**Symbiosis Centre of Management Studies**

**NOIDA**

****

**Assessment Component-2**

**(2020-21)**

**Predictive Analytics**

**Aman Tibrewal (18021021023)**

**Divye Kant (18021021089)**

**Vridhi Wadhawan (18021021354)**

**Submitted to:**

**Dr Kriti Priya Gupta**

**Associate Professor**

# Objective: To formulate an accurate predictive linear relation model for the Average Monthly Working Hours in the Employee Data File

## 

## Case A: Employee hours

Company ABC has very poor employee satisfaction and retention. They have recently conducted a series of exit interviews to understand what went wrong and how they could make an impact on employee retention. A large number of the leaving employees indicated that they would have stayed if they were compensated with overtime pay for their extra hours. While Company ABC may not have been tracking employee hours this year, they do have a sample of previous employee data from an in-depth employee quiz performed 2 years ago. The information available for the sample employees includes currently available information such as:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.No.** | **Variable** | **Description** | **Data Type** |
| 1. | satisfaction\_level | Satisfaction level of employees | Continuous |
| 2. | last\_evaluation | Evaluation received in the last appraisal | Continuous |
| 3. | number\_project | Number of projects worked on | Discrete |
| 4. | average\_montly\_hours | Average hours an employee is likely to work | Continuous |
| 5. | time\_spend\_company | Tenure (in years) | Continuous |
| 6. | Work\_accident | Whether accident happened during work (Yes=1, No=0) | Nominal |
| 7. | left | Left the company or not (Yes=1, No=0) | Nominal |
| 8. | promotion\_last\_5years | Whether received promotion during last 5 years (Yes=1, No=0) | Nominal |
| 9. | dept | Department where employee is working | Nominal |
| 10. | salary | Salary level | Nominal |


The company wants to estimate the average hours an employee is likely to work so that it can estimate how much money it would have to pay out to its employees. Specifically, the company wants to build a predictive model for the average hours an employee is likely to work based on the other factors.

The related to the analysis and the working directory can be found in:

<https://github.com/Aman-Tibrewal/Predictive-Component>

### Data Cleaning and Processing:

There were 2996 duplicate entries in the dataset, which were removed from the dataset, after which the dataset was left with 12003 rows of data.



In addition to this, there were certain missing values identified, which were treated accordingly.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Data Type** | **Mean** | **Mode** | **Missing Values** | **Method of Treating Missing Values** |
| Satisfaction Level | Continuous | 0.63 | 0.74 | 3.00 | Imputation (Mean Value) |
| Last Evaluation | Continuous | 0.72 | 0.55 | 4.00 | Imputation (Mean Value) |
| Number Project | Discrete | 3.80 | 4.00 | 0.00 | Imputation (Mean Value) |
| Average Monthly Hours | Continuous | 200.47 | 160.00 | 3.00 | Imputation (Mean Value) |
| Time Spend Company | Continuous | 3.37 | 3.00 | 0.00 | Imputation (Mean Value) |
| Work Accident | Nominal | 0.15 | 0.00 | 1.00 | Imputation (Mode Value) |
| Left | Nominal | 0.17 | 0.00 | 3.00 | Imputation (Mode Value) |
| Promotion Last 5 Years | Nominal | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Imputation (Mode Value) |
| Dept | Nominal | 6.97 | 8.00 | 1.00 | Imputation (Mode Value) |
| Salary | Nominal | 1.60 | 1.00 | 0.00 | Imputation (Mode Value) |

### Assumptions Testing:

#### Normality Testing

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Kurtosis** | **Skewness** |
| **satisfaction\_level** | 2.477300 | -0.539013 |
| **last\_evaluation** | 1.820919 | -0.031801 |
| **number\_project** | 2.604474 | 0.332810 |
| **average\_montly\_hours** | 1.916970 | 0.027523 |
| **time\_spend\_company** | 8.132913 | 1.815038 |
| **Log\_TimeSpent** | 3.185936 | 0.544127 |
| **Inv\_TimeSpent** | 2.191859 | 0.236493 |
| **Imp\_timeSpend** | 2.841937 | 0.613427 |

For a variable to be normally distributed, the skewness and kurtosis values have to be within the following threshold: Skewness between -2 and +2 and Kurtosis between -7 and +7 for R.

Thus, as per the Descriptive Statistics reported for the variables in Table 1, all the variables expect the Time Spent Company Variable are normally distributed. The Time Spent variable has extremely high skewness and kurtosis.

#### Outliers Test

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

As per Table \_, the boxplots for all the variables, it can be established that most of the data does not have many outliers, except Time Spend Company.

#### Processing Heavy Skewness and Outliers

Since the data for Time Spend in the company is heavily skewed and has 824 out of 12003 rows as outliers, we have transformed it using the following transformations:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Transformation** | **Outliers Treated** | **Kurtosis** | **Skewness** |
| **Log\_TimeSpent** | Log10 | False | 3.185936 | 0.544127 |
| **Inv\_TimeSpent** | Inverse | False | 2.191859 | 0.236493 |
| **Imp\_TimeSpend** | Imputation (With Mean Values) | True | 2.841937 | 0.613427 |

#### Linear Relationship and Multicollinearity Test

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Final Selection** | Average Monthly hours | Satisfaction level | Last evaluation | Number project | Time spend company | Log Time Spent | Imp time Spend | Inv Time Spent |
| Average Monthly hours | 1 | -0.006 | 0.265\*\* | 0.331\*\* | 0.103\*\* | 0.106\*\* | 0.139\*\* | -0.094\*\* |
| Satisfaction level | -0.006 | 1 | 0.095\*\* | -0.134\*\* | -0.153\*\* | -0.187\*\* | -0.211\*\* | 0.202\*\* |
| Last evaluation | 0.265\*\* | 0.095\*\* | 1 | 0.271\*\* | 0.097\*\* | 0.096\*\* | 0.132\*\* | -0.081\*\* |
| Number project | 0.331\*\* | -0.134\*\* | 0.271\*\* | 1 | 0.189\*\* | 0.202\*\* | 0.248\*\* | -0.189\*\* |
| Time spend company | 0.103\*\* | -0.153\*\* | 0.097\*\* | 0.189\*\* | 1 | 0.967\*\* | 0.63\*\* | -0.893\*\* |
| Log Time Spent | 0.106\*\* | -0.187\*\* | 0.096\*\* | 0.202\*\* | 0.967\*\* | 1 | 0.768\*\* | -0.977\*\* |
| Imp time Spend | 0.139\*\* | -0.211\*\* | 0.132\*\* | 0.248\*\* | 0.63\*\* | 0.768\*\* | 1 | -0.83\*\* |
| Inv Time Spent | -0.094\*\* | 0.202\*\* | -0.081\*\* | -0.189\*\* | -0.893\*\* | -0.977\*\* | -0.83\*\* | 1 |

As per Table *\_*, It can be established that all the data is significantly correlated with *Average Monthly Hours,* except the variables (Marked with *Red* in the table): *Satisfaction Level*; This is because the p-value for thevariabl*e* was greater than 0.05 (i.e., at 95% confidence interval). Thus, it can be established that the *Average Monthly Hours* Variable has a linear relationship with the *3* other variables (i.e., Last Evaluation, Number Project, Time Spend) as well as the conversions for Time Spent (Log, Inverse and Imputed).

Additionally, as it can be noticed in Table \_, it can be said that there is a situation of multicollinearity between 3 variables (Marked in Yellow in the table). But that is because of the variables are the transformed versions of each other, thus, resulting in multicollinearity amongst each other.

#### Testing the Linear Relation between the Categorical Variables and the Dependant Variable

**Department**

Levene’s test (Levene statistic=0.8101, p=0.6068>0.05) indicates that the variances of Average Monthly Hours in the 10 groups of Department are homogeneous (no significant difference in variance). Hence, Welch ANOVA will not be used, simple ANOVA will be used. As per the ANOVA Results (F= 0.175 and p=0.676>0.05), Since the p-value is more than 0.05 then we can conclude that there is no linear relation between the department and the average monthly hours as there is no significant impact of the 2 on each other.

**Salary**

Levene’s test (Levene statistic= 3.557, p= 0.02856<0.05) indicates that the variances of Average Monthly Hours in the 3 groups of Salary are not homogeneous (significant difference in variance). Hence, Welch ANOVA will be used, simple ANOVA will not be used. As per the Welch ANOVA Results (F= 2804.0 and p=0.951>0.05), Since the p-value is more than 0.05 then we can conclude that there is no linear relation between the salary and the average monthly hours as there is no significant impact of the 2 on each other.

**Work Accident**

Levene’s test (Levene statistic= 13.89, p=0.00019<0.05) indicates that the variances of prices in the 2 groups of Work Accident are not homogeneous (significant difference in variance). Hence, it is established that there are no equal variances. As per the Welch 2 Sample T-Test Results (T= 1.4445 and p=0.1487 >0.05), Since the p-value is more than 0.05 then we can conclude that there is no linear relation between average monthly hours and Work Accidents as there is no significant impact of the 2 on each other.

**Left**

Levene’s test (Levene statistic= 1085.8, p= 2.2e-16<0.05) indicates that the variances of prices in the 2 groups of Left are not homogeneous (significant difference in variance). Hence, it is established that there are no equal variances. As per the Welch 2 Sample T-Test Results (T= -6.2841 and p= 3.887e-10 <0.05), Since the p-value is less than 0.05 then we can conclude that there is a linear relation between average monthly hours and Left as there is a significant impact of the 2 on each other.

**Promotion last 5 years**

Levene’s test (Levene statistic= 0.2031, p= 0.6522 >0.05) indicates that the variances of prices in the 2 groups of Promotion last 5 years are homogeneous (no significant difference in variance). Hence, it is established that there are equal variances. As per the Welch 2 Sample T-Test Results (p=0.5882(>0.05) and T=0.54143), Since the p-value is more than 0.05 then we can conclude that there is no linear relation between average monthly hours and Work Accidents as there is no significant impact of the 2 on each other.

### Final Acceptable Variables Results as per the Assumptions:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Final Selection | Normality | Outliers | Linear Relationship | Multicollinearity |
| **satisfaction\_level** | TRUE | TRUE | FALSE | TRUE |
| **last\_evaluation** | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE |
| **number\_project** | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE |
| **time\_spend\_company** | TRUE | FALSE | TRUE | FALSE (1) |
| **Work\_accident** | TRUE | TRUE | FALSE | TRUE |
| **left** | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE |
| **promotion\_last\_5years** | TRUE | TRUE | FALSE | TRUE |
| **Dept\_Convert** | TRUE | TRUE | FALSE | TRUE |
| **Salary\_Convert** | TRUE | TRUE | FALSE | TRUE |
| **Log\_TimeSpent** | TRUE | FALSE | TRUE | FALSE (1) |
| **Inv\_TimeSpent** | TRUE | FALSE | TRUE | FALSE (1) |
| **Imp\_TimeSpent** | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE | TRUE |

Therefore, the final selected variables for independent variables are:

* Last Evaluation
* Number of Projects
* Left
* Time Spent (Log, Inverse and Imputed)

### Model Testing:

##### MODEL 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F (4,11998)** | **Prob > P** | **R-Squared** | **Adj-R2** |  |
|  | 516.492 | 2.2e-16 | 0.147 | 0.1469 |  |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **t value** | **PR(>|t|)** | **Std. Beta Coeff.** |
| (Intercept) | 112.082 | 2.29 | 48.948 | 2E-16 |  |
| last\_evaluation | 53.998 | 2.542 | 21.24 | 2E-16 | 0.18654257 |
| number\_project | 11.349 | 0.376 | 30.158 | 2E-16 | 0.27123093 |
| left | 6.297 | 1.164 | 5.409 | 6.5E-08 | 0.04816194 |
| Imp\_timeSpend | 1.761 | 0.517 | 3.41 | 0.00065 | 0.03139965 |

**Variables Taken:**

**DV:** Average\_monthly\_hours;

**IV:** Last\_evaluation, Number\_project, Left, Imp\_TimeSpent

**Model significance:** F=516.492, p<0.05 indicate that overall regression model is significant

**Significance of individual predictors:**


* The Table indicates that all the IV’s have a significant effect on the DV. Hence Average\_monthly\_hours are dependent on all IV’s
* last\_evaluation and number\_project are the most significant predictors of Average\_monthly\_hours followed by left and Imp\_timeSpend
* All IVs are affecting the DV positively.

**Model Fit:**

**Adjusted R2**= 14.7%

**Standard Error** = 45.01 on 11998 degrees of freedom

The model is able to explain 14.7% variation in Average\_monthly\_hours.



MODEL 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F (3,11999)** | **Prob > P** | **R-Squared** | **Adj-R2** |  |
|  | 684.174 | 2.2e-16 | 0.1461 | 0.1459 |  |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **t value** | **Pr(>|t|)** | **Std. Beta Coeff.** |
| (Intercept) | 115.79 | 2.016 | 57.436 | 2E-16 |  |
| last\_evaluation | 54.623 | 2.537 | 21.532 | 2E-16 | 0.18870057 |
| number\_project | 11.638 | 0.367 | 31.722 | 2E-16 | 0.27812347 |
| Left | 7.565 | 1.104 | 6.855 | 4.9E-09 | 0.05786218 |

**Variables Taken:**

**DV:** Average\_monthly\_hours;

**IV:** Last\_evaluation, Number\_project, Left

**Model significance:** F= 684.2, p<0.05 indicate that overall regression model is significant

**Significance of individual predictors:**


* The Table indicates that all the IV’s have a significant effect on the DV. Hence Average\_monthly\_hours are dependent on all IV’s
* last\_evaluation and number\_project are the most significant predictors of Average\_monthly\_hours followed by left.
* All IVs are affecting the DV positively.

**Model fit**

**Adjusted R2** =14.59%

**Standard Error** = 45.03 on 11999 degrees of freedom

Hence, Model 2 is worse off than Model 1 as it is able to explain a lesser degree of the total variation in DV.



#### MODEL 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F (4,11998)** | **Prob > P** | **R-Squared** | **Adj-R2** |  |
|  | 513.69 | 2.2e-16 | 0.1462 | 0.1459 |  |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **t value** | **Pr(>|t|)** | **Std. Beta Coeff.** |
| (Intercept) | 118.208 | 2.628 | 44.977 | 2E-16 |  |
| last\_evaluation | 54.508 | 2.538 | 21.477 | 2E-16 | 0.18830178 |
| number\_project | 11.546 | 0.372 | 31.005 | 2E-16 | 0.27592955 |
| Left | 7.152 | 1.141 | 6.271 | 3.71E-10 | 0.05470242 |
| Inv\_TimeSpent | -5.715 | 3.986 | -1.434 | 0.152 | -0.01273642 |

**Variables Taken:**

**DV:** Average\_monthly\_hours;

**IV:** Last\_evaluation, Number\_project, Left, Inv\_TimeSpent

**Model significance:** F= 513.7, p<0.05 indicate that overall regression model is significant

**Significance of individual predictors:**


* The Table indicates that all the IV’s have a significant effect on the DV except for Inv\_TimeSpent. Hence Average\_monthly\_hours are dependent on all IV’s except for Inv\_TimeSpent
* last\_evaluation and number\_project are the most significant predictors of Average\_monthly\_hours followed by left.
* All IVs are influencing the DV positively except for Inv\_TimeSpent which is negatively influencing it.

**Model fit**

**Adjusted R2** = 14.59%

**Standard Error** = 45.03 on 11998 degrees of freedom

Hence, Model 3 is still worse off than the original Model 1 in being able to explain the degree of variation in the DV. But its results are equivalent to Model 2.



## Redacting Outlier Rows from Employee Data

After Model Testing with the Original dataset, there was another Dataset created, after removing the 824 rows of data from the 12003 rows, which were the outliers in the Time Spent in the Company Variable. The resulting dataset was named as EmployeeData\_Redacted and in the variable names, “2” was concatenated in the end of all the variable names.

Additionally, since there were various rows of data which were removed, the assumptions testing was done again in the new data frame to check if there were any new developments in the assumptions.

The results were as followed:


### Assumption Testing (Redacted):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Normality Test Redacted** | Skewness | Kurtosis |
| satisfaction\_level2 | -0.5514 | 2.5383 |
| last\_evaluation2 | -0.0154 | 1.8175 |
| number\_project2 | 0.3559 | 2.6467 |
| average\_montly\_hours2 | 0.0571 | 1.9156 |
| time\_spend\_company2 | 0.5678 | 2.6328 |
| Log\_TimeSpent2 | 0.0383 | 2.1677 |
| Inv\_TimeSpent2 | 0.4081 | 2.0244 |

As per the above table, all the variables were normally distributed along with the New Time Spend and their transformations.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlation Test Redacted** | Average Monthly hours 2 | Satisfaction level 2 | Last evaluation 2 | Number project 2 | Time Spend company 2 | Log Time Spent 2 | Inv Time Spent 2 |
| Average Monthly hours 2 | 1.000 | -0.012 | 0.267 | 0.344 | 0.145 | 0.123 | 0.222 |
| Satisfaction level 2 | -0.012 | 1.000 | 0.095 | -0.134 | -0.222 | -0.226 | -0.087 |
| Last evaluation 2 | 0.267 | 0.095 | 1.000 | 0.281 | 0.138 | 0.114 | -0.195 |
| Number project 2 | 0.344 | -0.134 | 0.281 | 1.000 | 0.259 | 0.230 | -0.099 |
| Time Spend company 2 | 0.145 | -0.222 | 0.138 | 0.259 | 1.000 | 0.988 | -0.954 |
| Log Time Spent 2 | 0.123 | -0.226 | 0.114 | 0.230 | 0.988 | 1.000 | -0.989 |
| Inv Time Spent 2 | 0.222 | -0.087 | -0.195 | -0.099 | -0.954 | -0.989 | 1.000 |

As per the above table, it can be established that there are no new major developments in the correlations among the redacted data. Just like the original file, it can be witnessed that there isn’t a linear relation b/w the Dependant Variable (Average Monthly Hours) and Satisfaction Level, and there is a linear relation between the various types of Time Spend Data and their Transformations.



As per the above boxplot, it can be established that all the outliers from the original Time Spend Variable have been removed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Linear Relation for Categorical Variations** | | | | |
| **Variable** | **Test** | **Test Value** | **P Value** | **Interpretation** |
| Work Accident 2 | Levene’s Test | 14.369 | 0.000151 | No Homogeneity |
|  | Welch T Test | 0.808 | 0.419 | No Significant Impact |
| Left 2 | Levene’s Test | 1230.100 | 2.20E-16 | No Homogeneity |
|  | Welch T Test | -4.758 | 2.08E-06 | Significant Impact |
| Promotion Last 5 Years | Levene’s Test | 0.320 | 0.5717 | Homogeneity |
|  | Independent T Test | 0.924 | 0.3556 | No Significant Impact |
| Department 2 | Levene’s Test | 0.863 | 0.5583 | Homogeneity |
|  | ANOVA | 0.137 | 0.711 | No Significant Impact |
| Salary 2 | Levene’s Test | 4.255 | 0.01421 | No Homogeneity |
|  | Welch ANOVA | 2505.000 | 0.912 | No Significant Impact |

Since all the assumptions are similar to the original dataset, thus the selected variables are as followed:

* Last Evaluation
* Number of Projects
* Left
* Time Spent (Original, Log and Inverse)

#### MODEL 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F (4,11174)** | **Prob > P** | **R-Squared** | **Adj-R2** |  |
|  | 507.462 | 2.2e-16 | 0.1537 | 0.1534 |  |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **t value** | **Pr(>|t|)** | **Std. Beta Coeff.** |
| (Intercept) | 110.873 | 2.317 | 47.86 | 2E-16 |  |
| last\_evaluation2 | 53.226 | 2.637 | 20.183 | 2E-16 | 0.18367906 |
| number\_project2 | 11.804 | 0.389 | 30.353 | 2E-16 | 0.28330932 |
| left2 | 5.224 | 1.196 | 4.367 | 1.3E-05 | 0.04033066 |
| time\_spend\_company2 | 1.792 | 0.517 | 3.465 | 0.00053 | 0.03319568 |

**Variables Taken:**

**DV:** Average\_monthly\_hours;

**IV:** Last\_evaluation, Number\_project, Left, Time Spent

**Model significance:** F=507.462, p<0.05 indicate that overall regression model is significant

**Significance of individual predictors:**


* The Table indicates that all the IV’s have a significant effect on the DV. Hence Price Average\_monthly\_hours are dependent on all the variables.
* last\_evaluation2 and number\_project2 are the most significant predictors of Average\_monthly\_hours followed by left2 and time\_spend\_company 2.
* All the IV’s positively influence the DV

**Model Fit:**

**Adjusted R2** =15.34%

**Standard Error** = 44.68 on 11174 degrees of freedom

The model is able to explain 15.34% variation in Average\_monthly\_hours.

****

#### MODEL 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F (3,11175)** | **Prob > P** | **R-Squared** | **Adj-R2** |  |
|  | 671.953 | 2.2e-16 | 0.1528 | 0.1526 |  |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **t value** | **Pr(>|t|)** | **Std. Beta Coeff.** |
| (Intercept) | 114.472 | 2.072 | 55.254 | 2E-16 |  |
| last\_evaluation2 | 53.979 | 2.63 | 20.528 | 2E-16 | 0.18627508 |
| number\_project2 | 12.121 | 0.378 | 32.054 | 2E-16 | 0.29092314 |
| left2 | 6.606 | 1.128 | 5.855 | 4.90E-09 | 0.05100475 |

**Variables Taken:**

**DV:** Average\_monthly\_hours;

**IV:** Last\_evaluation, Number\_project, Left

**Significance of individual predictors:**


* The Table indicates that all the IV’s have a significant effect on the DV. Thus, Average\_monthly\_hours is dependent on all IV’s.
* left2 is the most significant predictors of Average\_monthly\_hours followed by last\_evaluation2 and number\_project2.
* All IVs are affecting the DV positively.

**Model fit**

**Adjusted R2** =15.26%

**Standard Error** = 44.7 on 11175 degrees of freedom

Hence, Model 5 is slightly worse off than Model 4 as it is able to explain a lesser degree of the total variation in the DV

****

#### MODEL 6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F (4,11174)** | **Prob > P** | **R-Squared** | **Adj-R2** |  |
|  | 505.561 | 2.2e-16 | 0.1532 | 0.1529 |  |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **t value** | **Pr(>|t|)** | **Std. Beta Coeff.** |
| (Intercept) | 111.5 | 2.424 | 45.989 | 2.00E-16 |  |
| last\_evaluation2 | 53.589 | 2.634 | 20.344 | 2.00E-16 | 0.18493226 |
| number\_project2 | 11.93 | 0.387 | 30.85 | 2.00E-16 | 0.28632424 |
| left2 | 5.684 | 1.194 | 4.761 | 1.95E-06 | 0.0438863 |
| Log\_TimeSpent2 | 8.701 | 3.69 | 2.358 | 0.0184 | 0.02235662 |

**Variables Taken:**

**DV:** Average\_monthly\_hours;

**IV:** Last\_evaluation, Number\_project, Left, Log\_TimeSpent

**Model fit**

**Adjusted R2** =15.29%

**Standard Error** = 44.69 on 11174 degrees of freedom

**Significance of individual predictors:**


* The Table indicates that all the IV’s have a significant effect on the DV. Thus, Average\_monthly\_hours is dependent on all IV’s.
* last\_evaluation2 and number\_project2 are the most significant predictors of Average\_monthly\_hours followed by left2 and Log\_TimeSpent2.
* All IVs are affecting the DV positively.

**Model fit**

**Adjusted R2** =15.29%

**Standard Error** = 44.69 on 11174 degrees of freedom

Hence, Model 6 is slightly better than Model 5 as it is able to explain a lesser degree of the total variation in the DV but is inferior to model 4 in it.

****

#### MODEL 7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F (4,11174)** | **Prob > P** | **R-Squared** | **Adj-R2** |  |
|  | 504.337 | 2.2e-16 | 0.1529 | 0.1526 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Estimate** | **Std. Error** | **t value** | **Pr(>|t|)** | **Std. Beta Coeff.** |
| (Intercept) | 116.848 | 2.877 | 40.611 | 2.00E-16 |  |
| last\_evaluation2 | 53.844 | 2.632 | 20.458 | 2.00E-16 | 0.18581242 |
| number\_project2 | 12.039 | 0.384 | 31.325 | 2.00E-16 | 0.28895972 |
| left2 | 6.16 | 1.189 | 5.181 | 2.25E-07 | 0.04755837 |
| Inv\_TimeSpent2 | -5.428 | 4.561 | -1.19 | 0.234 | -0.01113823 |

**Variables Taken:**

**DV:** Average\_monthly\_hours;

**IV:** Last\_evaluation, Number\_project, Left, Inv\_TimeSpent

**Significance of individual predictors:**


* The Table indicates that all the IV’s have a significant effect on the DV. Thus, Average\_monthly\_hours is dependent on all IV’s.
* last\_evaluation2, number\_project2 and left2 are the most significant predictors of Average\_monthly\_hours followed by Inv\_TimeSpent2.
* last\_evaluation2, number\_project2 and left2 are affecting the DV positively where as Inv\_TimeSpent2 is affecting the DV negatively.

**Model fit**

**Adjusted R2** =15.26%

**Standard Error** = 44.7 on 11174 degrees of freedom

Hence, Model 7 is slightly worse off than Model 6 as it is able to explain a lesser degree of the total variation in the DV. It is equivalent to model 5 and inferior to model 4.



## Summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Models** | **F Value** | **P Value** | **Adj R2** |
| **Model 1** | 516.492 | 2.20E-16 | 0.147 |
| **Model 2** | 684.174 | 2.20E-16 | 0.1459 |
| **Model 3** | 513.69 | 2.20E-16 | 0.1459 |
| **Model 4** | 507.462 | 2.20E-16 | 0.1534 |
| **Model 5** | 671.953 | 2.20E-16 | 0.1526 |
| **Model 6** | 505.561 | 2.20E-16 | 0.1529 |
| **Model 7** | 504.337 | 2.20E-16 | 0.1526 |

Final Selected Model: MODEL 4

**DV:** Average\_monthly\_hours;

**IV:** Last\_evaluation, Number\_project, Left, Time Spent

**Model Fit:**

**Adjusted R2** =15.34%

**Standard Error** = 44.68 on 11,174 degrees of freedom

The model is able to explain 15.34% variation in Average\_monthly\_hours.

Therefore,

Average\_monthly\_hours = 110.873 + 0.1837\* (Last\_Evaluation2) + 0.2833 \* (number\_project2) + 0.0403 \* (left2) + 0.03319 \* (time\_spend\_company2)