# **The Bivariate Linear Model**

EH6127 – Quantitative Methods

Steven V. Miller

Department of Economic History and International Relations



# **Goal for Today**

Use correlation and linear regression to describe the relationship between two continuous variables.

## **Building Toward Normal Social Science**

Everything we have done is building toward normal quantitative research.

- We have concepts of interest, operationalized to variables.
- We observe central tendencies and variation in our variables.
- We believe there is cause and effect.
  - Though, importantly, we need to make controlled comparisons.
- We learned about random sampling and hypothesis testing.

If our sample statistic is more than 1.96 standard errors from a proposed population parameter, we suggest a population parameter is highly unlikely given what we got.

• This is admittedly an indirect answer to the question you're not asking, but this is what we're doing.

## What We Will Be Doing Today

We'll go over the following two topics.

- 1. Correlation analysis
- 2. Regression analysis

#### Correlation

Question: does a country's life expectancy vary by its human capital?

- Human capital (index): how well today can citizen expect to achieve full health and achieve her formal education potential. [0:1]
- Life expectancy: average life expectancy form men and women (in years)
- Data subset to 2020 for states in the EU (incl. the UK)

We'll start with a preliminary judgment by way of a scatterplot.

#### If You'd Like to Follow Along...

```
# library(stevedata) # has eurostat_codes and wbd_example
```

```
# ?eurostat_codes
```

```
# ?wbd_example
```

```
eurostat_codes %>%
  # filters to any eurostat codes that are/were EU
 filter(cat == "EU" | iso2c == "UK") %>%
  # pulls to a vector, and assigns
 pull(iso2c) -> isocodes we want
wbd_example %>%
  na.omit %>% # for ease, given the nature of the data
  # then, filter to just observations in 2020
 filter(vear == 2020) %>%
  # then, filter where isocode matches what we want, and assign to Data
 filter(iso2c %in% isocodes we want) -> Data
```

#### A Scatterplot of Human Capital and Life Expectancy in 2020

The data are scattered in a formal consistent/positive way.



Human Capital Index

Data: ?wbd\_example in {stevedata}, by way of World Bank.

#### Correlation

This relationship looks easy enough: positive.

• The relationship is not perfect, but it looks fairly "strong".

How strong? Pearson's correlation coefficient (or Pearson's r) will tell us.

#### Pearson's r

$$\Sigma \frac{\left(\frac{x_i - \overline{x}}{s_x}\right) \left(\frac{y_i - \overline{y}}{s_y}\right)}{n - 1}$$

...where:

- $x_i$ ,  $y_i$  = individual observations of x or y, respectively.
- $\overline{x}$ ,  $\overline{y}$  = sample means of *x* and *y*, respectively.
- $s_x$ ,  $s_y$  = sample standard deviations of x and y, respectively.
- *n* = number of observations in the sample.

#### A Scatterplot of Human Capital and Life Expectancy in 2020

Observations in the negative correlation quadrants are highlighted for emphasis.



Human Capital Index (Standardized)

Data: ?wbd\_example in {stevedata}, by way of World Bank.

## Human Capital and Life Expectancy (z-scores)

- Cases in upper-right quadrant are above the mean in both x and y.
- Cases in lower-left quadrant are below the mean in both *x* and *y*.
- Upper-left and lower-right quadrants are negative-correlation quadrants.

All told, our Pearson's r is 16.91/24, or about .70

• We would informally call this a fairly strong positive relationship.

### **Linear Regression**

Correlation has a lot of nice properties.

- It's another "first step" analytical tool.
- Useful for detecting **multicollinearity**.
  - This is when two independent variables correlate so highly that no partial effect for either can be summarized.

However, it's neutral on what is *x* and what is *y*.

• It won't communicate cause and effect.

Fortunately, regression does that for us.

# **Demystifying Regression**

Does this look familiar?

y = mx + b

That was the slope-intercept equation.

- *b* is the intercept: the observed *y* when x = 0.
- *m* is the familiar "rise over run", measuring the amount of change in *y* for a unit change in *x*.

The slope-intercept equation is, in essence, the representation of a regression line.

• However, statisticians prefer a different rendering of the same concept measuring linear change.

$$y = a + b(x)$$

The *b* is the **regression coefficient** that communicates the change in *y* for each unit change in x.

## A Simple Example

Suppose I want to explain your test score (y) by reference to how many hours you studied for it (x).

Hours (x)	Score (y)
0	55
1	61
2	67
3	73
4	79
5	85
6	91
7	97

Table 1: Hours Spent Studying and Exam Score

### A Simple Example

In this eight-student class, the student who studied 0 hours got a 55.

- The student who studied 1 hour got a 61.
- The student who studied 2 hours got a 67.
- ...and so on...

Each hour studied corresponds with a six-unit change in test score. Alternatively:

$$y = a + b(x) = \text{Test Score} = 55 + 6(x)$$

Notice that our *y*-intercept is meaningful.

## A Slightly Less Simple Example

However, real data are never that simple. Let's complicate it a bit.

Hours (x)	Score (y)	Estimated Score ( $\hat{y}_{i}$
0	53	55
0	57	
1	59	61
1	63	
2	65	67
2	69	
3	71	73
3	75	
4	77	79
4	81	
5	83	85
5	87	
6	89	91
6	93	
7	95	97
7	99	

Table 2: Hours Spent Studying, Exam Score, and Estimated Score

Complicating it a bit doesn't change the regression line.

- Notice that regression averages over differences.
- An additional hour studied, *on average*, corresponds with a six-unit increase in the exam score.
- We have observed data points (y) and our estimates ( $\hat{y}$ , or y-hat).

Thus, we get this form of the regression line.

$$\hat{y} = \hat{a} + \hat{b}(x) + e$$

...where:

- $\hat{y}$ ,  $\hat{a}$  and  $\hat{b}$  are estimates of y, a, and b over the data.
- *e* is the error term.
  - It contains random sampling error, prediction error, and predictors not included in the model.

How do we get a regression coefficient for more complicated data?

- Start with the **prediction error**, formally:  $y_i \hat{y}$ .
- Square them. In other words:  $(y_i \hat{y})^2$ 
  - If you didn't, the sum of prediction errors would equal zero.

The regression coefficient that emerges minimizes the sum of squared differences ( $(y_i - \hat{y})^2$ ).

• Put another way: "ordinary least squares" (OLS) regression.

The next figure offers a representation of this for our example.

#### A Scatterplot of Human Capital and Life Expectancy in 2020

The line that minimizes the sum of squared prediction errors is drawn through these points.



Human Capital Index

Data: ?wbd\_example in {stevedata}, by way of World Bank.

#### How You'd Get What You Want in R

```
summary(M1 <- lm(lifeexp ~ hci, data=Data))</pre>
#>
\#> Call:
#> lm(formula = lifeexp ~ hci, data = Data)
#>
#> Residuals:
      Min 10 Median 30 Max
#>
#> -3.9279 -1.0137 -0.0183 1.0120 4.3228
#>
#> Coefficients:
             Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
#>
#> (Intercept) 51.102 6.002 8.515 1.45e-08 ***
#> hci
           38.941 8.177 4.762 8.42e-05 ***
#> ---
#> Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#>
#> Residual standard error: 2.185 on 23 degrees of freedom
#> Multiple R-squared: 0.1965. Adjusted R-squared: 0.1716
#> F-statistic: 22.68 on 1 and 23 DF, p-value: 8.424e-05
```

## On the Output You See

The important stuff:

- "Estimate": y-intercept, and regression coefficients (i.e. "rise over run")
- Standard errors: an estimate of variability around the estimate (coefficient).
- Test statistic stuff (t-statistic, p-value): the stuff you'll use for inference.
- $R^2$ s: measures of how well the model fit the data.

The less important stuff:

- *F*-statistic: "overall significance" of the model.
- Residual standard error: standard error of the residuals
  - Used for calculating standard errors, in combination with the var-cov matrix (which you don't see).
- Distribution of residuals (at the top): provides a summary of the range of residuals.

Each parameter in the regression model comes with a "standard error."

• These estimate how precisely the model estimates the coefficient's unknown value.

This has a convoluted estimation procedure.

- Namely: you need the diagonal of the square root of the variance-covariance matrix.
- This requires matrix algebra, and I hate matrix algebra. :P

It's standard output in a regression formula object in R, though.

#### A Scatterplot of Human Capital and Life Expectancy in 2020

The line that minimizes the sum of squared prediction errors is drawn through these points.



Human Capital Index

Data: ?wbd\_example in {stevedata}, by way of World Bank.

# **Regression: Human Capital and Life Expectancy**

This would be our regression line:

$$\hat{y} = 51.102 + 38.941(x)$$

How to interpret this:

- The country for which human capital is 0 would have an average life expectancy of 51.102.
  - This would never be observed, but it's at least a plausible quantity.
- A one-unit increase in human capital corresponds with an estimate increase in life expectancy of 38.941 years.
  - Given this variable's scale, this is incidentally a min-max effect.

What do we say about that *b*-hat ( $\hat{b}$  = 38.941?)

- If we took another "sample", would we observe something drastically different?
- How would we know?

You've done this before. Remember our last lectures? And z-scores?

$$Z = \frac{\overline{x} - \mu}{s.e.}$$

We do the same thing, but with a Student's *t*-distribution.

$$t = \frac{\hat{b} - \beta}{s.e.}$$

 $\hat{b}$  is our regression coefficient. What is our eta?

 $\beta$  is actually zero!

- We are testing whether our regression coefficient is an artifact of the "sampling process".
- We're testing a competing hypothesis that there is no relationship between *x* and *y*.
  - This is the "null hypothesis" you'll read about in your travels.

# **Inference in Regression**

This makes things a lot simpler.

$$t = \frac{\hat{b}}{s.e.}$$

In our example, this turns out nicely.

$$t = \frac{38.941}{8.177} = 4.762$$

Our regression coefficient is more than four standard errors from zero .

• The probability of observing it if  $\beta$  were really zero is 0.0000842

We judge our regression coefficient to be "statistically significant."

• This is a fancy (and misleading) way of saying "it's highly unlikely to be 0."

#### Conclusion

Hopefully, this lecture demystified regression.

- It builds on everything discussed to this point.
- The same process of inference from sample to population is used.
- Really nothing to it but to do it, I 'spose.

We're going to add a fair bit on top of this next.

• If you understand this, everything else to follow is basically window dressing.

# **Table of Contents**

Introduction

Correlation

Linear Regression

Demystifying Regression A Simple Example Getting a Regression Coefficient Inference in Regression

#### Conclusion