Beverly Martinez and Donna Brogan, Emory University

INTRODUCTION

This paper uses the results of a 1983 complex sample survey in rural Georgia to empirically compare two methods of estimating the intraclass correlation (ROH) of blood pressure. One method estimates ROH from the design effect (DEFF). The other method estimates ROH from the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of a nested design. We found that the two methods give approximately equivalent estimates when the sample sizes are not too small. Sampling variability is one possible explanation for some discrepancies we observed when the sample sizes are small. METHODS

The complex sample survey conducted in six counties in south Georgia was designed with the counties as strata and segments of 16 to 73 housing units (HU's) as the primary sampling units (PSU's). Within each selected PSU, 6 to 18 HU's were selected, and all adults (18 years or older) in the selected HU's were interviewed. This paper estimates the intraclass correlation of diastolic blood pressure within ultimate clusters. An ultimate cluster consists of all adults belonging to the same PSU. We have estimated ROH for each stratum separately, and for some age, race and sex domains in each stratum. All analyses were unweighted. (Probabilities of HU selection within a stratum were planned to be equal.)

The first method uses the formula suggested by Kish (1965) Deff-1

$$roh = \frac{berr-r}{b} - 1$$

where b = the average size of the clusters

Deff = the design effect, computed by SESUDAAN, a computer program developed at the Research Triangle Institute (RTI).

The second method uses the formula suggested by Ebel (1951)

$$roh = \frac{MSC - MSE}{MSC + (h^{*}-1) MSE}$$

where MSC, MSE and b* are obtained from the following ANOVA table of an unbalanced nested design:

Source	d.f.	SS	MS	E(MS)				
Among clusters	a-1 ∑ i=]	$b_{i}(\bar{y}_{i},-\bar{y}_{})^{2}$	MSC	$b*\sigma_c^2+\sigma_e^2$				
Within clusters	a n-a∑ i=1	$\sum_{j=1}^{b^{i}} (y_{ij} - \bar{y}_{i.})^{2}$	MSE	σ ² e				
The coefficient b* is given by								
$b*=(n-\sum_{j=1}^{a}b_{j}^{2}/n)/(a-1)$								
where	a=the r	number of clus	ters					
b _i = the number of adults in the ith								
$n = the total sample size, \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i$								

RESULTS

Tables 1 to 6 give the results for the six counties or strata. Rounded to the first decimal place, the difference between estimates of ROH from the two methods is approximately zero for 58 out of 66 instances (88%). This we consider as a relatively high degree of agreement.

The two methods produce estimates which differ considerably from each other only for those domains with small sample sizes. For example, black men in Crawford County were selected in only four PSU's with an average cluster size of 5, for a total sample size of 20 adults. The estimate of ROH from DEFF is -0.07 while that from the ANOVA is 0.48, giving a difference of -0.55. In contrast, the two estimates of ROH for the total population in each stratum did not differ from each other by more than 0.02. The sample sizes for these strata range from 134 to 370. Hence, the sample size seems to affect the magnitude of the difference between the two estimates. A small sample size produces more sampling variability of estimates and therefore increases the likelihood of getting different estimates from the two methods.

Both sets of estimates were computed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) in conjunction with complex sample survey software developed at the Research Triangle Institute (RTI). Within this statistical package, estimating ROH from DEFF for all domains in all counties used up a total of approximately 9 CPU seconds. The same number of estimates obtained from the ANOVA used up a total of approximately 5 CPU seconds. It was noted that the first method uses the procedure SESUDAAN which took about the same amount of time (4.39 CPU seconds) as the procedure NESTED (4.49 CPU seconds) used by the second method. The total amount of time used in computing ROH was greater for the_first method because the average cluster size (b) had to be computed separately first, while the coefficient b* was already outputted by the NESTED procedure.

CONCLUSION

Except for domains with very small sample sizes, estimates of the intraclass correlation obtained from the design effect are approximately equivalent to estimates obtained from the analysis of variance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Work on this paper was supported by grant HL24004, "Community Hypertension Intervention Program," awarded by NHLBI of the NIH to Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia. Acknowledgements are expressed to staff at Fort Valley State College, Emory University School of Medicine, and Georgia Department of Human Resources for contributing to the implementation of the sample survey.

Table 1								
Estimates of Intraclass Correlation (roh)								
of Blood Pressure Among Adults in								
Crawford County, Georgia, 1983								

Domain	n ¹	a ²	-3 b	roh_1^4	roh2	diff ⁶
Total Popn	134	8	17	0.06	0.06	0.00
01d ⁷	13	7	2	0.11	-0.02	0.13
Young ⁸	121	8	15	0.05	0.04	0.01
Blacks	42	4	10	0.01	0.13	-0.12
Whites	92	8	12	0.04	-0.02	0.06
Women	69	8	9	0.05	0.05	0.00
Men	65	8	8	0.07	0.07	0.00
Black Women	22	4	6	-0.07	-0.01	-0.06
Black Men	20	4	5	-0.07	0.48	-0.55
White Women	47	7	7	0.16	0.04	0.12
White Men	45	8	6	-0.07	-0.12	0.05

Table 2 Estimates of Intraclass Correlation (roh) of Blood Pressure Among Adults in Macon County, Georgia, 1983

Domain	n]	a ²	⁻³	roh ⁴	roh_2^5	diff ⁶
Total Popn	292	12	24	0.02	0.04	-0.02
01d ⁷	54	12	4	-0.06	-0.07	0.01
Young ⁸	238	12	20	0.01	0.04	-0.03
Blacks	176	11	16	-0.02	0.00	-0.02
Whites	116	8	14	0.10	0.14	-0.04
Women	163	12	14	0.00	0.00	0.00
Men	129	12	11	0.04	0.08	-0.04
Black Womer	n 100	11	9	-0.07	-0.06	-0.01
Black Men	76	10	8	-0.06	-0.03	-0.03
Black Wome	n 63	8	8	0.18	0.20	-0.02
White Men	53	8	7	0.20	0.19	0.01

Estima of	tes of Blood Peach	Intra Press Count	Tabl iclas iure ty, (e 3 s Corr Among Georgia	elation Adults i , 1983	(roh) n
Domain	n ¹	a ²	<u>ь</u> З	roh_1^4	roh ⁵	diff ⁶
Total Popn	370	20	18	0.03	0.04	-0.01
01d ⁷	49	17	3	0.64	0.29	0.35
Young ⁸	321	20	16	0.02	0.01	0.01
Blacks	147	11	13	0.03	0.01	0.02
Whites	223	14	16	0.05	0.05	0.00
Women	213	20	11	0.07	0.07	0.00
Men	157	20	8	0.01	-0.02	0.03
Black Women	91	11	8	0.01	0.00	0.01
Black Men	56	10	6	-0.07	-0.08	0.01
White Women	122	14	9	0.21	0.16	0.05
White Men	101	14	7	0.02	-0.02	0.04

Table 4 Estimates of Intraclass Correlation (roh) of Blood Pressure Among Adults in Taylor County, Georgia, 1983

Domain	n ¹	a ²	-3 b	roh ⁴	roh ⁵ 2	diff ⁶
Total Popn	157	8	20	0.11	0.10	0.01
01 d ⁷	31	8	4	0.23	0.14	0.09
Young ⁸	126	8	16	0.12	0.11	0.01
Blacks	101	6	17	0.11	0.15	-0.04
Whites	56	6	9	0.02	0.00	0.02
Women	95	8	12	0.08	0.06	0.02
Men	62	7	9	0.12	0.19	-0.07
Black Women	66	6	11	0.10	0.12	-0.02
Black Men	35	5	7	0.21	0.27	-0.06
White Women	29	6	5	-0.11	-0.10	-0.01
White Men	27	5	5	0.08	0.11	-0.03

See Table 7 for footnotes.

Table 5 Estimates of Intraclass Correlation (roh) of Blood Pressure Among Adults in Twiggs County, Georgia, 1983

		•	-	5 -		
Domain	n ¹	a ²	-3 b	roh_1^4	roh ₂ 5	diff ⁶
Total Popn	342	16	21	0.06	0.05	0.01
01 d ⁷	42	13	3	0.21	0.11	0.10
Young ⁸	300	16	19	0.03	0.03	0.00
Blacks	215	13	17	0.09	0.08	0.01
Whites	127	14	9	-0.06	-0.04	-0.02
Women	197	16	12	0.04	0.03	0.01
Men	145	16	9	0.08	0.06	0.02
Black Women	126	13	10	0.03	0.05	-0.02
Black Men	89	13	7	0.16	0.05	0.11
White Women	71	14	5	-0.13	-0.11	-0.02
White Men	56	13	4	-0.16	-0.10	-0.06

Table 7 Footnotes to Tables 1 to 6

- 1. n = total number of adults interviewed in
 the domain
- 2. a = number of primary sampling units in
- which domain members are present
- b = average cluster size for PSU's where domain members are present
- 5. roh₂ = estimate of ROH from the analysis of variance (ANOVA) computed by the SAS procedure NESTED
- 6. diff = $roh_1 roh_2$
- 7. old = age > 65 years
- 8. young = age > 18 years and age < 65 years

Table 6
Estimates of Intraclass Correlation (roh)
of Blood Pressure Among Adults in
Wilkinson County, Georgia, 1983

ATTRI	1501	oouncy, acongra, 1505					
Domain	n ¹	a ²	-3 b	roh_1^4	roh_2^5	diff ⁶	
Total Popn	281	16	18	0.08	0.08	0.00	
01d ⁷	72	15	5	-0.09	-0.08	-0.01	
Young ⁸	209	16	13	0.11	0.12	-0.01	
Blacks	69	10	7	-0.05	-0.01	-0.04	
Whites	212	16	13	0.04	0.05	-0.01	
Women	154	16	10	0.04	0.06	-0.02	
Men	127	16	8	0.08	0.08	0.00	
Black Women	37	10	4	-0.15	-0.06	-0.09	
Black Men	32	8	4	-0.22	-0.10	-0.12	
White Women	117	16	7	0.00	0.03	-0.03	
White Men	95	16	6	0.02	0.01	0.01	

References

- Ebel, R.L. (1951), "Estimation of the Reliability of Ratings," <u>Psychometrika</u> <u>16</u>, 407-24.
- Kish, L. (1965), <u>Survey Sampling</u>, New York: John Wiley.
- SAS Institute Inc. <u>SAS User's Guide:</u> <u>Statistics</u>, 1982 ed., Cary, NC: SAS <u>Institute</u> Inc., 1982.
 Shah, B.V. "SESUDAAN: Standard Errors
- 4. Shah, B.V. "SESUDAAN: Standard Errors Program for Computing of Standardized Rates from Sample Survey Data." Report #RTI/5250/00-015. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, N.C. April, 1981.