

3

Linear Regression



This chapter is about *linear regression*, a very simple approach for supervised learning. In particular, linear regression is a useful tool for predicting a quantitative response. It has been around for a long time and is the topic of innumerable textbooks. Though it may seem somewhat dull compared to some of the more modern statistical learning approaches described in later chapters of this book, linear regression is still a useful and widely used statistical learning method. Moreover, it serves as a good jumping-off point for newer approaches: as we will see in later chapters, many fancy statistical learning approaches can be seen as generalizations or extensions of linear regression. Consequently, the importance of having a good understanding of linear regression before studying more complex learning methods cannot be overstated. In this chapter, we review some of the key ideas underlying the linear regression model, as well as the least squares approach that is most commonly used to fit this model.

Recall the `Advertising` data from Chapter 2. Figure 2.1 displays `sales` (in thousands of units) for a particular product as a function of advertising budgets (in thousands of dollars) for `TV`, `radio`, and `newspaper` media. Suppose that in our role as statistical consultants we are asked to suggest, on the basis of this data, a marketing plan for next year that will result in high product sales. What information would be useful in order to provide such a recommendation? Here are a few important questions that we might seek to address:

1. *Is there a relationship between advertising budget and sales?*

Our first goal should be to determine whether the data provide evidence of an association between advertising expenditure and sales. If the evidence is weak, then one might argue that no money should be spent on advertising!

2. *How strong is the relationship between advertising budget and sales?*

Assuming that there is a relationship between advertising and sales, we would like to know the strength of this relationship. Does knowledge of the advertising budget provide a lot of information about product sales?

3. *Which media are associated with sales?*

Are all three media—TV, radio, and newspaper—associated with sales, or are just one or two of the media associated? To answer this question, we must find a way to separate out the individual contribution of each medium to sales when we have spent money on all three media.

4. *How large is the association between each medium and sales?*

For every dollar spent on advertising in a particular medium, by what amount will sales increase? How accurately can we predict this amount of increase?

5. *How accurately can we predict future sales?*

For any given level of television, radio, or newspaper advertising, what is our prediction for sales, and what is the accuracy of this prediction?

6. *Is the relationship linear?*

If there is approximately a straight-line relationship between advertising expenditure in the various media and sales, then linear regression is an appropriate tool. If not, then it may still be possible to transform the predictor or the response so that linear regression can be used.

7. *Is there synergy among the advertising media?*

Perhaps spending \$50,000 on television advertising and \$50,000 on radio advertising is associated with higher sales than allocating \$100,000 to either television or radio individually. In marketing, this is known as a *synergy* effect, while in statistics it is called an *interaction* effect.

synergy
interaction

It turns out that linear regression can be used to answer each of these questions. We will first discuss all of these questions in a general context, and then return to them in this specific context in Section 3.4.

3.1 Simple Linear Regression

Simple linear regression lives up to its name: it is a very straightforward approach for predicting a quantitative response Y on the basis of a single predictor variable X . It assumes that there is approximately a linear relationship between X and Y . Mathematically, we can write this linear relationship as

$$Y \approx \beta_0 + \beta_1 X. \quad (3.1)$$

simple linear
regression

You might read “ \approx ” as “*is approximately modeled as*”. We will sometimes describe (3.1) by saying that we are *regressing Y on X* (or *Y onto X*).

For example, X may represent **TV** advertising and Y may represent **sales**. Then we can regress **sales** onto **TV** by fitting the model

$$\text{sales} \approx \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \text{TV}.$$

In Equation 3.1, β_0 and β_1 are two unknown constants that represent the *intercept* and *slope* terms in the linear model. Together, β_0 and β_1 are known as the model *coefficients* or *parameters*. Once we have used our training data to produce estimates $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$ for the model coefficients, we can predict future sales on the basis of a particular value of TV advertising by computing

$$\hat{y} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x, \quad (3.2)$$

intercept
slope
coefficient
parameter

where \hat{y} indicates a prediction of Y on the basis of $X = x$. Here we use a *hat* symbol, $\hat{}$, to denote the estimated value for an unknown parameter or coefficient, or to denote the predicted value of the response.

3.1.1 Estimating the Coefficients

In practice, β_0 and β_1 are unknown. So before we can use (3.1) to make predictions, we must use data to estimate the coefficients. Let

$$(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$$

represent n observation pairs, each of which consists of a measurement of X and a measurement of Y . In the **Advertising** example, this data set consists of the TV advertising budget and product sales in $n = 200$ different markets. (Recall that the data are displayed in Figure 2.1.) Our goal is to obtain coefficient estimates $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$ such that the linear model (3.1) fits the available data well—that is, so that $y_i \approx \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. In other words, we want to find an intercept $\hat{\beta}_0$ and a slope $\hat{\beta}_1$ such that the resulting line is as close as possible to the $n = 200$ data points. There are a number of ways of measuring *closeness*. However, by far the most common approach involves minimizing the *least squares* criterion, and we take that approach in this chapter. Alternative approaches will be considered in Chapter 6.

least squares

Let $\hat{y}_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i$ be the prediction for Y based on the i th value of X . Then $e_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$ represents the i th *residual*—this is the difference between the i th observed response value and the i th response value that is predicted by our linear model. We define the *residual sum of squares* (RSS) as

$$\text{RSS} = e_1^2 + e_2^2 + \dots + e_n^2,$$

residual

residual sum
of squares

or equivalently as

$$\text{RSS} = (y_1 - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_1 x_1)^2 + (y_2 - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_1 x_2)^2 + \dots + (y_n - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_1 x_n)^2. \quad (3.3)$$

The least squares approach chooses $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$ to minimize the RSS. Using some calculus, one can show that the minimizers are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_1 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}, \\ \hat{\beta}_0 &= \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$




FIGURE 3.1. For the `Advertising` data, the least squares fit for the regression of `Sales` onto `TV` is shown. The fit is found by minimizing the residual sum of squares. Each grey line segment represents a residual. In this case a linear fit captures the essence of the relationship, although it overestimates the trend in the left of the plot.

where $\bar{y} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$ and $\bar{x} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ are the sample means. In other words, (3.4) defines the *least squares coefficient estimates* for simple linear regression.

Figure 3.1 displays the simple linear regression fit to the `Advertising` data, where $\hat{\beta}_0 = 7.03$ and $\hat{\beta}_1 = 0.0475$. In other words, according to this approximation, an additional \$1,000 spent on TV advertising is associated with selling approximately 47.5 additional units of the product. In Figure 3.2, we have computed RSS for a number of values of β_0 and β_1 , using the advertising data with `sales` as the response and `TV` as the predictor. In each plot, the red dot represents the pair of least squares estimates $(\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1)$ given by (3.4). These values clearly minimize the RSS.

3.1.2 Assessing the Accuracy of the Coefficient Estimates

Recall from (2.1) that we assume that the *true* relationship between X and Y takes the form $Y = f(X) + \epsilon$ for some unknown function f , where ϵ is a mean-zero random error term. If f is to be approximated by a linear function, then we can write this relationship as

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \epsilon. \quad (3.5)$$

Here β_0 is the intercept term—that is, the expected value of Y when $X = 0$, and β_1 is the slope—the average increase in Y associated with a one-unit increase in X . The error term is a catch-all for what we miss with this simple model: the true relationship is probably not linear, there may be other variables that cause variation in Y , and there may be measurement error. We typically assume that the error term is independent of X .




FIGURE 3.2. Contour and three-dimensional plots of the RSS on the `Advertising` data, using `sales` as the response and `TV` as the predictor. The red dots correspond to the least squares estimates $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$, given by (3.4).

The model given by (3.5) defines the *population regression line*, which is the best linear approximation to the true relationship between X and Y .¹ The least squares regression coefficient estimates (3.4) characterize the *least squares line* (3.2). The left-hand panel of Figure 3.3 displays these two lines in a simple simulated example. We created 100 random X s, and generated 100 corresponding Y s from the model

$$Y = 2 + 3X + \epsilon, \quad (3.6)$$

where ϵ was generated from a normal distribution with mean zero. The red line in the left-hand panel of Figure 3.3 displays the *true* relationship, $f(X) = 2 + 3X$, while the blue line is the least squares estimate based on the observed data. The true relationship is generally not known for real data, but the least squares line can always be computed using the coefficient estimates given in (3.4). In other words, in real applications, we have access to a set of observations from which we can compute the least squares line; however, the population regression line is unobserved. In the right-hand panel of Figure 3.3 we have generated ten different data sets from the model given by (3.6) and plotted the corresponding ten least squares lines. Notice that different data sets generated from the same true model result in slightly different least squares lines, but the unobserved population regression line does not change.

At first glance, the difference between the population regression line and the least squares line may seem subtle and confusing. We only have one data set, and so what does it mean that two different lines describe the relationship between the predictor and the response? Fundamentally, the concept of these two lines is a natural extension of the standard statistical approach of using information from a sample to estimate characteristics of a large population. For example, suppose that we are interested in knowing

population
regression
line

least squares
line

¹The assumption of linearity is often a useful working model. However, despite what many textbooks might tell us, we seldom believe that the true relationship is linear.




FIGURE 3.3. A simulated data set. Left: The red line represents the true relationship, $f(X) = 2 + 3X$, which is known as the population regression line. The blue line is the least squares line; it is the least squares estimate for $f(X)$ based on the observed data, shown in black. Right: The population regression line is again shown in red, and the least squares line in dark blue. In light blue, ten least squares lines are shown, each computed on the basis of a separate random set of observations. Each least squares line is different, but on average, the least squares lines are quite close to the population regression line.

the population mean μ of some random variable Y . Unfortunately, μ is unknown, but we do have access to n observations from Y , y_1, \dots, y_n , which we can use to estimate μ . A reasonable estimate is $\hat{\mu} = \bar{y}$, where $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$ is the sample mean. The sample mean and the population mean are different, but in general the sample mean will provide a good estimate of the population mean. In the same way, the unknown coefficients β_0 and β_1 in linear regression define the population regression line. We seek to estimate these unknown coefficients using $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$ given in (3.4). These coefficient estimates define the least squares line.

The analogy between linear regression and estimation of the mean of a random variable is an apt one based on the concept of *bias*. If we use the sample mean $\hat{\mu}$ to estimate μ , this estimate is *unbiased*, in the sense that on average, we expect $\hat{\mu}$ to equal μ . What exactly does this mean? It means that on the basis of one particular set of observations y_1, \dots, y_n , $\hat{\mu}$ might overestimate μ , and on the basis of another set of observations, $\hat{\mu}$ might underestimate μ . But if we could average a huge number of estimates of μ obtained from a huge number of sets of observations, then this average would *exactly* equal μ . Hence, an unbiased estimator does not *systematically* over- or under-estimate the true parameter. The property of unbiasedness holds for the least squares coefficient estimates given by (3.4) as well: if we estimate β_0 and β_1 on the basis of a particular data set, then our estimates won't be exactly equal to β_0 and β_1 . But if we could average the estimates obtained over a huge number of data sets, then the average of these estimates would be spot on! In fact, we can see from the right-hand panel of Figure 3.3 that the average of many least squares lines, each

bias
unbiased

estimated from a separate data set, is pretty close to the true population regression line.

We continue the analogy with the estimation of the population mean μ of a random variable Y . A natural question is as follows: how accurate is the sample mean $\hat{\mu}$ as an estimate of μ ? We have established that the average of $\hat{\mu}$'s over many data sets will be very close to μ , but that a single estimate $\hat{\mu}$ may be a substantial underestimate or overestimate of μ . How far off will that single estimate of $\hat{\mu}$ be? In general, we answer this question by computing the *standard error* of $\hat{\mu}$, written as $\text{SE}(\hat{\mu})$. We have the well-known formula

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\mu}) = \text{SE}(\hat{\mu})^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}, \quad (3.7)$$

standard
error

where σ is the standard deviation of each of the realizations y_i of Y .² Roughly speaking, the standard error tells us the average amount that this estimate $\hat{\mu}$ differs from the actual value of μ . Equation 3.7 also tells us how this deviation shrinks with n —the more observations we have, the smaller the standard error of $\hat{\mu}$. In a similar vein, we can wonder how close $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$ are to the true values β_0 and β_1 . To compute the standard errors associated with $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$, we use the following formulas:

$$\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_0)^2 = \sigma^2 \left[\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \right], \quad \text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}, \quad (3.8)$$

where $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(\epsilon)$. For these formulas to be strictly valid, we need to assume that the errors ϵ_i for each observation have common variance σ^2 and are uncorrelated. This is clearly not true in Figure 3.1, but the formula still turns out to be a good approximation. Notice in the formula that $\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)$ is smaller when the x_i are more spread out; intuitively we have more *leverage* to estimate a slope when this is the case. We also see that $\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_0)$ would be the same as $\text{SE}(\hat{\mu})$ if \bar{x} were zero (in which case $\hat{\beta}_0$ would be equal to \bar{y}). In general, σ^2 is not known, but can be estimated from the data. This estimate of σ is known as the *residual standard error*, and is given by the formula $\text{RSE} = \sqrt{\text{RSS}/(n-2)}$. Strictly speaking, when σ^2 is estimated from the data we should write $\widehat{\text{SE}}(\hat{\beta}_1)$ to indicate that an estimate has been made, but for simplicity of notation we will drop this extra “hat”.

residual
standard
error

Standard errors can be used to compute *confidence intervals*. A 95% confidence interval is defined as a range of values such that with 95% probability, the range will contain the true unknown value of the parameter. The range is defined in terms of lower and upper limits computed from the sample of data. A 95% confidence interval has the following property: if we take repeated samples and construct the confidence interval for each sample, 95% of the intervals will contain the true unknown value of the parameter. For linear regression, the 95% confidence interval for β_1 approximately takes the form

$$\hat{\beta}_1 \pm 2 \cdot \text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1). \quad (3.9)$$

confidence
interval

²This formula holds provided that the n observations are uncorrelated.

That is, there is approximately a 95 % chance that the interval

$$\left[\hat{\beta}_1 - 2 \cdot \text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1), \hat{\beta}_1 + 2 \cdot \text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1) \right] \quad (3.10)$$

will contain the true value of β_1 .³ Similarly, a confidence interval for β_0 approximately takes the form

$$\hat{\beta}_0 \pm 2 \cdot \text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_0). \quad (3.11)$$

In the case of the advertising data, the 95 % confidence interval for β_0 is [6,130, 7,935] and the 95 % confidence interval for β_1 is [0,042, 0,053]. Therefore, we can conclude that in the absence of any advertising, sales will, on average, fall somewhere between 6,130 and 7,935 units. Furthermore, for each \$1,000 increase in television advertising, there will be an average increase in sales of between 42 and 53 units.

Standard errors can also be used to perform *hypothesis tests* on the coefficients. The most common hypothesis test involves testing the *null hypothesis* of

$$H_0 : \text{There is no relationship between } X \text{ and } Y \quad (3.12)$$

versus the *alternative hypothesis*

$$H_a : \text{There is some relationship between } X \text{ and } Y. \quad (3.13)$$

Mathematically, this corresponds to testing

$$H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$$

versus

$$H_a : \beta_1 \neq 0,$$

since if $\beta_1 = 0$ then the model (3.5) reduces to $Y = \beta_0 + \epsilon$, and X is not associated with Y . To test the null hypothesis, we need to determine whether $\hat{\beta}_1$, our estimate for β_1 , is sufficiently far from zero that we can be confident that β_1 is non-zero. How far is far enough? This of course depends on the accuracy of $\hat{\beta}_1$ —that is, it depends on $\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)$. If $\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)$ is small, then even relatively small values of $\hat{\beta}_1$ may provide strong evidence that $\beta_1 \neq 0$, and hence that there is a relationship between X and Y . In contrast, if $\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)$ is large, then $\hat{\beta}_1$ must be large in absolute value in order for us to reject the null hypothesis. In practice, we compute a *t-statistic*, given by

$$t = \frac{\hat{\beta}_1 - 0}{\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)}, \quad (3.14)$$

³Approximately for several reasons. Equation 3.10 relies on the assumption that the errors are Gaussian. Also, the factor of 2 in front of the $\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)$ term will vary slightly depending on the number of observations n in the linear regression. To be precise, rather than the number 2, (3.10) should contain the 97.5 % quantile of a *t*-distribution with $n - 2$ degrees of freedom. Details of how to compute the 95 % confidence interval precisely in R will be provided later in this chapter.

	Coefficient	Std. error	<i>t</i> -statistic	<i>p</i> -value
Intercept	7.0325	0.4578	15.36	< 0.0001
TV	0.0475	0.0027	17.67	< 0.0001

TABLE 3.1. For the **Advertising** data, coefficients of the least squares model for the regression of number of units sold on TV advertising budget. An increase of \$1,000 in the TV advertising budget is associated with an increase in sales by around 50 units. (Recall that the **sales** variable is in thousands of units, and the **TV** variable is in thousands of dollars.)

which measures the number of standard deviations that $\hat{\beta}_1$ is away from 0. If there really is no relationship between X and Y , then we expect that (3.14) will have a *t*-distribution with $n - 2$ degrees of freedom. The *t*-distribution has a bell shape and for values of n greater than approximately 30 it is quite similar to the standard normal distribution. Consequently, it is a simple matter to compute the probability of observing any number equal to $|t|$ or larger in absolute value, assuming $\beta_1 = 0$. We call this probability the *p-value*. Roughly speaking, we interpret the *p-value* as follows: a small *p-value* indicates that it is unlikely to observe such a substantial association between the predictor and the response due to chance, in the absence of any real association between the predictor and the response. Hence, if we see a small *p-value*, then we can infer that there is an association between the predictor and the response. We *reject the null hypothesis*—that is, we declare a relationship to exist between X and Y —if the *p-value* is small enough. Typical *p-value* cutoffs for rejecting the null hypothesis are 5% or 1%, although this topic will be explored in much greater detail in Chapter 13. When $n = 30$, these correspond to *t*-statistics (3.14) of around 2 and 2.75, respectively.

Table 3.1 provides details of the least squares model for the regression of number of units sold on TV advertising budget for the **Advertising** data. Notice that the coefficients for $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$ are very large relative to their standard errors, so the *t*-statistics are also large; the probabilities of seeing such values if H_0 is true are virtually zero. Hence we can conclude that $\beta_0 \neq 0$ and $\beta_1 \neq 0$.⁴

3.1.3 Assessing the Accuracy of the Model

Once we have rejected the null hypothesis (3.12) in favor of the alternative hypothesis (3.13), it is natural to want to quantify *the extent to which the model fits the data*. The quality of a linear regression fit is typically assessed using two related quantities: the *residual standard error* (RSE) and the R^2 statistic.

⁴In Table 3.1, a small *p-value* for the intercept indicates that we can reject the null hypothesis that $\beta_0 = 0$, and a small *p-value* for **TV** indicates that we can reject the null hypothesis that $\beta_1 = 0$. Rejecting the latter null hypothesis allows us to conclude that there is a relationship between **TV** and **sales**. Rejecting the former allows us to conclude that in the absence of **TV** expenditure, **sales** are non-zero.

Quantity	Value
Residual standard error	3.26
R^2	0.612
F -statistic	312.1

TABLE 3.2. For the **Advertising** data, more information about the least squares model for the regression of number of units sold on TV advertising budget.

Table 3.2 displays the RSE, the R^2 statistic, and the F -statistic (to be described in Section 3.2.2) for the linear regression of number of units sold on TV advertising budget.

Residual Standard Error

Recall from the model (3.5) that associated with each observation is an error term ϵ . Due to the presence of these error terms, even if we knew the true regression line (i.e. even if β_0 and β_1 were known), we would not be able to perfectly predict Y from X . The RSE is an estimate of the standard deviation of ϵ . Roughly speaking, it is the average amount that the response will deviate from the true regression line. It is computed using the formula

$$\text{RSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-2} \text{RSS}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}. \quad (3.15)$$

Note that RSS was defined in Section 3.1.1, and is given by the formula

$$\text{RSS} = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2. \quad (3.16)$$

In the case of the advertising data, we see from the linear regression output in Table 3.2 that the RSE is 3.26. In other words, actual sales in each market deviate from the true regression line by approximately 3,260 units, on average. Another way to think about this is that even if the model were correct and the true values of the unknown coefficients β_0 and β_1 were known exactly, any prediction of sales on the basis of TV advertising would still be off by about 3,260 units on average. Of course, whether or not 3,260 units is an acceptable prediction error depends on the problem context. In the advertising data set, the mean value of **sales** over all markets is approximately 14,000 units, and so the percentage error is $3,260/14,000 = 23\%$.

The RSE is considered a measure of the *lack of fit* of the model (3.5) to the data. If the predictions obtained using the model are very close to the true outcome values—that is, if $\hat{y}_i \approx y_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ —then (3.15) will be small, and we can conclude that the model fits the data very well. On the other hand, if \hat{y}_i is very far from y_i for one or more observations, then the RSE may be quite large, indicating that the model doesn't fit the data well.

R^2 Statistic

The RSE provides an absolute measure of lack of fit of the model (3.5) to the data. But since it is measured in the units of Y , it is not always

clear what constitutes a good RSE. The R^2 statistic provides an alternative measure of fit. It takes the form of a *proportion*—the proportion of variance explained—and so it always takes on a value between 0 and 1, and is independent of the scale of Y .

To calculate R^2 , we use the formula

$$R^2 = \frac{\text{TSS} - \text{RSS}}{\text{TSS}} = 1 - \frac{\text{RSS}}{\text{TSS}} \quad (3.17)$$

where $\text{TSS} = \sum(y_i - \bar{y})^2$ is the *total sum of squares*, and RSS is defined in (3.16). TSS measures the total variance in the response Y , and can be thought of as the amount of variability inherent in the response before the regression is performed. In contrast, RSS measures the amount of variability that is left unexplained after performing the regression. Hence, $\text{TSS} - \text{RSS}$ measures the amount of variability in the response that is explained (or removed) by performing the regression, and R^2 measures the *proportion of variability in Y that can be explained using X* . An R^2 statistic that is close to 1 indicates that a large proportion of the variability in the response is explained by the regression. A number near 0 indicates that the regression does not explain much of the variability in the response; this might occur because the linear model is wrong, or the error variance σ^2 is high, or both. In Table 3.2, the R^2 was 0.61, and so just under two-thirds of the variability in **sales** is explained by a linear regression on **TV**.

total sum of squares

The R^2 statistic (3.17) has an interpretational advantage over the RSE (3.15), since unlike the RSE, it always lies between 0 and 1. However, it can still be challenging to determine what is a *good* R^2 value, and in general, this will depend on the application. For instance, in certain problems in physics, we may know that the data truly comes from a linear model with a small residual error. In this case, we would expect to see an R^2 value that is extremely close to 1, and a substantially smaller R^2 value might indicate a serious problem with the experiment in which the data were generated. On the other hand, in typical applications in biology, psychology, marketing, and other domains, the linear model (3.5) is at best an extremely rough approximation to the data, and residual errors due to other unmeasured factors are often very large. In this setting, we would expect only a very small proportion of the variance in the response to be explained by the predictor, and an R^2 value well below 0.1 might be more realistic!

The R^2 statistic is a measure of the linear relationship between X and Y . Recall that *correlation*, defined as

$$\text{Cor}(X, Y) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}, \quad (3.18)$$

correlation

is also a measure of the linear relationship between X and Y .⁵ This suggests that we might be able to use $r = \text{Cor}(X, Y)$ instead of R^2 in order to assess the fit of the linear model. In fact, it can be shown that in the simple

⁵We note that in fact, the right-hand side of (3.18) is the sample correlation; thus, it would be more correct to write $\widehat{\text{Cor}}(X, Y)$; however, we omit the “hat” for ease of notation.

Simple regression of sales on radio				
	Coefficient	Std. error	t-statistic	p-value
Intercept	9.312	0.563	16.54	< 0.0001
radio	0.203	0.020	9.92	< 0.0001

Simple regression of **sales** on **newspaper**

	Coefficient	Std. error	t-statistic	p-value
Intercept	12.351	0.621	19.88	< 0.0001
newspaper	0.055	0.017	3.30	0.00115

TABLE 3.3. More simple linear regression models for the **Advertising** data. Coefficients of the simple linear regression model for number of units sold on Top: radio advertising budget and Bottom: newspaper advertising budget. A \$1,000 increase in spending on radio advertising is associated with an average increase in sales by around 203 units, while the same increase in spending on newspaper advertising is associated with an average increase in sales by around 55 units. (Note that the **sales** variable is in thousands of units, and the **radio** and **newspaper** variables are in thousands of dollars.)

linear regression setting, $R^2 = r^2$. In other words, the squared correlation and the R^2 statistic are identical. However, in the next section we will discuss the multiple linear regression problem, in which we use several predictors simultaneously to predict the response. The concept of correlation between the predictors and the response does not extend automatically to this setting, since correlation quantifies the association between a single pair of variables rather than between a larger number of variables. We will see that R^2 fills this role.

3.2 Multiple Linear Regression

Simple linear regression is a useful approach for predicting a response on the basis of a single predictor variable. However, in practice we often have more than one predictor. For example, in the **Advertising** data, we have examined the relationship between sales and TV advertising. We also have data for the amount of money spent advertising on the radio and in newspapers, and we may want to know whether either of these two media is associated with sales. How can we extend our analysis of the advertising data in order to accommodate these two additional predictors?

One option is to run three separate simple linear regressions, each of which uses a different advertising medium as a predictor. For instance, we can fit a simple linear regression to predict sales on the basis of the amount spent on radio advertisements. Results are shown in Table 3.3 (top table). We find that a \$1,000 increase in spending on radio advertising is associated with an increase in sales of around 203 units. Table 3.3 (bottom table) contains the least squares coefficients for a simple linear regression of sales onto newspaper advertising budget. A \$1,000 increase in newspaper advertising budget is associated with an increase in sales of approximately 55 units.

However, the approach of fitting a separate simple linear regression model for each predictor is not entirely satisfactory. First of all, it is unclear how to make a single prediction of sales given the three advertising media budgets, since each of the budgets is associated with a separate regression equation. Second, each of the three regression equations ignores the other two media in forming estimates for the regression coefficients. We will see shortly that if the media budgets are correlated with each other in the 200 markets in our data set, then this can lead to very misleading estimates of the association between each media budget and sales.

Instead of fitting a separate simple linear regression model for each predictor, a better approach is to extend the simple linear regression model (3.5) so that it can directly accommodate multiple predictors. We can do this by giving each predictor a separate slope coefficient in a single model. In general, suppose that we have p distinct predictors. Then the multiple linear regression model takes the form

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \cdots + \beta_p X_p + \epsilon, \quad (3.19)$$

where X_j represents the j th predictor and β_j quantifies the association between that variable and the response. We interpret β_j as the *average* effect on Y of a one unit increase in X_j , *holding all other predictors fixed*. In the advertising example, (3.19) becomes

$$\text{sales} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \text{TV} + \beta_2 \times \text{radio} + \beta_3 \times \text{newspaper} + \epsilon. \quad (3.20)$$

3.2.1 Estimating the Regression Coefficients

As was the case in the simple linear regression setting, the regression coefficients $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p$ in (3.19) are unknown, and must be estimated. Given estimates $\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_p$, we can make predictions using the formula

$$\hat{y} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_1 + \hat{\beta}_2 x_2 + \cdots + \hat{\beta}_p x_p. \quad (3.21)$$

The parameters are estimated using the same least squares approach that we saw in the context of simple linear regression. We choose $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p$ to minimize the sum of squared residuals

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RSS} &= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_1 x_{i1} - \hat{\beta}_2 x_{i2} - \cdots - \hat{\beta}_p x_{ip})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

The values $\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_p$ that minimize (3.22) are the multiple least squares regression coefficient estimates. Unlike the simple linear regression estimates given in (3.4), the multiple regression coefficient estimates have somewhat complicated forms that are most easily represented using matrix algebra. For this reason, we do not provide them here. Any statistical software package can be used to compute these coefficient estimates, and later in this chapter we will show how this can be done in R. Figure 3.4




FIGURE 3.4. In a three-dimensional setting, with two predictors and one response, the least squares regression line becomes a plane. The plane is chosen to minimize the sum of the squared vertical distances between each observation (shown in red) and the plane.

illustrates an example of the least squares fit to a toy data set with $p = 2$ predictors.

Table 3.4 displays the multiple regression coefficient estimates when TV, radio, and newspaper advertising budgets are used to predict product sales using the [Advertising](#) data. We interpret these results as follows: for a given amount of TV and newspaper advertising, spending an additional \$1,000 on radio advertising is associated with approximately 189 units of additional sales. Comparing these coefficient estimates to those displayed in Tables 3.1 and 3.3, we notice that the multiple regression coefficient estimates for **TV** and **radio** are pretty similar to the simple linear regression coefficient estimates. However, while the **newspaper** regression coefficient estimate in Table 3.3 was significantly non-zero, the coefficient estimate for **newspaper** in the multiple regression model is close to zero, and the corresponding p -value is no longer significant, with a value around 0.86. This illustrates that the simple and multiple regression coefficients can be quite different. This difference stems from the fact that in the simple regression case, the slope term represents the average increase in product sales associated with a \$1,000 increase in newspaper advertising, ignoring other predictors such as **TV** and **radio**. By contrast, in the multiple regression setting, the coefficient for **newspaper** represents the average increase in product sales associated with increasing newspaper spending by \$1,000 while holding **TV** and **radio** fixed.

Does it make sense for the multiple regression to suggest no relationship between **sales** and **newspaper** while the simple linear regression implies the

	Coefficient	Std. error	<i>t</i> -statistic	<i>p</i> -value
Intercept	2.939	0.3119	9.42	< 0.0001
TV	0.046	0.0014	32.81	< 0.0001
radio	0.189	0.0086	21.89	< 0.0001
newspaper	-0.001	0.0059	-0.18	0.8599

TABLE 3.4. For the `Advertising` data, least squares coefficient estimates of the multiple linear regression of number of units sold on TV, radio, and newspaper advertising budgets.

	TV	radio	newspaper	sales
TV	1.0000	0.0548	0.0567	0.7822
radio		1.0000	0.3541	0.5762
newspaper			1.0000	0.2283
sales				1.0000

TABLE 3.5. Correlation matrix for TV, radio, newspaper, and sales for the `Advertising` data.

opposite? In fact it does. Consider the correlation matrix for the three predictor variables and response variable, displayed in Table 3.5. Notice that the correlation between `radio` and `newspaper` is 0.35. This indicates that markets with high newspaper advertising tend to also have high radio advertising. Now suppose that the multiple regression is correct and newspaper advertising is not associated with sales, but radio advertising is associated with sales. Then in markets where we spend more on radio our sales will tend to be higher, and as our correlation matrix shows, we also tend to spend more on newspaper advertising in those same markets. Hence, in a simple linear regression which only examines `sales` versus `newspaper`, we will observe that higher values of `newspaper` tend to be associated with higher values of `sales`, even though newspaper advertising is not directly associated with sales. So `newspaper` advertising is a surrogate for `radio` advertising; `newspaper` gets “credit” for the association between `radio` on `sales`.

This slightly counterintuitive result is very common in many real life situations. Consider an absurd example to illustrate the point. Running a regression of shark attacks versus ice cream sales for data collected at a given beach community over a period of time would show a positive relationship, similar to that seen between `sales` and `newspaper`. Of course no one has (yet) suggested that ice creams should be banned at beaches to reduce shark attacks. In reality, higher temperatures cause more people to visit the beach, which in turn results in more ice cream sales and more shark attacks. A multiple regression of shark attacks onto ice cream sales and temperature reveals that, as intuition implies, ice cream sales is no longer a significant predictor after adjusting for temperature.

3.2.2 Some Important Questions

When we perform multiple linear regression, we usually are interested in answering a few important questions.

1. Is at least one of the predictors X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p useful in predicting the response?
2. Do all the predictors help to explain Y , or is only a subset of the predictors useful?
3. How well does the model fit the data?
4. Given a set of predictor values, what response value should we predict, and how accurate is our prediction?

We now address each of these questions in turn.

One: Is There a Relationship Between the Response and Predictors?

Recall that in the simple linear regression setting, in order to determine whether there is a relationship between the response and the predictor we can simply check whether $\beta_1 = 0$. In the multiple regression setting with p predictors, we need to ask whether all of the regression coefficients are zero, i.e. whether $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_p = 0$. As in the simple linear regression setting, we use a hypothesis test to answer this question. We test the null hypothesis,

$$H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_p = 0$$

versus the alternative

$$H_a : \text{at least one } \beta_j \text{ is non-zero.}$$

This hypothesis test is performed by computing the *F-statistic*,

F-statistic

$$F = \frac{(\text{TSS} - \text{RSS})/p}{\text{RSS}/(n - p - 1)}, \quad (3.23)$$

where, as with simple linear regression, $\text{TSS} = \sum(y_i - \bar{y})^2$ and $\text{RSS} = \sum(y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$. If the linear model assumptions are correct, one can show that

$$E\{\text{RSS}/(n - p - 1)\} = \sigma^2$$

and that, provided H_0 is true,

$$E\{(\text{TSS} - \text{RSS})/p\} = \sigma^2.$$

Hence, when there is no relationship between the response and predictors, one would expect the *F*-statistic to take on a value close to 1. On the other hand, if H_a is true, then $E\{(\text{TSS} - \text{RSS})/p\} > \sigma^2$, so we expect *F* to be greater than 1.

The *F*-statistic for the multiple linear regression model obtained by regressing **sales** onto **radio**, **TV**, and **newspaper** is shown in Table 3.6. In this example the *F*-statistic is 570. Since this is far larger than 1, it provides compelling evidence against the null hypothesis H_0 . In other words, the large *F*-statistic suggests that at least one of the advertising media must be related to **sales**. However, what if the *F*-statistic had been closer to 1? How large does the *F*-statistic need to be before we can reject H_0 and

Quantity	Value
Residual standard error	1.69
R^2	0.897
F -statistic	570

TABLE 3.6. More information about the least squares model for the regression of number of units sold on TV, newspaper, and radio advertising budgets in the **Advertising** data. Other information about this model was displayed in Table 3.4.

conclude that there is a relationship? It turns out that the answer depends on the values of n and p . When n is large, an F -statistic that is just a little larger than 1 might still provide evidence against H_0 . In contrast, a larger F -statistic is needed to reject H_0 if n is small. When H_0 is true and the errors ϵ_i have a normal distribution, the F -statistic follows an F -distribution.⁶ For any given value of n and p , any statistical software package can be used to compute the p -value associated with the F -statistic using this distribution. Based on this p -value, we can determine whether or not to reject H_0 . For the advertising data, the p -value associated with the F -statistic in Table 3.6 is essentially zero, so we have extremely strong evidence that at least one of the media is associated with increased **sales**.

In (3.23) we are testing H_0 that all the coefficients are zero. Sometimes we want to test that a particular subset of q of the coefficients are zero. This corresponds to a null hypothesis

$$H_0 : \beta_{p-q+1} = \beta_{p-q+2} = \cdots = \beta_p = 0,$$

where for convenience we have put the variables chosen for omission at the end of the list. In this case we fit a second model that uses all the variables *except* those last q . Suppose that the residual sum of squares for that model is RSS_0 . Then the appropriate F -statistic is

$$F = \frac{(\text{RSS}_0 - \text{RSS})/q}{\text{RSS}/(n - p - 1)}. \quad (3.24)$$

Notice that in Table 3.4, for each individual predictor a t -statistic and a p -value were reported. These provide information about whether each individual predictor is related to the response, after adjusting for the other predictors. It turns out that each of these is exactly equivalent⁷ to the F -test that omits that single variable from the model, leaving all the others in—i.e. $q=1$ in (3.24). So it reports the *partial effect* of adding that variable to the model. For instance, as we discussed earlier, these p -values indicate that **TV** and **radio** are related to **sales**, but that there is no evidence that **newspaper** is associated with **sales**, when **TV** and **radio** are held fixed.

Given these individual p -values for each variable, why do we need to look at the overall F -statistic? After all, it seems likely that if any one of the p -values for the individual variables is very small, then *at least one of the predictors is related to the response*. However, this logic is flawed, especially when the number of predictors p is large.

⁶Even if the errors are not normally-distributed, the F -statistic approximately follows an F -distribution provided that the sample size n is large.

⁷The square of each t -statistic is the corresponding F -statistic.

For instance, consider an example in which $p = 100$ and $H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_p = 0$ is true, so no variable is truly associated with the response. In this situation, about 5% of the p -values associated with each variable (of the type shown in Table 3.4) will be below 0.05 by chance. In other words, we expect to see approximately five *small* p -values even in the absence of any true association between the predictors and the response.⁸ In fact, it is likely that we will observe at least one p -value below 0.05 by chance! Hence, if we use the individual t -statistics and associated p -values in order to decide whether or not there is any association between the variables and the response, there is a very high chance that we will incorrectly conclude that there is a relationship. However, the F -statistic does not suffer from this problem because it adjusts for the number of predictors. Hence, if H_0 is true, there is only a 5% chance that the F -statistic will result in a p -value below 0.05, regardless of the number of predictors or the number of observations.

The approach of using an F -statistic to test for any association between the predictors and the response works when p is relatively small, and certainly small compared to n . However, sometimes we have a very large number of variables. If $p > n$ then there are more coefficients β_j to estimate than observations from which to estimate them. In this case we cannot even fit the multiple linear regression model using least squares, so the F -statistic cannot be used, and neither can most of the other concepts that we have seen so far in this chapter. When p is large, some of the approaches discussed in the next section, such as *forward selection*, can be used. This *high-dimensional* setting is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6.

high-dimensional

Two: Deciding on Important Variables

As discussed in the previous section, the first step in a multiple regression analysis is to compute the F -statistic and to examine the associated p -value. If we conclude on the basis of that p -value that at least one of the predictors is related to the response, then it is natural to wonder *which* are the guilty ones! We could look at the individual p -values as in Table 3.4, but as discussed (and as further explored in Chapter 13), if p is large we are likely to make some false discoveries.

It is possible that all of the predictors are associated with the response, but it is more often the case that the response is only associated with a subset of the predictors. The task of determining which predictors are associated with the response, in order to fit a single model involving only those predictors, is referred to as *variable selection*. The variable selection problem is studied extensively in Chapter 6, and so here we will provide only a brief outline of some classical approaches.

variable selection

Ideally, we would like to perform variable selection by trying out a lot of different models, each containing a different subset of the predictors. For instance, if $p = 2$, then we can consider four models: (1) a model containing no variables, (2) a model containing X_1 only, (3) a model containing

⁸This is related to the important concept of *multiple testing*, which is the focus of Chapter 13.

X_2 only, and (4) a model containing both X_1 and X_2 . We can then select the *best* model out of all of the models that we have considered. How do we determine which model is best? Various statistics can be used to judge the quality of a model. These include *Mallow's C_p* , *Akaike information criterion* (AIC), *Bayesian information criterion* (BIC), and *adjusted R^2* . These are discussed in more detail in Chapter 6. We can also determine which model is best by plotting various model outputs, such as the residuals, in order to search for patterns.

Unfortunately, there are a total of 2^p models that contain subsets of p variables. This means that even for moderate p , trying out every possible subset of the predictors is infeasible. For instance, we saw that if $p = 2$, then there are $2^2 = 4$ models to consider. But if $p = 30$, then we must consider $2^{30} = 1,073,741,824$ models! This is not practical. Therefore, unless p is very small, we cannot consider all 2^p models, and instead we need an automated and efficient approach to choose a smaller set of models to consider. There are three classical approaches for this task:

- *Forward selection.* We begin with the *null model*—a model that contains an intercept but no predictors. We then fit p simple linear regressions and add to the null model the variable that results in the lowest RSS. We then add to that model the variable that results in the lowest RSS for the new two-variable model. This approach is continued until some stopping rule is satisfied.
- *Backward selection.* We start with all variables in the model, and remove the variable with the largest p -value—that is, the variable that is the least statistically significant. The new $(p - 1)$ -variable model is fit, and the variable with the largest p -value is removed. This procedure continues until a stopping rule is reached. For instance, we may stop when all remaining variables have a p -value below some threshold.
- *Mixed selection.* This is a combination of forward and backward selection. We start with no variables in the model, and as with forward selection, we add the variable that provides the best fit. We continue to add variables one-by-one. Of course, as we noted with the **Advertising** example, the p -values for variables can become larger as new predictors are added to the model. Hence, if at any point the p -value for one of the variables in the model rises above a certain threshold, then we remove that variable from the model. We continue to perform these forward and backward steps until all variables in the model have a sufficiently low p -value, and all variables outside the model would have a large p -value if added to the model.

Backward selection cannot be used if $p > n$, while forward selection can always be used. Forward selection is a greedy approach, and might include variables early that later become redundant. Mixed selection can remedy this.

Mallow's C_p
Akaike
information
criterion
Bayesian
information
criterion
adjusted R^2

forward
selection
null model

backward
selection

mixed
selection

Three: Model Fit

Two of the most common numerical measures of model fit are the RSE and R^2 , the fraction of variance explained. These quantities are computed and interpreted in the same fashion as for simple linear regression.

Recall that in simple regression, R^2 is the square of the correlation of the response and the variable. In multiple linear regression, it turns out that it equals $\text{Cor}(Y, \hat{Y})^2$, the square of the correlation between the response and the fitted linear model; in fact one property of the fitted linear model is that it maximizes this correlation among all possible linear models.

An R^2 value close to 1 indicates that the model explains a large portion of the variance in the response variable. As an example, we saw in Table 3.6 that for the `Advertising` data, the model that uses all three advertising media to predict `sales` has an R^2 of 0.8972. On the other hand, the model that uses only `TV` and `radio` to predict `sales` has an R^2 value of 0.89719. In other words, there is a *small* increase in R^2 if we include newspaper advertising in the model that already contains `TV` and `radio` advertising, even though we saw earlier that the p -value for newspaper advertising in Table 3.4 is not significant. It turns out that R^2 will always increase when more variables are added to the model, even if those variables are only weakly associated with the response. This is due to the fact that adding another variable always results in a decrease in the residual sum of squares on the training data (though not necessarily the testing data). Thus, the R^2 statistic, which is also computed on the training data, must increase. The fact that adding newspaper advertising to the model containing only `TV` and `radio` advertising leads to just a tiny increase in R^2 provides additional evidence that `newspaper` can be dropped from the model. Essentially, `newspaper` provides no real improvement in the model fit to the training samples, and its inclusion will likely lead to poor results on independent test samples due to overfitting.

By contrast, the model containing only `TV` as a predictor had an R^2 of 0.61 (Table 3.2). Adding `radio` to the model leads to a substantial improvement in R^2 . This implies that a model that uses `TV` and `radio` expenditures to predict `sales` is substantially better than one that uses only `TV` advertising. We could further quantify this improvement by looking at the p -value for the `radio` coefficient in a model that contains only `TV` and `radio` as predictors.

The model that contains only `TV` and `radio` as predictors has an RSE of 1.681, and the model that also contains `newspaper` as a predictor has an RSE of 1.686 (Table 3.6). In contrast, the model that contains only `TV` has an RSE of 3.26 (Table 3.2). This corroborates our previous conclusion that a model that uses `TV` and `radio` expenditures to predict `sales` is much more accurate (on the training data) than one that only uses `TV` spending. Furthermore, given that `TV` and `radio` expenditures are used as predictors, there is no point in also using `newspaper` spending as a predictor in the model. The observant reader may wonder how RSE can increase when `newspaper` is added to the model given that RSS must decrease. In general RSE is defined as

$$\text{RSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n - p - 1} \text{RSS}}, \quad (3.25)$$




FIGURE 3.5. For the `Advertising` data, a linear regression fit to `sales` using `TV` and `radio` as predictors. From the pattern of the residuals, we can see that there is a pronounced non-linear relationship in the data. The positive residuals (those visible above the surface), tend to lie along the 45-degree line, where `TV` and `Radio` budgets are split evenly. The negative residuals (most not visible), tend to lie away from this line, where budgets are more lopsided.

which simplifies to (3.15) for a simple linear regression. Thus, models with more variables can have higher RSE if the decrease in RSS is small relative to the increase in p .

In addition to looking at the RSE and R^2 statistics just discussed, it can be useful to plot the data. Graphical summaries can reveal problems with a model that are not visible from numerical statistics. For example, Figure 3.5 displays a three-dimensional plot of `TV` and `radio` versus `sales`. We see that some observations lie above and some observations lie below the least squares regression plane. In particular, the linear model seems to overestimate `sales` for instances in which most of the advertising money was spent exclusively on either `TV` or `radio`. It underestimates `sales` for instances where the budget was split between the two media. This pronounced non-linear pattern suggests a *synergy* or *interaction* effect between the advertising media, whereby combining the media together results in a bigger boost to sales than using any single medium. In Section 3.3.2, we will discuss extending the linear model to accommodate such synergistic effects through the use of interaction terms.

interaction

Four: Predictions

Once we have fit the multiple regression model, it is straightforward to apply (3.21) in order to predict the response Y on the basis of a set of values for the predictors X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p . However, there are three sorts of uncertainty associated with this prediction.

1. The coefficient estimates $\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_p$ are estimates for $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p$. That is, the *least squares plane*

$$\hat{Y} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 X_1 + \dots + \hat{\beta}_p X_p$$

is only an estimate for the *true population regression plane*

$$f(X) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \cdots + \beta_p X_p.$$

The inaccuracy in the coefficient estimates is related to the *reducible error* from Chapter 2. We can compute a *confidence interval* in order to determine how close \hat{Y} will be to $f(X)$.

2. Of course, in practice assuming a linear model for $f(X)$ is almost always an approximation of reality, so there is an additional source of potentially reducible error which we call *model bias*. So when we use a linear model, we are in fact estimating the best linear approximation to the true surface. However, here we will ignore this discrepancy, and operate as if the linear model were correct.
3. Even if we knew $f(X)$ —that is, even if we knew the true values for $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p$ —the response value cannot be predicted perfectly because of the random error ϵ in the model (3.20). In Chapter 2, we referred to this as the *irreducible error*. How much will Y vary from \hat{Y} ? We use *prediction intervals* to answer this question. Prediction intervals are always wider than confidence intervals, because they incorporate both the error in the estimate for $f(X)$ (the reducible error) and the uncertainty as to how much an individual point will differ from the population regression plane (the irreducible error).

We use a *confidence interval* to quantify the uncertainty surrounding the *average sales* over a large number of cities. For example, given that \$100,000 is spent on **TV** advertising and \$20,000 is spent on **radio** advertising in each city, the 95 % confidence interval is [10,985, 11,528]. We interpret this to mean that 95 % of intervals of this form will contain the true value of $f(X)$.⁹ On the other hand, a *prediction interval* can be used to quantify the uncertainty surrounding *sales* for a *particular* city. Given that \$100,000 is spent on **TV** advertising and \$20,000 is spent on **radio** advertising in that city the 95 % prediction interval is [7,930, 14,580]. We interpret this to mean that 95 % of intervals of this form will contain the true value of Y for this city. Note that both intervals are centered at 11,256, but that the prediction interval is substantially wider than the confidence interval, reflecting the increased uncertainty about *sales* for a given city in comparison to the average *sales* over many locations.

confidence
interval

prediction
interval

⁹In other words, if we collect a large number of data sets like the **Advertising** data set, and we construct a confidence interval for the average *sales* on the basis of each data set (given \$100,000 in **TV** and \$20,000 in **radio** advertising), then 95 % of these confidence intervals will contain the true value of average *sales*.

3.3 Other Considerations in the Regression Model

3.3.1 Qualitative Predictors

In our discussion so far, we have assumed that all variables in our linear regression model are *quantitative*. But in practice, this is not necessarily the case; often some predictors are *qualitative*.

For example, the `Credit` data set displayed in Figure 3.6 records variables for a number of credit card holders. The response is `balance` (average credit card debt for each individual) and there are several quantitative predictors: `age`, `cards` (number of credit cards), `education` (years of education), `income` (in thousands of dollars), `limit` (credit limit), and `rating` (credit rating). Each panel of Figure 3.6 is a scatterplot for a pair of variables whose identities are given by the corresponding row and column labels. For example, the scatterplot directly to the right of the word “Balance” depicts `balance` versus `age`, while the plot directly to the right of “Age” corresponds to `age` versus `cards`. In addition to these quantitative variables, we also have four qualitative variables: `own` (house ownership), `student` (student status), `status` (marital status), and `region` (East, West or South).

Predictors with Only Two Levels

Suppose that we wish to investigate differences in credit card balance between those who own a house and those who don’t, ignoring the other variables for the moment. If a qualitative predictor (also known as a *factor*) only has two *levels*, or possible values, then incorporating it into a regression model is very simple. We simply create an indicator or *dummy variable* that takes on two possible numerical values.¹⁰ For example, based on the `own` variable, we can create a new variable that takes the form

$$x_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i\text{th person owns a house} \\ 0 & \text{if } i\text{th person does not own a house,} \end{cases} \quad (3.26)$$

factor
level
dummy
variable

and use this variable as a predictor in the regression equation. This results in the model

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \epsilon_i = \begin{cases} \beta_0 + \beta_1 + \epsilon_i & \text{if } i\text{th person owns a house} \\ \beta_0 + \epsilon_i & \text{if } i\text{th person does not.} \end{cases} \quad (3.27)$$

Now β_0 can be interpreted as the average credit card balance among those who do not own, $\beta_0 + \beta_1$ as the average credit card balance among those who do own their house, and β_1 as the average difference in credit card balance between owners and non-owners.

Table 3.7 displays the coefficient estimates and other information associated with the model (3.27). The average credit card debt for non-owners is estimated to be \$509.80, whereas owners are estimated to carry \$19.73 in additional debt for a total of $\$509.80 + \$19.73 = \$529.53$. However, we

¹⁰In the machine learning community, the creation of dummy variables to handle qualitative predictors is known as “one-hot encoding”.




FIGURE 3.6. The Credit data set contains information about **balance**, **age**, **cards**, **education**, **income**, **limit**, and **rating** for a number of potential customers.

notice that the p -value for the dummy variable is very high. This indicates that there is no statistical evidence of a difference in average credit card balance based on house ownership.

The decision to code owners as 1 and non-owners as 0 in (3.27) is arbitrary, and has no effect on the regression fit, but does alter the interpretation of the coefficients. If we had coded non-owners as 1 and owners as 0, then the estimates for β_0 and β_1 would have been 529.53 and -19.73 , respectively, leading once again to a prediction of credit card debt of $\$529.53 - \$19.73 = \$509.80$ for non-owners and a prediction of $\$529.53$ for owners. Alternatively, instead of a 0/1 coding scheme, we could create a dummy variable

$$x_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i\text{th person owns a house} \\ -1 & \text{if } i\text{th person does not own a house} \end{cases}$$

and use this variable in the regression equation. This results in the model

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \epsilon_i = \begin{cases} \beta_0 + \beta_1 + \epsilon_i & \text{if } i\text{th person owns a house} \\ \beta_0 - \beta_1 + \epsilon_i & \text{if } i\text{th person does not own a house.} \end{cases}$$

	Coefficient	Std. error	t-statistic	p-value
Intercept	509.80	33.13	15.389	< 0.0001
own [Yes]	19.73	46.05	0.429	0.6690

TABLE 3.7. Least squares coefficient estimates associated with the regression of `balance` onto `own` in the `Credit` data set. The linear model is given in (3.27). That is, ownership is encoded as a dummy variable, as in (3.26).

Now β_0 can be interpreted as the overall average credit card balance (ignoring the house ownership effect), and β_1 is the amount by which house owners and non-owners have credit card balances that are above and below the average, respectively.¹¹ In this example, the estimate for β_0 is \$519.665, halfway between the non-owner and owner averages of \$509.80 and \$529.53. The estimate for β_1 is \$9.865, which is half of \$19.73, the average difference between owners and non-owners. It is important to note that the final predictions for the credit balances of owners and non-owners will be identical regardless of the coding scheme used. The only difference is in the way that the coefficients are interpreted.

Qualitative Predictors with More than Two Levels

When a qualitative predictor has more than two levels, a single dummy variable cannot represent all possible values. In this situation, we can create additional dummy variables. For example, for the `region` variable we create two dummy variables. The first could be

$$x_{i1} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i\text{th person is from the South} \\ 0 & \text{if } i\text{th person is not from the South,} \end{cases} \quad (3.28)$$

and the second could be

$$x_{i2} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i\text{th person is from the West} \\ 0 & \text{if } i\text{th person is not from the West.} \end{cases} \quad (3.29)$$

Then both of these variables can be used in the regression equation, in order to obtain the model

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \epsilon_i = \begin{cases} \beta_0 + \beta_1 + \epsilon_i & \text{if } i\text{th person is from the South} \\ \beta_0 + \beta_2 + \epsilon_i & \text{if } i\text{th person is from the West} \\ \beta_0 + \epsilon_i & \text{if } i\text{th person is from the East.} \end{cases} \quad (3.30)$$

Now β_0 can be interpreted as the average credit card balance for individuals from the East, β_1 can be interpreted as the difference in the average balance between people from the South versus the East, and β_2 can be interpreted as the difference in the average balance between those from the West versus the East. There will always be one fewer dummy variable than the number of levels. The level with no dummy variable—East in this example—is known as the *baseline*.

baseline

¹¹Technically β_0 is half the sum of the average debt for house owners and the average debt for non-house owners. Hence, β_0 is exactly equal to the overall average only if the two groups have an equal number of members.

	Coefficient	Std. error	t-statistic	p-value
Intercept	531.00	46.32	11.464	< 0.0001
region[South]	-12.50	56.68	-0.221	0.8260
region[West]	-18.69	65.02	-0.287	0.7740

TABLE 3.8. Least squares coefficient estimates associated with the regression of `balance` onto `region` in the `Credit` data set. The linear model is given in (3.30). That is, `region` is encoded via two dummy variables (3.28) and (3.29).

From Table 3.8, we see that the estimated `balance` for the baseline, East, is \$531.00. It is estimated that those in the South will have \$18.69 less debt than those in the East, and that those in the West will have \$12.50 less debt than those in the East. However, the *p*-values associated with the coefficient estimates for the two dummy variables are very large, suggesting no statistical evidence of a real difference in average credit card balance between South and East or between West and East.¹² Once again, the level selected as the baseline category is arbitrary, and the final predictions for each group will be the same regardless of this choice. However, the coefficients and their *p*-values do depend on the choice of dummy variable coding. Rather than rely on the individual coefficients, we can use an *F*-test to test $H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$; this does not depend on the coding. This *F*-test has a *p*-value of 0.96, indicating that we cannot reject the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between `balance` and `region`.

Using this dummy variable approach presents no difficulties when incorporating both quantitative and qualitative predictors. For example, to regress `balance` on both a quantitative variable such as `income` and a qualitative variable such as `student`, we must simply create a dummy variable for `student` and then fit a multiple regression model using `income` and the dummy variable as predictors for credit card balance.

There are many different ways of coding qualitative variables besides the dummy variable approach taken here. All of these approaches lead to equivalent model fits, but the coefficients are different and have different interpretations, and are designed to measure particular *contrasts*. This topic

contrast

3.3.2 Extensions of the Linear Model

The standard linear regression model (3.19) provides interpretable results and works quite well on many real-world problems. However, it makes several highly restrictive assumptions that are often violated in practice. Two of the most important assumptions state that the relationship between the predictors and response are *additive* and *linear*. The additivity assumption means that the association between a predictor X_j and the response Y does not depend on the values of the other predictors. The linearity assumption states that the change in the response Y associated with a one-unit change in X_j is constant, regardless of the value of X_j . In later chapters of this book, we examine a number of sophisticated methods that relax these two

additive
linear

¹²There could still in theory be a difference between South and West, although the data here does not suggest any difference.

assumptions. Here, we briefly examine some common classical approaches for extending the linear model.

Removing the Additive Assumption

In our previous analysis of the `Advertising` data, we concluded that both `TV` and `radio` seem to be associated with `sales`. The linear models that formed the basis for this conclusion assumed that the effect on `sales` of increasing one advertising medium is independent of the amount spent on the other media. For example, the linear model (3.20) states that the average increase in `sales` associated with a one-unit increase in `TV` is always β_1 , regardless of the amount spent on `radio`.

However, this simple model may be incorrect. Suppose that spending money on radio advertising actually increases the effectiveness of TV advertising, so that the slope term for `TV` should increase as `radio` increases. In this situation, given a fixed budget of \$100,000, spending half on `radio` and half on `TV` may increase `sales` more than allocating the entire amount to either `TV` or to `radio`. In marketing, this is known as a *synergy* effect, and in statistics it is referred to as an *interaction* effect. Figure 3.5 suggests that such an effect may be present in the advertising data. Notice that when levels of either `TV` or `radio` are low, then the true `sales` are lower than predicted by the linear model. But when advertising is split between the two media, then the model tends to underestimate `sales`.

Consider the standard linear regression model with two variables,

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \epsilon.$$

According to this model, a one-unit increase in X_1 is associated with an average increase in Y of β_1 units. Notice that the presence of X_2 does not alter this statement—that is, regardless of the value of X_2 , a one-unit increase in X_1 is associated with a β_1 -unit increase in Y . One way of extending this model is to include a third predictor, called an *interaction term*, which is constructed by computing the product of X_1 and X_2 . This results in the model

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_1 X_2 + \epsilon. \quad (3.31)$$

How does inclusion of this interaction term relax the additive assumption? Notice that (3.31) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= \beta_0 + (\beta_1 + \beta_3 X_2) X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \epsilon \\ &= \beta_0 + \tilde{\beta}_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

where $\tilde{\beta}_1 = \beta_1 + \beta_3 X_2$. Since $\tilde{\beta}_1$ is now a function of X_2 , the association between X_1 and Y is no longer constant: a change in the value of X_2 will change the association between X_1 and Y . A similar argument shows that a change in the value of X_1 changes the association between X_2 and Y .

For example, suppose that we are interested in studying the productivity of a factory. We wish to predict the number of `units` produced on the basis of the number of production `lines` and the total number of `workers`. It seems likely that the effect of increasing the number of production lines

	Coefficient	Std. error	<i>t</i> -statistic	<i>p</i> -value
Intercept	6.7502	0.248	27.23	< 0.0001
TV	0.0191	0.002	12.70	< 0.0001
radio	0.0289	0.009	3.24	0.0014
TV×radio	0.0011	0.000	20.73	< 0.0001

TABLE 3.9. For the *Advertising* data, least squares coefficient estimates associated with the regression of **sales** onto **TV** and **radio**, with an interaction term, as in (3.33).

will depend on the number of workers, since if no workers are available to operate the lines, then increasing the number of lines will not increase production. This suggests that it would be appropriate to include an interaction term between **lines** and **workers** in a linear model to predict **units**. Suppose that when we fit the model, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{units} &\approx 1.2 + 3.4 \times \text{lines} + 0.22 \times \text{workers} + 1.4 \times (\text{lines} \times \text{workers}) \\ &= 1.2 + (3.4 + 1.4 \times \text{workers}) \times \text{lines} + 0.22 \times \text{workers}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, adding an additional line will increase the number of units produced by $3.4 + 1.4 \times \text{workers}$. Hence the more **workers** we have, the stronger will be the effect of **lines**.

We now return to the *Advertising* example. A linear model that uses **radio**, **TV**, and an interaction between the two to predict **sales** takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sales} &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \text{TV} + \beta_2 \times \text{radio} + \beta_3 \times (\text{radio} \times \text{TV}) + \epsilon \\ &= \beta_0 + (\beta_1 + \beta_3 \times \text{radio}) \times \text{TV} + \beta_2 \times \text{radio} + \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

We can interpret β_3 as the increase in the effectiveness of TV advertising associated with a one-unit increase in radio advertising (or vice-versa). The coefficients that result from fitting the model (3.33) are given in Table 3.9.

The results in Table 3.9 strongly suggest that the model that includes the interaction term is superior to the model that contains only *main effects*. The *p*-value for the interaction term, **TV**×**radio**, is extremely low, indicating that there is strong evidence for $H_a : \beta_3 \neq 0$. In other words, it is clear that the true relationship is not additive. The R^2 for the model (3.33) is 96.8 %, compared to only 89.7 % for the model that predicts **sales** using **TV** and **radio** without an interaction term. This means that $(96.8 - 89.7)/(100 - 89.7) = 69\%$ of the variability in **sales** that remains after fitting the additive model has been explained by the interaction term. The coefficient estimates in Table 3.9 suggest that an increase in TV advertising of \$1,000 is associated with increased sales of $(\hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_3 \times \text{radio}) \times 1,000 = 19 + 1.1 \times \text{radio}$ units. And an increase in radio advertising of \$1,000 will be associated with an increase in sales of $(\hat{\beta}_2 + \hat{\beta}_3 \times \text{TV}) \times 1,000 = 29 + 1.1 \times \text{TV}$ units.

In this example, the *p*-values associated with **TV**, **radio**, and the interaction term all are statistically significant (Table 3.9), and so it is obvious that all three variables should be included in the model. However, it is sometimes the case that an interaction term has a very small *p*-value, but the associated main effects (in this case, **TV** and **radio**) do not. The *hierarchical principle* states that *if we include an interaction in a model, we*

main effect

hierarchical principle

should also include the main effects, even if the *p*-values associated with their coefficients are not significant. In other words, if the interaction between X_1 and X_2 seems important, then we should include both X_1 and X_2 in the model even if their coefficient estimates have large *p*-values. The rationale for this principle is that if $X_1 \times X_2$ is related to the response, then whether or not the coefficients of X_1 or X_2 are exactly zero is of little interest. Also $X_1 \times X_2$ is typically correlated with X_1 and X_2 , and so leaving them out tends to alter the meaning of the interaction.

In the previous example, we considered an interaction between `TV` and `radio`, both of which are quantitative variables. However, the concept of interactions applies just as well to qualitative variables, or to a combination of quantitative and qualitative variables. In fact, an interaction between a qualitative variable and a quantitative variable has a particularly nice interpretation. Consider the `Credit` data set from Section 3.3.1, and suppose that we wish to predict `balance` using the `income` (quantitative) and `student` (qualitative) variables. In the absence of an interaction term, the model takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{balance}_i &\approx \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \text{income}_i + \begin{cases} \beta_2 & \text{if } i\text{th person is a student} \\ 0 & \text{if } i\text{th person is not a student} \end{cases} \\ &= \beta_1 \times \text{income}_i + \begin{cases} \beta_0 + \beta_2 & \text{if } i\text{th person is a student} \\ \beta_0 & \text{if } i\text{th person is not a student.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

Notice that this amounts to fitting two parallel lines to the data, one for students and one for non-students. The lines for students and non-students have different intercepts, $\beta_0 + \beta_2$ versus β_0 , but the same slope, β_1 . This is illustrated in the left-hand panel of Figure 3.7. The fact that the lines are parallel means that the average effect on `balance` of a one-unit increase in `income` does not depend on whether or not the individual is a student. This represents a potentially serious limitation of the model, since in fact a change in `income` may have a very different effect on the credit card balance of a student versus a non-student.

This limitation can be addressed by adding an interaction variable, created by multiplying `income` with the dummy variable for `student`. Our model now becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \text{balance}_i &\approx \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \text{income}_i + \begin{cases} \beta_2 + \beta_3 \times \text{income}_i & \text{if student} \\ 0 & \text{if not student} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (\beta_0 + \beta_2) + (\beta_1 + \beta_3) \times \text{income}_i & \text{if student} \\ \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \text{income}_i & \text{if not student.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

Once again, we have two different regression lines for the students and the non-students. But now those regression lines have different intercepts, $\beta_0 + \beta_2$ versus β_0 , as well as different slopes, $\beta_1 + \beta_3$ versus β_1 . This allows for the possibility that changes in income may affect the credit card balances of students and non-students differently. The right-hand panel of Figure 3.7




FIGURE 3.7. For the `Credit` data, the least squares lines are shown for prediction of `balance` from `income` for students and non-students. Left: The model (3.34) was fit. There is no interaction between `income` and `student`. Right: The model (3.35) was fit. There is an interaction term between `income` and `student`.

shows the estimated relationships between `income` and `balance` for students and non-students in the model (3.35). We note that the slope for students is lower than the slope for non-students. This suggests that increases in income are associated with smaller increases in credit card balance among students as compared to non-students.

Non-linear Relationships

As discussed previously, the linear regression model (3.19) assumes a linear relationship between the response and predictors. But in some cases, the true relationship between the response and the predictors may be non-linear. Here we present a very simple way to directly extend the linear model to accommodate non-linear relationships, using *polynomial regression*. In later chapters, we will present more complex approaches for performing non-linear fits in more general settings.

polynomial regression

Consider Figure 3.8, in which the `mpg` (gas mileage in miles per gallon) versus `horsepower` is shown for a number of cars in the `Auto` data set. The orange line represents the linear regression fit. There is a pronounced relationship between `mpg` and `horsepower`, but it seems clear that this relationship is in fact non-linear: the data suggest a curved relationship. A simple approach for incorporating non-linear associations in a linear model is to include transformed versions of the predictors. For example, the points in Figure 3.8 seem to have a *quadratic* shape, suggesting that a model of the form

$$\text{mpg} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \text{horsepower} + \beta_2 \times \text{horsepower}^2 + \epsilon \quad (3.36)$$

quadratic

may provide a better fit. Equation 3.36 involves predicting `mpg` using a non-linear function of `horsepower`. *But it is still a linear model!* That is, (3.36) is simply a multiple linear regression model with $X_1 = \text{horsepower}$ and $X_2 = \text{horsepower}^2$. So we can use standard linear regression software to estimate β_0 , β_1 , and β_2 in order to produce a non-linear fit. The blue curve in Figure 3.8 shows the resulting quadratic fit to the data. The quadratic




FIGURE 3.8. The `Auto` data set. For a number of cars, `mpg` and `horsepower` are shown. The linear regression fit is shown in orange. The linear regression fit for a model that includes `horsepower`² is shown as a blue curve. The linear regression fit for a model that includes all polynomials of `horsepower` up to fifth-degree is shown in green.

	Coefficient	Std. error	t-statistic	p-value
<code>Intercept</code>	56.9001	1.8004	31.6	< 0.0001
<code>horsepower</code>	-0.4662	0.0311	-15.0	< 0.0001
<code>horsepower</code> ²	0.0012	0.0001	10.1	< 0.0001

TABLE 3.10. For the `Auto` data set, least squares coefficient estimates associated with the regression of `mpg` onto `horsepower` and `horsepower`².

fit appears to be substantially better than the fit obtained when just the linear term is included. The R^2 of the quadratic fit is 0.688, compared to 0.606 for the linear fit, and the p -value in Table 3.10 for the quadratic term is highly significant.

If including `horsepower`² led to such a big improvement in the model, why not include `horsepower`³, `horsepower`⁴, or even `horsepower`⁵? The green curve in Figure 3.8 displays the fit that results from including all polynomials up to fifth degree in the model (3.36). The resulting fit seems unnecessarily wiggly—that is, it is unclear that including the additional terms really has led to a better fit to the data.

The approach that we have just described for extending the linear model to accommodate non-linear relationships is known as *polynomial regression*, since we have included polynomial functions of the predictors in the regression model. We further explore this approach and other non-linear extensions of the linear model in Chapter 7.

3.3.3 Potential Problems

When we fit a linear regression model to a particular data set, many problems may occur. Most common among these are the following:

1. *Non-linearity of the response-predictor relationships.*
2. *Correlation of error terms.*
3. *Non-constant variance of error terms.*
4. *Outliers.*
5. *High-leverage points.*
6. *Collinearity.*

In practice, identifying and overcoming these problems is as much an art as a science. Many pages in countless books have been written on this topic. Since the linear regression model is not our primary focus here, we will provide only a brief summary of some key points.

1. Non-linearity of the Data




FIGURE 3.9. Plots of residuals versus predicted (or fitted) values for the `Auto` data set. In each plot, the red line is a smooth fit to the residuals, intended to make it easier to identify a trend. Left: A linear regression of `mpg` on `horsepower`. A strong pattern in the residuals indicates non-linearity in the data. Right: A linear regression of `mpg` on `horsepower` and `horsepower`². There is little pattern in the residuals.

The linear regression model assumes that there is a straight-line relationship between the predictors and the response. If the true relationship is far from linear, then virtually all of the conclusions that we draw from the fit are suspect. In addition, the prediction accuracy of the model can be significantly reduced.

Residual plots are a useful graphical tool for identifying non-linearity. Given a simple linear regression model, we can plot the residuals, $e_i =$

residual plot

$y_i - \hat{y}_i$, versus the predictor x_i . In the case of a multiple regression model, since there are multiple predictors, we instead plot the residuals versus the predicted (or *fitted*) values \hat{y}_i . Ideally, the residual plot will show no discernible pattern. The presence of a pattern may indicate a problem with some aspect of the linear model.

The left panel of Figure 3.9 displays a residual plot from the linear regression of `mpg` onto `horsepower` on the `Auto` data set that was illustrated in Figure 3.8. The red line is a smooth fit to the residuals, which is displayed in order to make it easier to identify any trends. The residuals exhibit a clear U-shape, which provides a strong indication of non-linearity in the data. In contrast, the right-hand panel of Figure 3.9 displays the residual plot that results from the model (3.36), which contains a quadratic term. There appears to be little pattern in the residuals, suggesting that the quadratic term improves the fit to the data.

If the residual plot indicates that there are non-linear associations in the data, then a simple approach is to use non-linear transformations of the predictors, such as $\log X$, \sqrt{X} , and X^2 , in the regression model. In the later chapters of this book, we will discuss other more advanced non-linear approaches for addressing this issue.

2. Correlation of Error Terms

An important assumption of the linear regression model is that the error terms, $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n$, are uncorrelated. What does this mean? For instance, if the errors are uncorrelated, then the fact that ϵ_i is positive provides little or no information about the sign of ϵ_{i+1} . The standard errors that are computed for the estimated regression coefficients or the fitted values are based on the assumption of uncorrelated error terms. If in fact there is correlation among the error terms, then the estimated standard errors will tend to underestimate the true standard errors. As a result, confidence and prediction intervals will be narrower than they should be. For example, a 95% confidence interval may in reality have a much lower probability than 0.95 of containing the true value of the parameter. In addition, *p*-values associated with the model will be lower than they should be; this could cause us to erroneously conclude that a parameter is statistically significant. In short, if the error terms are correlated, we may have an unwarranted sense of confidence in our model.

As an extreme example, suppose we accidentally doubled our data, leading to observations and error terms identical in pairs. If we ignored this, our standard error calculations would be as if we had a sample of size $2n$, when in fact we have only n samples. Our estimated parameters would be the same for the $2n$ samples as for the n samples, but the confidence intervals would be narrower by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$!

Why might correlations among the error terms occur? Such correlations frequently occur in the context of *time series* data, which consists of observations for which measurements are obtained at discrete points in time. In many cases, observations that are obtained at adjacent time points will have positively correlated errors. In order to determine if this is the case for a given data set, we can plot the residuals from our model as a function of time. If the errors are uncorrelated, then there should be no discernible pat-

time series




FIGURE 3.10. Plots of residuals from simulated time series data sets generated with differing levels of correlation ρ between error terms for adjacent time points.

tern. On the other hand, if the error terms are positively correlated, then we may see *tracking* in the residuals—that is, adjacent residuals may have similar values. Figure 3.10 provides an illustration. In the top panel, we see the residuals from a linear regression fit to data generated with uncorrelated errors. There is no evidence of a time-related trend in the residuals. In contrast, the residuals in the bottom panel are from a data set in which adjacent errors had a correlation of 0.9. Now there is a clear pattern in the residuals—adjacent residuals tend to take on similar values. Finally, the center panel illustrates a more moderate case in which the residuals had a correlation of 0.5. There is still evidence of tracking, but the pattern is less clear.

tracking

Many methods have been developed to properly take account of correlations in the error terms in time series data. Correlation among the error terms can also occur outside of time series data. For instance, consider a study in which individuals' heights are predicted from their weights. The assumption of uncorrelated errors could be violated if some of the individuals in the study are members of the same family, eat the same diet, or have been exposed to the same environmental factors. In general, the assumption of uncorrelated errors is extremely important for linear regression as well as for other statistical methods, and good experimental design is crucial in order to mitigate the risk of such correlations.




FIGURE 3.11. Residual plots. In each plot, the red line is a smooth fit to the residuals, intended to make it easier to identify a trend. The blue lines track the outer quantiles of the residuals, and emphasize patterns. Left: The funnel shape indicates heteroscedasticity. Right: The response has been log transformed, and there is now no evidence of heteroscedasticity.

3. Non-constant Variance of Error Terms

Another important assumption of the linear regression model is that the error terms have a constant variance, $\text{Var}(\epsilon_i) = \sigma^2$. The standard errors, confidence intervals, and hypothesis tests associated with the linear model rely upon this assumption.

Unfortunately, it is often the case that the variances of the error terms are non-constant. For instance, the variances of the error terms may increase with the value of the response. One can identify non-constant variances in the errors, or *heteroscedasticity*, from the presence of a *funnel shape* in the residual plot. An example is shown in the left-hand panel of Figure 3.11, in which the magnitude of the residuals tends to increase with the fitted values. When faced with this problem, one possible solution is to transform the response Y using a concave function such as $\log Y$ or \sqrt{Y} . Such a transformation results in a greater amount of shrinkage of the larger responses, leading to a reduction in heteroscedasticity. The right-hand panel of Figure 3.11 displays the residual plot after transforming the response using $\log Y$. The residuals now appear to have constant variance, though there is some evidence of a slight non-linear relationship in the data.

Sometimes we have a good idea of the variance of each response. For example, the i th response could be an average of n_i raw observations. If each of these raw observations is uncorrelated with variance σ^2 , then their average has variance $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2/n_i$. In this case a simple remedy is to fit our model by *weighted least squares*, with weights proportional to the inverse variances—i.e. $w_i = n_i$ in this case. Most linear regression software allows for observation weights.

heteroscedasticity

weighted least squares

4. Outliers

An *outlier* is a point for which y_i is far from the value predicted by the outlier




FIGURE 3.12. Left: The least squares regression line is shown in red, and the regression line after removing the outlier is shown in blue. Center: The residual plot clearly identifies the outlier. Right: The outlier has a studentized residual of 6; typically we expect values between -3 and 3 .

model. Outliers can arise for a variety of reasons, such as incorrect recording of an observation during data collection.

The red point (observation 20) in the left-hand panel of Figure 3.12 illustrates a typical outlier. The red solid line is the least squares regression fit, while the blue dashed line is the least squares fit after removal of the outlier. In this case, removing the outlier has little effect on the least squares line: it leads to almost no change in the slope, and a minuscule reduction in the intercept. It is typical for an outlier that does not have an unusual predictor value to have little effect on the least squares fit. However, even if an outlier does not have much effect on the least squares fit, it can cause other problems. For instance, in this example, the RSE is 1.09 when the outlier is included in the regression, but it is only 0.77 when the outlier is removed. Since the RSE is used to compute all confidence intervals and p -values, such a dramatic increase caused by a single data point can have implications for the interpretation of the fit. Similarly, inclusion of the outlier causes the R^2 to decline from 0.892 to 0.805.

Residual plots can be used to identify outliers. In this example, the outlier is clearly visible in the residual plot illustrated in the center panel of Figure 3.12. But in practice, it can be difficult to decide how large a residual needs to be before we consider the point to be an outlier. To address this problem, instead of plotting the residuals, we can plot the *studentized residuals*, computed by dividing each residual e_i by its estimated standard error. Observations whose studentized residuals are greater than 3 in absolute value are possible outliers. In the right-hand panel of Figure 3.12, the outlier's studentized residual exceeds 6, while all other observations have studentized residuals between -2 and 2 .

studentized residual

If we believe that an outlier has occurred due to an error in data collection or recording, then one solution is to simply remove the observation. However, care should be taken, since an outlier may instead indicate a deficiency with the model, such as a missing predictor.

5. High Leverage Points

We just saw that outliers are observations for which the response y_i is unusual given the predictor x_i . In contrast, observations with *high leverage* have an unusual value for x_i . For example, observation 41 in the left-hand

high leverage




FIGURE 3.13. Left: Observation 41 is a high leverage point, while 20 is not. The red line is the fit to all the data, and the blue line is the fit with observation 41 removed. Center: The red observation is not unusual in terms of its X_1 value or its X_2 value, but still falls outside the bulk of the data, and hence has high leverage. Right: Observation 41 has a high leverage and a high residual.

panel of Figure 3.13 has high leverage, in that the predictor value for this observation is large relative to the other observations. (Note that the data displayed in Figure 3.13 are the same as the data displayed in Figure 3.12, but with the addition of a single high leverage observation.) The red solid line is the least squares fit to the data, while the blue dashed line is the fit produced when observation 41 is removed. Comparing the left-hand panels of Figures 3.12 and 3.13, we observe that removing the high leverage observation has a much more substantial impact on the least squares line than removing the outlier. In fact, high leverage observations tend to have a sizable impact on the estimated regression line. It is cause for concern if the least squares line is heavily affected by just a couple of observations, because any problems with these points may invalidate the entire fit. For this reason, it is important to identify high leverage observations.

In a simple linear regression, high leverage observations are fairly easy to identify, since we can simply look for observations for which the predictor value is outside of the normal range of the observations. But in a multiple linear regression with many predictors, it is possible to have an observation that is well within the range of each individual predictor's values, but that is unusual in terms of the full set of predictors. An example is shown in the center panel of Figure 3.13, for a data set with two predictors, X_1 and X_2 . Most of the observations' predictor values fall within the blue dashed ellipse, but the red observation is well outside of this range. But neither its value for X_1 nor its value for X_2 is unusual. So if we examine just X_1 or just X_2 , we will fail to notice this high leverage point. This problem is more pronounced in multiple regression settings with more than two predictors, because then there is no simple way to plot all dimensions of the data simultaneously.

In order to quantify an observation's leverage, we compute the *leverage statistic*. A large value of this statistic indicates an observation with high leverage. For a simple linear regression,

leverage
statistic

$$h_i = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{\sum_{i'=1}^n (x_{i'} - \bar{x})^2}. \quad (3.37)$$




FIGURE 3.14. Scatterplots of the observations from the `Credit` data set. Left: A plot of `age` versus `limit`. These two variables are not collinear. Right: A plot of `rating` versus `limit`. There is high collinearity.

It is clear from this equation that h_i increases with the distance of x_i from \bar{x} . There is a simple extension of h_i to the case of multiple predictors, though we do not provide the formula here. The leverage statistic h_i is always between $1/n$ and 1, and the average leverage for all the observations is always equal to $(p+1)/n$. So if a given observation has a leverage statistic that greatly exceeds $(p+1)/n$, then we may suspect that the corresponding point has high leverage.

The right-hand panel of Figure 3.13 provides a plot of the studentized residuals versus h_i for the data in the left-hand panel of Figure 3.13. Observation 41 stands out as having a very high leverage statistic as well as a high studentized residual. In other words, it is an outlier as well as a high leverage observation. This is a particularly dangerous combination! This plot also reveals the reason that observation 20 had relatively little effect on the least squares fit in Figure 3.12: it has low leverage.

6. Collinearity

Collinearity refers to the situation in which two or more predictor variables are closely related to one another. The concept of collinearity is illustrated in Figure 3.14 using the `Credit` data set. In the left-hand panel of Figure 3.14, the two predictors `limit` and `age` appear to have no obvious relationship. In contrast, in the right-hand panel of Figure 3.14, the predictors `limit` and `rating` are very highly correlated with each other, and we say that they are *collinear*. The presence of collinearity can pose problems in the regression context, since it can be difficult to separate out the individual effects of collinear variables on the response. In other words, since `limit` and `rating` tend to increase or decrease together, it can be difficult to determine how each one separately is associated with the response, `balance`.

collinearity

Figure 3.15 illustrates some of the difficulties that can result from collinearity. The left-hand panel of Figure 3.15 is a contour plot of the RSS (3.22) associated with different possible coefficient estimates for the regression of `balance` on `limit` and `age`. Each ellipse represents a set of coefficients




FIGURE 3.15. Contour plots for the RSS values as a function of the parameters β for various regressions involving the `Credit` data set. In each plot, the black dots represent the coefficient values corresponding to the minimum RSS. Left: A contour plot of RSS for the regression of `balance` onto `age` and `limit`. The minimum value is well defined. Right: A contour plot of RSS for the regression of `balance` onto `rating` and `limit`. Because of the collinearity, there are many pairs $(\beta_{\text{Limit}}, \beta_{\text{Rating}})$ with a similar value for RSS.

that correspond to the same RSS, with ellipses nearest to the center taking on the lowest values of RSS. The black dots and associated dashed lines represent the coefficient estimates that result in the smallest possible RSS—in other words, these are the least squares estimates. The axes for `limit` and `age` have been scaled so that the plot includes possible coefficient estimates that are up to four standard errors on either side of the least squares estimates. Thus the plot includes all plausible values for the coefficients. For example, we see that the true `limit` coefficient is almost certainly somewhere between 0.15 and 0.20.

In contrast, the right-hand panel of Figure 3.15 displays contour plots of the RSS associated with possible coefficient estimates for the regression of `balance` onto `limit` and `rating`, which we know to be highly collinear. Now the contours run along a narrow valley; there is a broad range of values for the coefficient estimates that result in equal values for RSS. Hence a small change in the data could cause the pair of coefficient values that yield the smallest RSS—that is, the least squares estimates—to move anywhere along this valley. This results in a great deal of uncertainty in the coefficient estimates. Notice that the scale for the `limit` coefficient now runs from roughly -0.2 to 0.2 ; this is an eight-fold increase over the plausible range of the `limit` coefficient in the regression with `age`. Interestingly, even though the `limit` and `rating` coefficients now have much more individual uncertainty, they will almost certainly lie somewhere in this contour valley. For example, we would not expect the true value of the `limit` and `rating` coefficients to be -0.1 and 1 respectively, even though such a value is plausible for each coefficient individually.

Since collinearity reduces the accuracy of the estimates of the regression coefficients, it causes the standard error for $\hat{\beta}_j$ to grow. Recall that the t -statistic for each predictor is calculated by dividing $\hat{\beta}_j$ by its standard

		Coefficient	Std. error	t-statistic	p-value
Model 1	Intercept	-173.411	43.828	-3.957	< 0.0001
	age	-2.292	0.672	-3.407	0.0007
	limit	0.173	0.005	34.496	< 0.0001
Model 2	Intercept	-377.537	45.254	-8.343	< 0.0001
	rating	2.202	0.952	2.312	0.0213
	limit	0.025	0.064	0.384	0.7012

TABLE 3.11. The results for two multiple regression models involving the `Credit` data set are shown. Model 1 is a regression of `balance` on `age` and `limit`, and Model 2 a regression of `balance` on `rating` and `limit`. The standard error of $\hat{\beta}_{\text{limit}}$ increases 12-fold in the second regression, due to collinearity.

error. Consequently, collinearity results in a decline in the t -statistic. As a result, in the presence of collinearity, we may fail to reject $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$. This means that the *power* of the hypothesis test—the probability of correctly detecting a *non-zero* coefficient—is reduced by collinearity.

Table 3.11 compares the coefficient estimates obtained from two separate multiple regression models. The first is a regression of `balance` on `age` and `limit`, and the second is a regression of `balance` on `rating` and `limit`. In the first regression, both `age` and `limit` are highly significant with very small p -values. In the second, the collinearity between `limit` and `rating` has caused the standard error for the `limit` coefficient estimate to increase by a factor of 12 and the p -value to increase to 0.701. In other words, the importance of the `limit` variable has been masked due to the presence of collinearity. To avoid such a situation, it is desirable to identify and address potential collinearity problems while fitting the model.

A simple way to detect collinearity is to look at the correlation matrix of the predictors. An element of this matrix that is large in absolute value indicates a pair of highly correlated variables, and therefore a collinearity problem in the data. Unfortunately, not all collinearity problems can be detected by inspection of the correlation matrix: it is possible for collinearity to exist between three or more variables even if no pair of variables has a particularly high correlation. We call this situation *multicollinearity*. Instead of inspecting the correlation matrix, a better way to assess multicollinearity is to compute the *variance inflation factor* (VIF). The VIF is the ratio of the variance of $\hat{\beta}_j$ when fitting the full model divided by the variance of $\hat{\beta}_j$ if fit on its own. The smallest possible value for VIF is 1, which indicates the complete absence of collinearity. Typically in practice there is a small amount of collinearity among the predictors. As a rule of thumb, a VIF value that exceeds 5 or 10 indicates a problematic amount of collinearity. The VIF for each variable can be computed using the formula

$$\text{VIF}(\hat{\beta}_j) = \frac{1}{1 - R_{X_j|X_{-j}}^2},$$

where $R_{X_j|X_{-j}}^2$ is the R^2 from a regression of X_j onto all of the other predictors. If $R_{X_j|X_{-j}}^2$ is close to one, then collinearity is present, and so the VIF will be large.

power

multi-collinearity
variance inflation factor

In the `Credit` data, a regression of `balance` on `age`, `rating`, and `limit` indicates that the predictors have VIF values of 1.01, 160.67, and 160.59. As we suspected, there is considerable collinearity in the data!

When faced with the problem of collinearity, there are two simple solutions. The first is to drop one of the problematic variables from the regression. This can usually be done without much compromise to the regression fit, since the presence of collinearity implies that the information that this variable provides about the response is redundant in the presence of the other variables. For instance, if we regress `balance` onto `age` and `limit`, without the `rating` predictor, then the resulting VIF values are close to the minimum possible value of 1, and the R^2 drops from 0.754 to 0.75. So dropping `rating` from the set of predictors has effectively solved the collinearity problem without compromising the fit. The second solution is to combine the collinear variables together into a single predictor. For instance, we might take the average of standardized versions of `limit` and `rating` in order to create a new variable that measures *credit worthiness*.

3.4 The Marketing Plan

We now briefly return to the seven questions about the `Advertising` data that we set out to answer at the beginning of this chapter.

1. Is there a relationship between sales and advertising budget?

This question can be answered by fitting a multiple regression model of `sales` onto `TV`, `radio`, and `newspaper`, as in (3.20), and testing the hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_{\text{TV}} = \beta_{\text{radio}} = \beta_{\text{newspaper}} = 0$. In Section 3.2.2, we showed that the F -statistic can be used to determine whether or not we should reject this null hypothesis. In this case the p -value corresponding to the F -statistic in Table 3.6 is very low, indicating clear evidence of a relationship between advertising and sales.

2. How strong is the relationship?

We discussed two measures of model accuracy in Section 3.1.3. First, the RSE estimates the standard deviation of the response from the population regression line. For the `Advertising` data, the RSE is 1.69 units while the mean value for the response is 14.022, indicating a percentage error of roughly 12 %. Second, the R^2 statistic records the percentage of variability in the response that is explained by the predictors. The predictors explain almost 90 % of the variance in `sales`. The RSE and R^2 statistics are displayed in Table 3.6.

3. Which media are associated with sales?

To answer this question, we can examine the p -values associated with each predictor's t -statistic (Section 3.1.2). In the multiple linear regression displayed in Table 3.4, the p -values for `TV` and `radio` are low, but the p -value for `newspaper` is not. This suggests that only `TV` and `radio` are related to `sales`. In Chapter 6 we explore this question in greater detail.

4. *How large is the association between each medium and sales?*

We saw in Section 3.1.2 that the standard error of $\hat{\beta}_j$ can be used to construct confidence intervals for β_j . For the **Advertising** data, we can use the results in Table 3.4 to compute the 95 % confidence intervals for the coefficients in a multiple regression model using all three media budgets as predictors. The confidence intervals are as follows: (0.043, 0.049) for **TV**, (0.172, 0.206) for **radio**, and (-0.013, 0.011) for **newspaper**. The confidence intervals for **TV** and **radio** are narrow and far from zero, providing evidence that these media are related to **sales**. But the interval for **newspaper** includes zero, indicating that the variable is not statistically significant given the values of **TV** and **radio**.

We saw in Section 3.3.3 that collinearity can result in very wide standard errors. Could collinearity be the reason that the confidence interval associated with **newspaper** is so wide? The VIF scores are 1.005, 1.145, and 1.145 for **TV**, **radio**, and **newspaper**, suggesting no evidence of collinearity.

In order to assess the association of each medium individually on sales, we can perform three separate simple linear regressions. Results are shown in Tables 3.1 and 3.3. There is evidence of an extremely strong association between **TV** and **sales** and between **radio** and **sales**. There is evidence of a mild association between **newspaper** and **sales**, when the values of **TV** and **radio** are ignored.

5. *How accurately can we predict future sales?*

The response can be predicted using (3.21). The accuracy associated with this estimate depends on whether we wish to predict an individual response, $Y = f(X) + \epsilon$, or the average response, $f(X)$ (Section 3.2.2). If the former, we use a prediction interval, and if the latter, we use a confidence interval. Prediction intervals will always be wider than confidence intervals because they account for the uncertainty associated with ϵ , the irreducible error.

6. *Is the relationship linear?*

In Section 3.3.3, we saw that residual plots can be used in order to identify non-linearity. If the relationships are linear, then the residual plots should display no pattern. In the case of the **Advertising** data, we observe a non-linear effect in Figure 3.5, though this effect could also be observed in a residual plot. In Section 3.3.2, we discussed the inclusion of transformations of the predictors in the linear regression model in order to accommodate non-linear relationships.

7. *Is there synergy among the advertising media?*

The standard linear regression model assumes an additive relationship between the predictors and the response. An additive model is easy to interpret because the association between each predictor and the response is unrelated to the values of the other predictors. However, the additive assumption may be unrealistic for certain data sets. In Section 3.3.2, we showed how to include an interaction term

in the regression model in order to accommodate non-additive relationships. A small p -value associated with the interaction term indicates the presence of such relationships. Figure 3.5 suggested that the **Advertising** data may not be additive. Including an interaction term in the model results in a substantial increase in R^2 , from around 90 % to almost 97 %.

3.5 Comparison of Linear Regression with K -Nearest Neighbors

As discussed in Chapter 2, linear regression is an example of a *parametric* approach because it assumes a linear functional form for $f(X)$. Parametric methods have several advantages. They are often easy to fit, because one need estimate only a small number of coefficients. In the case of linear regression, the coefficients have simple interpretations, and tests of statistical significance can be easily performed. But parametric methods do have a disadvantage: by construction, they make strong assumptions about the form of $f(X)$. If the specified functional form is far from the truth, and prediction accuracy is our goal, then the parametric method will perform poorly. For instance, if we assume a linear relationship between X and Y but the true relationship is far from linear, then the resulting model will provide a poor fit to the data, and any conclusions drawn from it will be suspect.

In contrast, *non-parametric* methods do not explicitly assume a parametric form for $f(X)$, and thereby provide an alternative and more flexible approach for performing regression. We discuss various non-parametric methods in this book. Here we consider one of the simplest and best-known non-parametric methods, *K -nearest neighbors regression* (KNN regression). The KNN regression method is closely related to the KNN classifier discussed in Chapter 2. Given a value for K and a prediction point x_0 , KNN regression first identifies the K training observations that are closest to x_0 , represented by \mathcal{N}_0 . It then estimates $f(x_0)$ using the average of all the training responses in \mathcal{N}_0 . In other words,

$$\hat{f}(x_0) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{N}_0} y_i.$$

*K -nearest
neighbors
regression*

Figure 3.16 illustrates two KNN fits on a data set with $p = 2$ predictors. The fit with $K = 1$ is shown in the left-hand panel, while the right-hand panel corresponds to $K = 9$. We see that when $K = 1$, the KNN fit perfectly interpolates the training observations, and consequently takes the form of a step function. When $K = 9$, the KNN fit still is a step function, but averaging over nine observations results in much smaller regions of constant prediction, and consequently a smoother fit. In general, the optimal value for K will depend on the *bias-variance tradeoff*, which we introduced in Chapter 2. A small value for K provides the most flexible fit, which will have low bias but high variance. This variance is due to the fact that the prediction in a given region is entirely dependent on just one observation.




FIGURE 3.16. Plots of $\hat{f}(X)$ using KNN regression on a two-dimensional data set with 64 observations (orange dots). Left: $K = 1$ results in a rough step function fit. Right: $K = 9$ produces a much smoother fit.

In contrast, larger values of K provide a smoother and less variable fit; the prediction in a region is an average of several points, and so changing one observation has a smaller effect. However, the smoothing may cause bias by masking some of the structure in $f(X)$. In Chapter 5, we introduce several approaches for estimating test error rates. These methods can be used to identify the optimal value of K in KNN regression.

In what setting will a parametric approach such as least squares linear regression outperform a non-parametric approach such as KNN regression? The answer is simple: *the parametric approach will outperform the non-parametric approach if the parametric form that has been selected is close to the true form of f .* Figure 3.17 provides an example with data generated from a one-dimensional linear regression model. The black solid lines represent $f(X)$, while the blue curves correspond to the KNN fits using $K = 1$ and $K = 9$. In this case, the $K = 1$ predictions are far too variable, while the smoother $K = 9$ fit is much closer to $f(X)$. However, since the true relationship is linear, it is hard for a non-parametric approach to compete with linear regression: a non-parametric approach incurs a cost in variance that is not offset by a reduction in bias. The blue dashed line in the left-hand panel of Figure 3.18 represents the linear regression fit to the same data. It is almost perfect. The right-hand panel of Figure 3.18 reveals that linear regression outperforms KNN for this data. The green solid line, plotted as a function of $1/K$, represents the test set mean squared error (MSE) for KNN. The KNN errors are well above the black dashed line, which is the test MSE for linear regression. When the value of K is large, then KNN performs only a little worse than least squares regression in terms of MSE. It performs far worse when K is small.

In practice, the true relationship between X and Y is rarely exactly linear. Figure 3.19 examines the relative performances of least squares regression and KNN under increasing levels of non-linearity in the relationship between X and Y . In the top row, the true relationship is nearly linear. In this case we see that the test MSE for linear regression is still superior




FIGURE 3.17. Plots of $\hat{f}(X)$ using KNN regression on a one-dimensional data set with 50 observations. The true relationship is given by the black solid line. Left: The blue curve corresponds to $K = 1$ and interpolates (i.e. passes directly through) the training data. Right: The blue curve corresponds to $K = 9$, and represents a smoother fit.




FIGURE 3.18. The same data set shown in Figure 3.17 is investigated further. Left: The blue dashed line is the least squares fit to the data. Since $f(X)$ is in fact linear (displayed as the black line), the least squares regression line provides a very good estimate of $f(X)$. Right: The dashed horizontal line represents the least squares test set MSE, while the green solid line corresponds to the MSE for KNN as a function of $1/K$ (on the log scale). Linear regression achieves a lower test MSE than does KNN regression, since $f(X)$ is in fact linear. For KNN regression, the best results occur with a very large value of K , corresponding to a small value of $1/K$.




FIGURE 3.19. Top Left: In a setting with a slightly non-linear relationship between X and Y (solid black line), the KNN fits with $K = 1$ (blue) and $K = 9$ (red) are displayed. Top Right: For the slightly non-linear data, the test set MSE for least squares regression (horizontal black) and KNN with various values of $1/K$ (green) are displayed. Bottom Left and Bottom Right: As in the top panel, but with a strongly non-linear relationship between X and Y .

to that of KNN for low values of K . However, for $K \geq 4$, KNN outperforms linear regression. The second row illustrates a more substantial deviation from linearity. In this situation, KNN substantially outperforms linear regression for all values of K . Note that as the extent of non-linearity increases, there is little change in the test set MSE for the non-parametric KNN method, but there is a large increase in the test set MSE of linear regression.

Figures 3.18 and 3.19 display situations in which KNN performs slightly worse than linear regression when the relationship is linear, but much better than linear regression for nonlinear situations. In a real life situation in which the true relationship is unknown, one might suspect that KNN should be favored over linear regression because it will at worst be slightly inferior to linear regression if the true relationship is linear, and may give substantially better results if the true relationship is non-linear. But in reality, even when the true relationship is highly non-linear, KNN may still provide inferior results to linear regression. In particular, both Figures 3.18




FIGURE 3.20. Test MSE for linear regression (black dashed lines) and KNN (green curves) as the number of variables p increases. The true function is non-linear in the first variable, as in the lower panel in Figure 3.19, and does not depend on the additional variables. The performance of linear regression deteriorates slowly in the presence of these additional noise variables, whereas KNN's performance degrades much more quickly as p increases.

and 3.19 illustrate settings with $p = 1$ predictor. But in higher dimensions, KNN often performs worse than linear regression.

Figure 3.20 considers the same strongly non-linear situation as in the second row of Figure 3.19, except that we have added additional *noise* predictors that are not associated with the response. When $p = 1$ or $p = 2$, KNN outperforms linear regression. But for $p = 3$ the results are mixed, and for $p \geq 4$ linear regression is superior to KNN. In fact, the increase in dimension has only caused a small deterioration in the linear regression test set MSE, but it has caused more than a ten-fold increase in the MSE for KNN. This decrease in performance as the dimension increases is a common problem for KNN, and results from the fact that in higher dimensions there is effectively a reduction in sample size. In this data set there are 50 training observations; when $p = 1$, this provides enough information to accurately estimate $f(X)$. However, spreading 50 observations over $p = 20$ dimensions results in a phenomenon in which a given observation has no *nearby neighbors*—this is the so-called *curse of dimensionality*. That is, the K observations that are nearest to a given test observation x_0 may be very far away from x_0 in p -dimensional space when p is large, leading to a very poor prediction of $f(x_0)$ and hence a poor KNN fit. As a general rule, parametric methods will tend to outperform non-parametric approaches when there is a small number of observations per predictor.

curse of dimensionality

Even when the dimension is small, we might prefer linear regression to KNN from an interpretability standpoint. If the test MSE of KNN is only slightly lower than that of linear regression, we might be willing to forego a little bit of prediction accuracy for the sake of a simple model that can be described in terms of just a few coefficients, and for which p -values are available.

3.6 Lab: Linear Regression

3.6.1 Importing packages

We import our standard libraries at this top level.

```
In [1]: import numpy as np
import pandas as pd
from matplotlib.pyplot import subplots
```

New imports

Throughout this lab we will introduce new functions and libraries. However, we will import them here to emphasize these are the new code objects in this lab. Keeping imports near the top of a notebook makes the code more readable, since scanning the first few lines tells us what libraries are used.

```
In [2]: import statsmodels.api as sm
```

We will provide relevant details about the functions below as they are needed.

Besides importing whole modules, it is also possible to import only a few items from a given module. This will help keep the *namespace* clean. We will use a few specific objects from the `statsmodels` package which we import here.

namespace
`statsmodels`

```
In [3]: from statsmodels.stats.outliers_influence \
    import variance_inflation_factor as VIF
from statsmodels.stats.anova import anova_lm
```

As one of the import statements above is quite a long line, we inserted a line break \ to ease readability.

We will also use some functions written for the labs in this book in the `ISLP` package.

```
In [4]: from ISLP import load_data
from ISLP.models import (ModelSpec as MS,
                           summarize,
                           poly)
```

Inspecting Objects and Namespaces

The function `dir()` provides a list of objects in a namespace.

`dir()`

```
In [5]: dir()
```

```
Out[5]: ['In',
        'MS',
        '_',
        '_',
        '_',
        '_',
        '__builtin__',
        '__builtins__',
        ...]
```

```
'poly',
'quit',
'sm',
'summarize']
```

This shows you everything that `Python` can find at the top level. There are certain objects like `__builtins__` that contain references to built-in functions like `print()`.

Every python object has its own notion of namespace, also accessible with `dir()`. This will include both the attributes of the object as well as any methods associated with it. For instance, we see '`sum`' in the listing for an array.

```
In [6]: A = np.array([3,5,11])
dir(A)
```

```
Out[6]: ...
'strides',
'sum',
'swapaxes',
...
...
```

This indicates that the object `A.sum` exists. In this case it is a method that can be used to compute the sum of the array `A` as can be seen by typing `A.sum?`.

```
In [7]: A.sum()
```

```
Out[7]: 19
```

3.6.2 Simple Linear Regression

In this section we will construct model matrices (also called design matrices) using the `ModelSpec()` transform from `ISLP.models`.

We will use the `Boston` housing data set, which is contained in the `ISLP` package. The `Boston` dataset records `medv` (median house value) for 506 neighborhoods around Boston. We will build a regression model to predict `medv` using 13 predictors such as `rmvar` (average number of rooms per house), `age` (proportion of owner-occupied units built prior to 1940), and `lstat` (percent of households with low socioeconomic status). We will use `statsmodels` for this task, a `Python` package that implements several commonly used regression methods.

We have included a simple loading function `load_data()` in the `ISLP` package:

```
In [8]: Boston = load_data("Boston")
Boston.columns
```

```
Out[8]: Index(['crim', 'zn', 'indus', 'chas', 'nox', 'rm', 'age', 'dis',
   'rad', 'tax', 'ptratio', 'black', 'lstat', 'medv'],
  dtype='object')
```

Type `Boston?` to find out more about these data.

We start by using the `sm.OLS()` function to fit a simple linear regression model. Our response will be `medv` and `lstat` will be the single predictor. For this model, we can create the model matrix by hand.

```
In [9]: X = pd.DataFrame({'intercept': np.ones(Boston.shape[0]),
                      'lstat': Boston['lstat']})
X[:4]
```

```
Out[9]:    intercept  lstat
0           1.0   4.98
1           1.0   9.14
2           1.0   4.03
3           1.0   2.94
```

We extract the response, and fit the model.

```
In [10]: y = Boston['medv']
model = sm.OLS(y, X)
results = model.fit()
```

Note that `sm.OLS()` does not fit the model; it specifies the model, and then `model.fit()` does the actual fitting.

Our `ISLP` function `summarize()` produces a simple table of the parameter estimates, their standard errors, t-statistics and p-values. The function takes a single argument, such as the object `results` returned here by the `fit` method, and returns such a summary.

```
In [11]: summarize(results)
```

```
Out[11]:      coef  std err      t  P>|t|
intercept  34.5538    0.563  61.415    0.0
lstat      -0.9500    0.039 -24.528    0.0
```

Before we describe other methods for working with fitted models, we outline a more useful and general framework for constructing a model matrix `X`.

Using Transformations: Fit and Transform

Our model above has a single predictor, and constructing `X` was straightforward. In practice we often fit models with more than one predictor, typically selected from an array or data frame. We may wish to introduce transformations to the variables before fitting the model, specify interactions between variables, and expand some particular variables into sets of variables (e.g. polynomials). The `sklearn` package has a particular notion for this type of task: a *transform*. A transform is an object that is created with some parameters as arguments. The object has two main methods: `fit()` and `transform()`.

We provide a general approach for specifying models and constructing the model matrix through the transform `ModelSpec()` in the `ISLP` library. `ModelSpec()` (renamed `MS()` in the preamble) creates a transform object, and then a pair of methods `transform()` and `fit()` are used to construct a corresponding model matrix.

`sm.OLS()`

`summarize()`

`sklearn`

`.fit()`
`.transform()`
`ModelSpec()`

We first describe this process for our simple regression model using a single predictor `lstat` in the `Boston` data frame, but will use it repeatedly in more complex tasks in this and other labs in this book. In our case the transform is created by the expression `design = MS(['lstat'])`.

The `fit()` method takes the original array and may do some initial computations on it, as specified in the transform object. For example, it may compute means and standard deviations for centering and scaling. The `transform()` method applies the fitted transformation to the array of data, and produces the model matrix.

```
In [12]: design = MS(['lstat'])
design = design.fit(Boston)
X = design.transform(Boston)
X[:4]
```

```
Out[12]:    intercept  lstat
0           1.0   4.98
1           1.0   9.14
2           1.0   4.03
3           1.0   2.94
```

In this simple case, the `fit()` method does very little; it simply checks that the variable `'lstat'` specified in `design` exists in `Boston`. Then `transform()` constructs the model matrix with two columns: an `intercept` and the variable `lstat`.

These two operations can be combined with the `fit_transform()` method.

```
In [13]: design = MS(['lstat'])
X = design.fit_transform(Boston)
X[:4]
```

```
Out[13]:    intercept  lstat
0           1.0   4.98
1           1.0   9.14
2           1.0   4.03
3           1.0   2.94
```

Note that, as in the previous code chunk when the two steps were done separately, the `design` object is changed as a result of the `fit()` operation. The power of this pipeline will become clearer when we fit more complex models that involve interactions and transformations.

Let's return to our fitted regression model. The object `results` has several methods that can be used for inference. We already presented a function `summarize()` for showing the essentials of the fit. For a full and somewhat exhaustive summary of the fit, we can use the `summary()` method (output not shown).

```
In [14]: results.summary()
```

The fitted coefficients can also be retrieved as the `params` attribute of `results`.

```
In [15]: results.params
```

```
Out[15]: intercept    34.553841
         lstat        -0.950049
         dtype: float64
```

The `get_prediction()` method can be used to obtain predictions, and produce confidence intervals and prediction intervals for the prediction of `medv` for given values of `lstat`.

We first create a new data frame, in this case containing only the variable `lstat`, with the values for this variable at which we wish to make predictions. We then use the `transform()` method of `design` to create the corresponding model matrix.

```
In [16]: new_df = pd.DataFrame({'lstat':[5, 10, 15]})
newX = design.transform(new_df)
newX
```

```
Out[16]:   intercept    lstat
          0         1.0      5
          1         1.0     10
          2         1.0     15
```

Next we compute the predictions at `newX`, and view them by extracting the `predicted_mean` attribute.

```
In [17]: new_predictions = results.get_prediction(newX);
new_predictions.predicted_mean
```

```
Out[17]: array([29.80359411, 25.05334734, 20.30310057])
```

We can produce confidence intervals for the predicted values.

```
In [18]: new_predictions.conf_int(alpha=0.05)
```

```
Out[18]: array([[29.00741194, 30.59977628],
                 [24.47413202, 25.63256267],
                 [19.73158815, 20.87461299]])
```

Prediction intervals are computing by setting `obs=True`:

```
In [19]: new_predictions.conf_int(obs=True, alpha=0.05)
```

```
Out[19]: array([[17.56567478, 42.04151344],
                 [12.82762635, 37.27906833],
                 [ 8.0777421 , 32.52845905]])
```

For instance, the 95% confidence interval associated with an `lstat` value of 10 is (24.47, 25.63), and the 95% prediction interval is (12.82, 37.28). As expected, the confidence and prediction intervals are centered around the same point (a predicted value of 25.05 for `medv` when `lstat` equals 10), but the latter are substantially wider.

Next we will plot `medv` and `lstat` using `DataFrame.plot.scatter()`, and wish to add the regression line to the resulting plot.

```
.plot.
scatter()
```

Defining Functions

While there is a function within the `ISLP` package that adds a line to an existing plot, we take this opportunity to define our first function to do so.

```
In [20]: def abline(ax, b, m):
    "Add a line with slope m and intercept b to ax"
    xlim = ax.get_xlim()
    ylim = [m * xlim[0] + b, m * xlim[1] + b]
    ax.plot(xlim, ylim)
```

A few things are illustrated above. First we see the syntax for defining a function: `def funcname(...)`. The function has arguments `ax`, `b`, `m` where `ax` is an axis object for an existing plot, `b` is the intercept and `m` is the slope of the desired line. Other plotting options can be passed on to `ax.plot` by including additional optional arguments as follows:

```
In [21]: def abline(ax, b, m, *args, **kwargs):
    "Add a line with slope m and intercept b to ax"
    xlim = ax.get_xlim()
    ylim = [m * xlim[0] + b, m * xlim[1] + b]
    ax.plot(xlim, ylim, *args, **kwargs)
```

The addition of `*args` allows any number of non-named arguments to `abline`, while `**kwargs` allows any number of named arguments (such as `linewidth=3`) to `abline`. In our function, we pass these arguments verbatim to `ax.plot` above. Readers interested in learning more about functions are referred to the section on defining functions in docs.python.org/tutorial.

Let's use our new function to add this regression line to a plot of `medv` vs. `lstat`.

```
In [22]: ax = Boston.plot.scatter('lstat', 'medv')
abline(ax,
       results.params[0],
       results.params[1],
       'r--',
       linewidth=3)
```

Thus, the final call to `ax.plot()` is `ax.plot(xlim, ylim, 'r--', linewidth=3)`. We have used the argument `'r--'` to produce a red dashed line, and added an argument to make it of width 3. There is some evidence for non-linearity in the relationship between `lstat` and `medv`. We will explore this issue later in this lab.

As mentioned above, there is an existing function to add a line to a plot — `ax.axline()` — but knowing how to write such functions empowers us to create more expressive displays.

Next we examine some diagnostic plots, several of which were discussed in Section 3.3.3. We can find the fitted values and residuals of the fit as attributes of the `results` object. Various influence measures describing the regression model are computed with the `get_influence()` method. As we will not use the `fig` component returned as the first value from `subplots()`, we simply capture the second returned value in `ax` below.

```
In [23]: ax = subplots(figsize=(8,8))[1]
```

`.get_influence()`

```
ax.scatter(results.fittedvalues, results.resid)
ax.set_xlabel('Fitted value')
ax.set_ylabel('Residual')
ax.axhline(0, c='k', ls='--');
```

We add a horizontal line at 0 for reference using the `ax.axhline()` method, indicating it should be black (`c='k'`) and have a dashed linestyle (`ls='--'`).

On the basis of the residual plot (not shown), there is some evidence of non-linearity. Leverage statistics can be computed for any number of predictors using the `hat_matrix_diag` attribute of the value returned by the `get_influence()` method.

```
In [24]: infl = results.get_influence()
ax = subplots(figsize=(8,8))[1]
ax.scatter(np.arange(X.shape[0]), infl.hat_matrix_diag)
ax.set_xlabel('Index')
ax.set_ylabel('Leverage')
np.argmax(infl.hat_matrix_diag)
```

Out[24]: 374

The `np.argmax()` function identifies the index of the largest element of an array, optionally computed over an axis of the array. In this case, we maximized over the entire array to determine which observation has the largest leverage statistic.

`np.argmax()`

3.6.3 Multiple Linear Regression

In order to fit a multiple linear regression model using least squares, we again use the `ModelSpec()` transform to construct the required model matrix and response. The arguments to `ModelSpec()` can be quite general, but in this case a list of column names suffice. We consider a fit here with the two variables `lstat` and `age`.

```
In [25]: X = MS(['lstat', 'age']).fit_transform(Boston)
model1 = sm.OLS(y, X)
results1 = model1.fit()
summarize(results1)
```

Out[25]:

	coef	std err	t	P> t
intercept	33.2228	0.731	45.458	0.000
lstat	-1.0321	0.048	-21.416	0.000
age	0.0345	0.012	2.826	0.005

Notice how we have compacted the first line into a succinct expression describing the construction of `X`.

The `Boston` data set contains 12 variables, and so it would be cumbersome to have to type all of these in order to perform a regression using all of the predictors. Instead, we can use the following short-hand:

```
In [26]: terms = Boston.columns.drop('medv')
```

`.columns.`
`drop()`

```
Out[26]: Index(['crim', 'zn', 'indus', 'chas', 'nox', 'rm', 'age', 'dis',
   'rad', 'tax', 'ptratio', 'lstat'],
  dtype='object')
```

We can now fit the model with all the variables in `terms` using the same model matrix builder.

```
In [27]: X = MS(terms).fit_transform(Boston)
model = sm.OLS(y, X)
results = model.fit()
summarize(results)
```

```
Out[27]:
```

	coef	std err	t	P> t
intercept	41.6173	4.936	8.431	0.000
crim	-0.1214	0.033	-3.678	0.000
zn	0.0470	0.014	3.384	0.001
indus	0.0135	0.062	0.217	0.829
chas	2.8400	0.870	3.264	0.001
nox	-18.7580	3.851	-4.870	0.000
rm	3.6581	0.420	8.705	0.000
age	0.0036	0.013	0.271	0.787
dis	-1.4908	0.202	-7.394	0.000
rad	0.2894	0.067	4.325	0.000
tax	-0.0127	0.004	-3.337	0.001
ptratio	-0.9375	0.132	-7.091	0.000
lstat	-0.5520	0.051	-10.897	0.000

What if we would like to perform a regression using all of the variables but one? For example, in the above regression output, `age` has a high p -value. So we may wish to run a regression excluding this predictor. The following syntax results in a regression using all predictors except `age` (output not shown).

```
In [28]: minus_age = Boston.columns.drop(['medv', 'age'])
Xma = MS(minus_age).fit_transform(Boston)
model1 = sm.OLS(y, Xma)
summarize(model1.fit())
```

3.6.4 Multivariate Goodness of Fit

We can access the individual components of `results` by name (`dir(results)` shows us what is available). Hence `results.rsquared` gives us the R^2 , and `np.sqrt(results.scale)` gives us the RSE.

Variance inflation factors (section 3.3.3) are sometimes useful to assess the effect of collinearity in the model matrix of a regression model. We will compute the VIFs in our multiple regression fit, and use the opportunity to introduce the idea of *list comprehension*.

list comprehension

List Comprehension

Often we encounter a sequence of objects which we would like to transform for some other task. Below, we compute the VIF for each feature in our `X` matrix and produce a data frame whose index agrees with the columns of `X`. The notion of list comprehension can often make such a task easier.

List comprehensions are simple and powerful ways to form lists of `Python` objects. The language also supports dictionary and *generator* comprehension, though these are beyond our scope here. Let's look at an example. We compute the VIF for each of the variables in the model matrix `X`, using the function `variance_inflation_factor()`.

```
In [29]: vals = [VIF(X, i)
            for i in range(1, X.shape[1])]
vif = pd.DataFrame({'vif':vals},
                    index=X.columns[1:])
vif
```

```
variance_
inflation_
factor()
```

```
Out[29]:      vif
crim    1.767
zn      2.298
indus   3.987
chas    1.071
nox     4.369
rm      1.913
age     3.088
dis     3.954
rad     7.445
tax     9.002
ptratio 1.797
lstat   2.871
```

The function `VIF()` takes two arguments: a dataframe or array, and a variable column index. In the code above we call `VIF()` on the fly for all columns in `X`. We have excluded column 0 above (the intercept), which is not of interest. In this case the VIFs are not that exciting.

The object `vals` above could have been constructed with the following for loop:

```
In [30]: vals = []
for i in range(1, X.values.shape[1]):
    vals.append(VIF(X.values, i))
```

List comprehension allows us to perform such repetitive operations in a more straightforward way.

3.6.5 Interaction Terms

It is easy to include interaction terms in a linear model using `ModelSpec()`. Including a tuple `("lstat", "age")` tells the model matrix builder to include an interaction term between `lstat` and `age`.

```
In [31]: X = MS(['lstat',
            'age',
            ('lstat', 'age')]).fit_transform(Boston)
model2 = sm.OLS(y, X)
summarize(model2.fit())
```

```
Out[31]:      coef    std err        t    P>|t|
intercept  36.0885     1.470   24.553   0.000
lstat     -1.3921     0.167   -8.313   0.000
```

```
age    -0.0007      0.020   -0.036    0.971
lstat:age    0.0042      0.002    2.244    0.025
```

3.6.6 Non-linear Transformations of the Predictors

The model matrix builder can include terms beyond just column names and interactions. For instance, the `poly()` function supplied in `ISLP` specifies that columns representing polynomial functions of its first argument are added to the model matrix.

```
In [32]: X = MS([poly('lstat', degree=2), 'age']).fit_transform(Boston)
model3 = sm.OLS(y, X)
results3 = model3.fit()
summarize(results3)
```

```
Out[32]:
```

	coef	std err	t	P> t
intercept	17.7151	0.781	22.681	0.000
poly(lstat, degree=2)[0]	-179.2279	6.733	-26.620	0.000
poly(lstat, degree=2)[1]	72.9908	5.482	13.315	0.000
age	0.0703	0.011	6.471	0.000

The effectively zero p -value associated with the quadratic term (i.e. the third row above) suggests that it leads to an improved model.

By default, `poly()` creates a basis matrix for inclusion in the model matrix whose columns are *orthogonal polynomials*, which are designed for stable least squares computations.¹³ Alternatively, had we included an argument `raw=True` in the above call to `poly()`, the basis matrix would consist simply of `lstat` and `lstat**2`. Since either of these bases represent quadratic polynomials, the fitted values would not change in this case, just the polynomial coefficients. Also by default, the columns created by `poly()` do not include an intercept column as that is automatically added by `MS()`.

We use the `anova_lm()` function to further quantify the extent to which the quadratic fit is superior to the linear fit.

```
In [33]: anova_lm(results1, results3)
```

```
Out[33]:
```

	df_resid	ssr	df_diff	ss_diff	F	Pr(>F)
0	503.0	19168.13	0.0	NaN	NaN	NaN
1	502.0	14165.61	1.0	5002.52	177.28	7.47e-35

Here `results1` represents the linear submodel containing predictors `lstat` and `age`, while `results3` corresponds to the larger model above with a quadratic term in `lstat`. The `anova_lm()` function performs a hypothesis test comparing the two models. The null hypothesis is that the quadratic term in the bigger model is not needed, and the alternative hypothesis is that the bigger model is superior. Here the F -statistic is 177.28 and the associated p -value is zero. In this case the F -statistic is the square of the t -statistic for the quadratic term in the linear model summary for `results3` — a consequence of the fact that these nested models differ by one degree of

`poly()`

orthogonal polynomial

`anova_lm()`

¹³Actually, `poly()` is a wrapper for the workhorse and standalone function `Poly()` that does the work in building the model matrix.

freedom. This provides very clear evidence that the quadratic polynomial in `lstat` improves the linear model. This is not surprising, since earlier we saw evidence for non-linearity in the relationship between `medv` and `lstat`.

The function `anova_lm()` can take more than two nested models as input, in which case it compares every successive pair of models. That also explains why their are `NaNs` in the first row above, since there is no previous model with which to compare the first.

```
In [34]: ax = subplots(figsize=(8,8))[1]
ax.scatter(results3.fittedvalues, results3.resid)
ax.set_xlabel('Fitted value')
ax.set_ylabel('Residual')
ax.axhline(0, c='k', ls='--')
```

We see that when the quadratic term is included in the model, there is little discernible pattern in the residuals. In order to create a cubic or higher-degree polynomial fit, we can simply change the degree argument to `poly()`.

3.6.7 Qualitative Predictors

Here we use the `Carseats` data, which is included in the `ISLP` package. We will attempt to predict `Sales` (child car seat sales) in 400 locations based on a number of predictors.

```
In [35]: Carseats = load_data('Carseats')
Carseats.columns
```

```
Out[35]: Index(['Sales', 'CompPrice', 'Income', 'Advertising',
       'Population', 'Price', 'ShelveLoc', 'Age', 'Education',
       'Urban', 'US'],
      dtype='object')
```

The `Carseats` data includes qualitative predictors such as `ShelveLoc`, an indicator of the quality of the shelving location — that is, the space within a store in which the car seat is displayed. The predictor `ShelveLoc` takes on three possible values, `Bad`, `Medium`, and `Good`. Given a qualitative variable such as `ShelveLoc`, `ModelSpec()` generates dummy variables automatically. These variables are often referred to as a *one-hot encoding* of the categorical feature. Their columns sum to one, so to avoid collinearity with an intercept, the first column is dropped. Below we see the column `ShelveLoc[Bad]` has been dropped, since `Bad` is the first level of `ShelveLoc`. Below we fit a multiple regression model that includes some interaction terms.

one-hot
encoding

```
In [36]: allvars = list(Carseats.columns.drop('Sales'))
y = Carseats['Sales']
final = allvars + [('Income', 'Advertising'),
                    ('Price', 'Age')]
X = MS(final).fit_transform(Carseats)
model = sm.OLS(y, X)
summarize(model.fit())
```

	coef	std err	t	P> t
intercept	6.5756	1.009	6.519	0.000

CompPrice	0.0929	0.004	22.567	0.000
Income	0.0109	0.003	4.183	0.000
Advertising	0.0702	0.023	3.107	0.002
Population	0.0002	0.000	0.433	0.665
Price	-0.1008	0.007	-13.549	0.000
ShelveLoc[Good]	4.8487	0.153	31.724	0.000
ShelveLoc[Medium]	1.9533	0.126	15.531	0.000
Age	-0.0579	0.016	-3.633	0.000
Education	-0.0209	0.020	-1.063	0.288
Urban[Yes]	0.1402	0.112	1.247	0.213
US[Yes]	-0.1576	0.149	-1.058	0.291
Income:Advertising	0.0008	0.000	2.698	0.007
Price:Age	0.0001	0.000	0.801	0.424

In the first line above, we made `allvars` a list, so that we could add the interaction terms two lines down. Our model-matrix builder has created a `ShelveLoc[Good]` dummy variable that takes on a value of 1 if the shelving location is good, and 0 otherwise. It has also created a `ShelveLoc[Medium]` dummy variable that equals 1 if the shelving location is medium, and 0 otherwise. A bad shelving location corresponds to a zero for each of the two dummy variables. The fact that the coefficient for `ShelveLoc[Good]` in the regression output is positive indicates that a good shelving location is associated with high sales (relative to a bad location). And `ShelveLoc[Medium]` has a smaller positive coefficient, indicating that a medium shelving location leads to higher sales than a bad shelving location, but lower sales than a good shelving location.

3.7 Exercises

Conceptual

1. Describe the null hypotheses to which the p -values given in Table 3.4 correspond. Explain what conclusions you can draw based on these p -values. Your explanation should be phrased in terms of `sales`, `TV`, `radio`, and `newspaper`, rather than in terms of the coefficients of the linear model.
2. Carefully explain the differences between the KNN classifier and KNN regression methods.
3. Suppose we have a data set with five predictors, $X_1 = \text{GPA}$, $X_2 = \text{IQ}$, $X_3 = \text{Level}$ (1 for College and 0 for High School), $X_4 = \text{Interaction between GPA and IQ}$, and $X_5 = \text{Interaction between GPA and Level}$. The response is starting salary after graduation (in thousands of dollars). Suppose we use least squares to fit the model, and get $\hat{\beta}_0 = 50$, $\hat{\beta}_1 = 20$, $\hat{\beta}_2 = 0.07$, $\hat{\beta}_3 = 35$, $\hat{\beta}_4 = 0.01$, $\hat{\beta}_5 = -10$.
 - (a) Which answer is correct, and why?
 - i. For a fixed value of IQ and GPA, high school graduates earn more, on average, than college graduates.
 - ii. For a fixed value of IQ and GPA, college graduates earn more, on average, than high school graduates.

- iii. For a fixed value of IQ and GPA, high school graduates earn more, on average, than college graduates provided that the GPA is high enough.
 - iv. For a fixed value of IQ and GPA, college graduates earn more, on average, than high school graduates provided that the GPA is high enough.
- (b) Predict the salary of a college graduate with IQ of 110 and a GPA of 4.0.
- (c) True or false: Since the coefficient for the GPA/IQ interaction term is very small, there is very little evidence of an interaction effect. Justify your answer.
4. I collect a set of data ($n = 100$ observations) containing a single predictor and a quantitative response. I then fit a linear regression model to the data, as well as a separate cubic regression, i.e. $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 X^2 + \beta_3 X^3 + \epsilon$.
- (a) Suppose that the true relationship between X and Y is linear, i.e. $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \epsilon$. Consider the training residual sum of squares (RSS) for the linear regression, and also the training RSS for the cubic regression. Would we expect one to be lower than the other, would we expect them to be the same, or is there not enough information to tell? Justify your answer.
- (b) Answer (a) using test rather than training RSS.
- (c) Suppose that the true relationship between X and Y is not linear, but we don't know how far it is from linear. Consider the training RSS for the linear regression, and also the training RSS for the cubic regression. Would we expect one to be lower than the other, would we expect them to be the same, or is there not enough information to tell? Justify your answer.
- (d) Answer (c) using test rather than training RSS.
5. Consider the fitted values that result from performing linear regression without an intercept. In this setting, the i th fitted value takes the form

$$\hat{y}_i = x_i \hat{\beta},$$

where

$$\hat{\beta} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \right) / \left(\sum_{i'=1}^n x_{i'}^2 \right). \quad (3.38)$$

Show that we can write

$$\hat{y}_i = \sum_{i'=1}^n a_{i'} y_{i'}.$$

What is $a_{i'}$?

Note: We interpret this result by saying that the fitted values from linear regression are linear combinations of the response values.

6. Using (3.4), argue that in the case of simple linear regression, the least squares line always passes through the point (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) .
7. It is claimed in the text that in the case of simple linear regression of Y onto X , the R^2 statistic (3.17) is equal to the square of the correlation between X and Y (3.18). Prove that this is the case. For simplicity, you may assume that $\bar{x} = \bar{y} = 0$. 

Applied

8. This question involves the use of simple linear regression on the `Auto` data set.
 - (a) Use the `sm.OLS()` function to perform a simple linear regression with `mpg` as the response and `horsepower` as the predictor. Use the `summarize()` function to print the results. Comment on the output. For example:
 - i. Is there a relationship between the predictor and the response?
 - ii. How strong is the relationship between the predictor and the response?
 - iii. Is the relationship between the predictor and the response positive or negative?
 - iv. What is the predicted `mpg` associated with a `horsepower` of 98? What are the associated 95 % confidence and prediction intervals?
 - (b) Plot the response and the predictor in a new set of axes `ax`. Use the `ax.axline()` method or the `abline()` function defined in the lab to display the least squares regression line.
 - (c) Produce some of diagnostic plots of the least squares regression fit as described in the lab. Comment on any problems you see with the fit.
9. This question involves the use of multiple linear regression on the `Auto` data set.
 - (a) Produce a scatterplot matrix which includes all of the variables in the data set.
 - (b) Compute the matrix of correlations between the variables using the `DataFrame.corr()` method.
 - (c) Use the `sm.OLS()` function to perform a multiple linear regression with `mpg` as the response and all other variables except `name` as the predictors. Use the `summarize()` function to print the results. Comment on the output. For instance:
 - i. Is there a relationship between the predictors and the response? Use the `anova_lm()` function from `statsmodels` to answer this question.

- ii. Which predictors appear to have a statistically significant relationship to the response?
 - iii. What does the coefficient for the `year` variable suggest?
- (d) Produce some of diagnostic plots of the linear regression fit as described in the lab. Comment on any problems you see with the fit. Do the residual plots suggest any unusually large outliers? Does the leverage plot identify any observations with unusually high leverage?
- (e) Fit some models with interactions as described in the lab. Do any interactions appear to be statistically significant?
- (f) Try a few different transformations of the variables, such as $\log(X)$, \sqrt{X} , X^2 . Comment on your findings.
10. This question should be answered using the `Carseats` data set.
- (a) Fit a multiple regression model to predict `Sales` using `Price`, `Urban`, and `US`.
 - (b) Provide an interpretation of each coefficient in the model. Be careful—some of the variables in the model are qualitative!
 - (c) Write out the model in equation form, being careful to handle the qualitative variables properly.
 - (d) For which of the predictors can you reject the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$?
 - (e) On the basis of your response to the previous question, fit a smaller model that only uses the predictors for which there is evidence of association with the outcome.
 - (f) How well do the models in (a) and (e) fit the data?
 - (g) Using the model from (e), obtain 95 % confidence intervals for the coefficient(s).
 - (h) Is there evidence of outliers or high leverage observations in the model from (e)?
11. In this problem we will investigate the t -statistic for the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta = 0$ in simple linear regression without an intercept. To begin, we generate a predictor `x` and a response `y` as follows.

```
rng = np.random.default_rng(1)
x = rng.normal(size=100)
y = 2 * x + rng.normal(size=100)
```

- (a) Perform a simple linear regression of `y` onto `x`, *without* an intercept. Report the coefficient estimate $\hat{\beta}$, the standard error of this coefficient estimate, and the t -statistic and p -value associated with the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta = 0$. Comment on these results. (You can perform regression without an intercept using the keyword argument `intercept=False` to `ModelSpec()`.)

- (b) Now perform a simple linear regression of \mathbf{x} onto \mathbf{y} without an intercept, and report the coefficient estimate, its standard error, and the corresponding t -statistic and p -values associated with the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta = 0$. Comment on these results.
- (c) What is the relationship between the results obtained in (a) and (b)?
- (d) For the regression of Y onto X without an intercept, the t -statistic for $H_0 : \beta = 0$ takes the form $\hat{\beta}/\text{SE}(\hat{\beta})$, where $\hat{\beta}$ is given by (3.38), and where

$$\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i \hat{\beta})^2}{(n-1) \sum_{i'=1}^n x_{i'}^2}}.$$

(These formulas are slightly different from those given in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, since here we are performing regression without an intercept.) Show algebraically, and confirm numerically in R, that the t -statistic can be written as

$$\frac{(\sqrt{n-1}) \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}{\sqrt{(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2)(\sum_{i'=1}^n y_{i'}^2) - (\sum_{i'=1}^n x_{i'} y_{i'})^2}}.$$

- (e) Using the results from (d), argue that the t -statistic for the regression of \mathbf{y} onto \mathbf{x} is the same as the t -statistic for the regression of \mathbf{x} onto \mathbf{y} .
- (f) In R, show that when regression is performed *with* an intercept, the t -statistic for $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ is the same for the regression of \mathbf{y} onto \mathbf{x} as it is for the regression of \mathbf{x} onto \mathbf{y} .
12. This problem involves simple linear regression without an intercept.
- (a) Recall that the coefficient estimate $\hat{\beta}$ for the linear regression of Y onto X without an intercept is given by (3.38). Under what circumstance is the coefficient estimate for the regression of X onto Y the same as the coefficient estimate for the regression of Y onto X ?
- (b) Generate an example in Python with $n = 100$ observations in which the coefficient estimate for the regression of X onto Y is *different from* the coefficient estimate for the regression of Y onto X .
- (c) Generate an example in Python with $n = 100$ observations in which the coefficient estimate for the regression of X onto Y is *the same as* the coefficient estimate for the regression of Y onto X .
13. In this exercise you will create some simulated data and will fit simple linear regression models to it. Make sure to use the default random number generator with seed set to 1 prior to starting part (a) to ensure consistent results.



- (a) Using the `normal()` method of your random number generator, create a vector, `x`, containing 100 observations drawn from a $N(0, 1)$ distribution. This represents a feature, X .
- (b) Using the `normal()` method, create a vector, `eps`, containing 100 observations drawn from a $N(0, 0.25)$ distribution—a normal distribution with mean zero and variance 0.25.
- (c) Using `x` and `eps`, generate a vector `y` according to the model

$$Y = -1 + 0.5X + \epsilon. \quad (3.39)$$

What is the length of the vector `y`? What are the values of β_0 and β_1 in this linear model?

- (d) Create a scatterplot displaying the relationship between `x` and `y`. Comment on what you observe.
- (e) Fit a least squares linear model to predict `y` using `x`. Comment on the model obtained. How do $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1$ compare to β_0 and β_1 ?
- (f) Display the least squares line on the scatterplot obtained in (d). Draw the population regression line on the plot, in a different color. Use the `legend()` method of the axes to create an appropriate legend.
- (g) Now fit a polynomial regression model that predicts `y` using `x` and `x2`. Is there evidence that the quadratic term improves the model fit? Explain your answer.
- (h) Repeat (a)–(f) after modifying the data generation process in such a way that there is *less* noise in the data. The model (3.39) should remain the same. You can do this by decreasing the variance of the normal distribution used to generate the error term ϵ in (b). Describe your results.
- (i) Repeat (a)–(f) after modifying the data generation process in such a way that there is *more* noise in the data. The model (3.39) should remain the same. You can do this by increasing the variance of the normal distribution used to generate the error term ϵ in (b). Describe your results.
- (j) What are the confidence intervals for β_0 and β_1 based on the original data set, the noisier data set, and the less noisy data set? Comment on your results.

14. This problem focuses on the *collinearity* problem.

- (a) Perform the following commands in **Python**:

```
rng = np.random.default_rng(10)
x1 = rng.uniform(0, 1, size=100)
x2 = 0.5 * x1 + rng.normal(size=100) / 10
y = 2 + 2 * x1 + 0.3 * x2 + rng.normal(size=100)
```

The last line corresponds to creating a linear model in which `y` is a function of `x1` and `x2`. Write out the form of the linear model. What are the regression coefficients?

- (b) What is the correlation between x_1 and x_2 ? Create a scatterplot displaying the relationship between the variables.
- (c) Using this data, fit a least squares regression to predict y using x_1 and x_2 . Describe the results obtained. What are $\hat{\beta}_0$, $\hat{\beta}_1$, and $\hat{\beta}_2$? How do these relate to the true β_0 , β_1 , and β_2 ? Can you reject the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$? How about the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_2 = 0$?
- (d) Now fit a least squares regression to predict y using only x_1 . Comment on your results. Can you reject the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$?
- (e) Now fit a least squares regression to predict y using only x_2 . Comment on your results. Can you reject the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$?
- (f) Do the results obtained in (c)–(e) contradict each other? Explain your answer.
- (g) Suppose we obtain one additional observation, which was unfortunately mismeasured. We use the function `np.concatenate()` to add this additional observation to each of x_1 , x_2 and y .

```
x1 = np.concatenate([x1, [0.1]])
x2 = np.concatenate([x2, [0.8]])
y = np.concatenate([y, [6]])
```

`np.concatenate()`

Re-fit the linear models from (c) to (e) using this new data. What effect does this new observation have on the each of the models? In each model, is this observation an outlier? A high-leverage point? Both? Explain your answers.

15. This problem involves the `Boston` data set, which we saw in the lab for this chapter. We will now try to predict per capita crime rate using the other variables in this data set. In other words, per capita crime rate is the response, and the other variables are the predictors.
- (a) For each predictor, fit a simple linear regression model to predict the response. Describe your results. In which of the models is there a statistically significant association between the predictor and the response? Create some plots to back up your assertions.
- (b) Fit a multiple regression model to predict the response using all of the predictors. Describe your results. For which predictors can we reject the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$?
- (c) How do your results from (a) compare to your results from (b)? Create a plot displaying the univariate regression coefficients from (a) on the x -axis, and the multiple regression coefficients from (b) on the y -axis. That is, each predictor is displayed as a single point in the plot. Its coefficient in a simple linear regression model is shown on the x -axis, and its coefficient estimate in the multiple linear regression model is shown on the y -axis.

- (d) Is there evidence of non-linear association between any of the predictors and the response? To answer this question, for each predictor X , fit a model of the form

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 X^2 + \beta_3 X^3 + \epsilon.$$