Automatic vs Manual Transmission on MPG

Regression Models Course Project

Xinchun Tian

Context

Exerpt from Regression Models Course Project.

Suppose I work for Motor Trend, a magazine about the automobile industry. I was asked to Look at a data set of a collection of cars in exploring the relationship between a set of variables and miles per gallon (MPG) (outcome), particularly interested in answering the following two questions:

- 1. Is an automatic or manual transmission better for MPG?
- 2. Quantify the MPG difference between automatic and manual transmissions.

Let's load the "mtcars" data and examine the first couple of rows.

```
library(datasets)
data(mtcars)
head(mtcars)
```

```
##
                     mpg cyl disp hp drat
                                              wt qsec vs am gear carb
                           6 160 110 3.90 2.620 16.46
## Mazda RX4
                    21.0
## Mazda RX4 Wag
                    21.0
                           6 160 110 3.90 2.875 17.02
                                                                     4
## Datsun 710
                    22.8
                          4 108 93 3.85 2.320 18.61
                                                                     1
## Hornet 4 Drive
                    21.4
                           6 258 110 3.08 3.215 19.44
                           8 360 175 3.15 3.440 17.02
                                                                3
                                                                     2
## Hornet Sportabout 18.7
## Valiant
                     18.1
                              225 105 2.76 3.460 20.22 1
```

The data look clean and there are no missing values as checked by "is.na" is 0.

The "am" column tells one car is automatic (0) or manual (1).

The automatic and manual samples are independent samples. The MPG mean and variance for automatic and manual cars are $\bar{X}_{automatic}$ =17.15, $s_{automatic}^2$ =14.7, \bar{X}_{manual} =24.39, s_{manual}^2 =38.03. There are 19 cars in automatic sample, and 13 cars in manual sample.

The pooled variance estimator and standard deviation estimator can be calculated as

```
vp <- (autocars_mpgvar*(n1-1) + manualcars_mpgvar*(n2-1))/(n1+n2-2)
sp <- sqrt(vp)</pre>
```

which are 24.03 and 4.9.

The 95% confidence MPG interval of (manual - automatic) can be caluclated as:

```
interval <- manualcars_mpgmean - autocars_mpgmean + c(-1,1) * qt(0.975, n1+n2-2) * sp * (1/n1 + 1/n2)^0.5
```

Because the interval [3.64, 10.85] is entirely above zero, therefore the conclusion is that manual transmission is better for MPG.

Consider the linear model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + X_{i1}\beta_1 + \epsilon_i, \tag{1}$$

where each X_{i1} is either automatic (0) or manual (1) so that it is a 1 if measurement i is in manual group and 0 in automatic group. Let us use the linear model fit to quantify the change in means between the automatic and manual groups. The automatic group is chosen as the reference category.

```
summary(lm(mpg~am, data=mtcars))$coef
```

```
## Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 17.147368 1.124603 15.247492 1.133983e-15
## am 7.244939 1.764422 4.106127 2.850207e-04
```

The above table shows that the coefficient for "am" which is 7.24 is the estimated increase in MPG from group 0 or automatic to group 1 or manual. The following plot shows the comparison of the means with 1 standard deviation intervals for automatic (black) and manual (red).

