## Exam exercise: Logistic regression analysis of Berkely admission data

You may use the combined lecture notes for this module available at https://asta.math.aau.dk to guide you to the relevant methods and R commands for this exam.

The following table shows the total number of admitted and rejected applicants to the six largest departments at University of Berkeley in 1973.

|  | Admitted | Rejected |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Male | 1198 | 1493 |
| Female | 557 | 1278 |

Use a $\chi^{2}$-test to check whether the admission statistics for Berkeley show any sign of gender discrimination. To enter the table in R you can do:

```
admit <- matrix(c(1198, 557, 1493, 1278), 2, 2)
rownames(admit) <- c("Male", "Female")
colnames(admit) <- c("Admitted", "Rejected")
admit <- as.table(admit)
```

Your analysis should as a minimum contain arguments that support:

- Statement of hypotheses
- Calculation of expected frequencies
- Calculation of test statistic
- Calculation and interpretation of p-value.

A more detailed data set with the admissions for each department is available on the course web page. The variables are:

- Gender (male/female)
- Dept (department A, B, C, D, E, F)
- Admit (frequency of admitted for each combination)
- Reject (frequency of rejected for each combination)

Load the data into RStudio:

| admission <read.tab |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| admission |  |  |  |  |
| \#\# | Gender | Dept | Admit | Reject |
| \#\# 1 | Male | A | 512 | 313 |
| \#\# 2 | Female | A | 89 | 19 |
| \#\# 3 | Male | B | 353 | 207 |
| \#\# 4 | Female | B | 17 | 8 |
| \#\# 5 | Male | C | 120 | 205 |
| \#\# 6 | Female | C | 202 | 391 |
| \#\# 7 | Male | D | 138 | 279 |
| \#\# 8 | Female | D | 131 | 244 |
| \#\# 9 | Male | E | 53 | 138 |
| \#\# 10 | Female | E | 94 | 299 |
| \#\# 11 | Male | F | 22 | 351 |
| \#\# 12 | Female | F | 24 | 317 |

In order to do logistic regression for this kind of data, the response is the columns Admit and Reject (which means that we model the probability of admit) :

```
m0 <- glm(cbind(Admit, Reject) ~ Gender + Dept, family = binomial, data = admission)
```

The glm-object m0 is a logistic model with main effects of Gender and Department.

- Investigate whether there is any effect of these predictors.

As a hint you might look at section 9.3 in the combined lecture notes.

```
summary (m0)
##
## Call:
## glm(formula = cbind(Admit, Reject) ~ Gender + Dept, family = binomial,
## data = admission)
##
## Coefficients:
## Estimate Std. Error z value Pr}(>|z|
## (Intercept) 0.68192 0.09911 6.880 5.97e-12 ***
## GenderMale -0.09987 0.08085 -1.235 0.217
## DeptB -0.04340 0.10984 -0.395 0.693
## DeptC -1.26260 0.10663 -11.841 < 2e-16 ***
## DeptD -1.29461 0.10582 -12.234 < 2e-16 ***
## DeptE <-1.73931 0.12611 -13.792 < 2e-16 ***
## DeptF -3.30648 0.16998 -19.452 < 2e-16 ***
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## (Dispersion parameter for binomial family taken to be 1)
##
## Null deviance: 877.056 on 11 degrees of freedom
## Residual deviance: 20.204 on 5 degrees of freedom
## AIC: 103.14
##
## Number of Fisher Scoring iterations: 4
```

Looking at the summary of m0:

- Is there a significant gender difference?
- What is the interpretation of the numbers in the DeptB-row?

We add the standardized residuals to admission:


| \#\# | 11 | Male | F | 22 | 351 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| \#\# | 12 | Female | F | 24 | 317 |

\#\# 12 Female F $24 \quad 317 \quad 0.30$

- Looking at the standardized residuals, which department deviates heavily from the model?
- What gender is discrimated in this department?

Next you should fit the model with the interaction Gender*Dept and use anova to compare this to m0.

- Explain what interaction means in the current context.
- Is there a significant interaction?
- In the light of your analysis, explain the reason for your answer to the previous question.

