

Weights of books

	weight (g)	volume (cm ³)	cover
1	800	885	hc
2	950	1016	hc
3	1050	1125	hc
4	350	239	hc
5	750	701	hc
6	600	641	hc
7	1075	1228	hc
8	250	412	pb
9	700	953	pb
10	650	929	pb
11	975	1492	pb
12	350	419	pb
13	950	1010	pb
14	425	595	pb
15	725	1034	pb



Lecture 17 - Introduction to Multiple linear regression


Sta102 / BME102

Colin Rundel

April 7, 2014

Weights of hard cover and paperback books

Can you identify a trend in the relationship between volume and weight of hardcover and paperback books?



Modeling weights of books using volume and cover type

```
book_mlr = lm(weight ~ volume + cover, data = allbacks)
summary(book_mlr)
```

```
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)  197.96284   59.19274   3.344 0.005841 **
## volume       0.71795    0.06153  11.669 6.6e-08 ***
## cover:pb    -184.04727   40.49420  -4.545 0.000672 ***
##
##
## Residual standard error: 78.2 on 12 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.9275, Adjusted R-squared:  0.9154
## F-statistic: 76.73 on 2 and 12 DF,  p-value: 1.455e-07
```

Linear model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

$$\widehat{\text{weight}} = 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \text{ cover:pb}$$


- 1 For *hardcover* books: plug in *0* for cover

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\text{weight}} &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \times 0 \\ &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume}\end{aligned}$$

- 2 For *paperback* books: plug in *1* for cover

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\text{weight}} &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \times 1 \\ &= 13.91 + 0.72 \text{ volume}\end{aligned}$$

Visualising the linear model



Interpretation of the regression coefficients

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

- **Slope of volume:** All else held constant, for each 1 cm³ increase in volume we would expect weight to increase on average by 0.72 grams.
- **Slope of cover:** All else held constant, the model predicts that paperback books weigh 184 grams less than hardcover books, on average.
- **Intercept:** Hardcover books with no volume are expected on average to weigh 198 grams.
 - Obviously, the intercept does not make sense in context. It only serves to adjust the height of the line.


Prediction

What is the correct calculation for the predicted weight of a paperback book that has a volume of 600 cm³?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

A note on interactions

$$\widehat{\text{weight}} = 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \text{ cover:pb}$$



This model assumes that hardcover and paperback books have the same slope for the relationship between their volume and weight. If this isn't reasonable, then we would include an "interaction" variable in the model.

Example of an interaction

```
summary( lm(weight ~ volume + cover + volume:cover, data = allbacks) )
```

```
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)  161.58654   86.51918   1.868  0.0887 .
## volume       0.76159    0.09718   7.837 7.94e-06 ***
## coverpb     -120.21407  115.65899  -1.039  0.3209
## volume:coverpb -0.07573   0.12802  -0.592  0.5661
##
## Residual standard error: 80.41 on 11 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.9297, Adjusted R-squared:  0.9105
## F-statistic:  48.5 on 3 and 11 DF, p-value: 1.245e-06
```

$$\widehat{\text{weight}} = 161.58 + 0.76 \text{ volume} - 120.21 \text{ cover:pb} - 0.076 \text{ volume} \times \text{cover:pb}$$

Example of an interaction - interpretation

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	161.5865	86.5192	1.87	0.0887
volume	0.7616	0.0972	7.84	0.0000
coverpb	-120.2141	115.6590	-1.04	0.3209
volume:coverpb	-0.0757	0.1280	-0.59	0.5661


Regression equations for hardbacks:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{weight}} &= 161.58 + 0.76 \text{ volume} - 120.21 \times 0 - 0.076 \text{ volume} \times 0 \\ &= 161.58 + 0.76 \text{ volume} \end{aligned}$$


Regression equations for paperbacks:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{weight}} &= 161.58 + 0.76 \text{ volume} - 120.21 \times 1 - 0.076 \text{ volume} \times 1 \\ &= 41.37 + 0.686 \text{ volume} \end{aligned}$$

Example of an interaction - Results




Revisit: Modeling poverty



Predicting poverty using % female householder

```
summary(lm(poverty ~ female_house, data = poverty))
```

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	3.31	1.90	1.74	0.09
female_house	0.69	0.16	4.32	0.00



$$R = 0.53$$

$$R^2 = 0.53^2 = 0.28$$

Another look at R² - from last week

```
anova(lm(poverty ~ female_house, data = poverty))
```

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.68	0.00
Residuals	49	347.68	7.10		
Total	50	480.25			

$$SS_{Tot} = \sum (y - \bar{y})^2 = 480.25 \rightarrow \text{total variability}$$

$$SS_{Err} = \sum e_i^2 = 347.68 \rightarrow \text{unexplained variability}$$

$$SS_{Reg} = SS_{Total} - SS_{Error} \rightarrow \text{explained variability}$$

$$= 480.25 - 347.68 = 132.57$$

$$R^2 = \frac{\text{explained variability}}{\text{total variability}} = \frac{132.57}{480.25} = 0.28 \checkmark$$

Predicting poverty using % female hh + % white

```
pov_mlr = lm(poverty ~ female_house + white, data = poverty)
summary(pov_mlr)
```

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-2.58	5.78	-0.45	0.66
female_house	0.89	0.24	3.67	0.00
white	0.04	0.04	1.08	0.29

```
anova(pov_mlr)
```

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.74	0.00
white	1	8.21	8.21	1.16	0.29
Residuals	48	339.47	7.07		
Total	50	480.25			

$$R^2 = \frac{\text{explained variability}}{\text{total variability}} = \frac{132.57 + 8.21}{480.25} = 0.29$$

R² vs. adjusted R²

	R ²	Adjusted R ²
Model 1 (poverty vs. female_house)	0.2760	0.2613
Model 2 (poverty vs. female_house + white)	0.2931	0.2637

- We would like to have some criteria to evaluate if adding an additional variable makes a difference in the explanatory power of the model.
- When any variable is added to the model R² increases.
- Adjusted R² is based on R² but it penalizes the addition of variables

Calculate adjusted R²

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.74	0.0001
white	1	8.21	8.21	1.16	0.2868
Residuals	48	339.47	7.07		
Total	50	480.25			

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_{adj}^2 &= 1 - \left(\frac{SS_{Error}}{SS_{Total}} \times \frac{n - 1}{n - k - 1} \right) \\
 &= 1 - \left(\frac{339.47}{480.25} \times \frac{51 - 1}{51 - 2 - 1} \right) \\
 &= 1 - \left(\frac{339.47}{480.25} \times \frac{50}{48} \right) \\
 &= 1 - 0.74 \\
 &= 0.26
 \end{aligned}$$

Adjusted R²


Adjusted R²

$$R_{adj}^2 = 1 - \left(\frac{SS_{Error}}{SS_{Total}} \times \frac{n - 1}{n - k - 1} \right)$$

where n is the number of cases and k is the number of predictors (explanatory variables) in the model.

- Because k is never negative, R_{adj}^2 will always be smaller than R^2 .
- R_{adj}^2 applies a penalty for the number of predictors included in the model.
- Therefore, we prefer models with higher R_{adj}^2

We saw that adding the variable `white` to the model only marginally increased adjusted R², i.e. did not add much useful information to the model. Why?



Collinearity between explanatory variables (cont.)

- Two predictor variables are said to be collinear when they are correlated, and this *collinearity* (also called *multicollinearity*) complicates model estimation.
Remember: Predictors are also called explanatory or independent variables, so ideally they should be independent of each other.
- We don't like adding predictors that are associated with each other to the model, because often times the addition of such variable brings nothing to the table. Instead, we prefer the simplest model that explains as much as possible - the most *parsimonious* model.
- In addition, inclusion of collinear variables can result in biased estimates of the slope parameters.
- While it's impossible to avoid all collinearity, often experiments are designed to control for correlated predictors.

Modeling children's test scores

Predicting cognitive test scores of three- and four-year-old children using characteristics of their mothers. Data are from a survey of adult American women and their children - a subsample from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth.

	kid_score	mom_hs	mom_iq	mom_work	mom_age
1	65	yes	121.12	yes	27
⋮					
5	115	yes	92.75	yes	27
6	98	no	107.90	no	18
⋮					
434	70	yes	91.25	yes	25

Gelman, Hill. *Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models*. (2007) Cambridge University Press.

Model output

```
cog_full = lm(kid_score ~ mom_hs + mom_iq + mom_work + mom_age,
             data = cognitive)
summary(cog_full)
```

```
##              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 19.59241    9.21906   2.125  0.0341
## mom_hsy     5.09482    2.31450   2.201  0.0282
## mom_iq      0.56147    0.06064   9.259 <2e-16
## mom_workyes 2.53718    2.35067   1.079  0.2810
## mom_age     0.21802    0.33074   0.659  0.5101
##
## Residual standard error: 18.14 on 429 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.2171, Adjusted R-squared:  0.2098
## F-statistic: 29.74 on 4 and 429 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

Inference for the model as a whole

Is the model as a whole significant?

$$H_0 : \beta_0 = \beta_1 = \dots = \beta_k = 0$$

$$H_A : \text{At least one of the } \beta_i \neq 0$$

F-statistic: 29.74 on 4 and 429 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

Since p-value < 0.05, the model as a whole is significant.

- The F test yielding a significant result doesn't mean the model fits the data well, it just means at least one of the β s is non-zero.
- The F test not yielding a significant result doesn't mean individuals variables included in the model are not good predictors of y , it just means that the combination of these variables doesn't yield a good model.

Inference for the slope(s)

Is whether or not mom went to high school a significant predictor of kid's cognitive test score, given all other variables in the model?

$H_0: \beta_1 = 0$, when all other variables are included in the model

$H_A: \beta_1 \neq 0$, when all other variables are included in the model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	19.59241	9.21906	2.125	0.0341
mom_hsyas	5.09482	2.31450	2.201	0.0282
mom_iq	0.56147	0.06064	9.259	<2e-16
mom_workyes	2.53718	2.35067	1.079	0.2810
mom_age	0.21802	0.33074	0.659	0.5101

Residual standard error: 18.14 on 429 degrees of freedom

$T = 2.201$, $df = n - k - 1 = 434 - 4 - 1 = 429$, $p\text{-value} = 0.0282$

Since $p\text{-value} < 0.05$, whether or not mom went to high school is a significant predictor of kid's test score, given all other variables in the model.

Interpreting the slope

What is the correct interpretation of the slope for mom_work?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	19.59	9.22	2.13	0.03
mom_hs:yes	5.09	2.31	2.20	0.03
mom_iq	0.56	0.06	9.26	0.00
mom_work:yes	2.54	2.35	1.08	0.28
mom_age	0.22	0.33	0.66	0.51

CI Recap from last time

Inference for the slope for a SLR model (only one explanatory variable):

- Hypothesis test:

$$T = \frac{b_1 - \text{null value}}{SE_{b_1}} \quad df = n - 2 = n - 1 - 1$$

- Confidence interval:

$$b_1 \pm t_{df}^* \times SE_{b_1}$$

The only difference for MLR is that we use b_i instead of b_1 , and use $df = n - k - 1$

CI for the slope

Construct a 95% confidence interval for the slope of mom_work.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & b_k \pm t^* SE_{b_k} \\
 & df = n - k - 1 = 434 - 4 - 1 = 429 \rightarrow 400 \\
 & 2.54 \pm 1.97 \times 2.35 \\
 & 2.54 \pm 4.63 \\
 & (-2.0895, 7.1695)
 \end{aligned}$$

Interpretation?

Inference for the slope(s) (cont.)

Given all variables in the model, which variables are significant predictors of kid's cognitive test score?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	19.59241	9.21906	2.125	0.0341
mom_hsyas	5.09482	2.31450	2.201	0.0282
mom_iq	0.56147	0.06064	9.259	<2e-16
mom_workyas	2.53718	2.35067	1.079	0.2810
mom_age	0.21802	0.33074	0.659	0.5101