

Chapter 8: Multiple and logistic regression

OpenIntro Statistics, 3rd Edition

Slides developed by Mine Çetinkaya-Rundel of OpenIntro.

The slides may be copied, edited, and/or shared via the CC BY-SA license.

Some images may be included under fair use guidelines (educational purposes).

Introduction to multiple regression

Multiple regression

- Simple linear regression: Bivariate - two variables: y and x
- Multiple linear regression: Multiple variables: y and x_1, x_2, \dots
Still only 1 response y

Weights of books

	weight (g)	volume (cm ³)	cover
1	800	885	hc
2	950	1016	hc
3	1050	1125	hc
4	350	239	hc
5	750	701	hc
6	600	641	hc
7	1075	1228	hc
8	250	412	pb
9	700	953	pb
10	650	929	pb
11	975	1492	pb
12	350	419	pb
13	950	1010	pb
14	425	595	pb
15	725	1034	pb


Cover is a categorical variable

*It has 2 values: hc, pb
This will introduce
Logistic Regression*



Weights of books (cont.)

The scatterplot shows the relationship between weights and volumes of books as well as the regression output. Which of the below is correct?



- (a) Weights of 80% of the books can be predicted accurately using this model.
- (b) *Books that are 10 cm³ over average are expected to weigh 7 g over average.*
- (c) The correlation between weight and volume is $R = 0.80^2 = 0.64$.
- (d) The model underestimates the weight of the book with the highest volume.

Modeling weights of books using volume

somewhat abbreviated output...

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	107.67931	88.37758	1.218	0.245
volume	0.70864	0.09746	7.271	6.26e-06


Residual standard error: 123.9 on 13 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.8026, Adjusted R-squared: 0.7875

F-statistic: 52.87 on 1 and 13 DF, p-value: 6.262e-06

Weights of hardcover and paperback books


Can you identify a trend in the relationship between volume and weight of hardcover and paperback books?



Weights of hardcover and paperback books

Can you identify a trend in the relationship between volume and weight of hardcover and paperback books?

Paperbacks generally weigh less than hardcover books after controlling for the book's volume.



Modeling weights of books using volume and cover type

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	197.96284	59.19274	3.344	0.005841	**
volume	0.71795	0.06153	11.669	6.6e-08	***
cover:pb	-184.04727	40.49420	-4.545	0.000672	***

Residual standard error: 78.2 on 12 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.9275, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9154

F-statistic: 76.73 on 2 and 12 DF, p-value: 1.455e-07

Determining the reference level

Based on the regression output below, which level of cover is the reference level? Note that pb: paperback.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.9628	59.1927	3.34	0.0058
volume	0.7180	0.0615	11.67	0.0000
cover:pb	-184.0473	40.4942	-4.55	0.0007

- (a) paperback
- (b) *hardcover*

Determining the reference level

Which of the below correctly describes the roles of variables in this regression model?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.9628	59.1927	3.34	0.0058
volume	0.7180	0.0615	11.67	0.0000
cover:pb	-184.0473	40.4942	-4.55	0.0007

- (a) response: weight, explanatory: volume, paperback cover
- (b) response: weight, explanatory: volume, hardcover cover
- (c) response: volume, explanatory: weight, cover type
- (d) *response: weight, explanatory: volume, cover type*

Linear model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

Linear model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

$$\widehat{weight} = 197.96 + 0.72 \textit{volume} - 184.05 \textit{cover : pb}$$

Linear model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

$$\widehat{weight} = 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \text{ cover : pb}$$

1. For *hardcover* books: plug in *0* for cover

$$\widehat{weight} = 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \times 0$$

Linear model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

$$\widehat{weight} = 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \text{ cover : pb}$$

1. For *hardcover* books: plug in *0* for cover

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{weight} &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \times 0 \\ &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume}\end{aligned}$$

Linear model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

$$\widehat{weight} = 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \text{ cover : pb}$$

1. For *hardcover* books: plug in *0* for cover

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{weight} &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \times 0 \\ &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume}\end{aligned}$$

2. For *paperback* books: plug in *1* for cover

$$\widehat{weight} = 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \times 1$$

Linear model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

$$\widehat{\text{weight}} = 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \text{ cover : pb}$$


1. For *hardcover* books: plug in *0* for cover

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\text{weight}} &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \times 0 \\ &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume}\end{aligned}$$

2. For *paperback* books: plug in *1* for cover

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\text{weight}} &= 197.96 + 0.72 \text{ volume} - 184.05 \times 1 \\ &= 13.91 + 0.72 \text{ volume}\end{aligned}$$

Visualising the linear model



Interpretation of the regression coefficients

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

Interpretation of the regression coefficients

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

- *Slope of volume:* All else held constant, books that are 1 more cubic centimeter in volume tend to weigh about 0.72 grams more.

Interpretation of the regression coefficients

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

- *Slope of volume:* All else held constant, books that are 1 more cubic centimeter in volume tend to weigh about 0.72 grams more.
- *Slope of cover:* All else held constant, the model predicts that paperback books weigh 184 grams lower than hardcover books.

Interpretation of the regression coefficients

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

- *Slope of volume:* All else held constant, books that are 1 more cubic centimeter in volume tend to weigh about 0.72 grams more.
- *Slope of cover:* All else held constant, the model predicts that paperback books weigh 184 grams lower than hardcover books.
- *Intercept:* Hardcover books with no volume are expected on average to weigh 198 grams.

Interpretation of the regression coefficients

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

- *Slope of volume:* All else held constant, books that are 1 more cubic centimeter in volume tend to weigh about 0.72 grams more.
- *Slope of cover:* All else held constant, the model predicts that paperback books weigh 184 grams lower than hardcover books.
- *Intercept:* Hardcover books with no volume are expected on average to weigh 198 grams.
 - Obviously, the intercept does not make sense in context. It only serves to adjust the height of the line.

Prediction

Which of the following is the correct calculation for the predicted weight of a paperback book that is 600 cm³?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

- (a) $197.96 + 0.72 * 600 - 184.05 * 1$
- (b) $184.05 + 0.72 * 600 - 197.96 * 1$
- (c) $197.96 + 0.72 * 600 - 184.05 * 0$
- (d) $197.96 + 0.72 * 1 - 184.05 * 600$

Prediction

Which of the following is the correct calculation for the predicted weight of a paperback book that is 600 cm³?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	197.96	59.19	3.34	0.01
volume	0.72	0.06	11.67	0.00
cover:pb	-184.05	40.49	-4.55	0.00

- (a) $197.96 + 0.72 * 600 - 184.05 * 1 = 445.91 \text{ grams}$
- (b) $184.05 + 0.72 * 600 - 197.96 * 1$
- (c) $197.96 + 0.72 * 600 - 184.05 * 0$
- (d) $197.96 + 0.72 * 1 - 184.05 * 600$

Another example: Modeling kid's test scores

Predicting cognitive test scores of three- and four-year-old children using characteristics of their mothers. Data are from a survey of adult American women and their children - a subsample from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth.

	kid_score	mom_hs	mom_iq	mom_work	mom_age
1	65	yes	121.12	yes	27
⋮					
5	115	yes	92.75	yes	27
6	98	no	107.90	no	18
⋮					
434	70	yes	91.25	yes	25

Gelman, Hill. *Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models*. (2007) Cambridge University Press.

Interpreting the slope

What is the correct interpretation of the slope for mom's IQ?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	19.59	9.22	2.13	0.03
mom_hs:yes	5.09	2.31	2.20	0.03
mom_iq	0.56	0.06	9.26	0.00
mom_work:yes	2.54	2.35	1.08	0.28
mom_age	0.22	0.33	0.66	0.51

, kids with mothers whose IQs are one point higher tend to score on average 0.56 points higher.

Interpreting the slope

What is the correct interpretation of the slope for mom's IQ?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	19.59	9.22	2.13	0.03
mom_hs:yes	5.09	2.31	2.20	0.03
mom_iq	0.56	0.06	9.26	0.00
mom_work:yes	2.54	2.35	1.08	0.28
mom_age	0.22	0.33	0.66	0.51

All else held constant, kids with mothers whose IQs are one point higher tend to score on average 0.56 points higher.

Interpreting the slope

What is the correct interpretation of the intercept?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	19.59	9.22	2.13	0.03
mom_hs:yes	5.09	2.31	2.20	0.03
mom_iq	0.56	0.06	9.26	0.00
mom_work:yes	2.54	2.35	1.08	0.28
mom_age	0.22	0.33	0.66	0.51

Interpreting the slope

What is the correct interpretation of the intercept?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	19.59	9.22	2.13	0.03
mom_hs:yes	5.09	2.31	2.20	0.03
mom_iq	0.56	0.06	9.26	0.00
mom_work:yes	2.54	2.35	1.08	0.28
mom_age	0.22	0.33	0.66	0.51

Kids whose moms haven't gone to HS, did not work during the first three years of the kid's life, have an IQ of 0 and are 0 yrs old are expected on average to score 19.59. Obviously, the intercept does not make any sense in context.

Interpreting the slope

What is the correct interpretation of the slope for mom_work?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	19.59	9.22	2.13	0.03
mom_hs:yes	5.09	2.31	2.20	0.03
mom_iq	0.56	0.06	9.26	0.00
mom_work:yes	2.54	2.35	1.08	0.28
mom_age	0.22	0.33	0.66	0.51

All else being equal, kids whose moms worked during the first three year's of the kid's life

- (a) are estimated to score 2.54 points lower
 - (b) are estimated to score 2.54 points higher
- than those whose moms did not work.

Interpreting the slope

What is the correct interpretation of the slope for mom_work?


	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	19.59	9.22	2.13	0.03
mom_hs:yes	5.09	2.31	2.20	0.03
mom_iq	0.56	0.06	9.26	0.00
mom_work:yes	2.54	2.35	1.08	0.28
mom_age	0.22	0.33	0.66	0.51

All else being equal, kids whose moms worked during the first three year's of the kid's life

- (a) are estimated to score 2.54 points lower
- (b) *are estimated to score 2.54 points higher*


than those whose moms did not work.

Revisit: Modeling poverty



Predicting poverty using % female householder

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	3.31	1.90	1.74	0.09
female_house	0.69	0.16	4.32	0.00



$$R = 0.53$$

$$R^2 = 0.53^2 = 0.28$$

Another look at R^2

R^2 can be calculated in three ways:

Another look at R^2

R^2 can be calculated in three ways:

1. square the correlation coefficient of x and y (how we have been calculating it)

Another look at R^2

R^2 can be calculated in three ways:

1. square the correlation coefficient of x and y (how we have been calculating it)
2. square the correlation coefficient of y and \hat{y}

Another look at R^2

R^2 can be calculated in three ways:

1. square the correlation coefficient of x and y (how we have been calculating it)
2. square the correlation coefficient of y and \hat{y}
3. based on definition:

$$R^2 = \frac{\text{explained variability in } y}{\text{total variability in } y}$$

Another look at R^2

R^2 can be calculated in three ways:

1. square the correlation coefficient of x and y (how we have been calculating it)
2. square the correlation coefficient of y and \hat{y}
3. based on definition:

$$R^2 = \frac{\text{explained variability in } y}{\text{total variability in } y}$$

Using **ANOVA** we can calculate the explained variability and total variability in y .

Sum of squares

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.68	0.00
Residuals	49	347.68	7.10		
Total	50	480.25			

Sum of squares

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.68	0.00
Residuals	49	347.68	7.10		
Total	50	480.25			

Sum of squares of y : $SS_{Total} = \sum (y - \bar{y})^2 = 480.25 \rightarrow \text{total variability}$

Sum of squares

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.68	0.00
Residuals	49	347.68	7.10		
Total	50	480.25			

Sum of squares of y : $SS_{Total} = \sum (y - \bar{y})^2 = 480.25 \rightarrow \text{total variability}$

Sum of squares of residuals: $SS_{Error} = \sum e_i^2 = 347.68 \rightarrow \text{unexplained variability}$

Sum of squares

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.68	0.00
Residuals	49	347.68	7.10		
Total	50	480.25			

$$\text{Sum of squares of } y: SS_{Total} = \sum (y - \bar{y})^2 = 480.25 \rightarrow \text{total variability}$$

$$\text{Sum of squares of residuals: } SS_{Error} = \sum e_i^2 = 347.68 \rightarrow \text{unexplained variability}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Sum of squares of } x: SS_{Model} &= SS_{Total} - SS_{Error} \rightarrow \text{explained variability} \\ &= 480.25 - 347.68 = 132.57\end{aligned}$$

Sum of squares

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.68	0.00
Residuals	49	347.68	7.10		
Total	50	480.25			

$$\text{Sum of squares of } y: SS_{Total} = \sum (y - \bar{y})^2 = 480.25 \rightarrow \text{total variability}$$

$$\text{Sum of squares of residuals: } SS_{Error} = \sum e_i^2 = 347.68 \rightarrow \text{unexplained variability}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Sum of squares of } x: SS_{Model} &= SS_{Total} - SS_{Error} \rightarrow \text{explained variability} \\ &= 480.25 - 347.68 = 132.57\end{aligned}$$

$$R^2 = \frac{\text{explained variability}}{\text{total variability}} = \frac{132.57}{480.25} = 0.28 \checkmark$$

Why bother?

Why bother with another approach for calculating R^2 when we had a perfectly good way to calculate it as the correlation coefficient squared?

Why bother?

Why bother with another approach for calculating R^2 when we had a perfectly good way to calculate it as the correlation coefficient squared?

- For single-predictor linear regression, having three ways to calculate the same value may seem like overkill.
- However, in multiple linear regression, we can't calculate R^2 as the square of the correlation between x and y because we have multiple x s.
- And next we'll learn another measure of explained variability, **adjusted R^2** , that requires the use of the third approach, ratio of explained and unexplained variability.

Predicting poverty using % female hh + % white

<i>Linear model:</i>	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-2.58	5.78	-0.45	0.66
female_house	0.89	0.24	3.67	0.00
white	0.04	0.04	1.08	0.29

<i>ANOVA:</i>	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.74	0.00
white	1	8.21	8.21	1.16	0.29
Residuals	48	339.47	7.07		
Total	50	480.25			


Predicting poverty using % female hh + % white

<i>Linear model:</i>	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-2.58	5.78	-0.45	0.66
female_house	0.89	0.24	3.67	0.00
white	0.04	0.04	1.08	0.29

<i>ANOVA:</i>	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.74	0.00
white	1	8.21	8.21	1.16	0.29
Residuals	48	339.47	7.07		
Total	50	480.25			

$$R^2 = \frac{\text{explained variability}}{\text{total variability}} = \frac{132.57 + 8.21}{480.25} = 0.29$$

Does adding the variable `white` to the model add valuable information that wasn't provided by `female_house`?



Collinearity between explanatory variables

poverty vs. % female head of household

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	3.31	1.90	1.74	0.09
female_house	0.69	0.16	4.32	0.00

poverty vs. % female head of household and % female hh

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-2.58	5.78	-0.45	0.66
female_house	0.89	0.24	3.67	0.00
white	0.04	0.04	1.08	0.29

Collinearity between explanatory variables

poverty vs. % female head of household

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	3.31	1.90	1.74	0.09
female_house	0.69	0.16	4.32	0.00

poverty vs. % female head of household and % female hh

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-2.58	5.78	-0.45	0.66
female_house	0.89	0.24	3.67	0.00
white	0.04	0.04	1.08	0.29

Collinearity between explanatory variables (cont.)

- Two predictor variables are said to be collinear when they are correlated, and this *collinearity* complicates model estimation.

Remember: Predictors are also called explanatory or independent variables. Ideally, they would be independent of each other.

Collinearity between explanatory variables (cont.)

- Two predictor variables are said to be collinear when they are correlated, and this *collinearity* complicates model estimation.

Remember: Predictors are also called explanatory or independent variables. Ideally, they would be independent of each other.

- We don't like adding predictors that are associated with each other to the model, because often times the addition of such variable brings nothing to the table. Instead, we prefer the simplest best model, i.e. *parsimonious* model.

Collinearity between explanatory variables (cont.)

- Two predictor variables are said to be collinear when they are correlated, and this *collinearity* complicates model estimation.
Remember: Predictors are also called explanatory or independent variables. Ideally, they would be independent of each other.
- We don't like adding predictors that are associated with each other to the model, because often times the addition of such variable brings nothing to the table. Instead, we prefer the simplest best model, i.e. *parsimonious* model.
- While it's impossible to avoid collinearity from arising in observational data, experiments are usually designed to prevent correlation among predictors.

R^2 vs. adjusted R^2

	R^2	Adjusted R^2
Model 1 (Single-predictor)	0.28	0.26
Model 2 (Multiple)	0.29	0.26

R^2 vs. adjusted R^2

	R^2	Adjusted R^2
Model 1 (Single-predictor)	0.28	0.26
Model 2 (Multiple)	0.29	0.26

- When any variable is added to the model R^2 increases.

R^2 vs. adjusted R^2

	R^2	Adjusted R^2
Model 1 (Single-predictor)	0.28	0.26
Model 2 (Multiple)	0.29	0.26

- When any variable is added to the model R^2 increases.
- But if the added variable doesn't really provide any new information, or is completely unrelated, adjusted R^2 does not increase.

Adjusted R^2

Adjusted R^2

$$R_{adj}^2 = 1 - \left(\frac{SS_{Error}}{SS_{Total}} \times \frac{n - 1}{n - p - 1} \right)$$

where n is the number of cases and p is the number of predictors (explanatory variables) in the model.

- Because p is never negative, R_{adj}^2 will always be smaller than R^2 .
- R_{adj}^2 applies a penalty for the number of predictors included in the model.
- Therefore, we choose models with higher R_{adj}^2 over others.

Calculate adjusted R^2

ANOVA:	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.74	0.0001
white	1	8.21	8.21	1.16	0.2868
Residuals	48	339.47	7.07		
Total	50	480.25			

$$R_{adj}^2 = 1 - \left(\frac{SS_{Error}}{SS_{Total}} \times \frac{n - 1}{n - p - 1} \right)$$

Calculate adjusted R^2

ANOVA:	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.74	0.0001
white	1	8.21	8.21	1.16	0.2868
Residuals	48	339.47	7.07		
Total	50	480.25			

$$\begin{aligned} R_{adj}^2 &= 1 - \left(\frac{SS_{Error}}{SS_{Total}} \times \frac{n - 1}{n - p - 1} \right) \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{339.47}{480.25} \times \frac{51 - 1}{51 - 2 - 1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Calculate adjusted R^2

ANOVA:	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.74	0.0001
white	1	8.21	8.21	1.16	0.2868
Residuals	48	339.47	7.07		
Total	50	480.25			

$$\begin{aligned} R_{adj}^2 &= 1 - \left(\frac{SS_{Error}}{SS_{Total}} \times \frac{n - 1}{n - p - 1} \right) \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{339.47}{480.25} \times \frac{51 - 1}{51 - 2 - 1} \right) \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{339.47}{480.25} \times \frac{50}{48} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Calculate adjusted R^2

ANOVA:	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.74	0.0001
white	1	8.21	8.21	1.16	0.2868
Residuals	48	339.47	7.07		
Total	50	480.25			

$$\begin{aligned} R_{adj}^2 &= 1 - \left(\frac{SS_{Error}}{SS_{Total}} \times \frac{n - 1}{n - p - 1} \right) \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{339.47}{480.25} \times \frac{51 - 1}{51 - 2 - 1} \right) \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{339.47}{480.25} \times \frac{50}{48} \right) \\ &= 1 - 0.74 \end{aligned}$$

Calculate adjusted R^2

ANOVA:	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
female_house	1	132.57	132.57	18.74	0.0001
white	1	8.21	8.21	1.16	0.2868
Residuals	48	339.47	7.07		
Total	50	480.25			

$$\begin{aligned} R_{adj}^2 &= 1 - \left(\frac{SS_{Error}}{SS_{Total}} \times \frac{n - 1}{n - p - 1} \right) \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{339.47}{480.25} \times \frac{51 - 1}{51 - 2 - 1} \right) \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{339.47}{480.25} \times \frac{50}{48} \right) \\ &= 1 - 0.74 \\ &= 0.26 \end{aligned}$$

Model selection


Beauty in the classroom

- Data: Student evaluations of instructors' beauty and teaching quality for 463 courses at the University of Texas.
- Evaluations conducted at the end of semester, and the beauty judgements were made later, by six students who had not attended the classes and were not aware of the course evaluations (2 upper level females, 2 upper level males, one lower level female, one lower level male).

Hamermesh & Parker. (2004) "Beauty in the classroom: instructors' pulchritude and putative pedagogical productivity" *Economics Education Review*.

Professor rating vs. beauty

Professor evaluation score (higher score means better) vs. beauty score (a score of 0 means average, negative score means below average, and a positive score above average):



Which of the below is correct based on the model output?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	4.19	0.03	167.24	0.00
beauty	0.13	0.03	4.00	0.00

$$R^2 = 0.0336$$

- (a) Model predicts 3.36% of professor ratings correctly.
- (b) Beauty is not a significant predictor of professor evaluation.
- (c) Professors who score 1 point above average in their beauty score are tend to also score 0.13 points higher in their evaluation.
- (d) 3.36% of variability in beauty scores can be explained by professor evaluation.
- (e) The correlation coefficient could be $\sqrt{0.0336} = 0.18$ or -0.18 , we can't tell which is correct.

Which of the below is correct based on the model output?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	4.19	0.03	167.24	0.00
beauty	0.13	0.03	4.00	0.00


$$R^2 = 0.0336$$

- (a) Model predicts 3.36% of professor ratings correctly.
- (b) Beauty is not a significant predictor of professor evaluation.
- (c) *Professors who score 1 point above average in their beauty score are tend to also score 0.13 points higher in their evaluation.*
- (d) 3.36% of variability in beauty scores can be explained by professor evaluation.
- (e) The correlation coefficient could be $\sqrt{0.0336} = 0.18$ or -0.18 , we can't tell which is correct.

Exploratory analysis

Any interesting features?

For a given beauty score,
are male professors evaluated
higher, lower, or about the same as female professors?




Exploratory analysis

Any interesting features?

Few females with very low beauty scores.

For a given beauty score, are male professors evaluated higher, lower, or about the same as female professors?




Exploratory analysis

Any interesting features?

Few females with very low beauty scores.

For a given beauty score, are male professors evaluated higher, lower, or about the same as female professors?

Difficult to tell from this plot only.



Professor rating vs. beauty + gender

For a given beauty score, are male professors evaluated higher, lower, or about the same as female professors?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	4.09	0.04	107.85	0.00
beauty	0.14	0.03	4.44	0.00
gender.male	0.17	0.05	3.38	0.00

$R^2_{adj} = 0.057$

- (a) higher
- (b) lower
- (c) about the same

Professor rating vs. beauty + gender

For a given beauty score, are male professors evaluated higher, lower, or about the same as female professors?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	4.09	0.04	107.85	0.00
beauty	0.14	0.03	4.44	0.00
gender.male	0.17	0.05	3.38	0.00

$R^2_{adj} = 0.057$

- (a) *higher → Beauty held constant, male professors are rated 0.17 points higher on average than female professors.*
- (b) lower
- (c) about the same

Full model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	4.6282	0.1720	26.90	0.00
beauty	0.1080	0.0329	3.28	0.00
gender.male	0.2040	0.0528	3.87	0.00
age	-0.0089	0.0032	-2.75	0.01
formal.yes ¹	0.1511	0.0749	2.02	0.04
lower.yes ²	0.0582	0.0553	1.05	0.29
native.non english	-0.2158	0.1147	-1.88	0.06
minority.yes	-0.0707	0.0763	-0.93	0.35
students ³	-0.0004	0.0004	-1.03	0.30
tenure.tenure track ⁴	-0.1933	0.0847	-2.28	0.02
tenure.tenured	-0.1574	0.0656	-2.40	0.02

¹ formal: picture wearing tie&jacket/blouse, levels: yes, no

² lower: lower division course, levels: yes, no

³ students: number of students

⁴ tenure: tenure status, levels: non-tenure track, tenure track, tenured

Hypotheses

Just as the interpretation of the slope parameters take into account all other variables in the model, the hypotheses for testing for significance of a predictor also takes into account all other variables.

$H_0 : B_i = 0$ when other explanatory variables are included in the model.

$H_A : B_i \neq 0$ when other explanatory variables are included in the model.

Assessing significance: numerical variables

The p-value for age is 0.01. What does this indicate?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
...				
age	-0.0089	0.0032	-2.75	0.01
...				

- (a) Since p-value is positive, higher the professor's age, the higher we would expect them to be rated.
- (b) If we keep all other variables in the model, there is strong evidence that professor's age is associated with their rating.
- (c) Probability that the true slope parameter for age is 0 is 0.01.
- (d) There is about 1% chance that the true slope parameter for age is -0.0089.

Assessing significance: numerical variables

The p-value for age is 0.01. What does this indicate?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
...				
age	-0.0089	0.0032	-2.75	0.01
...				

- (a) Since p-value is positive, higher the professor's age, the higher we would expect them to be rated.
- (b) *If we keep all other variables in the model, there is strong evidence that professor's age is associated with their rating.*
- (c) Probability that the true slope parameter for age is 0 is 0.01.
- (d) There is about 1% chance that the true slope parameter for age is -0.0089.

Assessing significance: categorical variables

Tenure is a categorical variable with 3 levels: non tenure track, tenure track, tenured. Based on the model output given, which of the below is false?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
...				
tenure.tenure track	-0.1933	0.0847	-2.28	0.02
tenure.tenured	-0.1574	0.0656	-2.40	0.02

- (a) Reference level is non tenure track.
- (b) All else being equal, tenure track professors are rated, on average, 0.19 points lower than non-tenure track professors.
- (c) All else being equal, tenured professors are rated, on average, 0.16 points lower than non-tenure track professors.
- (d) All else being equal, there is a significant difference between the average ratings of tenure track and tenured professors.

Assessing significance: categorical variables

Tenure is a categorical variable with 3 levels: non tenure track, tenure track, tenured. Based on the model output given, which of the below is false?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
...				
tenure.tenure track	-0.1933	0.0847	-2.28	0.02
tenure.tenured	-0.1574	0.0656	-2.40	0.02

- (a) Reference level is non tenure track.
- (b) All else being equal, tenure track professors are rated, on average, 0.19 points lower than non-tenure track professors.
- (c) All else being equal, tenured professors are rated, on average, 0.16 points lower than non-tenure track professors.
- (d) *All else being equal, there is a significant difference between the average ratings of tenure track and tenured professors.*

Assessing significance

Which predictors do not seem to meaningfully contribute to the model, i.e. may not be significant predictors of professor's rating score?

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	4.6282	0.1720	26.90	0.00
beauty	0.1080	0.0329	3.28	0.00
gender.male	0.2040	0.0528	3.87	0.00
age	-0.0089	0.0032	-2.75	0.01
formal.yes	0.1511	0.0749	2.02	0.04
lower.yes	0.0582	0.0553	1.05	0.29
native.non english	-0.2158	0.1147	-1.88	0.06
minority.yes	-0.0707	0.0763	-0.93	0.35
students	-0.0004	0.0004	-1.03	0.30
tenure.tenure track	-0.1933	0.0847	-2.28	0.02
tenure.tenured	-0.1574	0.0656	-2.40	0.02

Model selection strategies

Based on what we've learned so far, what are some ways you can think of that can be used to determine which variables to keep in the model and which to leave out?

Backward-elimination

1. R^2_{adj} approach:

- Start with the full model
- Drop one variable at a time and record R^2_{adj} of each smaller model
- Pick the model with the highest increase in R^2_{adj}
- Repeat until none of the models yield an increase in R^2_{adj}

2. p-value approach:

- Start with the full model
- Drop the variable with the highest p-value and refit a smaller model
- Repeat until all variables left in the model are significant

Backward-elimination: R^2_{adj} approach

Step	Variables included	R^2_{adj}
Full	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0839

Backward-elimination: R^2_{adj} approach

Step	Variables included	R^2_{adj}
Full	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0839
Step 1	gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0642
	beauty + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0557
	beauty + gender + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0706
	beauty + gender + age + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0777
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0837
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + minority + students + tenure	0.0788
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0842
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + tenure	0.0838
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students	0.0733

Backward-elimination: R^2_{adj} approach

Step	Variables included	R^2_{adj}
Full	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0839
Step 1	gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0642
	beauty + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0557
	beauty + gender + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0706
	beauty + gender + age + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0777
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0837
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + minority + students + tenure	0.0788
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0842
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + tenure	0.0838
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students	0.0733
Step 2	gender + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0647
	beauty + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0543
	beauty + gender + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0708
	beauty + gender + age + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0776
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + students + tenure	0.0846
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + tenure	0.0844
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + students	0.0725

Backward-elimination: R^2_{adj} approach

Step	Variables included	R^2_{adj}
Full	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0839
Step 1	gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0642
	beauty + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0557
	beauty + gender + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0706
	beauty + gender + age + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0777
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0837
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + minority + students + tenure	0.0788
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0842
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + tenure	0.0838
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students	0.0733
Step 2	gender + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0647
	beauty + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0543
	beauty + gender + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0708
	beauty + gender + age + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0776
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + students + tenure	0.0846
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + tenure	0.0844
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + students	0.0725
Step 3	gender + age + formal + native + students + tenure	0.0653
	beauty + age + formal + native + students + tenure	0.0534
	beauty + gender + formal + native + students + tenure	0.0707
	beauty + gender + age + native + students + tenure	0.0786
	beauty + gender + age + formal + students + tenure	0.0756
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + tenure	0.0855
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + students	0.0713

Backward-elimination: R^2_{adj} approach

Step	Variables included	R^2_{adj}
Full	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0839
Step 1	gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0642
	beauty + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0557
	beauty + gender + formal + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0706
	beauty + gender + age + lower + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0777
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + minority + students + tenure	0.0837
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + minority + students + tenure	0.0788
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0842
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + tenure	0.0838
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + minority + students	0.0733
Step 2	gender + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0647
	beauty + age + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0543
	beauty + gender + formal + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0708
	beauty + gender + age + lower + native + students + tenure	0.0776
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + students + tenure	0.0846
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + tenure	0.0844
	beauty + gender + age + formal + lower + native + students	0.0725
Step 3	gender + age + formal + native + students + tenure	0.0653
	beauty + age + formal + native + students + tenure	0.0534
	beauty + gender + formal + native + students + tenure	0.0707
	beauty + gender + age + native + students + tenure	0.0786
	beauty + gender + age + formal + students + tenure	0.0756
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + tenure	0.0855
	beauty + gender + age + formal + native + students	0.0713
Step 4	gender + age + formal + native + tenure	0.0667
	beauty + age + formal + native + tenure	0.0553
	beauty + gender + formal + native + tenure	0.0723
	beauty + gender + age + native + tenure	0.0806

step function in R

Call:

```
lm(formula = profevaluation ~ beauty + gender + age + formal +  
    native + tenure, data = d)
```

Coefficients:

	beauty	gendermale
(Intercept)	4.628435	0.208079
age	0.105546	formalyes
-0.008844	0.132422	nativenon english
tenure	tenure track	-0.243003
-0.206784	tenure tenured	
	-0.175967	

step function in R

Call:

```
lm(formula = profevaluation ~ beauty + gender + age + formal +  
    native + tenure, data = d)
```

Coefficients:

	(Intercept)	beauty	gendermale
	4.628435	0.105546	0.208079
age		formalyes	nativenon english
-0.008844		0.132422	-0.243003
tenure	tenure track	tenuretenured	
-0.206784		-0.175967	

Best model: beauty + gender + age + formal + native + tenure

Backward-elimination: p – value approach

Step	Variables included & p-value										
	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native	minority	students	tenure	tenure	tenure
Full	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01	formal yes 0.04	lower yes 0.29	native non english 0.06	minority yes 0.35	students 0.30	tenure tenure track 0.02	tenure tenured 0.02	

Backward-elimination: p – value approach

Step	Variables included & p-value										
	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native	minority	students	tenure	tenure	tenure
Full	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native	minority	students	tenure	tenure	tenure
	male			yes	yes	non english	yes		tenure track		tenured
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.29	0.06	0.35	0.30	0.02	0.02	0.02
Step 1	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native		students	tenure	tenure	tenured
	male			yes	yes	non english			tenure track		tenured
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.38	0.03		0.34	0.02	0.02	0.02

Backward-elimination: p – value approach

Step	Variables included & p-value										
	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native	minority	students	tenure	tenure	tenure
Full		male		yes	yes	non english	yes		tenure track	tenure track	tenured
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.29	0.06	0.35	0.30	0.02	0.02	0.02
Step 1	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native		students	tenure	tenure	tenured
	male			yes	yes	non english			tenure track	tenure track	tenured
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.38	0.03		0.34	0.02	0.02	0.02
Step 2	beauty	gender	age	formal		native		students	tenure	tenure	tenured
	male			yes		non english			tenure track	tenure track	tenured
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.05		0.02		0.44	0.01	0.01	0.01

Backward-elimination: p – value approach

Step	Variables included & p-value										
	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native	minority	students	tenure	tenure track	tenured
Full	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01	formal yes 0.04	lower yes 0.29	native non english 0.06	minority yes 0.35	students 0.30	tenure tenure track 0.02	tenured 0.02	tenured 0.02
Step 1	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01	formal yes 0.04	lower yes 0.38	native non english 0.03	students 0.34	tenure tenure track 0.02	tenured 0.02	tenured 0.02	tenured 0.02
Step 2	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01	formal yes 0.05	native non english 0.02	students 0.44	tenure tenure track 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01
Step 3	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01	formal yes 0.06	native non english 0.02	students 0.44	tenure tenure track 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01

Backward-elimination: p – value approach

Step	Variables included & p-value										
	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native	minority	students	tenure	tenure	tenure
Full		male		yes	yes	non english	yes		tenure track	tenure track	tenure track
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.29	0.06	0.35	0.30	0.02	0.02	0.02
Step 1	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native		students	tenure	tenure	tenure
	male			yes	yes	non english			tenure track	tenure track	tenure track
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.38	0.03		0.34	0.02	0.02	0.02
Step 2	beauty	gender	age	formal		native		students	tenure	tenure	tenure
	male			yes		non english			tenure track	tenure track	tenure track
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.05		0.02			0.01	0.01	0.01
Step 3	beauty	gender	age	formal		native			tenure	tenure	tenure
	male			yes		non english			tenure track	tenure track	tenure track
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.06		0.02			0.01	0.01	0.01
Step 4	beauty	gender	age			native			tenure	tenure	tenure
	male					non english			tenure track	tenure track	tenure track
	0.00	0.00	0.01			0.06			0.01	0.01	0.01

Backward-elimination: p – value approach

Step	Variables included & p-value										
	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native	minority	students	tenure	tenure	tenure
Full		male		yes	yes	non english	yes		tenure track	tenure	tenure
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.29	0.06	0.35	0.30	0.02	0.02	0.02
Step 1	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native		students	tenure	tenure	tenure
	male			yes	yes	non english			tenure track	tenure	tenure
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.38	0.03		0.34	0.02	0.02	0.02
Step 2	beauty	gender	age	formal		native		students	tenure	tenure	tenure
	male			yes		non english			tenure track	tenure	tenure
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.05		0.02			0.44	0.01	0.01
Step 3	beauty	gender	age	formal		native			tenure	tenure	tenure
	male			yes		non english			tenure track	tenure	tenure
	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.06		0.02			0.01	0.01	0.01
Step 4	beauty	gender	age			native			tenure	tenure	tenure
	male					non english			tenure track	tenure	tenure
	0.00	0.00	0.01			0.06			0.01	0.01	0.01
Step 5	beauty	gender	age						tenure	tenure	tenure
	male								tenure track	tenure	tenure
	0.00	0.00	0.01						0.01	0.01	0.01

Backward-elimination: p – value approach

Step	Variables included & p-value										
	beauty	gender	age	formal	lower	native	minority	students	tenure	tenure track	tenured
Full	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01	formal yes 0.04	lower yes 0.29	native non english 0.06	minority yes 0.35	students 0.30	tenure tenure track 0.02	tenured 0.02	tenured 0.02
Step 1	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01	formal yes 0.04	lower yes 0.38	native non english 0.03	students 0.34	tenure tenure track 0.02	tenured 0.02	tenured 0.02	tenured 0.02
Step 2	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01	formal yes 0.05	native non english 0.02	students 0.44	tenure tenure track 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01
Step 3	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01	formal yes 0.06	native non english 0.02	tenure tenure track 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01
Step 4	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01		native non english 0.06	tenure tenure track 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01
Step 5	beauty 0.00	gender male 0.00	age 0.01			tenure tenure track 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01	tenured 0.01

Best model: beauty + gender + age + tenure

Forward-selection

1. R^2_{adj} approach:

- Start with regressions of response vs. each explanatory variable
- Pick the model with the highest R^2_{adj}
- Add the remaining variables one at a time to the existing model, and once again pick the model with the highest R^2_{adj}
- Repeat until the addition of any of the remaining variables does not result in a higher R^2_{adj}

2. p – value approach:

- Start with regressions of response vs. each explanatory variable
- Pick the variable with the lowest significant p-value
- Add the remaining variables one at a time to the existing model, and pick the variable with the lowest significant p-value
- Repeat until any of the remaining variables does not have a significant p-value

In forward-selection the p-value approach isn't any simpler.

Selected model

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	4.6284	0.1673	27.66	0.00
beauty	0.1055	0.0328	3.21	0.00
gender.male	0.2081	0.0519	4.01	0.00
age	-0.0088	0.0032	-2.75	0.01
formal.yes	0.1324	0.0714	1.85	0.06
native:non english	-0.2430	0.1080	-2.25	0.02
tenure:tenure track	-0.2068	0.0839	-2.46	0.01
tenure:tenured	-0.1760	0.0641	-2.74	0.01

Checking model conditions using graphs

Modeling conditions

$$\hat{y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \cdots + \beta_p x_p$$


The model depends on the following conditions

1. residuals are nearly normal (primary concern relates to residuals that are outliers)
2. residuals have constant variability
3. residuals are independent
4. each variable is linearly related to the outcome

We often use graphical methods to check the validity of these conditions, which we will go through in detail in the following slides.

(1) nearly normal residuals


normal probability plot and/or histogram of residuals:



Does this condition appear to be satisfied?

(2) constant variability in residuals

scatterplot of residuals and/or absolute value of residuals vs. fitted (predicted):



Does this condition appear to be satisfied?

Checking constant variance - recap

- When we did simple linear regression (one explanatory variable) we checked the constant variance condition using a plot of *residuals vs. x*.
- With multiple linear regression (2+ explanatory variables) we checked the constant variance condition using a plot of *residuals vs. fitted*.

Why are we using different plots?

Checking constant variance - recap


- When we did simple linear regression (one explanatory variable) we checked the constant variance condition using a plot of *residuals vs. x*.
- With multiple linear regression (2+ explanatory variables) we checked the constant variance condition using a plot of *residuals vs. fitted*.

Why are we using different plots?

In multiple linear regression there are many explanatory variables, so a plot of residuals vs. one of them wouldn't give us the complete picture.

(3) independent residuals

scatterplot of residuals vs. order of data collection:




Does this condition appear to be satisfied?

More on the condition of independent residuals

- Checking for independent residuals allows us to indirectly check for independent observations.
- If observations and residuals are independent, we would not expect to see an increasing or decreasing trend in the scatterplot of residuals vs. order of data collection.
- This condition is often violated when we have time series data. Such data require more advanced time series regression techniques for proper analysis.

(4) linear relationships

scatterplot of residuals vs. each (numerical) explanatory variable:



Does this condition appear to be satisfied?

Note: We use residuals instead of the predictors on the y-axis so that we can still check for linearity without worrying about other possible violations like collinearity between the predictors.