

# Poisson Regression: The Training Data

Office workers at a large insurance company are randomly assigned to one of 3 computer use training programmes, and their number of calls to IT support during the following month is recorded. Additional information on each worker includes years of experience and score on a computer literacy test (out of 100). It is reasonable to model calls to IT support as a Poisson process, and the question is whether training programme affects the rate of the process.

Could test  $H_0: \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3$  with a likelihood ratio test, but ...

```
> train = read.table("https://www.utstat.toronto.edu/~brunner/data/legal/training.data.txt")
> head(train)
  Program Experience Score Support
1      A      3.92    60      6
2      A      5.83    64      3
3      A      0.92    51      8
4      A      8.50    58      2
5      A      7.83    59      1
6      A      1.17    49      3
> attach(train)
> table(Support)
Support
 0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9 10 11 12
6 27 42 61 70 39 23 17  9  2  2  1  1
> aggregate(Support, by=list(Program), FUN=mean)
  Group.1  x
1      A 4.07
2      B 3.47
3      C 4.05
> aggregate(Support, by=list(Program), FUN=length)
  Group.1  x
1      A 100
2      B 100
3      C 100
>
```

```
> model1 = glm(Support ~ Program, family=poisson)
> summary(model1)
```

```
Call:
glm(formula = Support ~ Program, family = poisson)
```

```
Deviance Residuals:
    Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-2.8531  -0.6319  -0.0348   0.4552   3.1765
```

```
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept)  1.403643   0.049567  28.318  <2e-16 ***
ProgramB     -0.159488   0.073066  -2.183   0.0291 *
ProgramC     -0.004926   0.070185  -0.070   0.9440
```

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

```
(Dispersion parameter for poisson family taken to be 1)
```

```
Null deviance: 330.39 on 299 degrees of freedom
Residual deviance: 324.26 on 297 degrees of freedom
AIC: 1250.2
```

```
Number of Fisher Scoring iterations: 4
```

```
> anova(model1, test="Chisq") # Overall likelihood ratio test
Analysis of Deviance Table
```

```
Model: poisson, link: log
```

```
Response: Support
```

```
Terms added sequentially (first to last)
```

```
          Df Deviance Resid. Df Resid. Dev Pr(>Chi)
NULL                299      330.39
Program  2          6.122      297      324.26 0.04684 *
```

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

```
> # Include covariates
> model2 = glm(Support ~ Score+Experience+Program, family=poisson)
> summary(model2)
```

Call:

```
glm(formula = Support ~ Score + Experience + Program, family = poisson)
```

Deviance Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.9625	-0.6957	-0.1018	0.5362	2.9386

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(> z )	
(Intercept)	1.992744	0.159223	12.515	< 2e-16	***
Score	-0.009205	0.003019	-3.049	0.00230	**
Experience	-0.028014	0.010317	-2.715	0.00662	**
ProgramB	-0.170519	0.073163	-2.331	0.01977	*
ProgramC	-0.007833	0.070218	-0.112	0.91118	

---

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

(Dispersion parameter for poisson family taken to be 1)

Null deviance: 330.39 on 299 degrees of freedom

Residual deviance: 305.90 on 295 degrees of freedom

AIC: 1235.8

Number of Fisher Scoring iterations: 4

```
> anova(model2, test="Chisq") # Sequential
```

Analysis of Deviance Table

Model: poisson, link: log

Response: Support

Terms added sequentially (first to last)

	Df	Deviance	Resid. Df	Resid. Dev	Pr(>Chi)	
NULL			299	330.39		
Score	1	9.9766	298	320.41	0.001585	**
Experience	1	7.6333	297	312.78	0.005730	**
Program	2	6.8767	295	305.90	0.032118	*

---

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