

Research Article



Estimating Sample Size and Fitting Multilevel Model in Agricultural Experiments

Iftikhar Ud Din* and Qamruz Zaman

University of Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

Received | March 08, 2019; **Accepted** | April 20, 2019; **Published** | May 20, 2019

*Correspondence | Iftikhar Ud Din, University of Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan; Email: iftikhar.din1@gmail.com

Citation | Din, I.U. and Q. Zaman. 2019. Estimating sample size and fitting multilevel model in agricultural experiments. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*, 35(2): 630-638.

DOI | <http://dx.doi.org/10.17582/journal.sja/2019/35.2.630.638>

Keywords | Multilevel modeling, Intra-class correlation, Standard error, Effect size, Power of the test

Table 1: Sample size consideration for varying N , n , ρ and S.E of the estimate.

$\rho = 0.1$			$\rho = 0.2$		
Sample sizes	Cost	S.E	Sample sizes	Cost	S.E
J^*n	J	n	$(n+c)J$	Intercept	J^*n
4320	216	20	4320	0.02591	7525
4326	206	21	4326	0.02633	7515
4312	196	22	4312	0.02681	7520
4324	188	23	4324	0.0272	7546
4320	180	24	4320	0.02764	7548
4325	173	25	4325	0.02804	7526
4316	166	26	4316	0.02848	7535
4320	160	27	4320	0.02887	7524
4312	154	28	4312	0.02929	7552
4321	149	29	4321	0.02966	7503
4320	144	30	4320	0.03005	7497
					119
					63
					7497
					0.03099

Table 2: Comparison of SRS and Two Stage Cluster sampling.

S.E	Simple random sampling		2 Stage cluster sampling (J, n)	
	$\rho = 0$	$\rho = 0.1$	$\rho = 0.2$	
0.02	2500	9750	16980 (566, 30)	
0.03	1111	4320(144, 30)	7552 (128, 59)	

Table 3(a): Coefficients of random intercept model.

	Value	Std.Error	Df	t-value	p-value
(Intercept) (CLRM)	801.191	4.442	399	180.367	0.000
(Intercept) (MLM)	801.191	4.822	396	166.161	0.000

Table 3(b): Comparison of CLRM and MLM (Sim 1).

Model	df	AIC	BIC	logLik	Test	L.Ratio	p-value
CLRM(1)	2	4722.80	4730.78	-2359.400			
MLM (2)	3	4724.76	4736.72	-2359.378	1 vs 2	0.0430	0.8356

Table 4(a): Coefficient of random intercept model (Sim 2).

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)CLRM	469.4437	13.67558	399	34.32715	0.000
(Intercept)MLM	469.4437	88.5494	390	5.301489	0.000

Table 4(b): Comparison of CLRM and MLM (Sim 2).

Model	df	AIC	BIC	logLik	Test	L.Ratio	p-value
CLRM(1)	2	5620.157	5628.135	-2808.08			
MLM (2)	3	4528.582	4540.548	-2261.29	1vs2	1093.575	<.0001

Table 5(a): Coefficients of random intercept model (Sim 1).

	Value	Std. Error	t-value	P-value
Intercept	725.577	675.27	1.074	0.283
CLRM Covariate	0.133	0.161	0.825	0.410
Covariate 2	-0.053	0.135	-0.394	0.694
MLM Intercept	489.55	195.21	2.508	0.013
Covariate 1	-0.090	0.0417	-2.162	0.031
Covariate 2	-0.032	0.0347	-0.093	0.926

Table 5(b): Model Comparison of CCRM and MLM (Sim 1).

Model	df	AIC	BIC	logLik	Test	L.Ratio	p-value
CLRM	4	5634.41	5650.34	-2813.20			
MLM	8	4543.32	4575.19	-2263.66	1vs2	1099.08	<.0001

Table 6(a): Coefficients of random intercept model (Sim 2).

	Value	Std. Error	t-value	P-value
Intercept	133.061	709.355	0.187	0.851
CLRM Covariate 1	0.133	0.163	0.813	0.416
Covariate 2	0.066	0.142	0.466	0.641
MLM Intercept	489.55	195.70	2.508	0.013
Covariate 1	-0.090	0.0417	-2.162	0.031
Covariate 2	-0.032	0.0347	-0.093	0.926

Table 6(b): Model Comparison of CCRM and MLM (Sim 2).

Model	df	AIC	BIC	logLik	Test	L.Ratio	p-value
CLRM (1)	4	5634.41	5650.34	-2813.203			
MLM (2)	8	4543.32	4575.19	-2263.662	1vs2	1099.08	<.0001

Table 7(a): Coefficients of random intercept model (Sim 3).

	Value	Std. Error	t-value	P-value
Intercept	725.57	675.273	1.074	0.283
CLRM Covariate 1	0.133	0.161	0.825	0.410
Covariate 2	-0.053	0.135	-0.394	0.694
MLM Intercept	272.57	190.70	1.427	0.154
Covariate 1	0.134	0.0778	1.725	0.085
Covariate 2	0.037	0.0341	1.091	0.276

CLRM possess 397 df while MLM has 388 df.

Table 7(b): Model Comparison of CCRM and MLM (Sim 3).

Model	df	AIC	BIC	logLik	Test	L.Ratio	p-value
CLRM (1)	4	5606.31	5622.25	-2799.16			
MLM (2)	8	4571.76	4603.63	-2277.88	1 vs 2	1042.56	<.0001

Table 8(a): Coefficients of random intercept model (Sim 4).

	Value	Std. Error	t-value	p-value
Intercept	1206.36	745.54	1.62	0.106
CLRM Covariate 1	-0.5654	0.18	-3.10	0.002
Covariate 2	-0.1115	0.15	-0.75	0.453
MLM Intercept	654.37	203.25	3.22	0.0014
Covariate 1	-0.56	0.067	-0.23	0.8148
Covariate 2	-0.11	0.035	-0.31	0.7560

Table 8(b): Model Comparison of CCRM and MLM (Sim 4).

	df	AIC	BIC	logLik	Test	L.Ratio	p-value
CIRM (1)	4	5709.78	5725.72	-2850.89			
MLM (2)	8	4627.50	4659.37	-2305.75	1 vs 2	1090.28	<.0001