

Re: observations in different scales

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2004-07/0118.html>

From: Richard Ulrich (*Rich.Ulrich_at_comcast.net*)

Date: 07/09/04

Date: Thu, 08 Jul 2004 22:07:50 -0400

– My replies and comments –

On Wed, 7 Jul 2004 15:02:53 +0000 (UTC), stari@ms.uky.edu (Sergey Tarima) wrote:

> On Tue, 06 Jul 2004 21:34:53 -0400, Richard Ulrich wrote:

>

[snip. On reporting averages...]

RU >

> >you can show how sensitive it is to low and

> >high assumptions about the "one or more".

ST >

> What assumption are you talking about?

> Prior on the observations "one or more" or smth else?

You might want to debrief your interviewers, to learn their opinions. (I've been impressed more than once.)

Was "one or more" a hesitation to elect between 1 and 2, or was it coyness, an unwillingness to put 10 or 100?

Was it the same few subjects, throughout?

You might want to look at other responses by the same subjects, in the same manner that you investigate Missing –

You need to see if the other data on hand do support 'missing randomly' or '1+ randomly' across subjects -- a critical audience will not accept that you merely assumed this.

RU >

> >Anything you find will be tied intrinsically to the subject

> >matter, more than you have described.

ST >

> Of course it is! We have more than 100 questions in the interviews

> but (for good or not) in our report we put basically frequencies on

> these variables. Only once I had to run logistic regression.

If this is the dependent variable, it is easily 0 vs 1+ for the logistic. Based on the data listed below? If I were using this one as an independent variable, I certainly would not use it

sci.stat.math: Re: observations in different scales

in its raw form: 73% are zero, 4% are above 10, up to 96, and 5% are "1+". I might try 0/1-10/11+ as categories, with "1+" experimentally placed in each of the latter categories.

> *Hence, we can neglect all the differences among the interviewed*
> *subjects and care only about one variable (which have the observations*
> *in a mixture of continuous and categorical scales).*

>

I don't follow that sentence.

RU >

> > *This is a variety of "missing" -- and the detail is (probably)*

>