

Sociology 63993
Exam 1
February 17, 2012

I. *True-False.* (20 points) Indicate whether the following statements are true or false. If false, briefly explain why.

1. Cohen and Cohen's dummy variable adjustment method is useful when variables like gender or age have missing values.
2. R^2 is biased downwards.
3. The more "tolerant" a variable is (i.e. the less highly correlated it is with the other IVs), the smaller its unique contribution to R^2 will be.
4. When you have more than one independent variable, random measurement error can cause coefficients to be biased either upward or downward.
5. A Durbin-Watson statistic of 4 or greater indicates that the case is an extreme outlier.

II. *Short answer.* Discuss all three of the following problems. (15 points each, 45 points total.) In each case, the researcher has used Stata to test for a possible problem, concluded that there is a problem, and then adopted a strategy to address that problem. Explain (a) what problem the researcher was testing for, and why she concluded that there was a problem, (b) the rationale behind the solution she chose, i.e. how does it try to address the problem, and (c) one alternative solution she could have tried, and why. (NOTE: a few sentences on each point will probably suffice – you don't have to repeat everything that was in the lecture notes.)

II-1.

```
. use "http://www.nd.edu/~rwilliam/stats3/statafiles/rwm11.dta", clear
(German Health Care Panel Data, Riphahn Wambach Million (2003), Greene (2007))

. reg newhsat female age handdum educ married working if year==1984
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 3874		
Model	4483.9589	6	747.326483	F(6, 3867) = 141.19		
Residual	20468.7796	3867	5.29319359	Prob > F = 0.0000		
				R-squared = 0.1797		
				Adj R-squared = 0.1784		
				Root MSE = 2.3007		
Total	24952.7385	3873	6.44274168			

newhsat	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
female	-.186618	.0870046	-2.14	0.032	-.3571973	-.0160387
age	-.0388289	.0035637	-10.90	0.000	-.0458159	-.031842
handdum	-2.341489	.1236374	-18.94	0.000	-2.58389	-2.099088
educ	.1089876	.0173546	6.28	0.000	.0749626	.1430125
married	.2048268	.0918166	2.23	0.026	.0248133	.3848402
working	.2955985	.0912629	3.24	0.001	.1166704	.4745265
_cons	7.409179	.2928951	25.30	0.000	6.834935	7.983422

. estat hettest

Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity
 Ho: Constant variance
 Variables: fitted values of newhsat

chi2(1) = 55.33
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

. reg newhsat female age handdum educ married working if year==1984, robust

Linear regression

Number of obs =	3874
F(6, 3867) =	129.51
Prob > F =	0.0000
R-squared =	0.1797
Root MSE =	2.3007

newhsat	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
female	-.186618	.0903374	-2.07	0.039	-.3637316	-.0095044
age	-.0388289	.0036116	-10.75	0.000	-.0459097	-.0317482
handdum	-2.341489	.1363509	-17.17	0.000	-2.608816	-2.074163
educ	.1089876	.0161526	6.75	0.000	.0773191	.1406561
married	.2048268	.0946607	2.16	0.031	.019237	.3904165
working	.2955985	.0974066	3.03	0.002	.1046252	.4865717
_cons	7.409179	.2968794	24.96	0.000	6.827124	7.991234

//-2.

. reg warm yr89 male white age ed prst

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	1290
Model	124.537637	6	20.7562729	F(6, 1283) =	27.43
Residual	970.982518	1283	.756806327	Prob > F =	0.0000
Total	1095.52016	1289	.849899267	R-squared =	0.1137
				Adj R-squared =	0.1095
				Root MSE =	.86995

warm	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
yr89	.2238435	.0502656	4.45	0.000	.1252318	.3224553
male	-.2846409	.048767	-5.84	0.000	-.3803127	-.1889691
white	-.2322106	.074535	-3.12	0.002	-.3784345	-.0859867
age	-.0086944	.001544	-5.63	0.000	-.0117234	-.0056654
ed	.0399421	.0098042	4.07	0.000	.0207081	.0591761
prst	.0019401	.0020726	0.94	0.349	-.002126	.0060063
_cons	2.688483	.1437892	18.70	0.000	2.406395	2.970571

. sum warm yr89 male white age ed prst

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
warm	2293	2.607501	.9282156	1	4
yr89	2293	.3986044	.4897178	0	1
male	2293	.4648932	.4988748	0	1
white	1712	.8785047	.3267975	0	1
age	2293	44.93546	16.77903	18	89
ed	1709	12.1849	3.179042	0	20
prst	2293	39.58526	14.49226	12	82

. mi set mlong

. mi register imputed white ed

(1003 m=0 obs. now marked as incomplete)

```
. mi register regular warm yr89 male age prst
. mi impute chained (logit) white (regress) ed = warm yr89 male age prst, add(50) rseed(1234)
```

Conditional models:

```
white: logit white ed warm yr89 male age prst
ed: regress ed i.white warm yr89 male age prst
```

Performing chained iterations ...

```
Multivariate imputation      Imputations =      50
Chained equations            added =      50
Imputed: m=1 through m=50    updated =      0

Initialization: monotone      Iterations =     500
                               burn-in =      10
```

```
white: logistic regression
ed: linear regression
```

Variable	Observations per m			Total
	Complete	Incomplete	Imputed	
white	1712	581	581	2293
ed	1709	584	584	2293

(complete + incomplete = total; imputed is the minimum across m of the number of filled-in observations.)

```
. mi estimate, dots: reg warm yr89 male white age ed prst
```

Imputations (50):

```
.....10.....20.....30.....40.....50 done
```

```
Multiple-imputation estimates      Imputations =      50
Linear regression                  Number of obs =     2293
                                   Average RVI   =     0.1214
                                   Largest FMI    =     0.3154
                                   Complete DF    =     2286
DF adjustment: Small sample        DF: min    =     380.43
                                   avg      =    1356.48
                                   max      =    2270.39
Model F test: Equal FMI            F( 6, 2035.1) =     46.46
Within VCE type: OLS               Prob > F    =     0.0000
```

warm	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
yr89	.2607513	.0380632	6.85	0.000	.1861084	.3353942
male	-.3335333	.0366975	-9.09	0.000	-.4054975	-.2615691
white	-.1599008	.068205	-2.34	0.020	-.2940068	-.0257948
age	-.0098668	.0011996	-8.22	0.000	-.0122195	-.0075141
ed	.0340434	.0087675	3.88	0.000	.0168149	.0512719
prst	.0023128	.0016503	1.40	0.161	-.0009248	.0055503
_cons	2.735879	.1198425	22.83	0.000	2.500675	2.971083

//-3.

. reg docvis educ ses female

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 27326		
Model	13264.8729	3	4421.6243	F(3, 27322) = 138.65		
Residual	871315.75	27322	31.8906284	Prob > F = 0.0000		
Total	884580.623	27325	32.3725754	R-squared = 0.0150		
				Adj R-squared = 0.0149		
				Root MSE = 5.6472		

docvis	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
educ	-.366295	.2382335	-1.54	0.124	-.8332447	.1006548
ses	.1992199	.2378011	0.84	0.402	-.2668824	.6653222
female	1.023064	.0695639	14.71	0.000	.8867151	1.159413
_cons	4.535222	.1913001	23.71	0.000	4.160265	4.91018

. corr docvis educ ses female

(obs=27326)

	docvis	educ	ses	female
docvis	1.0000			
educ	-0.0847	1.0000		
ses	-0.0843	0.9981	1.0000	
female	0.1023	-0.1831	-0.1832	1.0000

. reg docvis educ female

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 27326		
Model	13242.4908	2	6621.24541	F(2, 27323) = 207.63		
Residual	871338.132	27323	31.8902804	Prob > F = 0.0000		
Total	884580.623	27325	32.3725754	R-squared = 0.0150		
				Adj R-squared = 0.0149		
				Root MSE = 5.6471		

docvis	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
educ	-.1671061	.0149471	-11.18	0.000	-.1964031	-.1378091
female	1.022659	.0695618	14.70	0.000	.886314	1.159003
_cons	4.585648	.1815832	25.25	0.000	4.229735	4.94156

III. Computation and interpretation. (35 points total) President Obama's plan to provide free birth control to most women has proven to be far more controversial than he expected. The President has therefore commissioned a study of 7,500 Americans to see where the public stands. The variables are

Variable	Description
bcontrol	Support for Obama's birth control policy. Ranges from a low of 0 (strongly oppose the policy) to a high of 100 (strongly favor)
catholic	Coded 1 if the respondent is Catholic, 0 otherwise
female	Coded 1 if the respondent is female, 0 otherwise

health	Overall health of the respondent. Ranges from 0 (very poor health) to 100 (very good health).
liberal	How liberal is the respondent? Ranges from 0 (very conservative) to 100 (very liberal).

An analysis of the data yields the following results. [NOTE: You'll need some parts of the following to answer the questions, but other parts are extraneous. You'll have to figure out which is which.]

. sum

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
bcontrol	7500	43.13119	9.173105	18.504	95.118
catholic	7500	.5262667	.4993429	0	1
female	7500	.1141333	.3179943	0	1
health	7500	57.41967	9.648723	25	87
liberal	7500	62.04155	22.21342	26	96.2

. reg bcontrol catholic female health liberal

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	7500
Model	153728.687	4	38432.1718	F(4, 7495) =	[1]
Residual	477281.098	7495	63.6799331	Prob > F =	0.0000
Total	631009.786	7499	84.1458575	R-squared =	[2]
				Adj R-squared =	
				Root MSE =	7.98

bcontrol	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
catholic	-.8740108	.2610363	-3.35	0.001	-1.385715 -.3623065
female	2.189993	.289954	[3]	0.000	1.621602 2.758385
health	-.4399353	.0138063	-31.86	0.000	-.4669995 -.4128712
liberal	.0540596	.0043219	12.51	0.000	.0455874 .0625318
_cons	65.2482	.6861085	95.10	0.000	63.90324 66.59317

. collin catholic female health liberal

(obs=7500)

Collinearity Diagnostics

Variable	VIF	SQRT VIF	Tolerance	R-Squared
catholic	2.00	1.41	[4]	0.5002
female	1.00	1.00	0.9989	0.0011
health	2.09	1.45	0.4785	0.5215
liberal	1.09	1.04	0.9213	0.0787

Mean VIF 1.54

	Eigenval	Cond Index
1	3.6921	1.0000
2	0.8578	2.0746
3	0.3751	3.1373
4	0.0671	7.4161
5	0.0078	21.6930

Condition Number 21.6930

Eigenvalues & Cond Index computed from scaled raw sscp (w/ intercept)

Det(correlation matrix) 0.4780

. test liberal

```
( 1) liberal = 0

      F( 1, 7495) =      [5]
      Prob > F =      0.0000
```

. test female = -catholic

```
( 1) catholic + female = 0

      F( 1, 7495) =     11.55
      Prob > F =      0.0007
```

. test catholic female health liberal

```
( 1) catholic = 0
( 2) female = 0
( 3) health = 0
( 4) liberal = 0

      F( 4, 7495) =    603.52
      Prob > F =      0.0000
```

. alpha catholic female health liberal

Test scale = mean(unstandardized items)

```
Average interitem covariance:      7.936035
Number of items in the scale:      4
Scale reliability coefficient:      0.1862
```

. alpha catholic female health liberal, s

Test scale = mean(standardized items)

```
Average interitem correlation:      0.1506
Number of items in the scale:      4
Scale reliability coefficient:      0.4149
```

. predict rstandard, rstandard

. extremes rstandard rstandard bcontrol catholic female health liberal

obs:	rstandard	rstandard	bcontrol	catholic	female	health	liberal
4166.	-2.774446	-2.774446	28.44	0	1	49.703	92.3
5909.	-2.773224	-2.773224	27.966	0	0	45	85.8
710.	-2.753186	-2.753186	18.504	0	0	67.203	88.4
4022.	-2.747619	-2.747619	29.94	0	1	46.30099	88.4
2839.	-2.601393	-2.601393	24.9	0	0	55.40199	88.4

4213.	5.357062	5.357062	78.924	1	0	68.703	37.7
742.	5.520198	5.520198	83.346	1	1	66.703	39
2097.	5.758528	5.758528	89.742	1	0	57.30099	85.8
1592.	5.899137	5.899137	95.118	0	1	48.80099	39
6511.	5.932644	5.932644	88.926	1	1	63.90199	58.5

. pcorr bcontrol catholic female health liberal

(obs=7500)

Partial and semipartial correlations of bcontrol with

Variable	Partial Corr.	Semipartial Corr.	Partial Corr.^2	Semipartial Corr.^2	Significance Value
catholic	-0.0386	-0.0336	0.0015	0.0011	0.0008
female	0.0869	0.0759	0.0076	0.0058	0.0000
health	-0.3454	-0.3201	0.1193	0.1025	0.0000
liberal	0.1430	0.1257	0.0204	0.0158	0.0000

a) (10 pts) Fill in the missing quantities [1] – [5]. (A few other values have also been blanked out, but you don't need to fill them in.)

b) (25 points) Answer the following questions about the analysis and the results, explaining how the printout supports your conclusions.

1. Summarize the key findings. What groups or types of individuals are most supportive of the President's policy and which are least supportive?

2. The researchers were worried that outliers might be problematic. Based on the results, do you see any reasons to be concerned?

3. The researchers were concerned that the items may suffer from random measurement error. Would you encourage them to create a scale out of the items in order to deal with the problem?

4. How would the R^2 value change if the variable liberal were dropped from the model? Do you think that would be a good idea?

5. The President's advisors believe that Female support for health care reform is stronger than Catholic opposition to it. Do you think they are right?

c) (1 point extra credit) As soon as the President started reading the results, he became concerned that something might be seriously wrong with the data. Why?