

PROBLEM SHEET 3_720

Srijita Dey

2026-02-12

2. Problem to demonstrate the role of qualitative (nominal) predictors in addition to quantitative predictors in multiple linear regression

Attach “Credits” data from R. Regress “balance” on (a) “gender” only. (b) “gender” and “ethnicity”. (c) “gender”, “ethnicity”, “income”. (d) Output all the regressions in (a)-(c) in a single table using stargazer. Comment on the significant coefficients in each of the models. (e) Explain how gender affects “balance” in each of the models (a)- (c) . (f) Compare the average credit card balance of a male African with a male Caucasian on the basis of model (b). (g) Compare the average credit card balance of a male African with a male Caucasian when each earns 100,000 dollars. For comparison, use the model in (c). (h) Compare and comment on the answers in (f) and (g) (i) Based on the model in (c), predict the credit card balance of a female Asian whose income is 2000,000 dollars. (j) Check the goodness of fit of the different models in (a) -(c) in terms of AIC, BIC and adjusted R2. Which model would you prefer?

```
rm(list=ls())
library(ISLR)

## Warning: package 'ISLR' was built under R version 4.5.2

??Credit

## starting httpd help server ... done

attach(Credit)

#a
m1=lm(Balance~Gender)
summary(m1)

##
## Call:
## lm(formula = Balance ~ Gender)
##
## Residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -529.54 -455.35  -60.17   334.71 1489.20
##
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)    509.80      33.13   15.389  <2e-16 ***
## GenderFemale    19.73      46.05    0.429   0.669
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

```
##
## Residual standard error: 460.2 on 398 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.0004611, Adjusted R-squared:  -0.00205
## F-statistic: 0.1836 on 1 and 398 DF,  p-value: 0.6685

#b
m2=lm(Balance~Gender+Ethnicity)
m2

##
## Call:
## lm(formula = Balance ~ Gender + Ethnicity)
##
## Coefficients:
##          (Intercept)          GenderFemale      EthnicityAsian
EthnicityCaucasian
##          520.88              20.04              -19.37              -
12.65

#c
m3=lm(Balance~Gender+Ethnicity+Income)
m3

##
## Call:
## lm(formula = Balance ~ Gender + Ethnicity + Income)
##
## Coefficients:
##          (Intercept)          GenderFemale      EthnicityAsian
EthnicityCaucasian
##          230.029              24.340              1.637
6.447
##          Income
##          6.054

#d
library(stargazer)

## Warning: package 'stargazer' was built under R version 4.5.2

##
## Please cite as:

##  Hlavac, Marek (2022). stargazer: Well-Formatted Regression and Summary
##  Statistics Tables.

##  R package version 5.2.3. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stargazer
stargazer(m1,m2,m3,type="html",out="f3.html")

##
## <table style="text-align:center"><tr><td colspan="4" style="border-bottom:
```

```

1px solid black"></td></tr><tr><td style="text-align:left"></td><td
colspan="3"><em>Dependent variable:</em></td></tr>
## <tr><td></td><td colspan="3" style="border-bottom: 1px solid
black"></td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left"></td><td colspan="3">Balance</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-
align:left"></td><td>(1)</td><td>(2)</td><td>(3)</td></tr>
## <tr><td colspan="4" style="border-bottom: 1px solid
black"></td></tr><tr><td style="text-
align:left">GenderFemale</td><td>19.733</td><td>20.038</td><td>24.340</td></t
r>
## <tr><td style="text-
align:left"></td><td>(46.051)</td><td>(46.178)</td><td>(40.963)</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left"></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left">EthnicityAsian</td><td></td><td>-
19.371</td><td>1.637</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-
align:left"></td><td></td><td>(65.107)</td><td>(57.787)</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left"></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left">EthnicityCaucasian</td><td></td><td>-
12.653</td><td>6.447</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-
align:left"></td><td></td><td>(56.740)</td><td>(50.363)</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left"></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-
align:left">Income</td><td></td><td></td><td>6.054<sup>***</sup></td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-
align:left"></td><td></td><td></td><td>(0.582)</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left"></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-
align:left">Constant</td><td>509.803<sup>***</sup></td><td>520.880<sup>***</s
up></td><td>230.029<sup>***</sup></td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-
align:left"></td><td>(33.128)</td><td>(51.901)</td><td>(53.857)</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left"></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
## <tr><td colspan="4" style="border-bottom: 1px solid
black"></td></tr><tr><td style="text-
align:left">Observations</td><td>400</td><td>400</td><td>400</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-
align:left">R<sup>2</sup></td><td>0.0005</td><td>0.001</td><td>0.216</td></tr>
>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left">Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></td><td>-
0.002</td><td>-0.007</td><td>0.208</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left">Residual Std. Error</td><td>460.230 (df =
398)</td><td>461.337 (df = 396)</td><td>409.218 (df = 395)</td></tr>
## <tr><td style="text-align:left">F Statistic</td><td>0.184 (df = 1;
398)</td><td>0.092 (df = 3; 396)</td><td>27.161<sup>***</sup> (df = 4;
395)</td></tr>
## <tr><td colspan="4" style="border-bottom: 1px solid
black"></td></tr><tr><td style="text-align:left"><em>Note:</em></td><td>

```

```
colspan="3" style="text-align:right">><sup>*</sup>p<0.1; <sup>**</sup>p<0.05;
<sup>***</sup>p<0.01</td></tr>
## </table>
```

Dependent variable:			
	(1)	Balance (2)	(3)
<u>GenderFemale</u>	19.733 (46.051)	20.038 (46.178)	24.340 (40.963)
<u>EthnicityAsian</u>		-19.371 (65.107)	1.637 (57.787)
<u>EthnicityCaucasian</u>		-12.653 (56.740)	6.447 (50.363)
Income			6.054*** (0.582)
Constant	509.803*** (33.128)	520.880*** (51.901)	230.029*** (53.857)
Observations	400	400	400
R2	0.0005	0.001	0.216
Adjusted R2	-0.002	-0.007	0.208
Residual Std. Error	460.230 (df = 398)	461.337 (df = 396)	409.218 (df = 395)
F Statistic	0.184 (df = 1; 398)	0.092 (df = 3; 396)	27.161*** (df = 4; 395)
Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01			

From the table above we see the presence of stars in the coefficient of Income only and hence we conclude that Income is a significant predictor used in predicting Credit.

(e) The regression equation of model (a) is

$$\widehat{\text{Balance}} = \beta_0 + 20.04 (\text{GenderFemale})$$

Here the baseline is male for gender. Here, females have 20.04 units of higher average balance than males. The regression equation of the model (b) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{Balance}} = & 520.88 + 20.04 (\text{GenderFemale}) - 19.37 (\text{EthnicityAsian}) \\ & - 12.65 (\text{EthnicityCaucasian}) \end{aligned}$$

Here the baseline Categories are Male in Gender and African in Ethnicity. When ethnicity is held constant, Females have a higher balance by \$20.04 in comparison to males. The regression equation of the model(c) is given by

$$\widehat{\text{Balance}} = 230.029 + 24.340 (\text{GenderFemale}) + 1.637 (\text{EthnicityAsian}) + 6.447 (\text{EthnicityCaucasian}) + 6.054 (\text{Income})$$

Here the baseline Categories are Male in Gender and African in Ethnicity. When ethnicity and income are held constant, Females have a higher credit balance by \$24.340 in comparison to Males.

(f) The regression equation of the model(b) is given by \$\$ = 520.88

- 20.04,()
- 19.37,()
- 12.65,() \$\$ The baseline Categories are Male in Gender and African in Ethnicity. To calculate Average Credit balance of a male African we put Gender_Female=0 and Ethnicity_African and Ethnicity_Caucasian both equal to 0. Hence from the fitted model, the intercept (\$520.88) represents the average balance of a male African. To calculate Average Credit balance of a male Caucasian we put Gender_Female=0 and Ethnicity_African=0 and Ethnicity_Caucasian=1. On putting the values in the fitted model, \$508.23 the average balance of a male African. Hence, the average credit card balance of a male African exceeds that of a male Caucasian by \$12.65 when all other factors are held constant.

(g)The regression equation of the model(c) is given by

$$\widehat{\text{Balance}} = 230.029 + 24.340 (\text{GenderFemale}) + 1.637 (\text{EthnicityAsian}) + 6.447 (\text{EthnicityCaucasian}) + 6.054 (\text{Income})$$

The baseline Categories are Male in Gender and African in Ethnicity. To calculate Average Credit balance of a male African when income is \$100000, we put Gender_Female=0 and Ethnicity_African and Ethnicity_Caucasian both equal to 0. Hence from the fitted model, the average balance of a male African is calculated as \$605630.029. To calculate Average Credit balance of a male Caucasian with income is 100000, we put Gender_Female=0, Ethnicity_African=0 and Ethnicity_Caucasian=1. Hence from the fitted model we get the average credit balance of a male Caucasian as \$605636.476. A male Caucasian has a higher average credit balance(by 6.447 dollars)in comparison to a male African when income of both are \$100,000 and all other factors are held constant.

(h) From model (b), the average credit card balance of a male African exceeds that of a male Caucasian by \$12.65 when all other factors are held constant.

From model (c), a male Caucasian has a higher average credit balance(by 6.447 dollars)in comparison to a male African when income of both are \$100,000 and all other factors are held constant.

(i) In case of the model (c), the baseline Categories are Male in Gender and African in Ethnicity. To calculate Average Credit balance of a female Asian when income is \$2000000, we put Gender_Female=1, Ethnicity_Asian=1 and Ethnicity_Caucasian= 0. Hence from the fitted model, the average balance of a female Asian is calculated as \$12108256.006

(j)

Dependent variable:			
	(1)	Balance (2)	(3)
<u>GenderFemale</u>	19.733 (46.051)	20.038 (46.178)	24.340 (40.963)
<u>EthnicityAsian</u>		-19.371 (65.107)	1.637 (57.787)
<u>EthnicityCaucasian</u>		-12.653 (56.740)	6.447 (50.363)
Income			6.054*** (0.582)
Constant	509.803*** (33.128)	520.880*** (51.901)	230.029*** (53.857)
Observations	400	400	400
R2	0.0005	0.001	0.216
Adjusted R2	-0.002	-0.007	0.208
Residual Std. Error	460.230 (df = 398)	461.337 (df = 396)	409.218 (df = 395)
F Statistic	0.184 (df = 1; 398)	0.092 (df = 3; 396)	27.161*** (df = 4; 395)
Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01			

Here the adjusted R^2 is least for model (b). Since the adjusted R^2 accounts for model complexity and the adjusted R^2 is maximum here in case of model (c) which suggests that out of the 3 models given here, model (c) has the best fit.

4. Problem to demonstrate the impact of ignoring interaction term in multiple linear regression

Consider a simulation setting where the data is generated as follows: Step 1: Generate x_{1i} from Normal(0,1) distribution, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ Step 2: Generate x_{2i} from Bernoulli (0,3) distribution, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ Step 3: Generate ε_i from Normal(0,1) and hence generate the response $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1i} + \beta_2 x_{2i} + \beta_3 (x_{1i} \times x_{2i}) + \varepsilon_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Step 4: Run two separate multiple linear regressions (i) using the model in Step 3 and (ii) using the model in Step 3 without the interaction term. Repeat Steps 1-4, $R = 1000$ times. At each simulation compute the MSE for the correct model (i.e. model with the interaction term) and the naive model (i.e. the model without the interaction term). Finally find the average MSE's

for each model. From the output, demonstrate the impact of ignoring the interaction term.

Carry out the analysis for $n = 100$ and the following parametric configurations: $(\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) = (-2.5, 1.2, 2.3, 0.001), (-2.5, 1.2, 2.3, 3.1)$. Set seed as 123.

```
rm(list=ls())
set.seed(123)
sim_fun=function(n, beta0, beta1, beta2, beta3, R=1000){
  mse_correct=numeric(R)
  mse_naive=numeric(R)
  for(r in 1:R){
    x1=rnorm(n, 0, 1)
    x2=rbinom(n, 1, 0.3)
    eps=rnorm(n, 0, 1)
    y=beta0 + beta1*x1 + beta2*x2 + beta3*(x1*x2) + eps

    fit_correct=lm(y ~ x1*x2)
    yhat_correct= predict(fit_correct)
    mse_correct[r]=mean((y - yhat_correct)^2)

    fit_naive=lm(y ~ x1 + x2)
    yhat_naive=predict(fit_naive)
    mse_naive[r]=mean((y - yhat_naive)^2)
  }

  return(c(mean(mse_correct), mean(mse_naive)))
}

sim_fun(100, -2.5, 1.2, 2.3, 0.001)
## [1] 0.9631944 0.9739083

sim_fun(100, -2.5, 1.2, 2.3, 3.1)
## [1] 0.9577982 2.8633349
```

When the interaction effect is very small ($\beta_3 = 0.001$), the average MSE of the correct and naive models are almost identical (0.9632 and 0.9739 respectively). Hence, ignoring the interaction term in this case does not affect model performance much.

However, when the interaction effect is strong ($\beta_3 = 3.1$), the naive model produces a much larger average MSE=2.8633 compared to the correct model=0.9578. This shows that omitting a significant interaction term leads to substantial loss in predictive accuracy.

Therefore, ignoring important interaction terms results in model misspecification and significantly higher prediction error.