

example 24 — Reliability

[Description](#)[Remarks and examples](#)[Also see](#)

Description

Below we demonstrate `sem`'s `reliability()` option with the following data:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r13/sem_rel
(measurement error with known reliabilities)
```

```
. summarize
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
y	1234	701.081	71.79378	487	943
x1	1234	100.278	14.1552	51	149
x2	1234	100.2066	14.50912	55	150

```
. notes
```

```
_dta:
```

1. Fictional data.
2. Variables `x1` and `x2` each contain a test score designed to measure `X`. The test is scored to have mean 100.
3. Variables `x1` and `x2` are both known to have reliability 0.5.
4. Variable `y` is the outcome, believed to be related to `X`.

See [\[SEM\] sem and gsem option reliability\(\)](#) for background.

Remarks and examples

stata.com

Remarks are presented under the following headings:

Baseline model (reliability ignored)

Model with reliability

Model with two measurement variables and reliability

Baseline model (reliability ignored)

```

. sem (y <- x1)
Endogenous variables
Observed:  y
Exogenous variables
Observed:  x1
Fitting target model:
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -11629.745
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -11629.745
Structural equation model                Number of obs      =      1234
Estimation method = ml
Log likelihood      = -11629.745

```

	OIM		z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	Coef.	Std. Err.				
Structural						
y <-						
x1	3.54976	.1031254	34.42	0.000	3.347637	3.751882
_cons	345.1184	10.44365	33.05	0.000	324.6492	365.5876
var(e.y)	2627.401	105.7752			2428.053	2843.115

```
LR test of model vs. saturated: chi2(0) = 0.00, Prob > chi2 = .
```

Notes:

1. In these data, variable x1 is measured with error.
2. If we ignore that, we obtain a path coefficient for $y \leftarrow x1$ of 3.55.
3. We also ran this model for $y \leftarrow x2$. We obtained a path coefficient of 3.48.

Model with reliability

```
. sem (x1<-X) (y<-X), reliability(x1 .5)
```

Endogenous variables

Measurement: x1 y

Exogenous variables

Latent: X

Fitting target model:

```
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -11745.845
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -11661.626
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -11631.469
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -11629.755
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -11629.745
Iteration 5: log likelihood = -11629.745
```

Structural equation model Number of obs = 1234

Estimation method = ml

Log likelihood = -11629.745

(1) [x1]X = 1

(2) [var(e.x1)]_cons = 100.1036

	OIM					[95% Conf. Interval]
	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z		
Measurement						
x1 <-						
X	1	(constrained)				
_cons	100.278	.4027933	248.96	0.000	99.4885	101.0674
y <-						
X	7.09952	.352463	20.14	0.000	6.408705	7.790335
_cons	701.081	2.042929	343.17	0.000	697.077	705.0851
var(e.x1)	100.1036	(constrained)				
var(e.y)	104.631	207.3381			2.152334	5086.411
var(X)	100.1036	8.060038			85.48963	117.2157

LR test of model vs. saturated: chi2(0) = 0.00, Prob > chi2 = .

Notes:

1. We wish to estimate the effect of $y \leftarrow x_1$ when x_1 is measured with error (0.50 reliability). To do that, we introduce latent variable X and write our model as $(x_1 \leftarrow X) (y \leftarrow X)$.
2. When we ignored the measurement error of x_1 , we obtained a path coefficient for $y \leftarrow x_1$ of 3.55. Taking into account the measurement error, we obtain a coefficient of 7.1.

Model with two measurement variables and reliability

```

. sem (x1 x2<-X) (y<-X), reliability(x1 .5 x2 .5)
Endogenous variables
Measurement:  x1 x2 y
Exogenous variables
Latent:      X
Fitting target model:
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -16258.636
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -16258.401
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -16258.4

Structural equation model          Number of obs      =      1234
Estimation method = ml
Log likelihood      = -16258.4
( 1) [x1]X = 1
( 2) [var(e.x1)]_cons = 100.1036
( 3) [var(e.x2)]_cons = 105.1719

```

	OIM					
	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Measurement						
x1 <-						
X	1	(constrained)				
_cons	100.278	.4037851	248.34	0.000	99.48655	101.0694
x2 <-						
X	1.030101	.0417346	24.68	0.000	.9483029	1.1119
_cons	100.2066	.4149165	241.51	0.000	99.39342	101.0199
y <-						
X	7.031299	.2484176	28.30	0.000	6.544409	7.518188
_cons	701.081	2.042928	343.17	0.000	697.077	705.0851
var(e.x1)	100.1036	(constrained)				
var(e.x2)	105.1719	(constrained)				
var(e.y)	152.329	105.26			39.31868	590.1553
var(X)	101.0907	7.343656			87.67509	116.5591

```
LR test of model vs. saturated: chi2(2) = 0.59, Prob > chi2 = 0.7430
```

Notes:

1. We wish to estimate the effect of $y <- X$. We have two measures of X — x_1 and x_2 —both measured with error (0.50 reliability).
2. In the [previous section](#), we used just x_1 . We obtained path coefficient 7.1 with standard error 0.4. Using both x_1 and x_2 , we obtain path coefficient 7.0 and standard error 0.2.
3. We at StataCorp created these fictional data. The true coefficient is 7.

Also see

[\[SEM\] sem and gsem option reliability\(\)](#) — Fraction of variance not due to measurement error

[\[SEM\] example 1](#) — Single-factor measurement model