How to: know if your model is good

Pseudo-R2

In linear models you can estimate the share of the variance explained by the model.

But as we already know, no variance can be observed in logistic models.

Nevertheless, logistic models have *likelihood*.

So, you can compare the likelihood of your model to the likelihood of the empty model and that is pseudo-R2 (here's the formula for McFadden's R2):

$$R_{MF}^2 = \frac{Log(L_m)}{Log(L_0)}$$

Values > 0.1 indicate acceptable fit; values 0.2<r<0.4 indicate excellent fit.

PCP and ePCP

You can also look at how good is your model at predicting real values PCP (percent of correctly predicted) and ePCP (expected percent of correctly predicted) show if your model works well.

- 1. Set the threshold for the probability values (usually it's 0.5 but you can change it). Values above the threshold predict 1, values below the threshold predict 0.
- Compare predicted values to the real ones. Calculate the percent of correctly predicted values. If it's below 0.5 – your model works worse than random prediction. PCP and ePCP > 0.7 indicate good fit.

How to: do it in R

Generalized linear models

For binomial regressions we are going to use *glm* function Let's have a look at this function using *Greene* data from package *car*.

This data frame contains the following columns:

- *rater* judgment of independent rater; a factor with levels: no, case has no merit; yes, case has some merit (leave to appeal should be granted).
- *decision* judge's decision; a factor with levels: no, leave to appeal not granted; yes, leave to appeal granted.
- language language of case; a factor with levels: English, French.
- *location* location of original refugee claim; afactor with levels: Montreal, other, Toronto.
- **success** logit of success rate, for all cases from the applicant's nation.

Let's predict the decision!

M1 = glm(decision ~ success + rater + language + location, data = Greene, family = binomial(link = logit))

Specify the type of your model (don't forget, or you will get an OLS model instead)

Specify the link function (let's have logit)

```
call:
glm(formula = decision \sim success + rater + language + location,
   family = binomial(link = logit), data = Greene)
Deviance Residuals:
   Min
            1Q Median
                            3Q
                                    Max
-1.6754 -0.8228 -0.5337 1.0403 2.6341
Coefficients:
              Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept)
               -0.2635
                          0.5918 - 0.445
                                          0.656
            1.3501 0.2695 5.010 5.45e-07 ***
success
        1.1889 0.2468 4.816 1.46e-06 ***
rateryes
languageFrench -0.3513 0.5670 -0.619 0.536
locationother 0.6408 0.6316 1.015 0.310
locationToronto 0.4237 0.5685 0.745 0.456
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
(Dispersion parameter for binomial family taken to be 1)
```

Let's check for multicollinearity

```
> vif(m1)

GVIF Df GVIF^(1/(2*Df))

success 1.108675 1 1.052936

rater 1.013855 1 1.006904

language 4.262896 1 2.064678

location 4.464368 2 1.453584
```

Choose between language and location

Let's keep language, then:

Call:

Deviance Residuals:

```
Min 1Q Median 3Q Max -1.6589 -0.8362 -0.5264 1.0393 2.5949
```

Coefficients:

```
> exp(coef(m2))
   (Intercept)
                                 rateryes languageFrench
                    success
    1.1546335
                  3.6709978
                                3.2235083 0.4692407
>library(margins)
> margins(m2)
Average marginal effects
glm(formula = decision ~ success + rater + language, family =
binomial(link = logit), data = Greene)
 success rateryes languageFrench
  0.2303 0.2275
                         -0.1268
```

Let's make our output beautiful:

```
> library(stargazer)
```

```
> stargazer(m2, type = 'text', apply.coef = exp, report = "vc*", se = NULL)
```

```
Dependent variable:
```

decision

success 3.671***

rateryes 3.224***

languageFrench 0.469*

Constant 1.155***

Observations 384

Log Likelihood -203.272

Akaike Inf. Crit. 414.544

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

> library(BaylorEdPsych)

414.5435294

> PseudoR2(m2)

Nagelkerke	Cox.Snell	Adj.McFadden	McFadden
0.2072987	0.1458763	0.1082202	0.1296293
Adj.Count	Count	Effron	McKelvey.Zavoina
0.1491228	0.7473958	0.1597444	0.2380312
		Corrected.AIC	AIC

414.6490703

Let's look at predictions

```
Find predicted values
```

```
fitted = predict(m2, type = 'response')
Greene$y[fitted >=0.5] = 2
Greene$y[fitted < 0.5] = 1</pre>
Specify the threshold
```

```
pcp = length(Greene$y[Greene$y==as.numeric(Greene$decision)])/384
> pcp
[1] 0.7473958 #Looks fine
```

- > library(OOmisc)
- > ePCP(Greene\$y, as.numeric(Greene\$decision), alpha = 0.05)

```
ePCP lower upper 0.7604167 0.7177256 0.8031077 #looks fine
```

Let's try probit!

Call:

```
glm(formula = decision ~ success + rater + language, family =
binomial(link = probit), data = Greene)
```

Deviance Residuals:

```
Min 1Q Median 3Q Max
-1.6241 -0.8521 -0.5361 1.0550 2.6791
```

Coefficients:

```
Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) 0.04424 0.17819 0.248 0.804
success 0.73758 0.14855 4.965 6.86e-07 ***
rateryes 0.69626 0.14617 4.763 1.90e-06 ***
languageFrench -0.41900 0.16040 -2.612 0.009 **
```

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

```
> margins(m3)
Average marginal effects
glm(formula = decision ~ success + rater + language, family = binomial(link = probit), data = Greene)
 success rateryes languageFrench
  0.2221 \quad 0.2276 \quad -0.1212
Comparing to the logit model:
> margins(m2)
Average marginal effects
glm(formula = decision ~ success + rater + language, family = binomial(link = logit), data = Greene)
 success rateryes languageFrench
  0.2303 \quad 0.2275 \quad -0.1268
```

#the average effects are similar

Let's have another practice

```
Get data on university admission:
mydata <- read.csv("https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/stat/data/binary.csv")
It should go as follows:</pre>
```

```
> head(mydata)
  admit gre gpa rank
1     0 380 3.61     3
2     1 660 3.67     3
3     1 800 4.00     1
4     1 640 3.19     4
5     0 520 2.93     4
6     1 760 3.00     2
```

- 1. Predict *admission* by the results of *GPA* and *GRE* tests and the *rank* of the university.
- 2. Interpret the coefficients. Which are significant? Which are positive/negative?
- 3. Test how the model fits the data. Find pseudo R2 and PCP (ePCP).