A LIKELIHOOD RATIO TEST FOR *MTP*₂ WITHIN BINARY VARIABLES

F. Bartolucci

Dipartimento di Scienze Statistiche Università di Perugia, Italy

Definition

• Let

$$\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_J)' \in \mathcal{X}$$

be a random vector of binary variables and $p(\mathbf{X})$ denote its joint probability distribution.

• If, for any pair of vectors \mathbf{x}_1 and $\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$p[\min(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)]p[\max(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)] \ge p(\mathbf{x}_1)p(\mathbf{x}_2)$$

then the random vector \mathbf{X} is Multivariate Totally Positive (MTP_2) .

MTP₂ defines a stochastic ordering amounting to a strong form of positive dependence since implies Association (A) and Strongly Positive Orthant Dependence (SPOD) (e. g. Holland and Rosenbaum, 1986). • J=2,

$$X_{2} = 0 \quad X_{2} = 1$$
$$X_{1} = 0 \quad p(00) \quad p(01)$$
$$X_{1} = 1 \quad p(10) \quad p(11)$$

$$\rho(X_1, X_2) = \log \frac{p(00)p(11)}{p(01)p(10)} \ge 0$$

• J=3,

$$X_{3} = 0 \qquad X_{3} = 1$$

$$X_{2} = 0 \quad X_{2} = 1 \quad X_{2} = 0 \quad X_{2} = 1$$

$$X_{1} = 0 \quad p(000) \quad p(010) \quad p(001) \quad p(011)$$

$$X_{1} = 1 \quad p(100) \quad p(110) \quad p(101) \quad p(111)$$

$$\rho(X_1, X_2 | X_3 = 0) \ge 0 \qquad \rho(X_1, X_2 | X_3 = 1) \ge 0$$

$$\rho(X_1, X_3 | X_2 = 0) \ge 0 \qquad \rho(X_1, X_3 | X_2 = 1) \ge 0$$

$$\rho(X_2, X_3 | X_1 = 0) \ge 0 \qquad \rho(X_2, X_3 | X_1 = 1) \ge 0$$

• Let $\mathcal{P} = \{j_1, j_2\}$ be any pair of indices belonging to $\mathcal{J} = \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$ and $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{P}}$.

• $\rho(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{U})$ be the log-odds ratio in the 2 × 2 subtable corresponding to the conditional distribution of (X_{j_1}, X_{j_2}) given $X_j = 1, \forall j \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X_j = 0, \forall j \notin \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{U}$.

•
$$J = 3, \mathcal{P} = \{1, 2\}, \mathcal{U} = \emptyset,$$

 $\rho(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{U}) = \rho(X_1, X_2 | X_3 = 0).$

•
$$J = 4, \mathcal{P} = \{2, 3\}, \mathcal{U} = \{1\},$$

 $\rho(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{U}) = \rho(X_2, X_3 | X_1 = 1, X_4 = 0).$

• In general (for any J), MTP_2 holds if and only if (Karlin and Rinott, 1980) for any $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{J}$ and any $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{P}}$

$$\rho(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{U}) \ge 0.$$

• In the whole we have a condition that concerns

$$\binom{J}{2} 2^{J-2}$$

log-odds ratios.

• We propose a procedure to test if MTP_2 holds for a certain data set.

• This condition is relevant in many fields: statistical mechanics, computer storage, Item Response Theory (IRT) models. IRT models are latent variable models used for the analysis of the results of a test assigned to a group of subjects. X_j is the response of an examinee to the *j*th item of the test:

- $-X_{j} = 1$ the response is correct
- $-X_j = 0$ otherwise

• These models are usually based on the non-parametric assumptions of *Local independence* (LI) and *Unidimensionality* (U) and *Monotonicity* (M).

• LI, U and M imply MTP_2 : violation of MTP_2 for a data set implies that no IRT model for the data set may exist.

• The procedure to test MTP₂ is based on the likelihood ratio statistic between a saturated log-linear model and the same model whose parameters are constrained to take into account MTP₂.

• The saturated model log-linear model is defined as

$$\log(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta}$$

where

 $-\mathbf{p}$ is the vector of all the joint probabilities apart from the first that is redundant;

 $-\mathbf{Z}$ is an invertible matrix obtained by deleting the first row and the first column from

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{E} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{E}}_{J \text{ times}}, \text{ with } \mathbf{E} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

 $-\beta$ is the parameter vector.

• The vector of all the conditional log-odds ratios $(\rho(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{U}))$ may be obtained as

$$oldsymbol{
ho} = \mathbf{R}oldsymbol{eta}$$

where \mathbf{R} is an appropriate matrix that may be obtained trough a series of Kronecker products between matrices \mathbf{E} and vectors $\mathbf{e}' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

• Since MTP₂ holds if and only if $\rho \geq 0$, MTP₂ is also equivalent to the requirement that the β belongs to the convex cone

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\boldsymbol{\beta} : \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\beta} \ge 0\}.$$

Maximum Likelihood Estimation

• Under the multinomial sampling scheme, let \boldsymbol{y} denote the vector of the observed frequencies apart from the first $(\boldsymbol{y}(\mathbf{0}))$ which is redundant.

• To estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ under MTP₂ we have to maximize the log-likelihood

 $L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y}' \log(\mathbf{p}) + (n - \mathbf{1}' \mathbf{y}) \log[1 - \mathbf{1}' \log(\mathbf{p})] + \text{constant}$

under the constraint $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{C}$.

• To maximize $L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y})$ under $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{C}$, an iterative algorithm based on reweighted least squared is proposed.

• At step any step the operation

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathcal{C}}Q(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\beta}_0),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ is the estimate at previous step, is performed. $Q(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ is the second order Taylor expansion of L in $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$.

• The starting value is given by the unrestricted estimate

 $\mathbf{Z}^{-1}\log[\mathbf{y}/y(\mathbf{0})].$

• This algorithm converges to the maximum of the L under $\beta \in C$ (concavity of L).

Hypothesis testing

- H_0 hypothesis of independence $(\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0})$.
- H_P hypothesis that MTP₂ holds ($\beta \in C$).
- H_U hypothesis that $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is unrestricted.

• Let $L_h(\mathbf{y})$ be the maximum likelihood obtained under the hypothesis h (h = 0, P, U).

• To test H_0 versus H_P/H_0 and H_P versus H_U/H_P a decomposition of the G^2 statistic for testing independence is used:

$$G^{2} = 2[L_{U}(\mathbf{y}) - L_{0}(\mathbf{y})] = T_{PU} + T_{0P}$$

where:

 $-T_{0P} = 2[L_P(\mathbf{y}) - L_0(\mathbf{y})] \text{ is a measure of the discrepancy}$ against H_0 in the direction of H_P ; $-T_{PU} = 2[L_U(\mathbf{y}) - L_P(\mathbf{y})] \text{ is a measure of the discrepancy}$

against H_P in the direction of H_U .

Asymptotic distribution of T_{0P} and T_{PU}

• Under H_0 , when *n* increases while *J* remains constant T_{PU} converges in distribution to

$$Q_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}} \sim \bar{\chi}^2(\bar{\mathcal{C}}, \Sigma)$$

and T_{0P} converges in distribution to

$$Q_{\mathcal{C}} \sim \bar{\chi}^2(\mathcal{C}, \Sigma)$$

where Σ is the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ (unconstrained estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$).

• In general for a cone \mathcal{S} and a covariance matrix \mathbf{V} , $\bar{\chi}^2(\mathcal{S}, \mathbf{V})$ is the distribution of

$$Q_{\mathcal{S}} = \hat{\mathbf{v}}' \mathbf{V}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{v}}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is the orthogonal projection of $\mathbf{v} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V})$ in the \mathbf{V}^{-1} metric. $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ solves the problem

$$\min_{\hat{\mathbf{v}}\in\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{v}-\hat{\mathbf{v}})'\mathbf{V}^{-1}(\mathbf{v}-\hat{\mathbf{v}}).$$

• $\bar{\chi}^2(\mathcal{S}, \mathbf{V})$ is a mixture of χ^2 distributions with appropriate weights which depend on \mathcal{S} and \mathbf{V} .

• In practice, once compute the value of T_{PU} to test for MTP₂ it is possible to compute a *local p*-value as

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} P(T_{PU} > t_{PU}) = \sum_{0}^{t} w_j(\bar{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_0) Pr(\chi_j^2 > t_{PU})$$

where:

- $-t = s^J J 1;$
- $-\hat{\Sigma}_0$ is the estimate of Σ under H_0 ;

 weights are estimated, with the required precision, by a Monte Carlo Simulation.

• This *p*-value depends on the local estimate of Σ .

• It has been proven that for any c > 0,

$$P(\bar{\chi}^2(\mathcal{O}_t) \ge c) \le \lim_{n \to \infty} Pr(T_{PU} \ge c)$$
$$\le P(\chi_{t-u}^2 + \bar{\chi}^2(\mathcal{O}_u) \ge c),$$

where

-u = J(J-1)/2;

 $-\mathcal{O}_t$ and \mathcal{O}_u are the positive orthants in \mathcal{R}^t and \mathcal{R}^u , respectively;

— the covariance matrix in the $\bar{\chi}^2$ distributions is the identity matrix.

• It is possible to compute an interval for the *p*-value which does not depend on the local estimate.

• The weights of the extreme distribution may be computed without simulation since correspond to probabilities of appropriate binomial distributions.

An Application

• We analyzed a data set concerning the responses of n = 150 students to a test made-up of J = 4 items used within an assessment for a basic course in Statistics at Perugia University.

$$\mathbf{y}' = (0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 4 \ 24 \ 0 \ 3 \ 0 \ 0 \ 4 \ 10 \ 0 \ 3 \ 10 \ 90).$$

• The value of T_{PU} equals 12.0603: the *p*-value is bounded between 0.0599 and 0.1564 with a local estimate equal to 0.1114.

• MTP₂ cannot be rejected and we cannot state that IRT models are not adequate to analyze these data.

REFERENCES

- DARDANONI, V. AND FORCINA, A. (1998). A unified approach to likelihood inference on stochastic orderings in a nonparametric context. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 93: 1112-1123.
- HOLLAND, P. W. AND ROSENBAUM, P. R. (1986). Conditional association and unidimensionality in monotone latent variable models. Ann. Statist.
 14: 1523-1543.
- JUNKER, B. W. AND ELLIS, J. L. (1997). A characterization of monotone unidimensional latent variable models. *Ann. Statist.* **25**: 1327-1343.
- KARLIN, S. AND RINOTT, Y. (1980). Classes of orderings of measures and related correlation inequalities. I. Multivariate totally positive distributions. J. Mult. An. 10: 467-498.
- LAWSON, L. L. AND HANSON, R. J. (1995). Solving Least Squares Problems. Philadelphia: SIAM ed.
- LINDSAY, B., CLOGG, C. AND GREGO, J. (1991). Semiparametric estimation in the Rasch model and related exponential response models, including a simple latent class model for item analysis, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 86: 86-107.
- ROSENBAUM, P. R. (1984). Testing the conditional independence and monotonicity assumption of item response theory. *Psychometrika* **49**: 425-435.
- SHAPIRO, A. (1988). Towards a Unified Theory of Inequality Constrained Testing in Multivariate Analysis. International Statistical Review 56: 49-62.
- WOLAK, F. A. (1989). Testing inequality constraints in linear econometric models. J. Economtrics 41: 205-235.