## Question 8.1

Describe a situation or problem from your job, everyday life, current events, etc., for which a linear regression model would be appropriate. List some (up to 5) predictors that you might use.

## Answer 8.1

At my work, we analyzed the root cause of production failure based on number of parameters in order to improve the process and yield rate. Linear regression model could be applied to estimate the outcome of production (product dimension) by using input quantity, temperature, humidity, machine settings, etc. as predictors from previous production datasets.

## Question 8.2

Using crime data from http://www.statsci.org/data/general/uscrime.txt (file uscrime.txt, description at http://www.statsci.org/data/general/uscrime.html), use regression (a useful R function is lm or glm) to predict the observed crime rate in a city with the following data:

```
M = 14.0

So = 0

Ed = 10.0

Po1 = 12.0 Po2 = 15.5

LF = 0.640

M.F = 94.0 Pop = 150

NW = 1.1

U1 = 0.120

U2 = 3.6 Wealth = 3200

Ineq = 20.1 Prob = 0.04 Time = 39.0
```

Show your model (factors used and their coefficients), the software output, and the quality of fit.

## Answer 8.2

```
2 25,2999 1635
3 24.3006 578
4 29.9012 1969
5 21.2998 1234
6 20.9995 682
# Fit the linear regression model using crime as response and all other variables as predictors. P-value
from the summary of the model suggests there are multiple predictors whose P-value fall below .1
significant level. Notice the R<sup>2</sup> value is 0.8031 with 15 factors, indicating possibilities of overfitting.
> model1 <- lm(Crime~., data = df1)
> summary(model1)
Call:
Im(formula = Crime ~ ., data = df1)
Residuals:
  Min
       1Q Median
                       3Q Max
-395.74 -98.09 -6.69 112.99 512.67
Coefficients:
       Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -5.984e+03 1.628e+03 -3.675 0.000893 ***
M
        8.783e+01 4.171e+01 2.106 0.043443 *
So
       -3.803e+00 1.488e+02 -0.026 0.979765
        1.883e+02 6.209e+01 3.033 0.004861 **
Ed
        1.928e+02 1.061e+02 1.817 0.078892.
Po1
Po2
        -1.094e+02 1.175e+02 -0.931 0.358830
LF
       -6.638e+02 1.470e+03 -0.452 0.654654
        1.741e+01 2.035e+01 0.855 0.398995
M.F
        -7.330e-01 1.290e+00 -0.568 0.573845
Pop
         4.204e+00 6.481e+00 0.649 0.521279
NW
U1
        -5.827e+03 4.210e+03 -1.384 0.176238
U2
        1.678e+02 8.234e+01 2.038 0.050161.
          9.617e-02 1.037e-01 0.928 0.360754
Wealth
        7.067e+01 2.272e+01 3.111 0.003983 **
Ineq
Prob
        -4.855e+03 2.272e+03 -2.137 0.040627 *
Time
        -3.479e+00 7.165e+00 -0.486 0.630708
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Residual standard error: 209.1 on 31 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared: 0.8031,
                              Adjusted R-squared: 0.7078
F-statistic: 8.429 on 15 and 31 DF, p-value: 3.539e-07
```

# After plotting the test points against the previous model, result suggests the number of crime for these test points is around 155. However, as previous summary of the model suggests, some predictors are insignificant and may affect the estimated crime value.

```
> df <- data.frame(M = 14.0,So = 0,Ed = 10.0,Po1 = 12.0,Po2 = 15.5,LF = 0.640,M.F = 94.0,Pop = 150,NW
= 1.1,U1 = 0.120,U2 = 3.6,Wealth = 3200,Ineq = 20.1,Prob = 0.04,Time = 39.0
> pred1 <- predict(model1, df)
> pred1
   1
155.4349
# Model was refitted based on predictors whose p-value was below .1 threshold. Result from the new
model suggests the number of crime for the same test points is around 1304, which seems more
reasonable comparing to the result(155) from previous model. The R^2 value is 0.7659, which is not
significantly different from the previous model as well. However, since P-value alone may not be the
best measure for variable selection, cross validation will also be performed for variable selection.
> model2 <- Im(Crime~M+Ed+Po1+U2+Ineq+Prob, data = df1)
> summary(model2)
Call:
Im(formula = Crime \sim M + Ed + Po1 + U2 + Ineq + Prob, data = df1)
Residuals:
  Min
         1Q Median
                       3Q Max
-470.68 -78.41 -19.68 133.12 556.23
Coefficients:
      Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -5040.50 899.84 -5.602 1.72e-06 ***
M
         105.02 33.30 3.154 0.00305 **
Ed
         196.47 44.75 4.390 8.07e-05 ***
Po1
         115.02 13.75 8.363 2.56e-10 ***
         89.37 40.91 2.185 0.03483 *
U2
         67.65 13.94 4.855 1.88e-05 ***
Inea
Prob
        -3801.84 1528.10 -2.488 0.01711 *
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Residual standard error: 200.7 on 40 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared: 0.7659,
                              Adjusted R-squared: 0.7307
F-statistic: 21.81 on 6 and 40 DF, p-value: 3.418e-11
> pred2 <- predict(model2, df)
> pred2
    1
1304.245
```

# Cross validation is performed using train command in the package caret by splitting the dataset into 5-fold, and test the model with 15 predictors. The R^2 value for model with 15 predictors is 0.4607 which is significantly lower than the R^2 value(0.8031) for linear regression model with identical predictors. Result suggests overfitting exists and model with 15 predictors may not be the best option for this dataset.

```
> install.packages("caret")
> library(caret)
> train1 <- trainControl(method = 'cv', number = 5)
> model1_cv <- train(Crime~., data = df1, method = "lm", trControl = train1)
> model1_cv
Linear Regression

47 samples
15 predictors

No pre-processing
Resampling: Cross-Validated (5 fold)
Summary of sample sizes: 37, 38, 38, 37, 38
Resampling results:
```

RMSE Rsquared MAE 300.6023 0.4606907 234.7824

Tuning parameter 'intercept' was held constant at a value of TRUE

# 5-fold cross validation is also performed on model with 6 predictors. The R^2 value is 0.6031 which is still lower than the R^2 value(0.7659) for linear regression model with identical predictors. Result suggests overfitting still exists for model with 6 predictors for this dataset, but much less comparing to model with 15 predictors.

> model2\_cv <- train(Crime~M+Ed+Po1+U2+Ineq+Prob, data = df1, method = "Im", trControl = train1) > model2\_cv Linear Regression

47 samples 6 predictor

No pre-processing Resampling: Cross-Validated (5 fold) Summary of sample sizes: 38, 37, 39, 38, 36 Resampling results:

RMSE Rsquared MAE 219.9196 0.6030733 169.1969

Tuning parameter 'intercept' was held constant at a value of TRUE