

126 Data Project, Step 2

Sam Ream, Valeria Lopez, Skyler Yee

Introduction

Analysis of Variables

When investigating the predictors, we noted it did not appear that we needed to use any transformation to make the data more linear. Additionally, it is clear that some predictors were highly correlated. An example of this is Singles and Doubles which have a correlation of 0.95. As a consequence of this, we elected to use only one of these two variables in our hand-made model and did the same with other predictors with similar levels of correlation.

We decided to not include interaction variables because different values of our categorical variables (BMI and handedness) do not drastically affect the response. We also felt it was not necessary for any of our non-categorical variables as there are no interactions that we believe to be interesting.

Computational Models

For our computational models, we used the predictors: Total Intentional walks, Singles, Triples, Stolen Bases, and Home_Runs obtained in a career. We selected these predictors because of their low correlation in addition to their interesting relation to obtained Runs. To help prevent over-correlation, we also elected to create a reduced model using only predictors related to hitting the ball and compared the two to see if we could use a smaller model.

Model 1 - Full Model

$$E[Y] = \text{Intercept} + \text{Intentional Walks} + \text{Singles} + \text{Triples} + \text{Stolen Bases} + \text{Home Runs} + \epsilon$$

Model 2 - Reduced Model

$$E[Y] = \text{Intercept} + \text{Singles} + \text{Triples} + \text{Home Runs} + \epsilon$$

Comparison:

H_0 : The Reduced Model is sufficient

H_α : The full Model is not sufficient

Analysis of Variance Table

##

Model 1: RUNS ~ INT_WALKS + SINGLES + TRIPLE + STOLEN_BASES + HOME_RUNS

Model 2: RUNS ~ SINGLES + TRIPLE + HOME_RUNS

```
##   Res.Df    RSS Df Sum of Sq      F    Pr(>F)
## 1     494 386485
## 2     496 448675 -2      -62189 39.745 < 2.2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Conclusion

As we rejected H_0 in favor for H_α , we can determine that the reduced model does not model the data well enough to justify the reduction in predictors. As such, we decided to use model 1, the full model, as our computational model.

Statistical Models

Model Selection and Analysis

Between the computational and Statistical models, we selected the [TEMP] because [TEMP]. For this model:

- Interpret β_i s and intercept. Are they significant?
- Report R^2 and adj R^2 /interpret/discuss
- Complete analysis of residuals and influence points. Use plots Consider refitting the data with points that have large leverage and residuals
- interpret the model in a way that makes sense. Why do you think some variables dropped out?
- Give CIs for a mean predicted value and the PIs of a future predicted value for at least one combination of X's
- Summarize

Conclusion

MODEL 1 and 2 stuff and analysis.