

## Regression with categorical variables

## Packages for this section

```
library(tidyverse)  
library(broom)
```

## The pigs revisited

- Recall pig feed data, after we tidied it:

```
my_url <- "http://ritsokiguess.site/datafiles/pigs2.txt"
pigs <- read_delim(my_url, " ")
pigs
```

```
# A tibble: 20 x 3
  pig feed weight
  <dbl> <chr>  <dbl>
1     1  1 feed1  60.8
2     2  2 feed1   57
3     3  3 feed1   65
4     4  4 feed1  58.6
5     5  5 feed1  61.7
6     6  1 feed2  68.7
7     7  2 feed2  67.7
8     8  3 feed2   74
9     9  4 feed2  66.3
10    10  5 feed2  69.8
11    11  1 feed3  92.6
```

# Summaries

```
pigs %>%  
  group_by(feed) %>%  
  summarize(n = n(), mean_wt = mean(weight),  
            sd_wt = sd(weight))
```

```
# A tibble: 4 x 4  
  feed      n mean_wt sd_wt  
  <chr> <int>   <dbl> <dbl>  
1 feed1     5    60.6  3.06  
2 feed2     5    69.3  2.93  
3 feed3     5    94.1  3.61  
4 feed4     5    86.2  2.90
```

## Running through aov and lm

- What happens if we run this through `lm` rather than `aov`?
- Recall `aov` first:

```
pigs.1 <- aov(weight ~ feed, data = pigs)
summary(pigs.1)
```

|           | Df | Sum Sq | Mean Sq | F value | Pr(>F)       |
|-----------|----|--------|---------|---------|--------------|
| feed      | 3  | 3521   | 1173.5  | 119.1   | 3.72e-11 *** |
| Residuals | 16 | 158    | 9.9     |         |              |

---

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

## and now lm

```
pigs.2 <- lm(weight ~ feed, data = pigs)
summary(pigs.2)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = weight ~ feed, data = pigs)
```

Residuals:

| Min    | 1Q     | Median | 3Q    | Max   |
|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| -3.900 | -2.025 | -0.570 | 1.845 | 5.000 |

Coefficients:

|             | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(> t )     |
|-------------|----------|------------|---------|--------------|
| (Intercept) | 60.620   | 1.404      | 43.190  | < 2e-16 ***  |
| feedfeed2   | 8.680    | 1.985      | 4.373   | 0.000473 *** |
| feedfeed3   | 33.480   | 1.985      | 16.867  | 1.30e-11 *** |
| feedfeed4   | 25.620   | 1.985      | 12.907  | 7.11e-10 *** |

---

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

Residual standard error: 3.138 on 16 degrees of freedom

## Understanding those slopes

- Get one slope for each category of categorical variable feed, except for first.
- feed1 treated as “baseline”, others measured relative to that.
- Thus prediction for feed 1 is intercept, 60.62 (mean weight for feed 1).
- Prediction for feed 2 is  $60.62 + 8.68 = 69.30$  (mean weight for feed 2).
- Or, mean weight for feed 2 is 8.68 bigger than for feed 1.
- Mean weight for feed 3 is 33.48 bigger than for feed 1.
- Slopes can be negative, if mean for a feed had been smaller than for feed 1.

# Reproducing the ANOVA

- Pass the fitted model object into `anova`:

```
anova(pigs.2)
```

## Analysis of Variance Table

Response: weight

|           | Df | Sum Sq | Mean Sq | F value | Pr(>F)       |
|-----------|----|--------|---------|---------|--------------|
| feed      | 3  | 3520.5 | 1173.51 | 119.14  | 3.72e-11 *** |
| Residuals | 16 | 157.6  | 9.85    |         |              |

---

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

- Same as before.
- But no Tukey this way:

```
TukeyHSD(pigs.2)
```

Error in UseMethod("TukeyHSD"): no applicable method for 'TukeyHSD' applied to an object of class 'anova'



# The crickets

- Male crickets rub their wings together to produce a chirping sound.
- Rate of chirping, called “pulse rate”, depends on species and possibly on temperature.
- Sample of crickets of two species’ pulse rates measured; temperature also recorded.
- Does pulse rate differ for species, especially when temperature accounted for?

# The crickets data

Read the data:

```
my_url <- "http://ritsokiguess.site/datafiles/crickets2.csv"
crickets <- read_csv(my_url)
crickets %>% slice_sample(n = 10) # display sample of rows
```

# A tibble: 10 x 3

|    | species       | temperature | pulse_rate |
|----|---------------|-------------|------------|
|    | <chr>         | <dbl>       | <dbl>      |
| 1  | exclamationis | 26.2        | 89.1       |
| 2  | exclamationis | 26.2        | 87.5       |
| 3  | exclamationis | 30.4        | 99.3       |
| 4  | exclamationis | 20.8        | 65.1       |
| 5  | exclamationis | 20.8        | 67.9       |
| 6  | niveus        | 21          | 58.5       |
| 7  | niveus        | 26.5        | 76.1       |
| 8  | exclamationis | 30.4        | 102.       |
| 9  | niveus        | 18.9        | 51.8       |
| 10 | niveus        | 28.6        | 84.7       |

## Fit model with `lm`

```
crickets.1 <- lm(pulse_rate ~ temperature + species,  
                data = crickets)
```

## Can I remove anything? No:

```
drop1(cricket1, test = "F")
```

Single term deletions

Model:

```
pulse_rate ~ temperature + species
```

|             | Df | Sum of Sq | RSS    | AIC     | F value | Pr(>F)        |
|-------------|----|-----------|--------|---------|---------|---------------|
| <none>      |    |           | 89.3   | 38.816  |         |               |
| temperature | 1  | 4376.1    | 4465.4 | 158.074 | 1371.4  | < 2.2e-16 *** |
| species     | 1  | 598.0     | 687.4  | 100.065 | 187.4   | 6.272e-14 *** |

---

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

drop1 is right thing to use in a regression with categorical (explanatory) variables in it: “can I remove this categorical variable *as a whole*?”

# The summary

```
summary(crickets.1)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = pulse_rate ~ temperature + species, data = crickets)
```

Residuals:

|  | Min     | 1Q      | Median  | 3Q     | Max    |
|--|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
|  | -3.0128 | -1.1296 | -0.3912 | 0.9650 | 3.7800 |

Coefficients:

|               | Estimate  | Std. Error | t value | Pr(> t ) |     |
|---------------|-----------|------------|---------|----------|-----|
| (Intercept)   | -7.21091  | 2.55094    | -2.827  | 0.00858  | **  |
| temperature   | 3.60275   | 0.09729    | 37.032  | < 2e-16  | *** |
| speciesniveus | -10.06529 | 0.73526    | -13.689 | 6.27e-14 | *** |

---

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

Residual standard error: 1.786 on 28 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.9896, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9888

F-statistic: 1331 on 2 and 28 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

# Conclusions

- Slope for temperature says that increasing temperature by 1 degree increases pulse rate by 3.6 (same for both species)
- Slope for speciesniveus says that pulse rate for niveus about 10 lower than that for exclamationis at same temperature (latter species is baseline).
- R-squared of almost 0.99 is very high, so that the prediction of pulse rate from species and temperature is very good.

## To end with a graph

- Two quantitative variables and one categorical: scatterplot with categories distinguished by colour.
- This graph seems to need a title, which I define first.

```
t1 <- "Pulse rate against temperature for two species of crick  
t2 <- "Temperature in degrees Celsius"  
ggplot(crickets, aes(x = temperature, y = pulse_rate,  
  colour = species)) +  
  geom_point() + geom_smooth(method = "lm", se = FALSE) +  
  ggtitle(t1, subtitle = t2) -> g
```

# The graph

09

Pulse rate against temperature for two species of crickets  
Temperature in degrees Celsius

