

Corrections to second edition

Analysis of Ordinal Categorical Data

Thanks to those who have pointed out errors, including Garry Anderson, David Hoaglin, Theo Nijssen, Nigel Smeeton, and Marek Omelka. Some of these errors have, I hope, been corrected in later printings of the book.

p. 6, Figure 1.1: In the label on the vertical axis of the right-hand plot, the y should not have an asterisk.

p. 28: In Table 2.5 and in the formula for SE, 1698 should be 1701.

p. 35: The count for the (mismatch, extreme) cell should be 1, as should the total in that column.

p. 89: The sentence with the third displayed equation, namely “The corresponding model for the category probabilities is ...” should be deleted. The correct formula for the model, which is clearer following the discussion in Section 4.1.3, is

$$\pi_j(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\exp(\sum_{k=j}^{c-1} \alpha_k + (c-j)\boldsymbol{\beta}'\mathbf{x})}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{c-1} \exp(\sum_{k'=j}^{c-1} \alpha_{k'} + (c-j)\boldsymbol{\beta}'\mathbf{x})}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, c-1.$$

p. 139: The intercept for the mean response model, reported as -5.08 , should not have the minus sign.

p. 153: For the output shown in Table 6.3, the column scores were (3, 2, 1) rather than (1, 2, 3), which is why $\hat{\beta} = 0.390$ instead of $\hat{\beta} = -0.390$ as stated in the text. Likewise, on p. 154, the marginal mean reported for opinion about astrology is based on the scores (3, 2, 1), which is why the mean is reported as 2.63, instead of 1.37, as it would be for the scores (1, 2, 3). The standardized scores should then also have reverse order and reversed sign.

p. 230: In the example, the second sample mean should be 3.789 (instead of 3.799).

p. 250: In the displayed formulas for popular choices for the weights for weighted kappa, 1 should be separate rather than in the numerator of the ratios shown; e.g., $w_{ij} = 1 - \frac{|i-j|}{c-1}$.

p. 290: Ten lines from the bottom, “estimated time at time 1” should be “estimated odds at time 1”.

p. 332: For the ML analysis, the SE is reported as 0.395 in the text but 0.396 in Table 11.5. Each is actually correct, as Newton-Raphson (observed information) yields 0.395 whereas Fisher scoring (expected information) yields 0.396.