Assignment 7: GLMs (Linear Regressios, ANOVA, & t-tests)

Alex Lopez

Fall 2024

OVERVIEW

This exercise accompanies the lessons in Environmental Data Analytics on generalized linear models.

Directions

1. Rename this file `<FirstLast>_A07_GLMs.Rmd` (replacing `<FirstLast>` with your first and last name).
2. Change "Student Name" on line 3 (above) with your name.
3. Work through the steps, **creating code and output** that fulfill each instruction.
4. Be sure to **answer the questions** in this assignment document.
5. When you have completed the assignment, **Knit** the text and code into a single PDF file.

Set up your session

1. Set up your session. Check your working directory. Load the tidyverse, agricolae and other needed packages. Import the *raw* NTL-LTER raw data file for chemistry/physics (`NTL-LTER_Lake_ChemistryPhysics_Raw.csv`). Set date columns to date objects.

2. Build a ggplot theme and set it as your default theme.

```
#1

#load packages
library(tidyverse)
```

```
## -- Attaching core tidyverse packages ------------------------ tidyverse 2.0.0 --
## v dplyr     1.1.4     v readr     2.1.5
## v forcats   1.0.0     v stringr   1.5.1
## v ggplot2   3.5.1     v tibble    3.2.1
## v lubridate 1.9.3     v tidyr     1.3.1
## v purrr     1.0.2
## -- Conflicts ------------------------------------------ tidyverse_conflicts() --
## x dplyr::filter() masks stats::filter()
## x dplyr::lag()    masks stats::lag()
## i Use the conflicted package (<http://conflicted.r-lib.org/>) to force all conflicts to become errors
```

```
library(agricolae)
library(here)
```

```
## here() starts at /home/guest/EDE_Fall2024
```

```r
#check wd
here()
```

```
## [1] "/home/guest/EDE_Fall2024"
```

```r
#import data
raw.ntl.lter <-
  read.csv(here("Data/Raw/NTL-LTER_Lake_ChemistryPhysics_Raw.csv"),
           stringsAsFactors = TRUE)

#format dates
raw.ntl.lter$sampledate <- as.Date(raw.ntl.lter$sampledate, format = "%m/%d/%y")

#2

#set theme
mytheme <- theme_classic(base_size = 14) +
  theme(axis.text = element_text(color = "black"),
        axis.title.x = element_text(size = 10),
        axis.title.y = element_text(size = 10),
        legend.position = "right",
        legend.title = element_text(size = 10),
        legend.text = element_text(size = 8),
        plot.title = element_text(hjust = 0.5, size = 12))
theme_set(mytheme)
```

Simple regression

Our first research question is: Does mean lake temperature recorded during July change with depth across all lakes?

3. State the null and alternative hypotheses for this question: > Answer: H0: There is no significant linear relationship between mean July temperature and depth. Ha: There is a significant linear relationship between mean July temperature and depth.
4. Wrangle your NTL-LTER dataset with a pipe function so that the records meet the following criteria:

- Only dates in July.
- Only the columns: `lakename`, `year4`, `daynum`, `depth`, `temperature_C`
- Only complete cases (i.e., remove NAs)

5. Visualize the relationship among the two continuous variables with a scatter plot of temperature by depth. Add a smoothed line showing the linear model, and limit temperature values from 0 to 35 °C. Make this plot look pretty and easy to read.

```r
#4

ntl.lter.july <- raw.ntl.lter %>%
  filter(month(sampledate) == 07) %>%
```

```r
  select(lakename, year4, daynum, depth, temperature_C) %>%
  na.omit()

#5

tempvsdepth <- ggplot(ntl.lter.july, aes(x = depth, y = temperature_C)) +
  geom_point(alpha = 0.5) +
  geom_smooth(method = 'lm', col = 'purple') +
  labs(x = "Depth (m)", y = "Temperature (°C)",
       title = "Temperature vs. Depth in July") +
  ylim(0, 35)

print(tempvsdepth)
```

```
## `geom_smooth()` using formula = 'y ~ x'

## Warning: Removed 24 rows containing missing values or values outside the scale range
## (`geom_smooth()`).
```



6. Interpret the figure. What does it suggest with regards to the response of temperature to depth? Do the distribution of points suggest about anything about the linearity of this trend?

   Answer: The figure suggests that there is an inverse relationship between depth and temperature. The distribution of points suggests that this trend is not strictly linear, especially when depth is greater than 5m, leading us to believe that a linear model might not be the best fit for this data.

7. Perform a linear regression to test the relationship and display the results.

```r
#7

lin.reg <- lm(data = ntl.lter.july, temperature_C ~ depth)
summary(lin.reg)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = temperature_C ~ depth, data = ntl.lter.july)
##
## Residuals:
##     Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max
## -9.5173 -3.0192  0.0633  2.9365 13.5834
##
## Coefficients:
##             Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 21.95597    0.06792   323.3   <2e-16 ***
## depth       -1.94621    0.01174  -165.8   <2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 3.835 on 9726 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.7387, Adjusted R-squared:  0.7387
## F-statistic: 2.75e+04 on 1 and 9726 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

8. Interpret your model results in words. Include how much of the variability in temperature is explained by changes in depth, the degrees of freedom on which this finding is based, and the statistical significance of the result. Also mention how much temperature is predicted to change for every 1m change in depth.

   Answer: According to the regression analysis, depth can be a predictor of temperature. Depth explains approximately 73.9% (R-squared value of 0.7387) of variability in temperature. This finding is based on 9726 degrees of freedom. The statistical significance is less than 0.05, which means we can reject the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative, indicating a signifcant relationship between depth and temperature. For every 1m change in depth, temperature is predicted to decrease by -1.94621 degrees Celsius.

Multiple regression

Let's tackle a similar question from a different approach. Here, we want to explore what might the best set of predictors for lake temperature in July across the monitoring period at the North Temperate Lakes LTER.

9. Run an AIC to determine what set of explanatory variables (year4, daynum, depth) is best suited to predict temperature.

10. Run a multiple regression on the recommended set of variables.

```r
#9

mlt.lin.reg <- lm(data = ntl.lter.july, temperature_C ~ year4 + daynum + depth)

step(mlt.lin.reg)
```

```
## Start:  AIC=26065.53
## temperature_C ~ year4 + daynum + depth
##
##          Df Sum of Sq    RSS   AIC
## <none>                141687 26066
## - year4   1       101 141788 26070
## - daynum  1      1237 142924 26148
## - depth   1    404475 546161 39189
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = temperature_C ~ year4 + daynum + depth, data = ntl.lter.july)
##
## Coefficients:
## (Intercept)        year4       daynum        depth
##    -8.57556      0.01134      0.03978     -1.94644
```

```r
#10

summary(mlt.lin.reg)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = temperature_C ~ year4 + daynum + depth, data = ntl.lter.july)
##
## Residuals:
##     Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max
## -9.6536 -3.0000  0.0902  2.9658 13.6123
##
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error  t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) -8.575564   8.630715   -0.994  0.32044
## year4        0.011345   0.004299    2.639  0.00833 **
## daynum       0.039780   0.004317    9.215  < 2e-16 ***
## depth       -1.946437   0.011683 -166.611  < 2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 3.817 on 9724 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.7412, Adjusted R-squared:  0.7411
## F-statistic:  9283 on 3 and 9724 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

11. What is the final set of explanatory variables that the AIC method suggests we use to predict temperature in our multiple regression? How much of the observed variance does this model explain? Is this an improvement over the model using only depth as the explanatory variable?

Answer: According to the AIC, the recommended set of explanatory variables best suited to predict temperature includes year4, daynum, and depth, because if we remove any of these variables, AIC increases. The smaller the AIC, the better. According to the regression analysis, this model explains approximately 74.1% (R-squared value of 0.7411) of the observed variance. This is a slight improvement over the model using only depth as the explanatory variable, an increase to 0.7411 from 0.7387.

Analysis of Variance

12. Now we want to see whether the different lakes have, on average, different temperatures in the month of July. Run an ANOVA test to complete this analysis. (No need to test assumptions of normality or similar variances.) Create two sets of models: one expressed as an ANOVA models and another expressed as a linear model (as done in our lessons).

```
#12

#ANOVA as aov
july.temps.anova <- aov(data = ntl.lter.july, temperature_C ~ lakename)
summary(july.temps.anova)
```

```
##               Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F)
## lakename       8  21642  2705.2      50 <2e-16 ***
## Residuals   9719 525813    54.1
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

```
#ANOVA as lm
july.temps.anova2 <- lm(data = ntl.lter.july, temperature_C ~ lakename)
summary(july.temps.anova2)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = temperature_C ~ lakename, data = ntl.lter.july)
##
## Residuals:
##     Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max
## -10.769  -6.614  -2.679   7.684  23.832
##
## Coefficients:
##                          Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)               17.6664     0.6501  27.174  < 2e-16 ***
## lakenameCrampton Lake     -2.3145     0.7699  -3.006 0.002653 **
## lakenameEast Long Lake    -7.3987     0.6918 -10.695  < 2e-16 ***
## lakenameHummingbird Lake  -6.8931     0.9429  -7.311 2.87e-13 ***
## lakenamePaul Lake         -3.8522     0.6656  -5.788 7.36e-09 ***
## lakenamePeter Lake        -4.3501     0.6645  -6.547 6.17e-11 ***
## lakenameTuesday Lake      -6.5972     0.6769  -9.746  < 2e-16 ***
## lakenameWard Lake         -3.2078     0.9429  -3.402 0.000672 ***
## lakenameWest Long Lake    -6.0878     0.6895  -8.829  < 2e-16 ***
## ---
```

```
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 7.355 on 9719 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.03953,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.03874
## F-statistic:    50 on 8 and 9719 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

13. Is there a significant difference in mean temperature among the lakes? Report your findings.

    Answer: The null hypothesis in this case states that all lakes have the same mean temperature. The alternative hypothesis states that the mean temperature is not the same for all lakes. According to the ANOVA test, there is a highly signifcant p-value (< 0.05) associated with 'lakename' in the ANOVA model and a highly signifcant p-value (< 0.05) in the F-test of the linear model. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative, leading us to conclude that there is indeed a significant difference in mean temperature among the lakes.

14. Create a graph that depicts temperature by depth, with a separate color for each lake. Add a geom_smooth (method = "lm", se = FALSE) for each lake. Make your points 50 % transparent. Adjust your y axis limits to go from 0 to 35 degrees. Clean up your graph to make it pretty.

```r
#14.

ggplot(ntl.lter.july, aes(x = depth, y = temperature_C, color = lakename)) +
  geom_point(alpha = 0.5, size = 0.5) +
  geom_smooth(method = "lm", se = F) +
  labs(x = "Depth (m)", y = "Temperature (°C)",
       title = "Temperature vs. Depth in July (by Lake)", color = "Lake Name") +
  ylim(0, 35)
```

```
## `geom_smooth()` using formula = 'y ~ x'
```

```
## Warning: Removed 73 rows containing missing values or values outside the scale range
## (`geom_smooth()`).
```



15. Use the Tukey's HSD test to determine which lakes have different means.

```
#15

#post-hoc test
TukeyHSD(july.temps.anova)
```

```
##   Tukey multiple comparisons of means
##     95% family-wise confidence level
##
## Fit: aov(formula = temperature_C ~ lakename, data = ntl.lter.july)
##
## $lakename
##                                         diff        lwr        upr     p adj
## Crampton Lake-Central Long Lake    -2.3145195 -4.7031913  0.0741524 0.0661566
## East Long Lake-Central Long Lake   -7.3987410 -9.5449411 -5.2525408 0.0000000
## Hummingbird Lake-Central Long Lake -6.8931304 -9.8184178 -3.9678430 0.0000000
## Paul Lake-Central Long Lake        -3.8521506 -5.9170942 -1.7872070 0.0000003
## Peter Lake-Central Long Lake       -4.3501458 -6.4115874 -2.2887042 0.0000000
## Tuesday Lake-Central Long Lake     -6.5971805 -8.6971605 -4.4972005 0.0000000
## Ward Lake-Central Long Lake        -3.2077856 -6.1330730 -0.2824982 0.0193405
## West Long Lake-Central Long Lake   -6.0877513 -8.2268550 -3.9486475 0.0000000
## East Long Lake-Crampton Lake       -5.0842215 -6.5591700 -3.6092730 0.0000000
## Hummingbird Lake-Crampton Lake     -4.5786109 -7.0538088 -2.1034131 0.0000004
## Paul Lake-Crampton Lake            -1.5376312 -2.8916215 -0.1836408 0.0127491
```

```
## Peter Lake-Crampton Lake          -2.0356263 -3.3842699 -0.6869828 0.0000999
## Tuesday Lake-Crampton Lake        -4.2826611 -5.6895065 -2.8758157 0.0000000
## Ward Lake-Crampton Lake           -0.8932661 -3.3684639  1.5819317 0.9714459
## West Long Lake-Crampton Lake      -3.7732318 -5.2378351 -2.3086285 0.0000000
## Hummingbird Lake-East Long Lake    0.5056106 -1.7364925  2.7477137 0.9988050
## Paul Lake-East Long Lake           3.5465903  2.6900206  4.4031601 0.0000000
## Peter Lake-East Long Lake          3.0485952  2.2005025  3.8966879 0.0000000
## Tuesday Lake-East Long Lake        0.8015604 -0.1363286  1.7394495 0.1657485
## Ward Lake-East Long Lake           4.1909554  1.9488523  6.4330585 0.0000002
## West Long Lake-East Long Lake      1.3109897  0.2885003  2.3334791 0.0022805
## Paul Lake-Hummingbird Lake         3.0409798  0.8765299  5.2054296 0.0004495
## Peter Lake-Hummingbird Lake        2.5429846  0.3818755  4.7040937 0.0080666
## Tuesday Lake-Hummingbird Lake      0.2959499 -1.9019508  2.4938505 0.9999752
## Ward Lake-Hummingbird Lake         3.6853448  0.6889874  6.6817022 0.0043297
## West Long Lake-Hummingbird Lake    0.8053791 -1.4299320  3.0406903 0.9717297
## Peter Lake-Paul Lake              -0.4979952 -1.1120620  0.1160717 0.2241586
## Tuesday Lake-Paul Lake            -2.7450299 -3.4781416 -2.0119182 0.0000000
## Ward Lake-Paul Lake                0.6443651 -1.5200848  2.8088149 0.9916978
## West Long Lake-Paul Lake          -2.2356007 -3.0742314 -1.3969699 0.0000000
## Tuesday Lake-Peter Lake           -2.2470347 -2.9702236 -1.5238458 0.0000000
## Ward Lake-Peter Lake               1.1423602 -1.0187489  3.3034693 0.7827037
## West Long Lake-Peter Lake         -1.7376055 -2.5675759 -0.9076350 0.0000000
## Ward Lake-Tuesday Lake             3.3893950  1.1914943  5.5872956 0.0000609
## West Long Lake-Tuesday Lake        0.5094292 -0.4121051  1.4309636 0.7374387
## West Long Lake-Ward Lake          -2.8799657 -5.1152769 -0.6446546 0.0021080
```

```r
#extract groupings for pairwise relationships
july.temps.groups <- HSD.test(july.temps.anova, "lakename", group = TRUE)
july.temps.groups
```

```
## $statistics
##   MSerror   Df     Mean       CV
##   54.1016 9719 12.72087 57.82135
##
## $parameters
##    test   name.t ntr StudentizedRange alpha
##   Tukey lakename   9         4.387504  0.05
##
## $means
##                    temperature_C      std    r        se Min  Max    Q25   Q50
## Central Long Lake       17.66641 4.196292  128 0.6501298 8.9 26.8 14.400 18.40
## Crampton Lake           15.35189 7.244773  318 0.4124692 5.0 27.5  7.525 16.90
## East Long Lake          10.26767 6.766804  968 0.2364108 4.2 34.1  4.975  6.50
## Hummingbird Lake        10.77328 7.017845  116 0.6829298 4.0 31.5  5.200  7.00
## Paul Lake               13.81426 7.296928 2660 0.1426147 4.7 27.7  6.500 12.40
## Peter Lake              13.31626 7.669758 2872 0.1372501 4.0 27.0  5.600 11.40
## Tuesday Lake            11.06923 7.698687 1524 0.1884137 0.3 27.7  4.400  6.80
## Ward Lake               14.45862 7.409079  116 0.6829298 5.7 27.6  7.200 12.55
## West Long Lake          11.57865 6.980789 1026 0.2296314 4.0 25.7  5.400  8.00
##                       Q75
## Central Long Lake  21.000
## Crampton Lake      22.300
## East Long Lake     15.925
## Hummingbird Lake   15.625
```

```
## Paul Lake         21.400
## Peter Lake        21.500
## Tuesday Lake      19.400
## Ward Lake         23.200
## West Long Lake    18.800
##
## $comparison
## NULL
##
## $groups
##                   temperature_C groups
## Central Long Lake      17.66641      a
## Crampton Lake          15.35189     ab
## Ward Lake              14.45862     bc
## Paul Lake              13.81426      c
## Peter Lake             13.31626      c
## West Long Lake         11.57865      d
## Tuesday Lake           11.06923     de
## Hummingbird Lake       10.77328     de
## East Long Lake         10.26767      e
##
## attr(,"class")
## [1] "group"
```

16.From the findings above, which lakes have the same mean temperature, statistically speaking, as Peter Lake? Does any lake have a mean temperature that is statistically distinct from all the other lakes?

> Answer: Statistically speaking, only Paul Lake has the same mean temperature as Peter Lake. After extracting the groupings for pairwise relationships in a plot, we can identify which lakes have the same mean temperature, statistically speaking, by looking at those that share the same letters. In our case, only Paul Lake is in the same letter grouping as Peter Lake. After running the Tukey HSD function and looking at the p-values for all the pariwise relationships, we can observe that there is not one lake with a mean temperature that is statistically distinct from all the other lakes. Each lake has at least one other lake with which, together, their difference in means is not statistically distinct, because the p-value is greater than 0.05 for that pairing.

17. If we were just looking at Peter Lake and Paul Lake. What's another test we might explore to see whether they have distinct mean temperatures?

> Answer: We could conduct a two-sample t-test to compare the mean temperatures of Peter Lake and Paul Lake. The null hypothesis would state that the mean temperatures of Peter Lake and Paul Lake are equal, and the alternative hypothesis would state that they have different mean temperatures.

18. Wrangle the July data to include only records for Crampton Lake and Ward Lake. Run the two-sample T-test on these data to determine whether their July temperature are same or different. What does the test say? Are the mean temperatures for the lakes equal? Does that match you answer for part 16?

```r
#wrangle july data
crampton.and.ward <- ntl.lter.july %>%
  filter(lakename %in% c("Crampton Lake", "Ward Lake"))
```

```r
#run test
temps.twosample <-
  t.test(crampton.and.ward$temperature_C ~ crampton.and.ward$lakename)
temps.twosample
```

```
##
##  Welch Two Sample t-test
##
## data:  crampton.and.ward$temperature_C by crampton.and.ward$lakename
## t = 1.1181, df = 200.37, p-value = 0.2649
## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means between group Crampton Lake and group Ward Lake is n
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  -0.6821129  2.4686451
## sample estimates:
## mean in group Crampton Lake     mean in group Ward Lake
##                    15.35189                    14.45862
```

> Answer: The null hypothesis states that the difference between the mean temperatures for Crampton Lake and Ward Lake is zero, and the alternative hypothesis states that the difference between the mean temperatures of both lakes is not zero. According to the t-test, the p-value is 0.2649, greater than 0.05, so we fail to reject the null hypothesis. In other words, the mean temperatures for Crampton Lake and Ward Lake are statistically the same.