The EPA mileage data contains a number of variables and measurements for each vehicle:

- miles per gallon (mpg)
- car or truck?
- cubic inches displacement (cylinder volume)
- rhp rated horsepower
- mfr manufacturer
- city or highway?
- vehicle weight

The EPA mileage data contains a number of variables and measurements for each vehicle:

- miles per gallon (mpg)
- car or truck?
- cubic inches displacement (cylinder volume)
- rhp rated horsepower
- mfr manufacturer
- city or highway?
- vehicle weight

Often, we are interested in *predicting* one variable, say mpg, from the others.

- miles per gallon (mpg)
- car or truck?
- cubic inches displacement (cylinder volume)
- rhp rated horsepower
- mfr manufacturer
- city or highway?
- vehicle weight

In this situation, mpg is considered a *response* and the others are considered *predictors*

- miles per gallon (mpg)
- car or truck?
- cubic inches displacement (cylinder volume)
- rhp rated horsepower
- mfr manufacturer
- city or highway?
- vehicle weight

In this situation, mpg is considered a *response* and the others are considered *predictors*

We want to find some way of using the predictors to estimate value of the response variable

Of course, we already know the value of the response variable for the entries in our data matrix.

It might seem odd that we would try to predict something we already know.

Of course, we already know the value of the response variable for the entries in our data matrix.

It might seem odd that we would try to predict something we already know.

The real value the model is to predict the response variable for combinations of the predictors that do not appear in our data.

Of course, we already know the value of the response variable for the entries in our data matrix.

It might seem odd that we would try to predict something we already know.

The real value the model is to predict the response variable for combinations of the predictors that do not appear in our data.

For example, suppose we were interested in the effect of increasing the displacement of the engine in a certain vehicle by 40 cubic inches.

Of course, we already know the value of the response variable for the entries in our data matrix.

It might seem odd that we would try to predict something we already know.

The real value the model is to predict the response variable for combinations of the predictors that do not appear in our data.

For example, suppose we were interested in the effect of increasing the displacement of the engine in a certain vehicle by 40 cubic inches.

If we increase the value of the corresponding predictor variable by 40, and keep the others the same, we can estimate the effect without actually having to build a modified vehicle.

The simplest type of mathematical model we can have is a *linear model*

The simplest type of mathematical model we can have is a *linear model*

A *linear model* estimates the response variable as a weighted average of the predictors.

The simplest type of mathematical model we can have is a *linear model*

A *linear model* estimates the response variable as a weighted average of the predictors.

If we label the response variable Y and the predictors X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n , the general form of a linear model is:

$$Y = \beta_1 \cdot X_1 + \beta_2 \cdot X_2 + \dots + \beta_n \cdot X_n$$

The simplest type of mathematical model we can have is a *linear model*

A *linear model* estimates the response variable as a weighted average of the predictors.

If we label the response variable Y and the predictors X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n , the general form of a linear model is:

$$Y = \beta_1 \cdot X_1 + \beta_2 \cdot X_2 + \dots + \beta_n \cdot X_n$$

The β values are constants that we need to assign values to.

The simplest type of mathematical model we can have is a *linear model*

A *linear model* estimates the response variable as a weighted average of the predictors.

If we label the response variable Y and the predictors X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n , the general form of a linear model is:

$$Y = \beta_1 \cdot X_1 + \beta_2 \cdot X_2 + \dots + \beta_n \cdot X_n$$

The β values are constants that we need to assign values to.

We choose the β values that "best" predict our measured responses from the corresponding predictors.

The term "best" needs some clarification.

The term "best" needs some clarification.

Generally with real data, it will be impossible to find values for the β s that exactly predict our observed response variables.

So the equation

$$Y = \beta_1 \cdot X_1 + \beta_2 \cdot X_2 + \dots + \beta_n \cdot X_n$$

cannot possibly hold for all of the rows in our data table.

The term "best" needs some clarification.

Generally with real data, it will be impossible to find values for the β s that exactly predict our observed response variables.

So the equation

$$Y = \beta_1 \cdot X_1 + \beta_2 \cdot X_2 + \dots + \beta_n \cdot X_n$$

cannot possibly hold for all of the rows in our data table.

Since equality is impossible, we try to make the difference between the predicted and actual response variables as small as possible:

difference =
$$Y - (\beta_1 \cdot X_1 + \beta_2 \cdot X_2 + \dots + \beta_n \cdot X_n)$$

Actually we determine the β values that make the total of the squares of these differences as small as possible.

We use squares of the differences to prevent positive and negative differences from cancelling out.

Actually we determine the β values that make the total of the squares of these differences as small as possible.

We use squares of the differences to prevent positive and negative differences from cancelling out.

The term *linear least squares models* or just *linear models* refers to the collection of models based on this technique.

Actually we determine the β values that make the total of the squares of these differences as small as possible.

We use squares of the differences to prevent positive and negative differences from cancelling out.

The term *linear least squares models* or just *linear models* refers to the collection of models based on this technique.

The following techniques are special types of linear models analysis:

- Analysis of Variance
- Simple and Multiple Regression
- Analysis of Covariance

- Analysis of Variance
- Simple and Multiple Regression
- Analysis of Covariance

Often these are presented as entirely separate topics, but in fact they are all essentially the same.

- Analysis of Variance
- Simple and Multiple Regression
- Analysis of Covariance

Often these are presented as entirely separate topics, but in fact they are all essentially the same.

Each of them estimates the β values of a linear equation of the form

$$Y = \beta_1 \cdot X_1 + \beta_2 \cdot X_2 + \dots + \beta_n \cdot X_n$$

- Analysis of Variance
- Simple and Multiple Regression
- Analysis of Covariance

Often these are presented as entirely separate topics, but in fact they are all essentially the same.

Each of them estimates the β values of a linear equation of the form

$$Y = \beta_1 \cdot X_1 + \beta_2 \cdot X_2 + \dots + \beta_n \cdot X_n$$

The difference is in the nature of the predictor variables X_i (whether they are categorical or continuous).

The relationship between the classical types of analysis and the nature of the predictor variables is:

Classical name	Predictor variables		
Analysis of Variance	All predictors are categorical		
Regression	All predictors are continuous		
Analysis of Covariance	Some categorical, some continuous		

The relationship between the classical types of analysis and the nature of the predictor variables is:

Classical name	Predictor variables	
Analysis of Variance	All predictors are categorical	
Regression	All predictors are continuous	
Analysis of Covariance	Some categorical, some continuous	

Current statistical software reflects the unified view as most packages provide a *general linear model* routine that handles all three situations.

The relationship between the classical types of analysis and the nature of the predictor variables is:

Classical name	Predictor variables		
Analysis of Variance	All predictors are categorical		
Regression	All predictors are continuous		
Analysis of Covariance	Some categorical, some continuous		

Current statistical software reflects the unified view as most packages provide a *general linear model* routine that handles all three situations.

In fact, the set of equations the program needs to solve to find the β values is the same in all three cases.

Returning to our EPA mileage data example, we would probably categorize the variables as follows:

Variable	Туре	
mpg (miles per gallon)	response	
c/t (car or truck)	categorical predictor	
cid (displacement)	continuous predictor	
rhp (horsepower)	continuous predictor	
mfr (manufacturer)	categorical predictor	
C/H (city/hwy)	categorical predictor	
etw (weight)	continuous predictor	
vpc (cylinders)	continuous predictor	

Returning to our EPA mileage data example, we would probably categorize the variables as follows:

Variable	Туре		
mpg (miles per gallon)	response		
c/t (car or truck)	categorical predictor		
cid (displacement)	continuous predictor		
rhp (horsepower)	continuous predictor		
mfr (manufacturer)	categorical predictor		
C/H (city/hwy)	categorical predictor		
etw (weight)	continuous predictor		
vpc (cylinders)	continuous predictor		

A variable like vpc, which assumes only a few values (4,6,8) may be treated as either categorical or continuous.

Generally there is one β_i parameter for each continuous predictor.

Generally there is one β_i parameter for each continuous predictor.

If we made a table of the response and predictor values for the EPA data, with weight as the predictor, the data/response matrix might look like this:

mpg	weight		
18.4	5400		
22.1	4400		
32.8	3300		
17.1	6000		
18.2	5600		

Actually, there would probably be one additional β known as the *intercept*,

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot X$$

Actually, there would probably be one additional β known as the *intercept*,

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot X$$

mpg	weight		
18.4	1 5400		
22.1	1	4400	
32.8	1	3300	
17.1	1	6000	
18.2	1	5600	

Actually, there would probably be one additional β known as the *intercept*,

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot X$$

mpg	weight		
18.4	1 5400		
22.1	1	4400	
32.8	1	3300	
17.1	1	6000	
18.2	1	5600	

The matrix of coefficients in the right hand box is called the *design matrix* for the model.

The interpretation of the design matrix is that the numbers

Equation:

$$18.4 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 5400 \cdot \beta_1$$

$$22.1 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 4400 \cdot \beta_1$$

$$32.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 3300 \cdot \beta_1$$

$$17.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 6000 \cdot \beta_1$$

$$18.2 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 5600 \cdot \beta_1$$

are multipliers for the β values:

The interpretation of the design matrix is that the numbers

Equation:

are multipliers for the
$$\beta$$
 values:
$$\begin{vmatrix} 18.4 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 5400 \cdot \beta_1 \\ 22.1 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 4400 \cdot \beta_1 \\ 22.9 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 4400 \cdot \beta_1 \\ 22.9 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 2200 \cdot \beta_0 + 2200 \cdot \beta_0 \\ 22.9 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 2200 \cdot \beta_0 + 2200 \cdot \beta_0 \\$$

$$32.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 3300 \cdot \beta_1$$

$$17.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 6000 \cdot \beta_1$$

$$18.2 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 5600 \cdot \beta_1$$

Each data observation produces one equation in this system.

are multipliers for the β values:

The interpretation of the design matrix is that the numbers

Equation:

$$18.4 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 5400 \cdot \beta_2$$

$$22.1 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 4400 \cdot \beta_1$$

$$32.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 3300 \cdot \beta_1$$

$$17.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 6000 \cdot \beta_1$$

$$18.2 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 5600 \cdot \beta_1$$

Each data observation produces one equation in this system.

The system almost never has an exact solution. The "best" solutions minimizes the squared differences between the predicted and actual response values.

Categorical predictors have a separate β parameter for *each value* they assume.

Categorical predictors have a separate β parameter for *each value* they assume.

For the categorical variable *car or truck*, there would be two β values, one for cars and one for trucks.

Categorical predictors have a separate β parameter for *each value* they assume.

For the categorical variable *car or truck*, there would be two β values, one for cars and one for trucks.

The design matrix has one column for each of these two beta values. Suppose entries 1, 4, and 5 are trucks, and β_1 represents cars while β_2 represents trucks. The design

	mpg		car	truck
	18.4	1	0	1
iv ic:	22.1	1	1	0
17 15.	32.8	1	1	0
	17.1	1	0	1
	18.2	1	0	1

The interpretation of the design matrix is that the numbers are multipliers for the β values:

Equation:

$$18.4 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 0 \cdot \beta_1 + 1 \cdot \beta_2$$

$$22.1 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 1 \cdot \beta_1 + 0 \cdot \beta_2$$

$$32.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 1 \cdot \beta_1 + 0 \cdot \beta_2$$

$$17.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 0 \cdot \beta_1 + 1 \cdot \beta_2$$

$$18.2 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 0 \cdot \beta_1 + 1 \cdot \beta_2$$

The interpretation of the design matrix is that the numbers are multipliers for the β values:

Equation:

$$18.4 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 0 \cdot \beta_1 + 1 \cdot \beta_2$$

$$22.1 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 1 \cdot \beta_1 + 0 \cdot \beta_2$$

$$32.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 1 \cdot \beta_1 + 0 \cdot \beta_2$$

$$17.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 0 \cdot \beta_1 + 1 \cdot \beta_2$$

$$18.2 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 0 \cdot \beta_1 + 1 \cdot \beta_2$$

Again, each data observation produces one equation in this system.

The interpretation of the design matrix is that the numbers are multipliers for the β values:

Equation:

 $18.4 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 0 \cdot \beta_1 + 1 \cdot \beta_2$ $22.1 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 1 \cdot \beta_1 + 0 \cdot \beta_2$ $32.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 1 \cdot \beta_1 + 0 \cdot \beta_2$ $17.8 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 0 \cdot \beta_1 + 1 \cdot \beta_2$ $18.2 = 1 \cdot \beta_0 + 0 \cdot \beta_1 + 1 \cdot \beta_2$

Again, each data observation produces one equation in this system.

The "best" solutions minimizes the squared differences between the predicted and actual response values.