ST221 Assignment 2

Student Number: 2106983

# Question 1

# a)

Call:

lm(formula = price ~ log2livingArea, data = houses)

Residuals:

Min 1Q Median 3Q Max

-66.253 -12.828 -0.071 13.796 63.267

Coefficients:

Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)

(Intercept) -428.885 19.398 -22.11 <2e-16 \*\*\*

log2livingArea 58.632 1.816 32.28 <2e-16 \*\*\*

---

Signif. codes: 0 ‘\*\*\*’ 0.001 ‘\*\*’ 0.01 ‘\*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 18.83 on 766 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.5763, Adjusted R-squared: 0.5758

F-statistic: 1042 on 1 and 766 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

# b)

As the slope for the model is 58.632 for each increase in square foot by a factor of 2, the average price of a house (in 1000 usd) is expected to increase by 58.632.

# c)

The intercept is -428.885 which says for a house with a living area of 1 square feet the price is expected to be -428,885 usd which is clearly nonsense as you can’t have a house with a negative price. Requires an extrapolation that lies well out of the range of the data cannot assume that fitted relationship still holds if we extrapolate this far.

# d)

Chart, scatter chart

Description automatically generated

This scatterplot shows all the indexed house prices identified with fuel they use which is done by colour and symbol. There are too many data points to see a clear pattern between the 2 variables so more investigation would need to be done.

Needed to be a boxplot

# e)

The expected price of a house given which fuel it uses for heating.

# f)

Chart, scatter chart

Description automatically generated

# g)

The model under the null hypothesis is as defined in f) or lm(price ~ bathrooms) in R notation and the model under the alternative hypothesis is again as defined in f) or lm(price ~ 0 + factor(bathrooms)) in R notation.

The test statistic is where , are the deviances of , (which are 385275.1 and 374856, see below) respectively, is the number of distinct numbers of bathrooms in the data, and is the total number of observations (which are 4 and 768 respectively in this case, see below). Under the null hypothesis this has an F distribution with and degrees of freedom or more specifically 2 and 764. Equivalently,

The observed value of the test statistic is ((385275.1-374856)/2)/(374856/764) which is 10.618 and the p-value is defined to be = 0.0000283 (see below) which is far less than 0.05 so at a 5% significance level we have strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis and we conclude that a more complex model than the straight line one is needed.

> deviance(M0)

[1] 385275.1

> deviance(M1)

[1] 374856

> length(unique(houses$bathrooms))

[1] 4

> length(houses$price)

[1] 768

> pf(10.618,2,764,lower.tail=FALSE)

[1] 2.828693e-05

# Question 2

# a)

gas

# b)

The expected price of a house using oil as fuel is 6.269 1000 usd (or 6269 usd) less than a house that has the same number of bathrooms and same living area but uses gas as fuel.

# c)

Predicted price in 1000 usd is -307.701 + (log2(1600)\*44.932) + (2\*14.512) = 199.523, so 199,523 usd

# d)

The reference category has changed from gas to oil and as seen in 2a) the estimated coefficients for oil and electric are quite similar so hard to tell if there’s really a difference.

Different p values are for different tests

# e)

The datapoint with the highest influence has index 455 and it’s cook’s distance is 0.03494 (see below). As seen in the residuals vs leverage plot below this data point has one of the highest standardised residual values and also one of the highest leverage values therefore this point is influential due to both, being a regression outlier and having a high leverage.

Chart, scatter chart

Description automatically generated

> which.max((cooks.distance(slr.houses3)))

455

455

> cooks.distance(slr.houses3)[455]

455

0.03493618

# f)

The information provided gives us the regression sum of squares added by each variable in the formula for . As we are considering the existence of regression for the model (which does not include fuel as a predictor variable) then the regression sum of squares contributed by the variable fuel is added to the residual sum of squares and the regression sum of squares is the sum from the other 2 variables. The total sum of squares remains the same and that enables us to produce the ANOVA table below. The regression degrees of freedom is number of parameters, of which the model has 3, minus 1 then the residual degrees of freedom is the number of observations minus the number of parameters, (768-3). Mean square is sum of squares divided by degrees of freedom and then the observed F statistic is the Regression mean square over the residual mean square as found in the notes.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| source | df | SS | ms | f |
| Regression | 2 | 406109 | 203054.5 | 661.987 |
| Residual | 765 | 234652 | 306.735 |  |
| Total | 767 | 640761 |  |  |

# g)

The null hypothesis is that price can be sufficiently modelled by and the alternative hypothesis is that is a significant improvement (aka adding fuel as a predictor variable is a significant improvement). If we look at the 3rd row of the sequential ANOVA table the p value is equivalent to the p value in our hypothesis test as the 3rd row corresponds to vs . The value is 0.0001528 so at a 5% significance level we have strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis and therefore conclude that including fuel as a predictor variable is a significant improvement to the model. In R you can define the 2 models and use the anova function on them to produce the anova table that demonstrates the same result. Wrong model needed to include an interaction.

> anova(LM1,LM2)

Analysis of Variance Table

Model 1: price ~ log2livingArea + bathrooms

Model 2: price ~ log2livingArea + bathrooms + fuel

Res.Df RSS Df Sum of Sq F Pr(>F)

1 765 234651

2 763 229309 2 5342.6 8.8885 0.0001528 \*\*\*

---

Signif. codes: 0 ‘\*\*\*’ 0.001 ‘\*\*’ 0.01 ‘\*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

# Question 3

# a)

Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated

There is a clear pattern in the plot that as the number of bedrooms increases the price of a house increases. It’s clear as the quartiles (inc. median) and the extremities (min and max) all increase as number of bedrooms increases. Distribution/spread fairly equal for all

# b)

Call:

lm(formula = price ~ fuel + bathrooms + log2livingArea + bedrooms,

data = houses)

Residuals:

Min 1Q Median 3Q Max

-54.445 -11.890 -0.146 11.764 57.550

Coefficients:

Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)

(Intercept) -330.99056 22.96310 -14.414 < 2e-16 \*\*\*

fuelgas 6.20059 1.71286 3.620 0.000314 \*\*\*

fueloil 0.08875 2.26726 0.039 0.968786

bathrooms 14.50238 1.49519 9.699 < 2e-16 \*\*\*

log2livingArea 47.13841 2.44635 19.269 < 2e-16 \*\*\*

bedrooms -2.04002 1.22614 -1.664 0.096569 .

---

Signif. codes: 0 ‘\*\*\*’ 0.001 ‘\*\*’ 0.01 ‘\*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 17.32 on 762 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.6434, Adjusted R-squared: 0.6411

F-statistic: 275 on 5 and 762 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

The p value of the estimated coefficient for bedrooms (0.0966) is not significant (as it is greater than 0.05) therefore including bedrooms as an explanatory variable is not a significant improvement on the model.

# c)

> VIFlm1 = lm(bedrooms ~ bathrooms + log2livingArea, data=houses)

> VIFlm2 = lm(log2livingArea ~ bathrooms + bedrooms, data=houses)

> CoD1 = summary(VIFlm1)$r.squared

> CoD2= summary(VIFlm2)$r.squared

> VIF1 = 1/(1-CoD1)

> VIF1

[1] 1.653273

> VIF2 = 1/(1-CoD2)

> VIF2

[1] 2.139509

So the VIF of bedrooms is 1.653 and VIF of log2living Area is 2.140. Neither are particularly large and they are both certainly less than 10 so there is no concerns about those variables being collinear with the other predictors.

Used wrong model (missed fuel as a predictor variable) and apparently explanatory variables carry some redundant information – not sure how you would know that