# Solutions for Session 6 

08/11/2022

. do solution.do
. global basedir http://personalpages.manchester.ac.uk/staff/mark.lunt

- global datadir \$basedir/stats/6_LinearModels2/data
. sysuse auto, clear
(1978 Automobile Data)
. regress weight foreign

1.1 foreign vehicles are, on average, 1000 lbs lighter than US vehicles The difference is significant, $p=0.000$


| Group | Obs | Mean | Std. Err | Std. Dev. | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Domestic | 52 | 3317.115 | 96.4296 | 695.3637 | 3123.525 | 3510.706 |
| Foreign | 22 | 2315.909 | 92.31665 | 433.0035 | 2123.926 | 2507.892 |
| combined | 74 | 3019.459 | 90.34692 | 777.1936 | 2839.398 | 3199.521 |
| diff |  | 1001.206 | 160.2876 |  | 681.6788 | 1320.734 |
| ```diff = mean(Domestic) - mean(Foreign) Ho: diff = 0``` |  |  |  | degrees of freedom |  | 6.2463 |
|  |  |  |  | 72 |
| Ha: did |  | Ha: diff ! $=0$ |  |  | Ha: diff > 0 |  |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{T}<\mathrm{t}$ | . 0000 | $\operatorname{Pr}(\|T\|>\|t\|)=0.0000$ |  |  | $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{T}>\mathrm{t})=0.0000$ |  |

```
1.3 the mean difference and standard error are exactly the same
(except for the minus sign)
. graph box weight, over(foreign)
. graph export graph1.eps replace
(file graph1.eps written in EPS format)
```

1.4 There is a wider spread of weights for Domestic cars compared to Foreign cars, i.e. greater variance
. by foreign: summ weight

| -> foreign = Domestic |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| weight | 52 | 3317.115 | 695.3637 | 1800 | 4840 |
| -> foreign = Foreign |  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| weight | 22 | 2315.909 | 433.0035 | 1760 | 3420 |



Figure 1: . graph box weight, over(foreign)

```
    1.5 the SD is much higher for Domestic (~700) compared to Foreign (~430)
    . hettest
Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity
    Ho: Constant variance
        Variables: fitted values of weight
        chi2(1) = 4.51
        Prob > chi2 = 0.0337
```

    1.6 The difference in variance is significant. Therefore, a linear model is inappropriate
    . use \$datadir/soap, clear
    . graph box appearance, over(operator)
    

Figure 2: . graph box appearance, over(operator)
. graph export graph2.eps replace
(file graph2.eps written in EPS format)
1.7 Operator 3 has the highest scores: $25 \%$ of scores are above 9
. sort operator

1.9 Yes: Prob > $F=0.0000$ is testing the null hypothesis that all operators are the same.
$1.10 p=0.0000$
1.11 Operator 1 is the baseline: there is no line for operator 1
. lincom _cons + 2.operator
(1) 2 .operator + _cons $=0$

| appearance | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{t}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(1)$ | 7.896667 | .0855162 | 92.34 | 0.000 | 7.726694 | 8.066639 |

1.12 This is the same as we have already seen

| appearance | Coef. | Std. Err | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | -. 73 | . 1209382 | -6.04 | 0.000 | -. 9703778 | -. 4896222 |

1.13 Yes: $t=-6.04, p=0.000$
. use \$datadir/cadmium, clear
. scatter capacity age


Figure 3: . scatter capacity age

[^0]| Source | SS | df | MS |  |  | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { Number of obs } & = \\ F(1, & 82) \end{array}=474.37$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model | 17.4445864 | 1 | 17. | 5864 |  |  |  |  |
| Residual | 30.1963679 | 82 | . 368 | 8388 |  | R-squared | $=$ | 0.3662 |
| Total | 47.6409543 | 83 | . 573 | 7401 |  | Adj R-squared <br> Root MSE |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3584 \\ & .60683 \end{aligned}$ |
| capacity | Coef. | Std. | Err. | t | $p>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. | In | nterval] |
| age | -. 0404781 | . 0058 |  | -6.88 | 0.000 | -. 0521776 |  | . 0287787 |
| _cons | 6.033316 | . 247 |  | 24.38 | 0.000 | 5.540986 |  | 6.525647 |

2.2 The regression coefficient for age is negative, showing that capacity decreases as age increases.

| (40 missing values generated) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . gen cap2 = capacity if exposure == 2 (56 missing values generated) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . gen cap3 = capacity if exposure == 3 <br> (72 missing values generated) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . scatter cap1 cap2 cap3 age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - graph export graph4.eps replace (file graph4.eps written in EPS format) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . regress capacity i.exposure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source | SS | df | MS |  | Number of obs | $=84$ |
| Model | 2.74733751 | 21.37 | 368875 |  | Prob > F | $=0.0902$ |
| Residual | 44.8936168 | 81.55 | 42182 |  | R-squared | $=0.0577$ |
| Total | 47.6409543 | 83.573 | 887401 |  | Adj R-squared Root MSE | $\begin{aligned} & =0.0344 \\ & =\quad .74447 \end{aligned}$ |
| capacity | Coef. | Std. Err . | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| exposure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| < 10 years | . 0097403 | . 1799744 | 0.05 | 0.957 | -. 3483523 | . 3678329 |
| > 10 years | -. 5128788 | . 2424526 | -2.12 | 0.037 | -. 9952834 | -. 0304741 |
| _cons | 4.462045 | . 1122337 | 39.76 | 0.000 | 4.238735 | 4.685355 |

[^1]

Figure 4: . scatter cap1 cap2 cap3 age

| Source | SS | df MS |  |  | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { Number of obs } & = \\ F(3, & 80) \\ F(34 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model | 17.6062849 | 35.86876164 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prob > F } \\ & \text { R-squared } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{rr} = & 15.63 \\ = & 0.0000 \end{array}$ |
| Residual | 30.0346693 | 80.375433367 |  |  |  | $=0.3696$ |
|  |  | 83.5 |  |  | Adj R-squared Root MSE | 0.3459 |
| Total | 47.6409543 |  | . 573987401 |  |  | $=.61273$ |
| capacity | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| age | -. 0397752 | . 0063224 | -6.29 | 0.000 | -. 0523572 | -. 0271931 |
| exposure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| < 10 years | -. 0701975 | . 1486686 | -0.47 | 0.638 | -. 3660575 | . 2256626 |
| > 10 years | -. 1169349 | . 2092361 | -0.56 | 0.578 | -. 5333281 | . 2994582 |
| _cons | 6.044917 | . 2680248 | 22.55 | 0.000 | 5.51153 | 6.578303 |

```
. testparm i.exposure
(1) 2.exposure = 0
( 2) 3.exposure = 0
F( 2, 80) = 0.22
Prob > F = 0.8067
```

    2.4 There are now no significant differences between groups
    . predict ppred, xb
. gen ppred1 = ppred if exposure == 1
( 40 missing values generated)
. gen ppred2 $=$ ppred if exposure $==2$
( 56 missing values generated)
. gen ppred3 $=$ ppred if exposure $==3$
( 72 missing values generated)
. scatter cap1 cap2 cap3 age || line ppred1 age || line ppred2 age || /* */
line ppred3 age

- graph export graph5.eps replace
(file graph5.eps written in EPS format)
. regress capacity i.exposure\#\#c.age

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs | 84 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | F( 5, 78) | 11.39 |
| Model | 20.1057424 | 5 | 4.02114849 | Prob > F | 0.0000 |
| Residual | 27.5352118 | 78 | . 353015536 | R-squared | 0.4220 |
|  |  |  |  | Adj R-squared | 0.3850 |
| Total | 47.6409543 | 83 | . 573987401 | Root MSE | . 59415 |


| capacity | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{t}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| exposure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| < 10 years | .5497403 | .5758844 | 0.95 | 0.343 | -.5967574 | 1.696238 |
| $>10$ years | 2.503148 | 1.041842 | 2.40 | 0.019 | .4289997 | 4.577296 |
| age | -.0306127 | .0075475 | -4.06 | 0.000 | -.0456385 | -.0155868 |
| exposure\#c.age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| < 10 years <br> $>10$ years | -.0159193 | .0145469 | -1.09 | 0.277 | -.0448799 | .0130413 |
| _cons | 5.680291 | .313426 | 18.12 | 0.000 | 5.056307 | 6.304274 |

[^2]

Figure 5: . scatter cap1 cap2 cap3 age __ line ppred1 age ___ line ppred2 age __ /*

```
    2.5 Yes, the slopes in the different exposure groups are different
. predict ipred, xb
. gen ipred1 = ipred if exposure == 1
(40 missing values generated)
. gen ipred2 = ipred if exposure == 2
(56 missing values generated)
. gen ipred3 = ipred if exposure == 3
(72 missing values generated)
. scatter cap1 cap2 cap3 age || line ipred1 age || line ipred2 age || /* */
line ipred3 age
```



Figure 6: . scatter cap1 cap2 cap3 age ___ line ipred1 age ___ line ipred2 age ___/*

```
. graph export graph6.eps replace
(file graph6.eps written in EPS format)
```

    2.6 The least steep is in the baseline (least exposed group)
    The steepest is in the most exposed group
    . lincom age + 3.exposure\#c.age
( 1) age + 3.exposure\#c.age $=0$

| capacity | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{t}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $(1)$ | -.085111 | .0196716 | -4.33 | 0.000 | -.1242742 | -.0459478 |

[^3]| . sw regress y x1 x2 x3 x4, pe(0.05)begin with empty model$p=0.0006<0.0500 \quad$adding $x 4$ <br> $p=0.0000<0.0500$ <br> adding $x 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | SS | df | MS |  | $\begin{array}{llr} \text { Number of obs } & = & 13 \\ F(2, & 10) & =176.63 \end{array}$ |  |
|  | 2641.00094 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model |  | 213 | 320.50047 |  | Prob > F | $=0.0000$ |
| Residual | 74.7621108 | 107. | . 47621108 |  | R-squared | $=0.9725$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | Adj R-square | 0.9670 |
| Total | 2715.76305 | 1222 | 226.313587 |  | Root MSE | $=2.7343$ |
| y | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf | Interval] |
| x 4 | -. 6139536 | . 0486446 | -12.62 | 0.000 | -. 7223404 | -. 5055668 |
| x1 | 1.439958 | . 1384166 | 10.40 | 0.000 | 1.131547 | 1.74837 |
| _cons | 103.0974 | 2.123984 | 48.54 | 0.000 | 98.36485 | 107.8299 |


| 3.1 x1 \% $x 4$ are retained |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text {. sw regress y x1 x2 x3 } x 4, \operatorname{pr}(0.05) \\ & \text { begin with full model } \\ & p=0.8959>=0.0500 \\ & \text { removing } x 3 \\ & p=0.2054>=0.0500 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SS | df | MS |  | Number of obs | 13 |
|  |  |  |  |  | F ( 2, 10) | $=229.50$ |
| Model <br> Residual | 2657.85857 | 2132 | 92929 |  | Prob > F | $=0.0000$ |
|  | 57.9044793 | $10 \quad 5.7$ | 44793 |  | R -squared | $=0.9787$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | Adj R-squared | $=0.9744$ |
| Total | 2715.76305 | 12226 | 313587 |  | Root MSE | $=2.4063$ |
| y | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| x 1 | 1.468306 | . 1213009 | 12.10 | 0.000 | 1.19803 | 1.738581 |
| x2 | . 6622505 | . 0458547 | 14.44 | 0.000 | . 5600798 | . 7644212 |
| _cons | 52.57735 | 2.286174 | 23.00 | 0.000 | 47.48344 | 57.67126 |

3.2 This time $x 1$ \& $x 2$ are retained


### 3.3 This is the same as the backwards model

- corr x*
(obs=13)

|  | x 1 | x 2 | x 3 | x 4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| x1 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| x2 | 0.2286 | 1.0000 |  |  |
| x3 | -0.8241 | -0.1392 | 1.0000 |  |
| x4 | -0.2454 | -0.9730 | 0.0295 | 1.0000 |

3.4 Correlation between $x 2$ § $x 4$ is -0.97
3.5 x2 छ $x 4$ are very strongly correlated: they contain the same information, so they are largely interchangeable

| Source | SS | df | MS |  | Number of obs $=13$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model | 2667.89941 | 4666 | 74853 |  | F( 4, 8) Prob > F | $=111.48$ $=0.0000$ |
| Residual | 47.863637 | 85.9 | 95463 |  | R-squared | $=0.9824$ |
| Total | 2715.76305 | 12226 | 313587 |  | Adj R-squared <br> Root MSE | $\begin{aligned} & =0.9736 \\ & =\quad 2.446 \end{aligned}$ |
| y | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| x 1 | 1.551103 | . 7447698 | 2.08 | 0.071 | -. 1663395 | 3.268545 |
| x 2 | . 5101677 | . 723788 | 0.70 | 0.501 | -1.15889 | 2.179226 |
| x3 | . 1019096 | . 754709 | 0.14 | 0.896 | -1.638453 | 1.842272 |
| x 4 | -. 1440609 | . 709052 | -0.20 | 0.844 | -1.779138 | 1.491016 |
| _cons | 62.40535 | 70.07096 | 0.89 | 0.399 | -99.17856 | 223.9893 |

3.6 The $F$ statistic says that the model is very highly significant: the null hypothesis that all coefficients are 0 could not have given rise to this data
$3.798 \%$ of the variance is explained
3. 8 None of the coefficients are significant, due to the strong correlations between them
. use \$datadir/growth, clear
. scatter weight week


Figure 7: . scatter weight week

- graph export graph7.eps replace
(file graph7.eps written in EPS format)
4.1 The line does not look quite straight: there appears to be some curvature

| Source | SS | df | MS |  |  | $\begin{array}{llr} \text { Number of obs } & = & 20 \\ F(1, & 18) & = \\ F(190.23 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model | 25438.7504 | 1 | 254 | 7504 |  | Prob > F | $=0.0000$ |
| Residual | 579.449624 | 18 | 32. | 6458 |  | R-squared | $=0.9777$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Adj R-squared | $=0.9765$ |
| Total | 26018.2 | 19 | 1369 |  |  | Root MSE | $=5.6738$ |
| weight | Coef. | Std. | Err. | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| week | 6.184962 | . 2200 | 193 | 28.11 | 0.000 | 5.722719 | 6.647206 |
| _cons | 125.3579 | 2.635 | 644 | 47.56 | 0.000 | 119.8206 | 130.8952 |

. cprplot week

| 4.2 There is definitely <br> gen week2 = week * week |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . regress weight week week2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source | SS | df | MS |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number of obs }=r \\ & F(2, \\ & F(17)=2436.58 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model | 25927.7513 | 2129 | . 8756 |  | Prob > F | $=0.0000$ |
| Residual | 90.4487127 | 175.3 | 51251 |  | R -squared | $=0.9965$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | Adj R-squared | $=0.9961$ |
| Total | 26018.2 | 19136 | 37895 |  | Root MSE | $=2.3066$ |
| weight | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| week | 2.680178 | . 3763642 | 7.12 | 0.000 | 1.886119 | 3.474237 |
| week2 | . 1668945 | . 0174086 | 9.59 | 0.000 | . 1301656 | . 2036235 |
| _cons | 138.2088 | 1.716086 | 80.54 | 0.000 | 134.5881 | 141.8294 |

```
    4.3 week2 is very highly significant ( }p=0.000\mathrm{ )
. predict pred2, xb
. twoway scatter weight week || line pred2 week
. graph export graph8.eps replace
(file graph8.eps written in EPS format)
```

    4.4 Curved predictor fits the data very well
    

Figure 8: . twoway scatter weight week _- line pred2 week


[^4]| . corr week* <br> (obs=20) |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | week | week2 | week3 |
| week | 1.0000 |  |  |
| week2 | 0.9713 | 1.0000 |  |
| week3 | 0.9221 | 0.9865 | 1.0000 |

4.6 Correlation between week and week2 is 0.97 end of do-file


[^0]:    - graph export graph3.eps replace
    (file graph3.eps written in EPS format)

[^1]:    2.3 Its borderline, $p=0.09$

[^2]:    . testparm i.exposure\#c.age
    ( 1) 2.exposure\#c.age $=0$
    (2) 3.exposure\#c.age $=0$

    $$
    \begin{array}{rll}
    \mathrm{F}(\quad 2, \quad 78) & = & 3.54 \\
    \text { Prob }>\mathrm{F} & = & 0.0338
    \end{array}
    $$

[^3]:    . use \$datadir/hald, clear

[^4]:    4.5 week3 is not significant

