cholest	-0.0004808	0.0051048	-0.0942	0.92496
DiedFirst:cholest	-0.0085263	0.0042825	-1.9910	0.04649 *
Dead10:famhistYes	-0.2413608	0.6552984	-0.3683	0.71263

DiedFirst:famhistYes -0.9337608 0.5108499 -1.8279 0.06757 .

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Log-Likelihood: -93.041

McFadden R<sup>2</sup>: 0.067872

Likelihood ratio test : chisq = 13.549 (p.value = 0.035095)

> # Now test each explanatory variable controlling for the other 2. Full model is always model1

> # Age controlling for cholest and famhist

> red1a = mlogit(outcome ~ 0 | cholest+famhist, data=longjohn)

> G2 = -2 \* as.numeric(red1a\$logLik - model1\$logLik); G2

[1] 5.865214

> df = length(model1\$coefficients)-length(red1a\$coefficients); df

[1] 2

> pval = 1-pchisq(G2,df); pval

[1] 0.053258

> # Cholest controlling for age and famhist

> red1b = mlogit(outcome ~ 0 | age+famhist, data=longjohn)

> G2 = -2 \* as.numeric(red1b\$logLik - model1\$logLik); G2

[1] 4.673621

> df = length(model1\$coefficients)-length(red1b\$coefficients); df

[1] 2

> pval = 1-pchisq(G2,df); pval

[1] 0.09663536

>

> # Famhist controlling for age and famhist

> red1c = mlogit(outcome ~ 0 | age+cholest, data=longjohn)

> G2 = -2 \* as.numeric(red1c\$logLik - model1\$logLik); G2

[1] 3.58312

> df = length(model1\$coefficients)-length(red1c\$coefficients); df

[1] 2

> pval = 1-pchisq(G2,df); pval

[1] 0.1666999

>

>