STAT 420: Quiz Assignment

Nico Kienawan, nicok2

4/30/2020

Collinearity

Consider the following model,

$$Y = 4 + 3X_1 + 2X_2 + X_3 + \epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon \sim N(\mu = 0, \sigma = 3)$.

Simulate a sample size of 100 observations from this model.

```
n = 100
set.seed(910)
x1 = runif(n, 0 , 10)
x2 = runif(n, 0 , 10)
y = function(x1, x2, x3) {4 + 3 * x1 + 2 * x2 + x3 + rnorm(n, 0 , 3)}
```

(a) Let $X_3 = 6X_1 + 5X_2$, save this as x3_a. Using lm(), fit a simple linear model and save the model as model_a. Then, print the summary() of the model. Describe anything unusual from the summary().

```
x3_a = 6 * x1 + 5 * x2
y_a = y(x1, x2, x3_a)
model_a = lm(y_a ~ x1 + x2 + x3_a)
summary(model_a)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = y_a \sim x1 + x2 + x3_a)
## Residuals:
##
      Min
                1Q Median
                                3Q
                                       Max
## -5.7237 -1.5196 -0.2401
                           1.5426
                                   6.1451
##
## Coefficients: (1 not defined because of singularities)
##
               Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 4.77144
                           0.62593
                                     7.623 1.68e-11 ***
                9.03216
                           0.08994 100.428
## x1
                                           < 2e-16 ***
## x2
                6.83283
                           0.08718
                                    78.372
                                            < 2e-16 ***
                                NA
                                                 NA
## x3_a
                     NA
                                        NA
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
## Residual standard error: 2.483 on 97 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.9948, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9947
## F-statistic: 9232 on 2 and 97 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

The values in the x3 row are all NAs.

(b) Now, let $X_3 = 6X_1 + 5X_2 + \epsilon$ where $\epsilon \sim N(\mu = 0, \sigma = 0.1)$, save this as x3_b. Using lm(), fit a simple linear model and save the model as model_b. Then, print the summary() of the model. Report the R-squared and the p-value of each predictors. Do you see any differences from the summary() in part (a)? Why are they different?

```
x3_b = 6 * x1 + 5 * x2 + rnorm(n, 0, 0.1)
y_b = y(x1, x2, x3_b)
model_b = lm(y_b \sim x1 + x2 + x3_b)
summary(model_b)
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = y_b \sim x1 + x2 + x3_b)
##
## Residuals:
##
       Min
                1Q Median
                                3Q
                                       Max
## -8.2818 -1.7153 0.2859
                           1.9853 5.7144
##
## Coefficients:
##
               Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)
                 5.0137
                            0.7025
                                     7.137 1.81e-10 ***
## x1
                -6.5509
                           16.4803
                                    -0.398
                                               0.692
## x2
                -5.9017
                           13.6945
                                    -0.431
                                               0.667
## x3_b
                 2.5715
                            2.7442
                                     0.937
                                               0.351
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
## Residual standard error: 2.78 on 96 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.9935, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9933
## F-statistic: 4874 on 3 and 96 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
summary(model_b)$r.squared
## [1] 0.9934775
```

```
summary(model b)$coefficient[2:4,4]
```

```
## x1 x2 x3_b
## 0.6918804 0.6674712 0.3510628
```

The values in the x3 row are not NAs anymore.

They are different because the x3 in model_a is exactly linearly dependent to x1 and x2. While in model_b, the x3 is still linearly dependent to x1 and x2 but not exactly.

(c) Notice that the R-squared in model_b is very close to 1. However, none of the predictors are significant. Why do you think this happen?

This happen because the predictors in model_b is highly correlated (x3 is very linearly dependent to x1 and x2 with the σ of ϵ only 0.1) which reduces the significance of x1 and x2.

(d) Suppose X = cbind(1, x1, x2, x3_b). Find the eigenvalues of X^TX . Report the smallest eigenvalue. What do you think is the relationship between this eigenvalue and the significance of the t-test above? (Remember: $(X^TX)^{-1} = QD^{-1}Q^T$ where D is a diagonal matrix with the eigenvalues of X^TX and variance of $\hat{\beta}$ is $\hat{\sigma}^2(X^TX)^{-1}$)

```
x = cbind(1, x1, x2, x3_b)
eigenval = eigen(t(x) %*% x)$values
eigenval
```

[1] 3.439976e+05 7.194713e+02 1.571251e+01 1.655574e-02

```
eigenval[which.min(eigenval)]
```

[1] 0.01655574

Since an eigenvalue of X^TX is very small, $(X^TX)^{-1}$ will be very large because $(X^TX)^{-1} = QD^{-1}Q^T$. If $(X^TX)^{-1}$ is very large, the variance of $\hat{\beta}$ will be very large too because $Var(\hat{\beta}) = \hat{\sigma}^2(X^TX)^{-1}$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2$ is around 1.

Since the variance of $\hat{\beta}$ is very large, the confidence interval of the test will also be large, which makes the t-test above not significant.

(e) Find the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of model_b. Do you find any "problematic" predictors? What does it mean?

```
library(car)
```

Loading required package: carData

```
vif(model_b)
```

```
## x1 x2 x3_b
## 27206.09 19990.38 52980.63
```

Yes, all of the predictors are "problematic" because the VIFs are very large. It means there are correlations between the predictors.