

Math6450_Assignment1_copy_for_pdf_render

September 5, 2025

Part 1: Data Exploration and Preparation

BOSTON HOUSING DATASET ANALYSIS

1.1 DATASET DIMENSIONS

Number of observations (rows): 506
Number of variables (columns): 14
Dataset shape: (506, 14)

Column names: ['crim', 'zn', 'indus', 'chas', 'nox', 'rm', 'age', 'dis', 'rad', 'tax', 'ptratio', 'b', 'lstat', 'medv']

1.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Descriptive statistics for TARGET VARIABLE (medv):

count 506.000
mean 22.533
std 9.197
min 5.000
25% 17.025
50% 21.200
75% 25.000
max 50.000

Name: medv, dtype: float64

Descriptive statistics for PRIMARY FEATURE (lstat):

count 506.000
mean 12.653
std 7.141
min 1.730
25% 6.950
50% 11.360
75% 16.955
max 37.970

Name: lstat, dtype: float64

Additional statistics for medv:

Variance: 84.5867
Standard deviation: 9.1971
Skewness: 1.1081
Kurtosis: 1.4952

Additional statistics for lstat:

Variance: 50.9948
Standard deviation: 7.1411
Skewness: 0.9065
Kurtosis: 0.4932

1.3 CORRELATION ANALYSIS


Correlation coefficient between medv and lstat: -0.7377

INTERPRETATION:

- The correlation coefficient of -0.7377 indicates a strong negative relationship
- This means that as lstat (% lower status population) increases, medv (median home value) tends to decrease
- The relationship explains approximately 54.4% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.5441$)


- Statistical significance: p-value = 5.08e-88
- The correlation is statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

1.4 SCATTER PLOT ANALYSIS



PATTERN OBSERVED IN SCATTER PLOT:

- The scatter plot reveals a clear negative relationship between lstat and medv
- As the percentage of lower status population increases, median home values tend to decrease
- The relationship appears to be non-linear, showing a curved pattern rather than a straight line
- There's more variability in home values at lower lstat percentages
- The relationship seems stronger (steeper decline) at lower lstat values and levels off at higher lstat values
- There are some potential outliers, particularly homes with high values despite higher lstat percentages
- The data points form a characteristic negative exponential or power-law pattern



SUMMARY:

- Dataset contains 506 observations and 14 variables
- Strong negative correlation (-0.7377) between lstat and medv
- Non-linear relationship visible in scatter plot
- Both variables show reasonable distributions for regression analysis

Part 2: Linear Regression Model Fitting

$$\text{medv} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 \times \text{lstat}$$

COEFFICIENTS:

Intercept (β_0): 34.5538

Slope (β_1): -0.9500

2.1 ESTIMATED REGRESSION EQUATION

$\text{medv} = 34.5538 + (-0.9500) \times \text{lstat}$

$\text{medv} = 34.5538 - 0.9500 \times \text{lstat}$

Alternative notation:

$\hat{y} = 34.5538 + (-0.9500)x$

where \hat{y} = predicted median home value and x = lstat

2.2 INTERPRETATION OF INTERCEPT (β_0)

Intercept value: 34.5538

INTERPRETATION:

- The intercept represents the predicted median home value when lstat = 0
- This means when 0% of the population has lower status, the predicted median home value is \$34.55k
- In practical terms: \$34554

PRACTICAL MEANING:

- Observed lstat range: 1.73% to 37.97%
- Since the minimum observed lstat is 1.73%, lstat = 0 is outside our data range
- Therefore, the intercept represents extrapolation beyond observed data
- While mathematically meaningful, it has LIMITED PRACTICAL MEANING because:
 - * No area in the dataset has 0% lower status population
 - * Real-world interpretation: represents the 'theoretical maximum' home value
 - * Should be interpreted cautiously due to extrapolation

2.3 INTERPRETATION OF SLOPE (β_1)

Slope value: -0.9500

INTERPRETATION:

For each 1% increase in lstat (lower status population), the median home value decreases by \$0.9500k on average, holding all other factors constant.

In practical terms:

- A 1% increase in lower status population is associated with a \$950 decrease in median home value
- A 5% increase in lower status population would decrease median home value by \$4750
- A 10% increase in lower status population would decrease median home value by \$9500

2.4 CONFIDENCE INTERVALS AND SIGNIFICANCE TESTING

95% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS:

	0	1
Intercept	33.448	35.659
lstat	-1.026	-0.874

DETAILED CONFIDENCE INTERVALS:

Intercept (β_0): [33.4485, 35.6592]

Slope (β_1): [-1.0261, -0.8740]

SIGNIFICANCE TESTING:

$H_0: \beta = 0$ (coefficient equals zero)

$H_1: \beta \neq 0$ (coefficient is significantly different from zero)

INTERCEPT (β_0) ANALYSIS:

- 95% CI: [33.4485, 35.6592]
- Contains zero? No
- Conclusion: The intercept IS significantly different from zero
- This means we can be 95% confident the true intercept is between 33.4485 and 35.6592

SLOPE (β_1) ANALYSIS:

- 95% CI: [-1.0261, -0.8740]
- Contains zero? No
- Conclusion: The slope IS significantly different from zero
- This means we can be 95% confident the true slope is between -1.0261 and -0.8740

P-VALUES (for additional confirmation):

Intercept p-value: 3.74e-236

Slope p-value: 5.08e-88

Both p-values < 0.05: True

MODEL SUMMARY STATISTICS:


R-squared: 0.5441

Adjusted R-squared: 0.5432

F-statistic: 601.62

F-statistic p-value: 5.08e-88

Standard Error: 6.2158



FINAL SUMMARY:

- Regression equation: $\text{medv} = 34.5538 + (-0.9500) \times \text{lstat}$
- Both coefficients are statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$
- The model explains 54.4% of the variance in median home values
- For every 1% increase in lower status population, median home value decreases by \$950 on average

2.5 R-SQUARED ANALYSIS

R-squared value: 0.5441

R-squared as percentage: 54.41%

INTERPRETATION:

- $R^2 = 0.5441$ means that 54.41% of the variation in median home values is explained by the percentage of lower status population (lstat)
- The remaining 45.59% of variation is due to other factors not included in this model
- This indicates a moderate relationship
- In practical terms: knowing the lstat value allows us to predict about 54.4% of the variation in home values

2.6 ROOT MEAN SQUARE ERROR (RMSE)

Mean Squared Error (MSE): 38.6357

Root Mean Square Error (RMSE): 6.2158

INTERPRETATION:

- RMSE = 6.2158 thousands of dollars
- In actual dollars: \$6216
- This means the typical prediction error is approximately \$6216
- On average, our predictions are off by about $\pm \$6216$ from the actual median home value

CONTEXT:

- Mean home value: \$22.53k (\$22533)
- Standard deviation of home values: \$9.20k
- Range of home values: \$45.00k
- RMSE as % of mean: 27.6%
- RMSE as % of standard deviation: 67.6%

2.7 F-STATISTIC AND OVERALL MODEL SIGNIFICANCE

F-statistic: 601.6179

F-statistic p-value: 5.08e-88

Degrees of freedom: Model = 1.0, Residual = 504.0

HYPOTHESIS TEST:

H_0 : The model has no explanatory power ($\beta_1 = 0$)

H_1 : The model has explanatory power ($\beta_1 \neq 0$)

INTERPRETATION:

- F-statistic = 601.6179 with p-value = 5.08e-88
- Since p-value < 0.05, we REJECT the null hypothesis
- Conclusion: The model IS statistically significant
- This means lstat DOES have significant explanatory power for predicting medv

PRACTICAL MEANING:

- The F-test confirms that our regression model performs significantly better than a model with no predictors (just the mean)
- The relationship between lstat and medv is statistically meaningful
- We can be confident that lstat is a useful predictor of median home values

2.8 ADJUSTED R-SQUARED COMPARISON

R-squared: 0.544146

Adjusted R-squared: 0.543242

Difference: 0.000904

WHY THERE MIGHT BE A DIFFERENCE:

- Regular R^2 : 0.544146
- Adjusted R^2 : 0.543242
- The difference of 0.000904 is very small

WHAT ADJUSTED R-SQUARED ACCOUNTS FOR:

- Number of predictors in the model: 1.0
- Sample size: 506 observations

- Degrees of freedom penalty for adding predictors

FORMULA EXPLANATION:

Adjusted $R^2 = 1 - [(1 - R^2) \times (n - 1) / (n - k - 1)]$
 where n = sample size (506) and k = number of predictors (1.0)

Manual calculation: 0.543242

INTERPRETATION:

- The very small difference suggests our model is not overfitting
- With only one predictor, the adjustment is minimal
- Both R^2 and adjusted R^2 tell essentially the same story

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS:

- For model comparison: Use adjusted R^2 when comparing models with different numbers of predictors
- For interpretation: Both values are nearly identical, indicating a robust single-predictor model
- The penalty for our one predictor is minimal given the sample size of 506 observations

FINAL SUMMARY:

- $R^2 = 0.5441$ (54.41% of variance explained)
- Adjusted $R^2 = 0.5432$ (54.32% of variance explained)
- RMSE = \$6216 (typical prediction error)
- F-statistic = 601.6179, $p < 0.05$ (highly significant model)
- Model explains 54.4% of home value variation using just lstat
- Typical prediction accuracy: $\pm \$6216$ (27.6% of mean home value)

Part 3: Statistical Inference and Hypothesis Testing

3.1 HYPOTHESIS TESTING SETUP

TESTING THE SLOPE COEFFICIENT:

$H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ (The slope coefficient is zero)
 → lstat has no linear relationship with medv
 → There is no linear association between % lower status population and median home value

$H_1: \beta_1 \neq 0$ (The slope coefficient is not zero)
 → lstat has a significant linear relationship with medv
 → There is a significant linear association between % lower status population and median home value

Type of test: Two-tailed test

Significance level: $\alpha = 0.05$

3.2 T-STATISTIC AND P-VALUE ANALYSIS

TEST STATISTICS:

t-statistic: -24.527900

p-value: 5.08e-88

Degrees of freedom: 504.0

Critical t-value ($\alpha = 0.05$, two-tailed): ± 1.9647

DECISION MAKING:

Decision rule: Reject H_0 if $|t| > 1.9647$ OR if p-value < 0.05

Observed: $|t| = 24.5279$, p-value = 5.08e-88

CONCLUSION AT 5% SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL:

- REJECT H_0 : The slope coefficient IS significantly
- different from zero
 - $|t| = 24.5279 > 1.9647$
 - $p\text{-value} = 5.08e-88 < 0.05$
 - Statistical evidence: There IS a significant
 - linear relationship between lstat and medv

PRACTICAL INTERPRETATION:

- We can be 95% confident that changes in % lower
- status population have a real, measurable effect
- on median home values
- The relationship observed in our sample is unlikely
- to be due to random chance
- The effect size: each 1% increase in lstat is
- associated with a \$950 decrease in median home
- value

3.3 CONFIDENCE INTERVAL ANALYSIS

CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR SLOPE COEFFICIENT:

95% Confidence Interval: [-1.026148, -0.873951]
99% Confidence Interval: [-1.050199, -0.849899]

INTERVAL WIDTH COMPARISON:

95% CI width: 0.152198
99% CI width: 0.200300
Width increase: 0.048102
Percent increase in width: 31.6%

INTERPRETATION:

95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL:

- We are 95% confident that the true slope
- coefficient lies between -1.026148 and -0.873951
- In practical terms: each 1% increase in lstat
- decreases median home value by between \$874 and
- \$1026

99% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL:

- We are 99% confident that the true slope
- coefficient lies between -1.050199 and -0.849899
- In practical terms: each 1% increase in lstat
- decreases median home value by between \$850 and
- \$1050

COMPARISON ANALYSIS:

- The 99% CI is wider than the 95% CI by 0.048102
- This represents a 31.6% increase in width
- WHY: Higher confidence level requires a wider
- interval to capture the true parameter
- TRADE-OFF: More confidence (99% vs 95%) comes at
- the cost of precision (wider interval)

SIGNIFICANCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 95% CI contains zero: No
99% CI contains zero: No
- Since neither interval contains zero, the slope is
 - significant at both levels
 - This provides strong evidence for a real
 - relationship between lstat and medv

3.4 TESTING SPECIFIC CLAIM

CLAIM TO TEST:

Someone claims that each 1% increase in lstat

- decreases median home value by exactly \$1000

In our units: $\beta_1 = -1.0$ (since medv is in thousands

- of dollars)

HYPOTHESES:

$H_0: \beta_1 = -1.0$ (the claim is correct)
 $H_1: \beta_1 \neq -1.0$ (the claim is incorrect)

TEST USING CONFIDENCE INTERVALS:

Observed slope coefficient: -0.950049
Claimed slope coefficient: -1.0

95% Confidence Interval Test:

- 95% CI: [-1.026148, -0.873951]
- Does the CI contain -1.0? Yes

99% Confidence Interval Test:

- 99% CI: [-1.050199, -0.849899]
- Does the CI contain -1.0? Yes

FORMAL T-TEST:

t-statistic = (observed - claimed) / SE = (-0.950049

- 1.0) / 0.038733


t-statistic = 1.2896
p-value (two-tailed): 0.1978

CONCLUSION:

- FAIL TO REJECT the claim at 95% confidence level
- The claimed value (-1.0) IS within the 95%
 - confidence interval
 - Our regression results SUPPORT the claim
 - FAIL TO REJECT the claim at 99% confidence level
 - The claimed value (-1.0) IS within the 99%
 - confidence interval

STATISTICAL EVIDENCE:

- Our estimate: Each 1% increase in lstat decreases
- home value by \$950
- Claimed effect: Each 1% increase in lstat decreases
- home value by \$1000
- Difference: \$50
- The difference is not statistically significant (p
- $= 0.1978 \geq 0.05$)
- Insufficient evidence to reject the claim



FINAL SUMMARY:

Hypotheses: $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ vs $H_1: \beta_1 \neq 0$
Test results: $t = -24.5279$, $p = 5.08e-88$
Conclusion: Reject H_0 - slope is significant
Confidence intervals:
95% CI: [-1.026148, -0.873951] (width: 0.152198)
99% CI: [-1.050199, -0.849899] (width: 0.200300)
99% CI is 31.6% wider than 95% CI
Claim test: The claim of exactly \$1000 decrease is- SUPPORTED
- Our estimate: \$950 decrease per 1% lstat increase

Statistical significance of difference: $p = 0.1978$

Part 4: Assumption Testing and Model Diagnostics

BOSTON HOUSING ASSUMPTION TESTING AND MODEL

DIAGNOSTICS

MODEL SUMMARY:

Sample size: 506

Number of residuals: 506

Mean of residuals: 0.000000 (should be ≈ 0)

Standard deviation of residuals: 6.2096

4.1 SHAPIRO-WILK TEST FOR NORMALITY OF RESIDUALS

HYPOTHESIS TESTING:

H_0 : Residuals follow a normal distribution

H_1 : Residuals do not follow a normal distribution

Significance level: $\alpha = 0.05$

TEST RESULTS:

Shapiro-Wilk test statistic (W): 0.878572

p-value: 0.000000

DECISION MAKING:

Decision rule: Reject H_0 if p-value < 0.05

Observed p-value: 0.000000

CONCLUSION AT 5% SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL:

REJECT H_0 : Residuals do not follow a normal

distribution

- Statistical evidence suggests departure from

normality

- The normality assumption may be violated

INTERPRETATION OF TEST STATISTIC:

- $W = 0.878572$

- W ranges from 0 to 1, with values closer to 1

indicating more normal-like data

- Our value suggests weak evidence of normality based

on the test statistic alone

ADDITIONAL NORMALITY TESTS (for comparison):

D'Agostino's test: statistic = 137.0434, p-value = 0.

000000

Jarque-Bera test: statistic = 291.3734, p-value = 0.

000000

CONSENSUS: Tests show mixed results regarding

normality

4.2 Q-Q PLOT ANALYSIS

Q-Q PLOT INTERPRETATION:

The Q-Q (Quantile-Quantile) plot compares residual

quantiles to theoretical

normal quantiles

Q-Q plot correlation: 0.9373

(Values closer to 1 indicate better fit to normal

distribution)

VISUAL ASSESSMENT:

- Good fit with minor deviations


- Look for points following the red diagonal line

- Systematic deviations suggest non-normality

- Graphed Q-Q plot backs up the previously observed

weak evidence of normality based on the test

statistic



4.3 HISTOGRAM WITH NORMAL DISTRIBUTION OVERLAY

SHAPE ANALYSIS:

Skewness: 1.4527

Kurtosis: 2.3191 (excess kurtosis)

SKEWNESS INTERPRETATION:

- Skewness = 1.4527 indicates highly skewed


- Distribution is skewed to the right

KURTOSIS INTERPRETATION:

- Excess kurtosis = 2.3191 indicates heavy-tailed

(leptokurtic)

- Normal distribution has excess kurtosis = 0



DEPARTURES FROM NORMALITY:

Identified departures from normality:

1. Skewness (1.453)

2. Kurtosis (2.319)

3. Shapiro-Wilk test rejection

4. Q-Q plot deviations

4.2 VISUAL EVIDENCE VS STATISTICAL TEST COMPARISON:

Statistical test result (Shapiro-Wilk): Rejects

normality

Visual evidence assessment: Shows deviations from

normality

AGREEMENT: Visual evidence and statistical test both

suggest departure from

normality

DETAILED VISUAL OBSERVATIONS:

Q-Q Plot:

- Systematic deviations from diagonal line ($r = 0.9373$)
- Visual evidence against perfect normality

Histogram:

- Notable departures from bell-shaped normal distribution
- Skewness and/or kurtosis concerns visible

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR REGRESSION:

NORMALITY ASSUMPTION VIOLATED:

- Confidence intervals may be less reliable
- Consider robust standard errors
- Prediction intervals may be inaccurate
- Consider variable transformation

SAMPLE SIZE CONSIDERATIONS:

- Sample size: 506 observations
- Large sample: Central Limit Theorem helps with normality concerns
- Minor deviations from normality are less problematic

FINAL SUMMARY:

Shapiro-Wilk test: $W = 0.878572$, $p = 0.000000$

Conclusion: Residuals deviate from normality

Q-Q plot assessment: $r = 0.9373$

Visual evidence: Shows deviations from normality

Histogram analysis:

Skewness: 1.4527, Kurtosis: 2.3191

Shape: highly skewed, heavy-tailed (leptokurtic)

Overall normality assessment: VIOLATED

4.4: BREUSCH-PAGAN TEST RESULTS

Test Statistic: 4.1871

P-value: 0.0407

Degrees of Freedom: 1

Conclusion: Reject H_0 at $\alpha = 0.05$. Evidence of heteroscedasticity.

Verification (statsmodels function): Stat = 65.1218, P-value = 0.0000

4.5: RESIDUALS VS. FITTED VALUES ANALYSIS

Pattern interpretation:


- HOMOSCEDASTICITY: Points should be randomly scattered around the horizontal line at $y=0$
- HETEROSCEDASTICITY indicators:
 - * Funnel shape (variance increases or decreases with fitted values)
 - * Curved patterns in the smoothing line
 - * Clear clustering or systematic patterns

Variance in lowest third of fitted values: 17.2703

Variance in highest third of fitted values: 31.7984

Variance ratio (high/low): 1.8412

Interpretation: Ratio > 2 or < 0.5 suggests heteroscedasticity



4.6: SCALE-LOCATION PLOT ANALYSIS


Evidence of changing variance:

- CONSTANT VARIANCE: Smoothing line should be roughly horizontal
- CHANGING VARIANCE indicators:
 - * Upward or downward trend in smoothing line
 - * Clear patterns or curves in the line

Correlation between fitted values and $|residuals|$: 0.1507

Interpretation:

- * Moderate correlation suggests possible heteroscedasticity



COMPREHENSIVE HOMOSCEDASTICITY ASSESSMENT

TEST RESULTS SUMMARY:

1. Breusch-Pagan Test: Statistic = 4.1871, P-value = 0.0407
 - Reject H_0 at $\alpha = 0.05$. Evidence of heteroscedasticity.

2. Variance Ratio Analysis: 1.8412
 - Suggests homoscedasticity

3. Scale-Location Correlation: 0.1507
 - Moderate evidence of heteroscedasticity

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Evidence suggests heteroscedasticity
- Consider transformations (log, Box-Cox)
- Use robust standard errors (White's correction)
- Consider weighted least squares regression
- Explore different model specifications

Note: Visual inspection of plots is crucial -
↪ statistical tests should be
combined with graphical analysis for complete
↪ assessment.

4.7: DURBIN-WATSON TEST RESULTS

Durbin-Watson Statistic: 1.0784

First-order autocorrelation (ρ): 0.4608

INTERPRETATION:

→ Evidence of positive autocorrelation. Independence
↪ assumption may be violated.

Durbin-Watson Guidelines:

- $DW \approx 2.0$: No autocorrelation (ideal)
- $DW < 1.5$: Strong positive autocorrelation
- $DW > 2.5$: Strong negative autocorrelation
- $1.5 \leq DW \leq 2.5$: Acceptable range

4.8: COOK'S DISTANCE ANALYSIS

Maximum Cook's Distance: 0.1657

Mean Cook's Distance: 0.0030

Standard Deviation: 0.0112

INFLUENTIAL OBSERVATIONS CRITERIA:

- Threshold $4/n = 4/506 = 0.0079$
- Conservative threshold = 1.0

RESULTS:

- Observations with Cook's D > $4/n$: 30 (5.9%)
- Observations with Cook's D > 1.0: 0 (0.0%)

CONCLUSION: Moderate Cook's distance values. Some
↪ observations may be
influential but not necessarily problematic.

TOP 5 MOST INFLUENTIAL OBSERVATIONS:

1. Observation 368: Cook's D = 0.1657
2. Observation 372: Cook's D = 0.0941
3. Observation 364: Cook's D = 0.0694
4. Observation 365: Cook's D = 0.0672
5. Observation 369: Cook's D = 0.0553

4.9: HIGH LEVERAGE ANALYSIS

Number of parameters (p): 14

Sample size (n): 506

High leverage threshold ($2p/n$): $2 \times 14 / 506 = 0.0553$

HIGH LEVERAGE RESULTS:

- Observations with high leverage: 36
- Percentage of total sample: 7.1%
- Maximum leverage value: 0.3060
- Mean leverage value: 0.0277

TOP 5 HIGHEST LEVERAGE OBSERVATIONS:

1. Observation 380: Leverage = 0.3060
2. Observation 418: Leverage = 0.1901
3. Observation 405: Leverage = 0.1564
4. Observation 410: Leverage = 0.1247
5. Observation 365: Leverage = 0.0985

4.10 Based on all assumption tests, is your linear regression
model valid for statistical inference? Summarize which
assumptions are satisfied and which (if any) are violated.

todo

4.10: COMPREHENSIVE MODEL VALIDATION SUMMARY

LINEAR REGRESSION ASSUMPTIONS ASSESSMENT:

1. LINEARITY:

Test method: Residuals vs. fitted plots, added
↪ variable plots

Result: [Add your previous linearity test results]

Status: [SATISFIED / VIOLATED / MARGINAL]

2. INDEPENDENCE OF RESIDUALS:

Test method: Durbin-Watson test

Result: DW = 1.0784

Status: VIOLATED

3. HOMOSCEDASTICITY (Constant Variance):

Test method: Breusch-Pagan test, residuals plots

Result: [Add your previous homoscedasticity test
↪ results]

Status: [SATISFIED / VIOLATED / MARGINAL]

4. NORMALITY OF RESIDUALS:

Test method: Shapiro-Wilk, Q-Q plots, histograms

Result: [Add your previous normality test results]

Status: [SATISFIED / VIOLATED / MARGINAL]

5. NO MULTICOLLINEARITY:

Test method: VIF analysis, correlation matrix

Result: [Add your multicollinearity test results
↪ if available]

Status: [SATISFIED / VIOLATED / MARGINAL]

6. NO EXCESSIVE INFLUENTIAL OBSERVATIONS:

Test method: Cook's distance, leverage analysis

Cook's D max: 0.1657

High leverage obs: 36 (7.1%)

Status: MARGINAL - Some influential observations
↪ present

OVERALL MODEL VALIDITY FOR STATISTICAL INFERENCE:

CURRENT ASSESSMENT (based on available tests):

- Assumptions checked: 2
- Assumptions satisfied: 0

RECOMMENDATIONS:


Some concerns with independence or influential
↪ observations

NEXT STEPS:

- Complete all assumption tests (linearity,
↪ homoscedasticity, normality)
- Consider remedial measures if assumptions are
↪ violated:
 - Data transformations (log, Box-Cox)
 - Robust regression methods
 - Remove or downweight influential observations
 - Use different modeling approaches if assumptions
↪ severely violated

Note: A complete assessment requires results from all
↪ assumption tests.

Update this summary once you have completed the full `diagnostic suite`.



5: Predictions and Intervals

PREDICTIONS AND INTERVALS ANALYSIS

DATASET OVERVIEW

Dataset shape: (506, 14)

Column names: ['crim', 'zn', 'indus', 'chas', 'nox', 'rm', 'age', 'dis', 'rad', 'tax', 'ptratio', 'b', 'lstat', 'medv']

Using 'medv' as target variable

Using 'lstat' as predictor variable (lstat)

SIMPLE LINEAR REGRESSION MODEL

Model: `medv ~ lstat`

R-squared: 0.5441

Regression equation: $\text{medv} = 34.5538 + -0.9500 \times \text{lstat}$

5.1: PREDICTION FOR LSTAT = 10%

CALCULATION:

$$\hat{y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times X$$

$$\hat{y} = 34.5538 + -0.9500 \times 10.0$$

$$\hat{y} = 25.0533$$

Predicted median home value for lstat = 10%: \$25.05k

5.2: 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL FOR MEAN RESPONSE

CALCULATION DETAILS:

- Predicted value: 25.0533
- Standard error of mean: 0.2948
- t-critical ($\alpha=0.05$, $df=504.0$): 1.9647
- Margin of error: 0.5792

95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL: [24.4741, 25.6326]

In dollars: [\$24.47k, \$25.63k]

INTERPRETATION:

We are 95% confident that the mean median home value `for all neighborhoods`

with lstat = 10% is between \$24.47k and \$25.63k.

5.3: 95% PREDICTION INTERVAL FOR INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE

CALCULATION DETAILS:

- Predicted value: 25.0533
- Standard error of prediction: 6.4803
- t-critical ($\alpha=0.05$, $df=504.0$): 1.9647
- Margin of error: 12.7316

95% PREDICTION INTERVAL: [12.3217, 37.7850]

In dollars: [\$12.32k, \$37.78k]

INTERVAL COMPARISON:

- Confidence interval width: 1.1584
- Prediction interval width: 25.4633
- Prediction interval is 21.98x wider than confidence `interval`

5.4: CONFIDENCE VS PREDICTION INTERVALS

CONCEPTUAL DIFFERENCES:

CONFIDENCE INTERVAL:

- Estimates uncertainty about the MEAN response for a `given X value`
- Answers: 'What is the average Y for all `observations with this X?`'
- Accounts for uncertainty in estimating the `population mean`
- Gets narrower as sample size increases
- Narrower interval (less uncertainty)

PREDICTION INTERVAL:

- Estimates uncertainty about an INDIVIDUAL response `for a given X value`
- Answers: 'What might Y be for a single new `observation with this X?`'
- Accounts for both estimation uncertainty AND `individual variation`
- Includes natural scatter around the regression line
- Wider interval (more uncertainty)

WHEN TO USE EACH:

USE CONFIDENCE INTERVAL when:

- Estimating average outcomes for policy/planning
- Comparing mean responses between groups
- Making statements about population parameters
- Example: 'What's the average home value in 10% `lstat neighborhoods?`'

USE PREDICTION INTERVAL when:

- Predicting outcomes for specific individuals/cases
- Setting bounds for individual forecasts
- Risk assessment for single observations
- Example: 'What might this specific house be worth?'

5.5: PREDICTIONS AT MULTIPLE LSTAT VALUES

POINT PREDICTIONS:

lstat = 5%:

- Predicted value: \$29.80k
- 95% CI: [\$29.01k, \$30.60k]
- 95% PI: [\$16.63k, \$42.98k]

lstat = 10%:

- Predicted value: \$25.05k
- 95% CI: [\$24.47k, \$25.63k]
- 95% PI: [\$12.32k, \$37.78k]

lstat = 15%:

- Predicted value: \$20.30k
- 95% CI: [\$19.73k, \$20.87k]
- 95% PI: [\$7.58k, \$33.02k]

lstat = 25%:

- Predicted value: \$10.80k

→ 95% CI: [\$9.72k, \$11.89k]
 → 95% PI: [\$-3.15k, \$24.75k]

RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS:

Model slope (β_1): -0.9500

Interpretation: For each 1% increase in lstat, median_h

↪ home value


decreases by \$0.95k on average

CHANGES BETWEEN LSTAT LEVELS:

- 5.0% → 10.0%: Change = \$-4.75k
Rate: \$-0.95k per 1% lstat increase
- 10.0% → 15.0%: Change = \$-4.75k
Rate: \$-0.95k per 1% lstat increase
- 15.0% → 25.0%: Change = \$-9.50k
Rate: \$-0.95k per 1% lstat increase

COMMENTS ON RELATIONSHIP:

- The relationship shows moderate negative association
- Linear relationship assumed constant across all_h
↪ lstat levels
- Higher lstat (more lower status population)_h
↪ associated with lower home values



PREDICTIONS SUMMARY TABLE

DETAILED PREDICTIONS TABLE:

lstat	prediction	ci_lower	ci_upper	pi_lower	pi_upper
5	29.804	29.007	30.600	16.627	42.980
10	25.053	24.474	25.633	12.322	37.785
15	20.303	19.732	20.875	7.585	33.021
25	10.803	9.717	11.888	-3.148	24.754

KEY INSIGHTS:

- As lstat increases, predicted home values decrease
- Prediction intervals are consistently 18.4x wider_h
↪ than confidence intervals
- The linear relationship appears moderate ($R^2 = 0.544$)

MODEL ASSUMPTIONS REMINDER

For these intervals to be valid, ensure:

- Linear relationship between variables
- Independence of residuals
- Homoscedasticity (constant variance)
- Normality of residuals
- No influential outliers