

Examples from Multilevel Software Comparative Reviews

Douglas Bates
R Development Core Team
`Douglas.Bates@R-project.org`

January 21, 2006

Abstract

The Center for Multilevel Modelling at the Institute of Education, London maintains a web site of “Software reviews of multilevel modeling packages”. The data sets discussed in the reviews are available at this web site. We have incorporated these data sets in the `mlmRev` package for R and, in this vignette, provide the results of fitting several models to these data sets.

1 Introduction

R is an Open Source implementation of John Chambers’ S language language for data analysis and graphics. R was initially developed by Ross Ihaka and Robert Gentleman of the University of Auckland and now is developed and maintained by an international group of statistical computing experts.

In addition to being Open Source software, which means that anyone can examine the source code to see exactly how the computations are being carried out, R is freely available from a network of archive sites on the Internet. There are precompiled versions for installation on the Windows operating system, Mac OS X and several distributions of the Linux operating system. Because the source code is available those interested in doing so can compile their own version if they wish.

R provides an environment for interactive computing with data and for graphical display of data. Users and developers can extend the capabilities of

R by writing their own functions in the language and by creating packages of functions and data sets. Many such packages are available on the archive network called CRAN (Comprehensive R Archive Network) for which the parent site is <http://cran.r-project.org>. One such package called `lme4` (along with a companion package called `Matrix`) provides functions to fit and display linear mixed models and generalized linear mixed models, which are the statisticians' names for the models called multilevel models or hierarchical linear models in other disciplines. The `lattice` package provides functions to generate several high level graphics plots that help with the visualization of the types of data to which such models are fit. Finally, the `mlmRev` package provides the data sets used in the "Software Reviews of Multilevel Modeling Packages" from the Multilevel Modeling Group at the Institute of Education in the UK. This package also contains several other data sets from the multilevel modeling literature.

The software reviews mentioned above were intended to provide comparison of the speed and accuracy of many different packages for fitting multilevel models. As such, there is a standard set of models that fit to each of the data sets in each of the packages that were capable of doing the fit. We will fit these models for comparative purposes but we will also do some graphical exploration of the data and, in some cases, discuss alternative models.

We follow the general outline of the previous reviews, beginning with simpler structures and moving to the more complex structures. Because the previous reviews were performed on older and considerably slower computers than the ones on which this vignette will be compiled, the timings produced by the `system.time` function and shown in the text should not be compared with previous timings given on the web site. They are an indication of the times required to fit such models to these data sets on recent computers with processors running at around 2 GHz or faster.

2 Two-level normal models

In the multilevel modeling literature a two-level model is one with two levels of random variation; the per-observation noise term and random effects which are grouped according to the levels of a factor. We call this factor a *grouping factor*. If the response is measured on a continuous scale (more or less) our initial models are based on a normal distribution for the per-observation noise and for the random effects. Thus such a model is called a "two-level normal

model” even though it has only one grouping factor for the random effects.

2.1 The Exam data

The data set called `Exam` provides the normalized exam scores attained by 4,059 students from 65 schools in inner London. Some of the covariates available with this exam score are the school the student attended, the sex of the student, the school gender (boys, girls, or mixed) and the student’s result on the Standardised London Reading test.

The R functions `str` and `summary` can be used to examine the structure of a data set (or, in general, any R object) and to provide a summary of an object.

```
> str(Exam)
`data.frame':      4059 obs. of  10 variables:
 $ school  : Factor w/ 65 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ normexam: num   0.261  0.134 -1.724  0.968  0.544 ...
 $ schgend : Factor w/ 3 levels "mixed","boys",...: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ schavg  : num   0.166  0.166  0.166  0.166  0.166 ...
 $ vr      : Factor w/ 3 levels "bottom 25%","mid 50%",...: 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 ...
 $ intake  : Factor w/ 3 levels "bottom 25%","mid 50%",...: 1 2 3 2 2 1 3 2 2 3 ...
 $ standLRT: num   0.619  0.206 -1.365  0.206  0.371 ...
 $ sex     : Factor w/ 2 levels "F","M": 1 1 2 1 1 2 2 2 1 2 ...
 $ type    : Factor w/ 2 levels "Mxd","Sngl": 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ student : Factor w/ 650 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 143 145 142 141 138 155 158 115 117 113 ...

> summary(Exam)

      school      normexam      schgend      schavg
14      : 198   Min.      :-3.6660720   mixed:2169   Min.      :-0.755961
17      : 126   1st Qu.: -0.6995050   boys : 513   1st Qu.: -0.149341
18      : 120   Median :  0.0043222   girls:1377   Median : -0.020198
49      : 113   Mean    :-0.0001138                Mean    :  0.001810
8       : 102   3rd Qu.:  0.6787592                3rd Qu.:  0.210525
15      : 91    Max.     :  3.6660912                Max.     :  0.637656
(Other):3309

      vr      intake      standLRT      sex      type
bottom 25%: 640   bottom 25%:1176   Min.      :-2.934953   F:2436   Mxd :2169
mid 50%   :2263   mid 50%   :2344   1st Qu.: -0.620713   M:1623   Sngl:1890
top 25%   :1156   top 25%   : 539   Median :  0.040499
                                Mean    :  0.001810
                                3rd Qu.:  0.619059
                                Max.     :  3.015952

      student
20      : 34
54      : 34
15      : 33
22      : 33
31      : 33
59      : 33
(Other):3859
```

2.2 Model fits and timings

The first model to fit to the Exam data incorporates fixed-effects terms for the pretest score, the student's sex and the school gender. The only random-effects term is an additive shift associated with the school.

```
> (Em1 <- lmer(normexam ~ standLRT + sex + schgend + (1 | school),  
+ Exam))
```

Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML

Formula: normexam ~ standLRT + sex + schgend + (1 | school)

Data: Exam

	AIC	BIC	logLik	MLdeviance	REMLdeviance
	9359.673	9397.526	-4673.837	9325.501	9347.673

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.
school	(Intercept)	0.085829	0.29297
Residual		0.562534	0.75002

of obs: 4059, groups: school, 65

Fixed effects:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value
(Intercept)	-0.0010493	0.0555690	-0.019
standLRT	0.5597545	0.0124500	44.960
sexM	-0.1673915	0.0340996	-4.909
schgendboys	0.1776907	0.1134749	1.566
schgendgirls	0.1589969	0.0894031	1.778

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

	(Intr)	stnLRT	sexM	schgndb
standLRT	-0.014			
sexM	-0.316	0.061		
schgendboys	-0.395	-0.003	-0.145	
schgendgrls	-0.622	0.009	0.197	0.245

The `system.time` function can be used to time the execution of an R expression. It returns a vector of five numbers giving the user time (time spend executing applications code), the system time (time spent executing system functions called by the applications code), the elapsed time, and the user and system time for any child processes. The first number is what is commonly viewed as the time required to do the model fit. (The elapsed time is unsuitable because it can be affected by other processes running on the computer.) These times are in seconds. On modern computers this fit takes only a fraction of a second.

```
> system.time(lmer(normexam ~ standLRT + sex + schgend + (1 | school),  
+ Exam))
```

```
[1] 0.25 0.07 0.31 0.00 0.00
```

2.3 Interpreting the fit

As can be seen from the output, the default method of fitting a linear mixed model is restricted maximum likelihood (REML). The estimates of the variance components correspond to those reported by other packages as given on the Multilevel Modelling Group's web site. Note that the estimates of the variance components are given on the scale of the variance and on the scale of the standard deviation. That is, the values in the column headed **Std.Dev.** are simply the square roots of the corresponding entry in the **Variance** column. They are **not** standard errors of the estimate of the variance.

The estimates of the fixed-effects are different from those quoted on the web site because the terms for **sex** and **schgend** use a different parameterization than in the reviews. Here the reference level of **sex** is female (F) and the coefficient labelled **sexM** represents the difference for males compared to females. Similarly the reference level of **schgend** is **mixed** and the two coefficients represent the change from mixed to boys only and the change from mixed to girls only. The value of the coefficient labelled **Intercept** is affected by both these changes as is the value of the REML criterion.

To reproduce the results obtained from other packages, we must change the reference level for each of these factors.

```
> Exam$sex <- relevel(Exam$sex, "M")
> Exam$schgend <- relevel(Exam$schgend, "girls")
> (Em2 <- lmer(normexam ~ standLRT + sex + schgend + (1 | school),
+ Exam))
```

Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML

Formula: normexam ~ standLRT + sex + schgend + (1 | school)

Data: Exam

	AIC	BIC	logLik	MLdeviance	REMLdeviance
	9359.673	9397.526	-4673.837	9325.501	9347.673

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.
school	(Intercept)	0.085829	0.29297
Residual		0.562534	0.75002

of obs: 4059, groups: school, 65

Fixed effects:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value
(Intercept)	-0.009444	0.077896	-0.121
standLRT	0.559755	0.012450	44.960
sexF	0.167391	0.034100	4.909
schgendmixed	-0.158997	0.089403	-1.778
schgendboys	0.018694	0.126058	0.148

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

	(Intr)	stnLRT	sexF	schgndm
standLRT	0.027			
sexF	-0.438	-0.061		

```
schgendmixd -0.790 -0.009 0.197
schgendboys -0.618 -0.009 0.270 0.488
```

The coefficients now correspond to those in the tables on the web site. It happens that the REML criterion at the optimum in this fit is the same as in the previous fit, but you cannot depend on this occurring. In general the value of the REML criterion at the optimum depends on the parameterization used for the fixed effects.

2.4 Further exploration

2.4.1 Checking consistency of the data

It is important to check the consistency of data before trying to fit sophisticated models. One should plot the data in many different ways to see if it looks reasonable and also check relationships between variables.

For example, each observation in these data is associated with a particular student. The variable `student` is not a unique identifier of the student as it only has 650 unique values. It is intended to be a unique identifier within a school but it is not. To show this we create a factor that is the interaction of school and student then drop unused levels.

```
> Exam$ids <- with(Exam, school:student)[, drop = TRUE]
> str(Exam)

`data.frame`:      4059 obs. of  11 variables:
 $ school  : Factor w/ 65 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ normexam: num  0.261 0.134 -1.724 0.968 0.544 ...
 $ schgend : Factor w/ 3 levels "girls","mixed",...: 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 ...
 $ schavg  : num  0.166 0.166 0.166 0.166 0.166 ...
 $ vr      : Factor w/ 3 levels "bottom 25%","mid 50%",...: 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 ...
 $ intake  : Factor w/ 3 levels "bottom 25%","mid 50%",...: 1 2 3 2 2 1 3 2 2 3 ...
 $ standLRT: num  0.619 0.206 -1.365 0.206 0.371 ...
 $ sex     : Factor w/ 2 levels "M","F": 2 2 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 1 ...
 $ type    : Factor w/ 2 levels "Mxd","Sngl": 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ student : Factor w/ 650 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 143 145 142 141 138 155 158 115 117 113 ...
 $ ids     : Factor w/ 4055 levels "1:1","1:4","1:6",...: 48 49 47 46 45 50 51 39 40 38 ...
```

Notice that there are 4059 observations but only 4055 unique levels of student within school. We can check the ones that are duplicated

```
> as.character(Exam$ids[which(duplicated(Exam$ids))])
[1] "43:86" "50:39" "52:2"  "52:21"
```

One of these cases

```
> subset(Exam, ids == "43:86")
```

```

      school  normexam schgend   schavg      vr  intake  standLRT sex type
2758      43 -0.8526700  mixed 0.4334322 top 25% mid 50% 0.1231502  M  Mxd
2759      43 0.8219882  mixed 0.4334322 top 25% top 25% -0.0421520  F  Mxd
      student  ids
2758      86 43:86
2759      86 43:86
> xtabs(~sex + school, Exam, subset = school %in% c(43, 50, 52),
+       drop = TRUE)
      school
sex 43 50 52
  M  1 35 61
  F 60 38  0

```

is particularly interesting. Notice that one of the students numbered 86 in school 43 is the only male student out of 61 students from this school who took the exam. It is quite likely that this student's score was attributed to the wrong school and that the school is in fact a girls-only school, not a mixed-sex school.

The causes of the other three cases of duplicate student numbers within a school are not as clear. It would be necessary to go back to the original data records to check these.

The cross-tabulation of the students by sex and school for the mixed-sex schools

```

> xtabs(~sex + school, Exam, subset = type == "Mxd", drop = TRUE)
      school
sex  1   3   4   5   9  10  12  13  14  15  17  19  20  22  23  26  28  32  33
  M 45 29 45 16 21 31 23 26 92 47 31 33 21 48 10 44 31 27 44
  F 28 23 34 19 13 19 24 38 106 44 95 22 18 42 18 31 26 15 33
      school
sex 34 38 42 43 45 46 47 50 51 54 55 56 59 61 62 63
  M 18 31 35  1  5 47 81 35 26  4 26 16 30 35 43 13
  F  8 23 23 60 48 36  1 38 32  4 25 22 17 29 28 17

```

shows another anomaly. School 47 is similar to school 43 in that, although it is classified as a mixed-sex school, 81 male students and only one female student took the exam. It is likely that the school was misrecorded for this one female student and the school is a male-only school.

Another school is worth noting. There were only eight students from school 54 who took the exam so any within-school estimates from this school will be unreliable.

A mosaic plot (Figure 1) produced with

```

> ExamMxd <- subset(Exam, type == "Mxd")
> ExamMxd$school <- ExamMxd$school[, drop = TRUE]
> mosaicplot(~school + sex, ExamMxd)

```

helps to detect mixed-sex schools with unusually large or unusually small ratios of females to males taking the exam.




Figure 1: A mosaic plot of the sex distribution by school. The areas of the rectangles are proportional to the number of students of that sex from that school who took the exam. Schools with an unusually large or unusually small ratio of females to males are highlighted.

2.4.2 Preliminary graphical displays

In addition to the pretest score (`standLRT`), the predictor variables used in this model are the student's sex and the school gender, which is coded as having three levels. There is some redundancy in these two variables in that all the students in a boys-only school must be male. For graphical exploration we convert from `schgend` to `type`, an indicator of whether the school is a mixed-sex school or a single-sex school, and plot the response versus the pretest score for each combination of sex and school type.

This plot is created with the `xyplot` from the `lattice` package as (essentially)

```
> xyplot(normexam ~ standLRT | sex * type, Exam, type = c("g",  
+ "p", "smooth"))
```

The formula would be read as “plot `normexam` by `standLRT` given `sex` by (school) `type`”. A few other arguments were added in the actual call to make the axis annotations more readable.

Figure 2 shows the even after accounting for a student's sex, pretest score and school type, there is considerable variation in the response. We may attribute some of this variation to differences in schools but the fitted model indicates that most of the variation is unaccounted or “residual” variation.

In some ways the high level of residual variation obscures the pattern in the data. By removing the data points and overlaying the scatterplot smoothers we can concentrate on the relationships between the covariates. The call to `xyplot` is essentially

```
> xyplot(normexam ~ standLRT, Exam, groups = sex:type, type = c("g",  
+ "smooth"))
```

Figure 3 is a remarkable plot in that it shows nearly a perfect “main effects” relationship of the response with the three covariates and almost no interaction. It is rare to see real data follow a simple theoretical relationship so closely.

To elaborate, we can see that for each of the four groups the smoothed relationship between the exam score and the pretest score is close to a straight line and that the lines are close to being parallel. The only substantial deviation is in the smoothed relationship for the males in single-sex schools and this is the group with the fewest observations and hence the least precision in the estimated relationship. The lack of parallelism for this group is most apparent in the region of extremely low pretest scores where there are few observations and a single student who had a low pretest score and a moderate




Figure 2: Normalized exam score versus pretest (Standardized London Reading Test) score for 4095 students from 65 schools in inner London. The panels on the left show the male students' scores; those on the right show the females' scores. The top row of panels shows the scores of students in single-sex schools and the bottom row shows the scores of students in mixed-sex schools. A scatterplot smoother line for each panel has been added to help visualize the trend.




Figure 3: Overlaid scatterplot smoother lines of the normalized test scores versus the pretest (Standardized London Reading Test) score for female (F) and male (M) students in single-sex (Sngl) and mixed-sex (Mxd) schools.

post-test score can substantially influence the curve. Five or six such points can be seen in the upper left panel of Figure 2.

We should also notice the ordering of the lines and the spacing between the lines. The smoothed relationships for students in single-sex schools are consistently above those in the mixed-sex schools and, except for the region of low pretest scores described above, the relationship for the females in a given type of school is consistently above that for the males. Furthermore the distance between the female and male lines in the single-sex schools is approximately the same as the corresponding distance in the mixed-sex schools. We would summarize this by saying that there is a positive effect for females versus males and a positive effect for single-sex versus mixed-sex and no indication of interaction between these factors.

2.4.3 The effect of schools

We can check for patterns within and between schools by plotting the response versus the pretest by school. Because there appear to be differences in this relationship for single-sex versus mixed-sex schools and for females versus males we consider these separately.




Figure 4: Normalized exam scores versus pretest (Standardized London Reading Test) score by school for female students in single-sex schools.

In Figure 4 we plot the normalized exam scores versus the pretest score by school for female students in single-sex schools. The plot is produced as

```
> xyplot(normexam ~ standLRT | school, Exam, type = c("g", "p",
+ "r"), subset = sex == "F" & type == "Sngl")
```

The "r" in the `type` argument adds a simple linear regression line to each panel.

The first thing we notice in Figure 4 is that school 48 is an anomaly because only two students in this school took the exam. Because within-school results based on only two students are unreliable, we will exclude this school from further plots (but we do include these data when fitting comprehensive models).

Although the regression lines on the panels can help us to look for variation in the schools, the ordering of the panels is, for our purposes, random. We recreate this plot in Figure 5 using

```
> xyplot(normexam ~ standLRT | school, Exam, type = c("g", "p",
+ "r"), subset = sex == "F" & type == "Sngl" & school != 48,
+ index.cond = function(x, y) coef(lm(y ~ x))[1])
```

so that the panels are ordered (from left to right starting at the bottom row) by increasing intercept for the regression line (i.e. by increasing predicted exam score for a student with a pretest score of 0).

Alternatively, we could order the panels by increasing slope of the within-school regression lines, as in Figure 6.

Although it is informative to plot the within-school regression lines we need to assess the variability in the estimates of the coefficients before concluding if there is “significant” variability between schools. We can obtain the individual regression fits with the `lmList` function

```
> show(ExamFS <- lmList(normexam ~ standLRT | school, Exam, subset = sex ==
+ "F" & type == "Sngl" & school != 48))
```

```
Call: lmList(formula = normexam ~ standLRT | school, data = Exam, subset = sex ==
Coefficients:
```

```
(Intercept) standLRT
2 0.48227991 0.7612884
6 0.60321439 0.5353444
7 0.39852689 0.2422785
8 -0.02519463 0.5674053
16 -0.38564292 0.4069399
18 -0.05733995 0.3593830
21 0.26872018 0.5544939
25 -0.26779146 0.5320575
29 0.20442314 0.4005158
30 0.11885028 0.8059021
31 -0.03922548 0.4022838
35 0.13173022 0.3966535
```

```
"F" & type == "Sngl")
```




Figure 5: Normalized exam scores versus pretest (Standardized London Reading Test) score by school for female students in single-sex schools. School 48 where only two students took the exam has been eliminated and the panels have been ordered by increasing intercept (predicted normalized score for a pretest score of 0) of the regression line.





Figure 6: Normalized exam scores versus pretest (Standardized London Reading Test) score by school for female students in single-sex schools. School 48 has been eliminated and the panels have been ordered by increasing slope of the within-school regression lines.






Figure 8: Normalized exam scores versus pretest (Standardized London Reading Test) score by school for male students in single-sex schools.

The corresponding plot of the confidence intervals is shown in Figure 9.

For the mixed-sex schools we can consider the effect of the pretest score and sex in the plot (Figure 10) and in the separate model fits for each school.

```
> show(ExamM <- lmList(normexam ~ standLRT + sex | school, Exam,
+ subset = type == "Mxd" & !school %in% c(43, 47, 54)))

Call: lmList(formula = normexam ~ standLRT + sex | school, data = Exam, subset = type == "Mxd" & !school %in% c(43, 47, 54))

Coefficients:
  (Intercept)  standLRT      sexF
1  0.24770238 0.7044798  0.355719842
3  0.58030950 0.5843480 -0.057223931
4 -0.16739321 0.7372405  0.402829332
5  0.36213174 0.6695127 -0.183238345
9 -0.32487665 0.3961812  0.222382659
10 -0.45139239 0.2972074  0.330917735
12 -0.26201220 0.4200265  0.378359201
13 -0.27196976 0.6037392  0.196013604
14 -0.28741229 0.5966633  0.202122649
15 -0.30963145 0.7370363  0.144392527
17 -0.30553035 0.4905235  0.156646395
19 -0.22542808 0.7214611  0.385544198
20  0.25120209 0.5187894  0.041342515
22 -0.50744197 0.5206371  0.089368918
23 -0.51727825 0.3873051 -0.189332381
26 -0.11870804 0.5342909  0.185283146
28 -0.84451962 0.2583861  0.138672637
32  0.02596084 0.6560569  0.082029123
33 -0.02539396 0.5148927  0.147967544
34 -0.19582273 0.7662681  0.327656212
```




Figure 9: Confidence intervals on the coefficients of the within-school regression lines for female students in single-sex schools. School 48 has been eliminated and the schools have been ordered by increasing estimated intercept.

```

38 -0.19255275 0.6184554 0.084872081
42 -0.01913469 0.3827088 0.246533297
45 -0.21212351 0.5665400 0.102317128
46 -0.30554555 0.4491187 -0.201294993
50 -0.32718434 0.6752947 0.001906973
51 -0.40150931 0.3076539 0.445100548
55 0.35743002 0.6118447 0.400034477
56 -0.18744293 0.8558783 0.391178135
59 -0.97233088 0.3594417 0.329480168
61 -0.01215078 0.6428683 -0.060024560
62 -0.16445110 0.5411566 0.283642476
63 0.60216184 0.3091657 0.150390337

```

```

Degrees of freedom: 2018 total; 1922 residual
Residual standard error: 0.7273955

```

The confidence intervals for these separately fitted models, shown in Figure 11 indicate differences in the intercepts and possibly differences in the slopes with respect to the pretest scores. However, there is not a strong indication of variation by school in the effect of sex.

2.5 Multilevel models for the exam data

We begin with a model that has a random effects for the intercept by school plus additive fixed effects for the pretest score, the student's sex and the school type.

```

> (Em3 <- lmer(normexam ~ standLRT + sex + type + (1 | school),
+ Exam))

```




Figure 10: Normalized exam scores versus pretest score by school and sex for students in mixed-sex schools.




Figure 11: Confidence intervals on the coefficients of the within-school regression lines for female students in single-sex schools. School 48 has been eliminated and the schools have been ordered by increasing estimated intercept.

```

Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML
Formula: normexam ~ standLRT + sex + type + (1 | school)
Data: Exam
      AIC      BIC    logLik MLdeviance REMLdeviance
9355.384 9386.928 -4672.692  9325.485    9345.384
Random effects:
Groups   Name              Variance Std.Dev.
school   (Intercept)  0.084367  0.29046
Residual                    0.562529  0.75002
# of obs: 4059, groups: school, 65

Fixed effects:
              Estimate Std. Error t value
(Intercept) -0.167682   0.054680  -3.067
standLRT     0.559834   0.012448  44.972
sexF         0.165959   0.032812   5.058
typeSngl     0.165458   0.077428   2.137

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
              (Intr) stnLRT sexF
standLRT     0.023
sexF        -0.291 -0.061
typeSngl    -0.624  0.005 -0.078

```

Our data exploration indicated that the slope with respect to the pretest score may vary by school. We can fit a model with random effects by school

for both the slope and the intercept as

```
> (Em4 <- lmer(normexam ~ standLRT + sex + type + (standLRT | school),
+ Exam))
```

Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML

Formula: normexam ~ standLRT + sex + type + (standLRT | school)

Data: Exam

	AIC	BIC	logLik	MLdeviance	REMLdeviance
	9314.573	9358.734	-4650.287	9281.17	9300.573

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.	Corr
school	(Intercept)	0.082477	0.28719	
	standLRT	0.015081	0.12280	0.579
Residual		0.550289	0.74181	

of obs: 4059, groups: school, 65

Fixed effects:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value
(Intercept)	-0.188698	0.051940	-3.6330
standLRT	0.554101	0.020117	27.5433
sexF	0.167971	0.032281	5.2034
typeSngl	0.176390	0.069587	2.5348

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

	(Intr)	stnLRT	sexF
standLRT	0.317		
sexF	-0.292	-0.037	
typeSngl	-0.580	0.017	-0.101

and compare this fit to the previous fit with

```
> anova(Em3, Em4)
```

Data: Exam

Models:

Em3: normexam ~ standLRT + sex + type + (1 | school)

Em4: normexam ~ standLRT + sex + type + (standLRT | school)

	Df	AIC	BIC	logLik	Chisq	Chi Df	Pr(>Chisq)
Em3	5	9355.4	9386.9	-4672.7			
Em4	7	9314.6	9358.7	-4650.3	44.811	2	1.859e-10

There is a strong evidence of a significant random effect for the slope by school, whether judged by AIC, BIC or the p-value for the likelihood ratio test.

The p-value for the likelihood ratio test is based on a χ^2 distribution with degrees of freedom calculated as the difference in the number of parameters in the two models. Because one of the parameters eliminated from the full model in the submodel is at its boundary the usual asymptotics for the likelihood ratio test do not apply. However, it can be shown that the p-value quoted for the test is conservative in the sense that it is an upper bound on the p-value that would be calculated say from a parametric bootstrap.

Having an upper bound of 1.9×10^{-10} on the p-value can be regarded as “highly significant” evidence of the utility of the random effect for the slope by school.

We could also add a random effect for the student’s sex by school

```
> (Em5 <- lmer(normexam ~ standLRT + sex + type + (standLRT + sex |
+ school), Exam))

Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML
Formula: normexam ~ standLRT + sex + type + (standLRT + sex | school)
Data: Exam
```

	AIC	BIC	logLik	MLdeviance	REMLdeviance
	9320.573	9383.66	-4650.287	9281.17	9300.573

```
Random effects:
Groups Name Variance Std.Dev. Corr
school (Intercept) 8.2474e-02 2.8718e-01
standLRT 1.5079e-02 1.2280e-01 0.579
sexF 2.7514e-10 1.6587e-05 0.000 0.000
Residual 5.5029e-01 7.4182e-01
# of obs: 4059, groups: school, 65

Fixed effects:

```

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value
(Intercept)	-0.188697	0.051940	-3.6330
standLRT	0.554102	0.020117	27.5445
sexF	0.167971	0.032281	5.2033
typeSngl	0.176389	0.069587	2.5348

```
Correlation of Fixed Effects:
(Intr) stnLRT sexF
standLRT 0.317
sexF -0.292 -0.037
typeSngl -0.580 0.017 -0.101
```

Notice that the estimate of the variance of the `sexM` term is essentially zero so there is no need to test the significance of this variance component. We proceed with the analysis of `Em4`.

2.6 Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods for assessing parameter variation

An important part of the analysis of a statistical model is the assessment of the precision of parameter estimates, either through confidence intervals and confidence regions or through hypothesis tests on the parameters. Sometimes such information is condensed and given as the parameter estimate and a standard error of the estimate, with the assumption that a confidence interval will be formed as the estimate plus/minus some multiple of the standard error.

Summarizing the variability in parameter estimates with such symmetric intervals is appropriate if the distribution of the parameters can be assumed to be reasonably symmetric but this is not the case for variance components. In general we expect the distribution of a variance component to be approximately χ^2 and, depending upon the precision with which the component is estimated, such a distribution can be quite asymmetric.

To examine the distribution of the parameter estimates we can use a parametric bootstrap or adopt a Bayesian approach and generate a sample from the posterior distribution of the parameters using a technique called Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampling. The `mcmcscamp` function applied to a fitted `lmer` model generates such a sample.

```
> Es4 <- mcmcscamp(Em4, 10000, trans = FALSE)
```

The parameter estimates in this sample are the fixed effects, the variance of the random per-observation noise, σ^2 , the variance of the intercept random effect, the variance of the slope random effect and their covariance. A plot of the estimated posterior densities of each of the parameters (Figure 12) shows that the posterior densities of the fixed effects are indeed quite symmetric and close to a normal (or Gaussian) distribution. The posterior density of σ^2 and the covariance parameter are reasonably symmetric but the posterior densities of the variances of the random effects are not.

A better way of assessing possible asymmetry is to use normal probability plots of the samples from each of the parameters, as in Figure 13.

We can see from Figure 13 that the posterior distributions of the fixed effects are remarkably close to the normal (or Gaussian) distribution. Except for a few points in each panel, these panels show almost perfect linearity. The few points that do deviate from the straight line in each case represent fewer than a dozen samples out of a total of 10,000 and are not a cause for concern.

The posterior distribution of σ^2 is satisfactorily close to a normal distribution. As we will see, it is not always the case that this parameter is close to normally distributed. It happens that in this example σ^2 is very precisely determined and possible asymmetry in the distribution will not be noticeable over such a small range of values.

There is noticeable asymmetry in the distribution of the variances of the random effects and perhaps some asymmetry in the distribution of the covariance of the intercept and slope random effects.

Using this sample we can examine the distribution of functions of these parameters. For example, (Box and Tiao, 1973) advocate approximating the




Figure 12: Plots of the estimated posterior probability densities from a Markov Chain Monte Carlo sample of the parameters in the model **Em4**.




Figure 13: Normal probability plots of the Markov Chain Monte Carlo samples from the posterior densities of the parameters in the model `Em4`.

distribution of the logarithm of a variance rather than the variance itself. For a covariance we first convert it to a correlation then apply Fisher’s z transformation (the hyperbolic arc-tangent) to the correlation. The density plots and normal probability plots of these transformed parameters are shown in Figures 14 and 15.

3 Three-level Normal Models

These results are from the 1997 A-level Chemistry exam. The `school` is nested in `lea` (local education authority) and has unique levels for each of the 2410 schools. It is a good practice to make the nesting explicit by specifying the grouping factors as the ‘outer’ factor, `lea` in this case, and the interaction of the outer and inner factors, `lea:school` or `school:lea` in this case. This will ensure unique levels for each `school` within `lea` combination.

To fit the model `mC2` we increase the number of EM iterations from its default of 20 to 40. Without this change the current version of the `optim` function in R will declare convergence to an incorrect optimum. By increasing the number of EM iterations we are able to get closer to the optimum before




Figure 14: Estimated density plots of the Markov Chain Monte Carlo samples from the posterior densities of the variance and covariance parameters in model **Em4**. The variance parameters are on the log scale and the covariance is expressed as Fisher's z transformation of the correlation.




Figure 15: Normal probability plots of the Markov Chain Monte Carlo samples from the posterior densities of the variance and covariance parameters in model **Em4**. The variance parameters are on the log scale and the covariance is expressed as Fisher's z transformation of the correlation.

calling optim and converge to the correct value. The optim function will be patched so this change will not be needed in future versions of R.

Data from the 1997 A-level Chemistry exam are available as Chem97.

```
> str(Chem97)
`data.frame':      31022 obs. of  8 variables:
 $ lea      : Factor w/ 131 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ school   : Factor w/ 2410 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ student  : Factor w/ 31022 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...
 $ score    : num  4 10 10 10 8 10 6 8 4 10 ...
 $ gender   : Factor w/ 2 levels "M","F": 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 ...
 $ age      : num  3 -3 -4 -2 -1 4 1 4 3 0 ...
 $ gcsecnt  : num  6.62 7.62 7.25 7.50 6.44 ...
 $ gcsecnt  : num  0.339 1.339 0.964 1.214 0.158 ...

> system.time(mC1 <- lmer(score ~ 1 + (1 | lea:school) + (1 | lea),
+ Chem97))
[1] 35.46  6.93 42.63  0.00  0.00

> summary(mC1)
Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML
Formula: score ~ 1 + (1 | lea:school) + (1 | lea)
Data: Chem97
      AIC      BIC    logLik MLdeviance REMLdeviance
157879.8 157904.8 -78936.9   157869.9     157873.8
Random effects:
Groups      Name      Variance Std.Dev.
lea:school (Intercept) 2.74871  1.65792
lea         (Intercept) 0.15347  0.39175
Residual                    8.51609  2.91823
# of obs: 31022, groups: lea:school, 2410; lea, 131

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error t value
(Intercept) 5.318979  0.058106  91.539

> system.time(mC2 <- lmer(score ~ gcsecnt + (1 | school) + (1 |
+ lea), Chem97, control = list(niterEM = 40)), gc = TRUE)
[1] 70.14 14.45 85.20  0.00  0.00

> summary(mC2)
Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML
Formula: score ~ gcsecnt + (1 | school) + (1 | lea)
Data: Chem97
      AIC      BIC    logLik MLdeviance REMLdeviance
141705 141738.4 -70848.5   141685.6     141697
Random effects:
Groups      Name      Variance Std.Dev.
school      (Intercept) 1.166158 1.07989
lea         (Intercept) 0.014764 0.12151
Residual                    5.154212 2.27029
# of obs: 31022, groups: school, 2410; lea, 131

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error t value
(Intercept) 5.635456  0.031234 180.43
gcsecnt     2.472557  0.016904 146.27

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
(Intr)
gcsecnt 0.058
```

4 Two-level models for binary data

When the response variable is binary or when it represents a count we frequently model the data with a *generalized linear model* (glm) or, if we use random effects in the model, a *generalized linear mixed model* (glmm). Determining maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters in such a model is not as easy as for the linear mixed model because the likelihood for a glmm is expressed as an integral that must be approximated.

The `lmer` function has provision for fitting such models using one of three approximations. The simplest approximation is called *penalized quasi-likelihood* (PQL). This method is generally quite fast but also the least accurate of the three. The Laplace approximation is more accurate than PQL and the most accurate approximation is called *adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature* (AGQ). At present AGQ can only be used on models that have one-dimensional random effects associated with a single grouping factor.

4.1 The contraception use data

A fertility survey of women in Bangladesh included as a response their use of artificial contraception. Some of the covariates included the woman's age (on a centered scale), the number of live children she had, whether she lived in an urban or rural setting, and the district in which she lived.

```
> str(Contraception)
`data.frame':      1934 obs. of  6 variables:
 $ woman   : Factor w/ 1934 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...
 $ district: Factor w/ 60 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ use     : Factor w/ 2 levels "N","Y": 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ livch   : Factor w/ 4 levels "0","1","2","3+": 4 1 3 4 1 1 4 4 2 4 ...
 $ age     : num   18.44 -5.56  1.44  8.44 -13.56 ...
 $ urban   : Factor w/ 2 levels "N","Y": 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 ...
```

4.2 Fitting the model used in the review

The “Software reviews of multilevel modeling packages” fit a simple model that includes fixed effects for `urban`, `age`, and `livch` and a simple additive random effect by district. We reproduce this fit as

```
> system.time(Cm1 <- lmer(use ~ age + urban + livch + (1 | district),
+   Contraception, binomial))
[1] 0.25 0.07 0.33 0.00 0.00

> Cm1
```

```

Generalized linear mixed model fit using PQL
Formula: use ~ age + urban + livch + (1 | district)
Data: Contraception
Family: binomial(logit link)
      AIC      BIC    logLik deviance
2427.664 2466.635 -1206.832 2413.664
Random effects:
      Groups      Name      Variance    Std.Dev.
district (Intercept)      0.21518      0.46387
# of obs: 1934, groups: district, 60

Estimated scale (compare to 1) 0.9844111

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) -1.6606460 0.1452147 -11.4358 < 2.2e-16
age          -0.0261558 0.0078152 -3.3468 0.0008176
urbanY       0.7193097 0.1183317 6.0788 1.211e-09
livch1       1.0921026 0.1565011 6.9782 2.989e-12
livch2       1.3545533 0.1729641 7.8314 4.824e-15
livch3+      1.3241531 0.1773558 7.4661 8.262e-14

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
      (Intr) age      urbanY livch1 livch2
age      0.446
urbanY   -0.300 -0.046
livch1   -0.589 -0.211 0.059
livch2   -0.631 -0.378 0.094 0.488
livch3+  -0.748 -0.674 0.098 0.539 0.619

> system.time(Cm2 <- lmer(use ~ age + urban + livch + (1 | district),
+   Contraception, binomial, method = "Laplace"))
[1] 2.03 0.84 2.90 0.00 0.00

> Cm2

Generalized linear mixed model fit using Laplace
Formula: use ~ age + urban + livch + (1 | district)
Data: Contraception
Family: binomial(logit link)
      AIC      BIC    logLik deviance
2427.616 2466.587 -1206.808 2413.616
Random effects:
      Groups      Name      Variance    Std.Dev.
district (Intercept)      0.21239      0.46086
# of obs: 1934, groups: district, 60

Estimated scale (compare to 1) 0.9844111

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) -1.6897104 0.1452147 -11.6359 < 2.2e-16
age          -0.0265950 0.0078152 -3.4030 0.0006666
urbanY       0.7329915 0.1183317 6.1944 5.852e-10
livch1       1.1091842 0.1565011 7.0874 1.367e-12
livch2       1.3763945 0.1729641 7.9577 1.753e-15
livch3+      1.3452327 0.1773558 7.5849 3.326e-14

```

```

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
      (Intr) age      urbanY livch1 livch2
age      0.446
urbanY   -0.300 -0.046
livch1   -0.589 -0.211  0.059
livch2   -0.631 -0.378  0.094  0.488
livch3+  -0.748 -0.674  0.098  0.539  0.619

> system.time(Cm4 <- lmer(use ~ age + urban + livch + (urban |
+      district), Contraception, binomial))
[1] 0.78 0.04 0.83 0.00 0.00

> Cm4
Generalized linear mixed model fit using PQL
Formula: use ~ age + urban + livch + (urban | district)
Data: Contraception
Family: binomial(logit link)
      AIC      BIC    logLik deviance
2417.121 2467.227 -1199.561 2399.121
Random effects:
Groups   Name      Variance Std.Dev. Corr
district (Intercept) 0.38774  0.62269
          urbanY      0.66745  0.81698  -0.793
# of obs: 1934, groups: district, 60

Estimated scale (compare to 1) 0.9759564

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) -1.6665200  0.1572532 -10.5977 < 2.2e-16
age          -0.0258502  0.0079082  -3.2688  0.00108
urbanY       0.7914232  0.1681257   4.7073 2.510e-06
livch1       1.0987723  0.1580051   6.9540 3.550e-12
livch2       1.3342511  0.1745854   7.6424 2.132e-14
livch3+      1.3227367  0.1795440   7.3672 1.743e-13

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
      (Intr) age      urbanY livch1 livch2
age      0.416
urbanY   -0.481 -0.036
livch1   -0.548 -0.211  0.038
livch2   -0.586 -0.378  0.068  0.487
livch3+  -0.695 -0.674  0.062  0.537  0.616

> system.time(Cm5 <- lmer(use ~ age + urban + livch + (urban |
+      district), Contraception, binomial, method = "Laplace"))
[1] 3.07 0.94 4.08 0.00 0.00

> Cm5
Generalized linear mixed model fit using Laplace
Formula: use ~ age + urban + livch + (urban | district)
Data: Contraception
Family: binomial(logit link)
      AIC      BIC    logLik deviance
2417.016 2467.123 -1199.508 2399.016
Random effects:
Groups   Name      Variance Std.Dev. Corr

```

```

district (Intercept) 0.38125 0.61746
                    urbanY    0.64194 0.80121 -0.798
# of obs: 1934, groups: district, 60

Estimated scale (compare to 1) 0.9759564

Fixed effects:
              Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) -1.7118507  0.1572532 -10.8860 < 2.2e-16
age          -0.0265204  0.0079082  -3.3535 0.0007978
urbanY        0.8152837  0.1681257   4.8493 1.239e-06
livch1        1.1256988  0.1580051   7.1244 1.045e-12
livch2        1.3683316  0.1745854   7.8376 4.592e-15
livch3+       1.3548000  0.1795440   7.5458 4.496e-14

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
              (Intr) age    urbanY livch1 livch2
age           0.416
urbanY       -0.481 -0.036
livch1       -0.548 -0.211  0.038
livch2       -0.586 -0.378  0.068  0.487
livch3+      -0.695 -0.674  0.062  0.537  0.616

```

4.3 Data exploration

As with the `Exam` data, we examine several data plots when formulating a model for these data. Because the response is either "Y" or "N", plots of the data points themselves tend to be uninformative because of overplotting. However, with a continuous covariate such as `age` it is useful to plot the scatterplot smoother line for the response versus the covariate to see the trend of the probability.

The model being fit assumes that the logistic transformation of the probability of a woman using artificial contraception is approximately linear in `age` given her urban/rural status and the number of live children she has. Figure 16, produced by `show` that this is not the case. Indeed the proportion of women using artificial contraception is more like a quadratic in `age`. Very young women and older women are less likely to use artificial contraception.

We also see that the differences according to the number of live children are predominantly differences between those women who have live children and those who don't.

4.4 Reformulated models

We include a quadratic term in `age`

```

> (Cm6 <- lmer(use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + livch + (1 | district),
+   Contraption, binomial, method = "Laplace"))

```





Figure 16: Scatterplot smoother curves of the use of artificial contraception versus age for women in the Bangladesh fertility survey. The panel on the left depicts the proportion for rural women and the panel on the right depicts the proportion for urban women.

```

Generalized linear mixed model fit using Laplace
Formula: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + livch + (1 | district)
Data: Contraception
Family: binomial(logit link)
      AIC      BIC    logLik deviance
2388.758 2433.297 -1186.379 2372.758
Random effects:
      Groups      Name      Variance  Std.Dev.
district (Intercept)  0.22965    0.47922
# of obs: 1934, groups: district, 60

Estimated scale (compare to 1) 0.9830444

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) -1.01594748  0.17423926 -5.8308 5.518e-09
age          0.00350980  0.00921331  0.3809  0.7032
I(age^2)     -0.00458879  0.00072305 -6.3465 2.203e-10
urbanY       0.68389839  0.11977356  5.7099 1.130e-08
livch1       0.80217960  0.16191417  4.9544 7.257e-07
livch2       0.90132794  0.18483015  4.8765 1.080e-06
livch3+      0.90006574  0.18546304  4.8531 1.216e-06

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
      (Intr) age      I(g^2) urbanY livch1 livch2
age      0.572
I(age^2) -0.548 -0.479
urbanY   -0.269 -0.054  0.023
livch1   -0.608 -0.275  0.254  0.067
livch2   -0.679 -0.457  0.358  0.099  0.524
livch3+  -0.761 -0.699  0.326  0.107  0.565  0.651

> anova(Cm1, Cm6)

Data: Contraception
Models:
Cm1: use ~ age + urban + livch + (1 | district)
Cm6: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + livch + (1 | district)
      Df      AIC      BIC logLik Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
Cm1   7  2427.7  2466.6 -1206.8
Cm6   8  2388.8  2433.3 -1186.4 40.905    1 1.598e-10

```

and we see that, as indicated by the plots, the quadratic term is highly significant.

We can check if the differences in the number of live children is primarily the difference between no children and any children by fitting a model with the indicator of any children as one of the terms in the fixed effects.

```

> Contraception$children <- factor(ifelse(Contraception$livch ==
+   0, "N", "Y"))
> (Cm7 <- lmer(use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (1 | district),
+   Contraception, binomial, method = "Laplace"))

Generalized linear mixed model fit using Laplace
Formula: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (1 | district)
Data: Contraception

```

```

Family: binomial(logit link)
      AIC      BIC    logLik deviance
2385.215 2418.619 -1186.607 2373.215
Random effects:
      Groups      Name      Variance  Std.Dev.
district (Intercept)      0.22830    0.47781
# of obs: 1934, groups: district, 60

Estimated scale (compare to 1) 0.9833451

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) -0.98792714 0.16778919 -5.8879 3.911e-09
age          0.00617736 0.00782799 0.7891 0.43
I(age^2)     -0.00466050 0.00071423 -6.5252 6.792e-11
urbanY       0.67973583 0.11956250 5.6852 1.307e-08
childrenY    0.84656016 0.14706981 5.7562 8.604e-09

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
      (Intr) age      I(g^2) urbanY
age      0.531
I(age^2) -0.540 -0.505
urbanY   -0.264 -0.031 0.015
childrenY -0.799 -0.566 0.350 0.098

> anova(Cm6, Cm7)

Data: Contraception
Models:
Cm7: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (1 | district)
Cm6: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + livch + (1 | district)
      Df      AIC      BIC logLik Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
Cm7  6 2385.2 2418.6 -1186.6
Cm6  8 2388.8 2433.3 -1186.4 0.4565      2      0.796

```

Based on the change in the log-likelihood the simpler model is adequate.
We check for an interaction with the urban factor.

```

> (Cm8 <- lmer(use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban * children + (1 | district),
+   Contraception, binomial, method = "Laplace"))

Generalized linear mixed model fit using Laplace
Formula: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban * children + (1 | district)
Data: Contraception
Family: binomial(logit link)
      AIC      BIC    logLik deviance
2386.14 2425.111 -1186.07 2372.14
Random effects:
      Groups      Name      Variance  Std.Dev.
district (Intercept)      0.2274    0.47686
# of obs: 1934, groups: district, 60

Estimated scale (compare to 1) 0.9840476

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) -1.07644093 0.19034365 -5.6552 1.556e-08
age          0.00554894 0.00785464 0.7065 0.4799

```

```

I (age^2)          -0.00460180  0.00071638 -6.4237 1.330e-10
urbanY             0.87145946  0.22228750  3.9204 8.840e-05
childrenY          0.95142629  0.18072909  5.2644 1.407e-07
urbanY:childrenY  -0.25574958  0.25002441 -1.0229  0.3064

```

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

```

(Intr) age      I(g^2) urbanY chldrY
age           0.502
I (age^2)     -0.511 -0.511
urbanY        -0.520 -0.080  0.073
childrenY     -0.848 -0.504  0.329  0.533
urbanY:chldrY  0.463  0.076 -0.076 -0.844 -0.576

```

The interaction is not significant.

We can check if there is significant variation by district in the effect of urban versus rural or in the effect of any children versus no children by fitting further models

```

> (Cm9 <- lmer(use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (urban |
+   district), Contraception, binomial, method = "Laplace"))
Generalized linear mixed model fit using Laplace
Formula: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (urban | district)
Data: Contraception
Family: binomial(logit link)
      AIC      BIC    logLik deviance
2376.976 2421.515 -1180.488 2360.976
Random effects:
Groups   Name             Variance Std.Dev. Corr
district (Intercept)  0.38255   0.61851
          urbanY       0.54549   0.73857  -0.794
# of obs: 1934, groups: district, 60

Estimated scale (compare to 1)  0.976043

```

Fixed effects:

```

      Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) -1.0373489   0.1783648 -5.8159 6.031e-09
age           0.0057913   0.0079049  0.7326  0.4638
I (age^2)    -0.0045541   0.0007210 -6.3164 2.678e-10
urbanY       0.7702699   0.1626603  4.7355 2.186e-06
childrenY    0.8723925   0.1484547  5.8765 4.191e-09

```

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

```

(Intr) age      I(g^2) urbanY
age           0.507
I (age^2)     -0.516 -0.507
urbanY        -0.428 -0.032  0.013
childrenY     -0.759 -0.568  0.353  0.071

```

```

> anova(Cm7, Cm9)

```

Data: Contraception

Models:

```

Cm7: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (1 | district)
Cm9: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (urban | district)
      Df      AIC      BIC logLik Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
Cm7   6  2385.2  2418.6 -1186.6
Cm9   8  2377.0  2421.5 -1180.5 12.239      2  0.002200

```

```

> (Cm10 <- lmer(use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (children |
+   district), Contraception, binomial, method = "Laplace"))
Generalized linear mixed model fit using Laplace
Formula: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (children | district)
Data: Contraception
Family: binomial(logit link)
      AIC      BIC    logLik deviance
2385.964 2430.502 -1184.982 2369.964
Random effects:
Groups   Name             Variance Std.Dev. Corr
district (Intercept) 0.45735   0.67627
childrenY 0.29003   0.53854   -0.722
# of obs: 1934, groups: district, 60

Estimated scale (compare to 1) 0.9741205

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) -1.06531749  0.18544077 -5.7448 9.204e-09
age          0.00699388  0.00789076  0.8863  0.3754
I(age^2)     -0.00465026  0.00071791 -6.4775 9.328e-11
urbanY       0.69640698  0.12042808  5.7828 7.348e-09
childrenY    0.91882820  0.17237364  5.3304 9.797e-08

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
      (Intr) age      I(g^2) urbanY
age      0.487
I(age^2) -0.497 -0.512
urbanY   -0.236 -0.027  0.013
childrenY -0.838 -0.491  0.308  0.078

> anova(Cm7, Cm10)
Data: Contraception
Models:
Cm7: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (1 | district)
Cm10: use ~ age + I(age^2) + urban + children + (children | district)
      Df      AIC      BIC    logLik  Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
Cm7    6 2385.2 2418.6 -1186.6
Cm10   8 2386.0 2430.5 -1185.0 3.2511      2    0.1968

```

Variation due to district in the effect of any children versus no children does not appear to be significant but there is a significant variation in the effect of urban versus rural. It is interesting that AIC (Akaike's Information Criterion) and BIC (Schwartz's Bayesian Information Criterion) lead to different conclusions in the comparison of Cm7 versus Cm9. For both these criteria the preferred model is the one with the lower value of the criterion. Hence, AIC prefers Cm9 and BIC prefers Cm7. The BIC criterion puts a heavier penalty on having a greater number of parameters.

At present the code for creating a Markov Chain Monte Carlo sample from the distribution of the parameters in a generalized linear mixed model does not allow for random effects of dimension greater than one so we produce a sample from the posterior distribution of the parameters in model Cm11




Figure 17: Plots of the estimated posterior probability densities from a Markov Chain Monte Carlo sample of the parameters in the model Cm11 fit to the Contraception data.

```
> Cs11 <- mcmcscamp(Em4, 10000, trans = FALSE)
```

Density plots (Figure 17) and normal probability plots (Figure 18)

for this sample show that the fixed-effects parameters are very well approximated by a normal distribution but the variance of the random effects shows noticeable skewness.

5 Growth curve model for repeated measures data

```
> str(Oxboys)
`data.frame':      234 obs. of  4 variables:
 $ Subject : Factor w/ 26 levels "1","10","11",...: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 12 ...
 $ age      : num  -1.0000 -0.7479 -0.4630 -0.1643 -0.0027 ...
 $ height   : num  140 143 145 147 148 ...
 $ Occasion: Factor w/ 9 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 ...
- attr(*, "ginfo")=List of 7
 ..$ formula      :Class 'formula' length 3 height ~ age | Subject
```




Figure 18: Normal probability plots of the Markov Chain Monte Carlo samples from the posterior densities of the parameters in the model Cm11 fit to the Contraception data.

```

.. .. - attr(*, ".Environment")=length 27 <environment>
..$ order.groups: logi TRUE
..$ FUN          :function (x)
.. .. - attr(*, "source")= chr "function (x) max(x, na.rm = TRUE)"
..$ outer        : NULL
..$ inner         : NULL
..$ labels       :List of 2
.. ..$ age       : chr "Centered age"
.. ..$ height    : chr "Height"
..$ units        :List of 1
.. ..$ height    : chr "(cm)"

> system.time(mX1 <- lmer(height ~ age + I(age^2) + I(age^3) +
+ I(age^4) + (age + I(age^2) | Subject), Oxboys))
[1] 0.14 0.00 0.13 0.00 0.00

> summary(mX1)
Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML
Formula: height ~ age + I(age^2) + I(age^3) + I(age^4) + (age + I(age^2) | Subject)
Data: Oxboys
      AIC      BIC    logLik MLdeviance REMLdeviance
649.9081 687.9167 -313.9541   625.3593     627.9081
Random effects:
Groups   Name             Variance Std.Dev. Corr
Subject (Intercept)  64.03464  8.00216
        age           2.86418  1.69239  0.614
        I(age^2)      0.67429  0.82115  0.215 0.658
Residual              0.21737  0.46623
# of obs: 234, groups: Subject, 26

Fixed effects:
              Estimate Std. Error t value
(Intercept) 149.01887    1.57036  94.895
age           6.17418    0.35650  17.319
I(age^2)      1.12823    0.35144   3.210
I(age^3)      0.45385    0.16246   2.794
I(age^4)     -0.37690    0.30018  -1.256

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
      (Intr) age    I(g^2) I(g^3)
age      0.572
I(age^2) 0.076 0.264
I(age^3) -0.001 -0.340 0.025
I(age^4) 0.021 0.016 -0.857 -0.021

> system.time(mX2 <- lmer(height ~ poly(age, 4) + (age + I(age^2) |
+ Subject), Oxboys))
[1] 0.19 0.00 0.20 0.00 0.00

> summary(mX2)
Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML
Formula: height ~ poly(age, 4) + (age + I(age^2) | Subject)
Data: Oxboys
      AIC      BIC    logLik MLdeviance REMLdeviance
638.8686 676.8771 -308.4343   625.3593     616.8686
Random effects:
Groups   Name             Variance Std.Dev. Corr

```



```

Subject (Intercept) 64.03465 8.00217
          age        2.86418 1.69239  0.614
          I(age^2)    0.67429 0.82115  0.215 0.658
Residual              0.21737 0.46623
# of obs: 234, groups: Subject, 26

```

```

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error t value
(Intercept) 149.51976    1.59031  94.019
poly(age, 4)1  64.54095    3.32787  19.394
poly(age, 4)2   4.20322    1.02361   4.106
poly(age, 4)3   1.29077    0.46628   2.768
poly(age, 4)4  -0.58547    0.46630  -1.256

```

```

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
      (Intr) p(,4)1 p(,4)2 p(,4)3
poly(ag,4)1 0.631
poly(ag,4)2 0.230 0.583
poly(ag,4)3 0.000 0.000 0.000
poly(ag,4)4 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000

```

6 Cross-classification model

```

> str(ScotsSec)
`data.frame':    3435 obs. of  6 variables:
 $ verbal : num  11 0 -14 -6 -30 -17 -17 -11 -9 -19 ...
 $ attain : num  10 3 2 3 2 2 4 6 4 2 ...
 $ primary: Factor w/ 148 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ...
 $ sex    : Factor w/ 2 levels "M","F": 1 2 1 1 2 2 2 1 1 1 ...
 $ social : num   0 0 0 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 ...
 $ second : Factor w/ 19 levels "1","2","3","4",...: 9 9 9 9 9 9 1 1 9 9 ...

> system.time(mS1 <- lmer(attain ~ sex + (1 | primary) + (1 | second),
+   ScotsSec), gc = TRUE)
[1] 0.32 0.02 0.34 0.00 0.00

> summary(mS1)
Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML
Formula: attain ~ sex + (1 | primary) + (1 | second)
Data: ScotsSec
      AIC      BIC    logLik MLdeviance REMLdeviance
17135.91 17160.48 -8563.956   17123.49    17127.91
Random effects:
Groups   Name      Variance Std.Dev.
primary (Intercept) 1.10962   1.0534
second  (Intercept) 0.36967   0.6080
Residual              8.05511   2.8382
# of obs: 3435, groups: primary, 148; second, 19

Fixed effects:
      Estimate Std. Error t value
(Intercept) 5.255154    0.184322 28.5107
sexF        0.498515    0.098255  5.0737

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
      (Intr)
sexF -0.264

```

References

G.E.P. Box and G.C. Tiao. *Bayesian Inference in Statistical Analysis*.
Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1973.