Re: observations in different scales

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2004−07/0123.html

---

From: John Uebersax (*jsuebersax_at_yahoo.com*)
Date: 07/09/04

Date: 9 Jul 2004 03:22:08 −0700

This is an interesting question, with implications beyond the present application.

To solve the immediate problem, I agree with Rich. From a purely pragmatic standpoint, the easiest thing in my opinion is to replace the "one or more" responses with an imputed value. The most naive, "mean value" imputation would replace these values with the mean of all specific reponses of 1 or more. But that is questionable: one might easily believe that people who would like to answer, say, "90 to 100 times" would be disinclined to say "at least one, but cannot say how many", as that would be much less helpful than simply saying "90", "100" or "95." If so, then mean value imputation would not work. Better would be, as Rich suggested, to take a subset of these respondents, press them for details, and use that to produce an imputed value for all "one or more" responses.

A fully general approach, however, is also interesting to consider because this kind of situation happens often in data collection. For statistical methods (including survival models) that are based on maximum likelihood estimation, and which involve a specific likelihood function, then it seems like the likelihood function can be adapted to handle both types of data (just as it can analogously be adapted to handle missing responses).

−−
John Uebersax
Richard Ulrich <Rich.Ulrich@comcast.net> wrote in message news:<aftre0dvifjba29b2rdf0pikdgv0864e4
> 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?