

Lab 4:

Classification and

Logistic

Regression

Team: Uno

Exercise 1

1. Execute the code above. Based on the results, rank the models from "most underfit" to "most overfit".
 - a. 1.(Most Underfit) `cv.glm(spam_trn, fit_caps, K = 5)$delta[1]`
 - b. 2. `cv.glm(spam_trn, fit_selected, K = 5)$delta[1]`
 - c. 3. `cv.glm(spam_trn, fit_over, K = 5)$delta[1]`
 - d. 4. (Most Overfit) `cv.glm(spam_trn, fit_additive, K = 5)$delta[1]`
2. Re-run the code above with 100 folds and a different seed. Does your conclusion change?
 - a. When running the code with 100 folds and a different seed, the same conclusions about order can be made.
3. Generate four confusion matrices for each of the four models fit in Part 1.

a.

```
> conf_mat_1
```

	actual	
predicted	nospam	spam
nospam	2004	1016
spam	183	398

b.

```
> conf_mat_2
```

	actual	
predicted	nospam	spam
nospam	2050	599
spam	137	815

c.

```
> conf_mat_3
```

	actual	
predicted	nospam	spam
nospam	2050	161
spam	137	1253

d.

```
> conf_mat_4
```

	actual	
predicted	nospam	spam
nospam	1979	153
spam	208	1261

4. Which is the best model? Write 2 paragraphs justifying your decision. You must mention (a) the overall accuracy of each model; and (b) whether some errors are better or worse than others, and you must use the terms *specificity* and *sensitivity*. For (b) think carefully... misclassified email is a pain in the butt for users!

Going in depth on each of the four models we explored - all generally outperform the classifier of simply classifying all observations to the majority class, as stated in the

lab to be effective. As a standard, accuracy should be defined as the ability of the model to predict both specificity and sensitivity. When the number of false negatives are low, the sensitivity is high and when the number of false positives are low, the specificity is high. Model two (fit_selected) and three (fit_additive) both have the lowest number of false negatives at 137 each. As well, model three (fit_additive at 161) and four (fit_over at 153) have the lowest number of false positives.

With that being said, in terms of predicting the test data, the best model would be model model three as it is both specific and sensitive, making it the most accurate overall. The least accurate model would be model one (fit_caps). With model two four coming in second and model four (fit_over) coming in third. All assessed based on total accuracy (number of false positives and false negatives). In terms of some errors being better and/or worse than others is relative. Often receiving a false positive is worse than receiving a false negative. Better safe than sorry when predicting.

Exercise 2

1. Use the bank data and create a train / test split.
 - a. Visible on R script.
2. Run any logistic regression you like with 10-fold cross-validation in order to predict the yes/no variable (y).

```
> fit_caps
```

```
Call: glm(formula = loan ~ balance, family = binomial, data = bank_trn)
```

```
Coefficients:
```

```
(Intercept)      balance
-1.5965122    -0.0001298
```

```
Degrees of Freedom: 999 Total (i.e. Null); 998 Residual
```

```
Null Deviance:      845.4
```

```
Residual Deviance: 837.5      AIC: 841.5
```

a.

```
> fit_selected
```

```
Call: glm(formula = loan ~ balance + duration + marital + age, family = binomial,
data = bank_trn)
```

```
Coefficients:
```

```
(Intercept)      balance      duration maritalmarried maritalsingle      age
-2.0889307    -0.0001328    0.0005634    0.3571958    0.0768115    0.0020354
```

```
Degrees of Freedom: 999 Total (i.e. Null); 994 Residual
```

```
Null Deviance:      845.4
```

```
Residual Deviance: 831.9      AIC: 843.9
```

b.

```
> fit_additive
```

```
Call: glm(formula = loan ~ ., family = binomial, data = bank_trn)
```

Coefficients:

(Intercept)	age	jobblue-collar	jobentrepreneur	jobhousemaid
-2.336194	0.007783	-0.101632	-0.178046	-0.631756
jobmanagement	jobretired	jobself-employed	jobservices	jobstudent
-0.568343	-0.316494	0.055188	-0.017650	-14.394983
jobtechnician	jobunemployed	jobunknown	maritalmarried	maritalsingle
-0.344574	-0.629785	-0.514692	0.383129	0.328527
educationsecondary	educationtertiary	educationunknown	defaultyes	balance
0.406921	0.019857	-1.897590	1.569121	-0.000095
housingyes	contacttelephone	contactunknown	day	monthaug
-0.133863	-0.212262	0.418650	-0.028422	-0.151131
monthdec	monthfeb	monthjan	monthjul	monthjun
1.495865	-0.695605	0.032815	0.999117	-0.622996
monthmar	monthmay	monthnov	monthoct	monthsep
0.480030	-0.202381	0.758782	0.717785	0.047280
duration	campaign	previous	yyes	
0.001167	0.033971	0.073684	-1.055121	

Degrees of Freedom: 999 Total (i.e. Null); 961 Residual

Null Deviance: 845.4

Residual Deviance: 755 AIC: 833

C.

```
> fit_over
```

```
Call: glm(formula = loan ~ balance * (.), family = binomial, data = bank_trn,
maxit = 50)
```

Coefficients:

(Intercept)	balance	age	jobblue-collar
-2.236e+00	-3.917e-04	1.697e-02	-3.546e-01
jobentrepreneur	jobhousemaid	jobmanagement	jobretired
-7.167e-01	-8.272e-01	-9.575e-01	5.687e-02
jobself-employed	jobservices	jobstudent	jobtechnician
-3.878e-01	-1.987e-01	-9.240e+02	-3.909e-01
jobunemployed	jobunknown	maritalmarried	maritalsingle
-1.136e+00	-5.600e-01	5.911e-01	6.266e-01
educationsecondary	educationtertiary	educationunknown	defaultyes
1.708e-01	5.031e-02	-2.173e+00	1.802e+00
housingyes	contacttelephone	contactunknown	day
-3.764e-01	5.420e-02	6.351e-01	-3.539e-02
monthaug	monthdec	monthfeb	monthjan
-3.883e-01	2.395e+00	-7.563e-01	-6.981e-01
monthjul	monthjun	monthmar	monthmay
5.955e-01	-7.162e-01	-2.386e+02	-3.204e-01
monthnov	monthoct	monthsep	duration
4.498e-01	1.100e+00	2.264e+00	1.341e-03
campaign	previous	yyes	balance:age
5.833e-02	5.226e-02	-1.285e+00	-8.180e-06
balance:jobblue-collar	balance:jobentrepreneur	balance:jobhousemaid	balance:jobmanagement
3.273e-04	7.759e-04	-2.301e-04	7.431e-04
balance:jobretired	balance:jobself-employed	balance:jobservices	balance:jobstudent
-8.845e-04	6.426e-04	3.070e-04	1.707e-01
balance:jobtechnician	balance:jobunemployed	balance:jobunknown	balance:maritalmarried
1.347e-04	1.363e-03	1.297e-04	-1.066e-04
balance:maritalsingle	balance:educationsecondary	balance:educationtertiary	balance:educationunknown
-1.682e-04	4.176e-04	-1.390e-04	1.228e-04
balance:defaultyes	balance:housingyes	balance:contacttelephone	balance:contactunknown
-5.498e-04	1.121e-04	-4.371e-04	-2.277e-04
balance:day	balance:monthaug	balance:monthdec	balance:monthfeb
6.535e-06	9.961e-05	-9.678e-04	-3.840e-04
balance:monthjan	balance:monthjul	balance:monthjun	balance:monthmar
4.862e-04	5.013e-04	-2.828e-04	4.444e-02
balance:monthmay	balance:monthnov	balance:monthoct	balance:monthsep
-1.023e-04	1.409e-04	-2.974e-03	-6.245e+00
balance:duration	balance:campaign	balance:previous	balance:yyes
-8.824e-09	-5.311e-05	7.958e-05	-3.585e-05

d.

Degrees of Freedom: 999 Total (i.e. Null); 924 Residual

Null Deviance: 845.4

Residual Deviance: 709.3 AIC: 861.3

- Discuss the interpretation of the coefficients in your model. That is, you must write at least one sentence for each of the coefficients which describes how it is

related to the response. You may use transformations of variables if you like.
FAKE EXAMPLE: age has a positive coefficient, which means that older individuals are more likely to have y = yes.

- a. Balance which has a negative coefficient saying if you have balance in your account the less likely you are to have a loan
 - b. Marital status which are positive for both single and married making it more likely you have a loan
 - c. Duration which is positive meaning the longer you have an account the more likely you have a loan
 - d. Age which has a positive coefficient meaning the older you are the more likelihood you would have a loan
4. Create a confusion matrix of your preferred model, evaluated against your test data.

```
> (conf_mat = make_conf_mat(predicted = bank_tst_pred, actual = bank_tst$loan))
```

	actual	
predicted	no	yes
no	2948	516
yes	32	25

a.