



## Evaluating random slopes for an HMLM model

HMLM and HMLM2 do not produce final tables for the variance components and  $\chi^2$  - statistics for individual components as is the case with HLM2 and HLM3. Consider the model for NYS data given in the HLM manual:

### Model 1:

#### Level-1 Model

$$Y = \text{IND1} * Y1 + \text{IND2} * Y2 + \text{IND3} * Y3 + \text{IND4} * Y4 + \text{IND5} * Y5$$
$$Y^* = B0 + B1 (\text{AGE13}) + R$$

#### Level-2 Model

$$B00 = G00 + U0$$
$$B1 = G10$$

Now consider the modified model with both a random intercept and a random AGE13 slope:

### Model 2:

#### Level-1 Model

$$Y = \text{IND1} * Y1 + \text{IND2} * Y2 + \text{IND3} * Y3 + \text{IND4} * Y4 + \text{IND5} * Y5$$
$$Y^* = B0 + B1 (\text{AGE13}) + R$$

#### Level-2 Model

$$B00 = G00 + U0$$
$$B1 = G10 + U1$$

To evaluate the random slope in the second model, fit both models as shown above: that is, models with and without the random slope of interest.

The deviance statistic for the unrestricted model is the same for both cases, namely

Deviance = -378.256523

Number of estimated parameters = 17

The deviance statistic for the model 1 (only one random effect at level-2) is

Deviance = -228.997813  
Number of estimated parameters = 4

while the deviance statistics for the model 2 (2 random effects at level-2) is

Deviance = -338.065855  
Number of estimated parameters = 6

The difference between the two deviance statistics obtained for the respective models has a  $\chi^2$  -distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the difference in the number of parameters estimated. In this case, the  $\tau$  -matrix for model 2 has three non-duplicated elements

$$\begin{matrix} \text{var}(u_0) \\ \text{cov}(u_0, u_1) & \text{var}(u_1) \end{matrix}$$

compared to the  $\tau$  for model 1 with only one element  $u_0$ . The difference in the number of parameters estimated is thus equal to 2. Note that by using this approach, the researcher is essentially testing that all variance-covariance components associated with the level-1 predictor are making a significant contribution to the explanation of variation in the outcome.