

# IDS 702: MODULE 1.3

## MODEL FITTING AND INTERPRETATION OF COEFFICIENTS

DR. OLANREWAJU MICHAEL AKANDE

# BACK TO OUR MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

Let's fit the following default MLR model to our Harris Trust and Savings Bank example using R.

$$\text{bsal}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{sex}_i + \beta_2 \text{senior}_i + \beta_3 \text{age}_i + \beta_4 \text{educ}_i + \beta_5 \text{exper}_i + \epsilon_i$$

We can estimate  $\hat{\beta}$  in R directly as follows:

```
X <- model.matrix(~ sex + senior + age + educ + exper, data= wages)
y <- as.matrix(wages$bsal)
beta_hat <- solve(t(X)%*%X)%*%t(X)%*%y; beta_hat
```

```
##                [,1]
## (Intercept) 6277.8933861
## sexFemale   -767.9126888
## senior      -22.5823029
## age          0.6309603
## educ         92.3060229
## exper        0.5006397
```

```
sigmasquared_hat <- t(y-X%*%beta_hat)%*%(y-X%*%beta_hat)/(nrow(X)-ncol(X))
SE_beta_hat <- sqrt(diag(c(sigmasquared_hat)*solve(t(X)%*%X))); SE_beta_hat
```

```
## (Intercept)    sexFemale      senior          age          educ          exper
## 652.2713190 128.9700022    5.2957316    0.7206541    24.8635404    1.0552624
```

# BACK TO OUR MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

Let's fit the same MLR model using the `lm` command in R.

```
regwage <- lm(bsal~ sex + senior + age + educ + exper, data= wages)
summary(regwage)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = bsal ~ sex + senior + age + educ + exper, data = wages)
##
## Residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -1217.36  -342.83   -55.61   297.10  1575.53
##
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)  6277.8934   652.2713   9.625 2.36e-15
## sexFemale    -767.9127   128.9700  -5.954 5.39e-08
## senior       -22.5823    5.2957  -4.264 5.08e-05
## age           0.6310     0.7207   0.876 0.383692
## educ          92.3060    24.8635   3.713 0.000361
## exper         0.5006     1.0553   0.474 0.636388
##
## Residual standard error: 508.1 on 87 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.5152,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.4873
## F-statistic: 18.49 on 5 and 87 DF,  p-value: 1.811e-12
```

# INTERPRETATION OF COEFFICIENTS

- Each estimated slope is the amount  $y$  is expected to increase when the value of the corresponding predictor is increased by one unit, *holding the values of the other predictors constant*.
- For example, the estimated coefficient of **educ** is approximately 92.

*Interpretation:* For each additional year of education for an employee, we expect baseline salary to increase by about \$92, holding all other variables constant.

- That interpretation is a bit different when dealing with a binary variable (more generally, categorical/factor variables).
- For example, the estimated coefficient of **sex (sexFemale)** is approximately -768.

*Interpretation:* For employees who started at the same time, had the same education and experience, and were the same age, women earned \$768 less on average than men.

# WHICH VARIABLE IS THE STRONGEST PREDICTOR OF THE OUTCOME?

- The coefficient that has the strongest linear association with the outcome variable is the one with the **largest absolute value of  $T$**  (referred to as  $t$ -value in the R output), the **test statistic**, which equals the coefficient over the corresponding SE.
- Note:  $T$  is NOT the size of the coefficient.
- The size of the coefficient is sensitive to scales of predictors, but  $T$  is not, since it is a standardized measure.
- Example: In our regression, seniority is a better predictor than education because it has a larger  $T$ .

# MODEL FIT

- How sure are we that this is actually a good model for this data?
- The easiest thing to do would be to look at the R-squared.
- R-squared has the same interpretation under both SLR and MLR, that is, the proportion of variation in the response variable, that is being explained by the regression fit.
- In this example, that proportion is approximately 52%. We will see if we can do better later.
- The adjusted R-squared is a modified version of R-squared that penalizes the original R-squared as extra variables are included in the model.
- In this example, we have approximately 48%, lower than the original 52%.
- We can do much better in assessing model fit, as we will see over the next few modules.

# CENTERING

- How should we interpret the estimated intercept  $\hat{\beta}_0 \approx 6278$ ?
- Generally speaking, we can say that the baseline salary for male employees, with zero age, zero seniority, zero education and zero experience is \$6278.
- This is clearly not meaningful or realistic. Why?
- One way around this problem is centering. We can mean-center (can also scale if we want) continuous predictors to improve interpretation of the intercept.
- Centering does not really improve model fit, however it does help a lot with interpretability.

# CENTERING

- So, for each continuous predictor, we will subtract its mean from every value, and use these mean centered predictors in our regression instead.
- The intercept can now be interpreted as the average value of  $Y$  at the average value of  $X$ , which is much more interpretable.
- Centering can be especially useful in models with interactions (which we are yet to explore).
- Centering can also help with multicollinearity (which we will also explore soon).
- Essentially, a transformed variable  $x_j^2$  may be highly correlated with the untransformed counterpart  $x_j$ , which we want to avoid. Centering  $x_j$  before taking the square helps with that.
- Going forward, we will often mean center continuous predictors.



# CENTERING

```
wages$agec <- c(scale(wages$age,scale=F))
wages$seniorc <- c(scale(wages$senior,scale=F))
wages$experc <- c(scale(wages$exper,scale=F))
wages$educc <- c(scale(wages$educ,scale=F))
regwagec <- lm(bsal~ sex + seniorc + agec + educc + experc, data= wages)
summary(regwagec)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = bsal ~ sex + seniorc + agec + educc + experc, data = wages)
##
## Residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -1217.36  -342.83   -55.61   297.10  1575.53
##
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)  5924.0072    99.6588   59.443 < 2e-16
## sexFemale    -767.9127   128.9700   -5.954 5.39e-08
## seniorc      -22.5823     5.2957   -4.264 5.08e-05
## agec          0.6310     0.7207    0.876 0.383692
## educc         92.3060    24.8635    3.713 0.000361
## experc        0.5006     1.0553    0.474 0.636388
##
## Residual standard error: 508.1 on 87 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.5152,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.4873
## F-statistic: 18.49 on 5 and 87 DF,  p-value: 1.811e-12
```

# CENTERING

- Notice that the coefficients for the predictors have not changed but the intercept has changed.
- We interpret the intercept as the average baseline salary for male employees who are 474 months old, have 82 months of seniority, 12.5 years of education, and 101 months of experience.

```
colMeans(wages[,c("age", "senior", "educ", "exper")])
```

```
##      age      senior      educ      exper  
## 474.39785  82.27957  12.50538 100.92742
```

- Much more meaningful!

# SOME NOTES

- We can't say for sure that our model has not violated any of the assumptions. We must do model assessment just as with SLR.
- We will address these issues and more over the next few modules.
- Be very wary of extrapolation! Because there are several predictors, you can fall into the extrapolation trap in many ways.

What do we mean by extrapolation?

- Finally, note that multiple regression shows association.

It does NOT prove causality.

Only a carefully designed observational study or randomized experiment or good causal inference methods can help show causality.

# WHAT'S NEXT?

MOVE ON TO THE READINGS FOR THE NEXT MODULE!