8. Additional topics in linear modeling

Outline

- We now have practical skills to
 - Write down linear models,
 - 2 Fit them in R,
 - Interpret the output in terms of parameter estimates, confidence intervals and hypothesis tests,
 - Oheck that R is fitting the model that we intend,
 - Oheck that the model we intend is appropriate for the data.
- These skills provide a foundation for many extensions helpful for particuluar situations.

Topics

- The linear model formula notation in R, as a third model representation to join the subscript format and matrix format.
- The \mathbb{R}^2 statistic to assess model fit.
- Fitting polynomial relationships using linear models.
- Multicolinearity: What happens when two or more explanatory variables are highly correlated. How to notice it, and what to do about it.
- Power: What is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when the alternative is true?

The R model formula notation

- A formula in lm() is something that looks like y~x.
- The R formula notation has various conventions that are designed to make it easy to specify useful models.
- ?formula tells you everything you need to know, and more.
- The R formula for lm() is a way of constructing a design matrix.
- Inspect the resulting design matrix using model.matrix() and check you understand what R has produced. If you can do this, you can safely use the power of the formula notation.

Question 8.1. In a report, the model should be written in mathematical notation, not as an R formula. Why?

Experimenting with the R formula notation

Consider the freshman GPA data

```
gpa <- read.table("gpa.txt",header=T); head(gpa,3)
## ID GPA High_School ACT Year
## 1 1 0.98 61 20 1996
## 2 2 1.13 84 20 1996
## 3 3 1.25 74 19 1996</pre>
```

- We can play the game of trying out various things in R formula notation, inspecting the resulting design matrix, and figuring out how to write the model efficiently in mathematical notation.
- You can also think about whether the different models give any new insights into the data.

lm1 <- lm(GPA~ACT+High_School*Year,data=gpa)</pre>

High_School:Year -1.681424e-04 8.518297e-04

• The * here denotes inclusion of an **interaction** between High_School and Year, written in the R output as High_School:Year.

Question 8.2. Conceptually, what do you think an interaction between two variables is, and why might it be needed?

• To find out exactly what R thinks an interaction is, we can check the design matrix.

head(model.matrix(lm1))

```
##
    (Intercept) ACT High_School Year High_School: Year
## 1
                20
                            61 1996
                                             121756
## 2
              1 20
                            84 1996
                                             167664
## 3
              1 19
                           74 1996
                                             147704
## 4
              1 23
                            95 1996
                                             189620
              1 28
                           77 1996
                                            153692
                23
                                              93812
                            47 1996
```

Question 8.3. Write out the sample model that R has computed in lm1 using subscript notation.

Interactions and additivity

```
lm2 <- lm(GPA~ACT+High_School+Year+High_School:Year,data=gpa)
head(model.matrix(lm2),4)</pre>
```

```
(Intercept) ACT High_School Year High_School: Year
##
                   20
## 1
                                61 1996
                                                   121756
                                                   167664
                1 20
                               84 1996
                1 19
                               74 1996
                                                   147704
## 4
                   23
                               95 1996
                                                   189620
```

- 1m2 has the same design matrix as 1m1.
- We see that, in R formula notation, y~u*v is the same as y~u+v+u:v.
- In the model y~u+v the effects of the variables are said to be **additive**.
- In a causal interpretation of an additive model, the result of changing u to u2 and v to v2 is the sum of the marginal effect of changing u to u2 plus the marginal effect of changing v to v2.
- ullet The interaction term u:v breaks additivity. In this case, we can't know the consequence for the fitted value of changing u to u2 unless we know the value of v.

The interaction between ACT and high school percentile

 We have not (yet) found any interesting effect of year. Let's drop year out of the model and look for whether there is an interaction between ACT and high school percentile for predicting freshman GPA.

```
lm3 <- lm(GPA~ACT*High_School,data=gpa)</pre>
```

Question 8.4. Write out the fitted sample linear model in subscript form, letting y_i , a_i , h_i and e_i be the freshman GPA, ACT score, high school percentile and residual error respectively for the ith student.

Interpreting a discovered interaction

Question 8.5. Explain in words to the admissions director what you have found about the interaction under investigation here.

Marginal effects when there is an interaction

• Notice in 'Im3' that the coefficients for ACT score and high school percentile are negative. That is surprising!

```
ACT_centered <- gpa$ACT-mean(gpa$ACT)

HS_centered <- gpa$Hi - mean(gpa$Hi)

lm3b <- lm(GPA~ACT_centered*HS_centered,data=gpa)

signif(coef(summary(lm3b))[,c(1,2,4)],3)

##

Estimate Std. Error Pr(>|t|)

## (Intercept) 2.94000 0.022900 0.00e+00

## ACT_centered 0.03640 0.005880 1.04e-09

## HS_centered 0.01190 0.001350 8.23e-18

## ACT_centered:HS_centered 0.00107 0.000264 5.46e-05
```

Question 8.6. After centering the variables, the interaction effect stays the same, but the marginal effects change sign. What is happening? Why?

Quantifying the improvement in the model

```
s3 <- summary(lm3)$sigma
lm4 <- lm(GPA~ACT+High_School,data=gpa)
s4 <- summary(lm4)$sigma
lm5 <- lm(GPA~1,data=gpa)
s5 <- summary(lm5)$sigma
cat("s3 =",s3,"; s4 =",s4,"; s5 =",s5)</pre>
## s3 = 0.5610067 ; s4 = 0.5671605 ; s5 = 0.6345278
```

Question 8.7. Comment on both **statistical significance** and **practical significance** of the interaction between a prediction of freshman GPA.

An interaction involving a factor

• Let's go back to the football field goal data.

```
goals <- read.table("FieldGoals2003to2006.csv",header=T,sep=",")
goals[1,c("Name","Teamt","FGt","FGtM1")]

## Name Teamt FGt FGtM1
## 1 Adam Vinatieri NE 73.5 90

lm6 <- lm(FGt~FGtM1*Name,data=goals)</pre>
```

Question 8.8. What model do you think is being fitted here? Write it in subscript form, where y_{ij} is the field goal average for the jth year of kicker i, with $i=1,\ldots,19$ and j=1,2,3,4. Let e_{ij} be the residual error, and let x_{ij} be the previous year's average. Check your answer against the design matrix shown on the next slide.

```
X<-model.matrix(lm6) ; colnames(X)<-1:38 ; X[1:17.c(1:8.21:26)]</pre>
##
            2 3 4 5 6 7 8
                             21
                                  22
                                        23 24 25 26
        90.0 0
                            0.0
                                       0.0
## 1
                0
                  0 0
                                 0.0
                            0.0
                                 0.0
## 2
      1 73.5 0
                0
                                       0.0
##
  3
        93.9 0
                            0.0
                                 0.0
                                       0.0
                0
                  0 0
##
   4
        80.00
                            0.0
                                 0.0
                                       0.0
                0
                  0 0
## 5
                      0 0 88.2
                                 0.0
                                       0.0
##
        82.7 1
                                 0.0
                                       0.0
   6
                  0 0
                      0
                          82.7
## 7
        84.3 1 0
                  0 0 0 0 84.3
                                 0.0
                                       0.0
##
   8
                          72.7
                                 0.0
                                       0.0
##
        72.20
                            0.072.2
                                       0.0
        87.0 0 1 0 0 0
                            0.0 87.0
                                       0.0
        85.2 0
                            0.0 85.2
                                       0.0
                            0.0 75.0
        75.0 0
                                       0.0
        82.1 0
                            0.0
                                 0.0 82.1
        95.6
                            0.0
                                 0.0 95.6
                                                0
   15
        85.7 0
                            0.0
                                 0.0 85.7
   16
        79.1 0
                0
                            0.0
                                 0.0 79.1
                                                   0
```

0.0

0.0

0.0800

80.00

0 0

Question 8.9. Interpret the ANOVA table below.

```
anova(lm6)
## Analysis of Variance Table
##
## Response: FGt
##
          Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F)
## FGtM1 1 87.20 87.199 1.9008 0.176047
## Name 18 2252.47 125.137 2.7279 0.004565 **
## FGtM1:Name 18 417.75 23.209 0.5059 0.938592
## Residuals 38 1743.20 45.874
## Signif. codes:
     '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```