

The Statistical Sleuth in R:

Chapter 8

Kate Aloisio

Ruobing Zhang

Nicholas J. Horton*

August 24, 2024

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Island Area and Number of Species	2
2.1	Summary statistics and graphical display	2
2.2	Simple Linear Model	4
2.3	Assessment of Assumptions	5
3	Breakdown Times for Insulating Fluid Under Different Voltages	6
3.1	Summary statistics and graphical display	6
3.2	Simple linear regression models	8
3.3	Assessment of Assumptions	11
3.4	Other transformations	12

1 Introduction

This document is intended to help describe how to undertake analyses introduced as examples in the Third Edition of the *Statistical Sleuth* (2013) by Fred Ramsey and Dan Schafer. More information about the book can be found at <http://www.proaxis.com/~panorama/home.htm>. This file as well as the associated `knitr` reproducible analysis source file can be found at <http://www.math.smith.edu/~nhorton/sleuth3>.

This work leverages initiatives undertaken by Project MOSAIC (<http://www.mosaic-web.org>), an NSF-funded effort to improve the teaching of statistics, calculus, science and computing in the undergraduate curriculum. In particular, we utilize the `mosaic` package, which was written to simplify the use of R for introductory statistics courses. A short summary of the R needed to teach introductory statistics can be found in the `mosaic` package vignette (<http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/mosaic/vignettes/MinimalR.pdf>).

To use a package within R, it must be installed (one time), and loaded (each session). The package can be installed using the following command:

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Smith College, nhorton@smith.edu

```
> install.packages('mosaic') # note the quotation marks
```

Once this is installed, it can be loaded by running the command:

```
> require(mosaic)
```

This needs to be done once per session.

In addition the data files for the *Sleuth* case studies can be accessed by installing the **Sleuth3** package.

```
> install.packages('Sleuth3') # note the quotation marks
```

```
> require(Sleuth3)
```

We also set some options to improve legibility of graphs and output.

```
> trellis.par.set(theme=col.mosaic()) # get a better color scheme for lattice
> options(digits=4)
```

The specific goal of this document is to demonstrate how to calculate the quantities described in Chapter 8: A Closer Look at Assumptions for Simple Linear Regression using R.

2 Island Area and Number of Species

What is the relationship between the area of islands and the number of animal and plant species living on them? This is the question addressed in case study 8.1 in the *Sleuth*.

2.1 Summary statistics and graphical display

We begin by reading the data and summarizing the variables.


```
> case0801
  Area Species
1 44218    100
2 29371    108
3  4244     45
4  3435     53
5   32      16
6   5       11
7   1        7
> summary(case0801)
```

Area		Species	
Min. :	1	Min. :	7.0
1st Qu.:	18	1st Qu.:	13.5
Median :	3435	Median :	45.0
Mean :	11615	Mean :	48.6
3rd Qu.:	16808	3rd Qu.:	76.5
Max. :	44218	Max. :	108.0

A total of 7 islands are included in this data as displayed in Display 8.1 (page 208).


We can then observe the relationship between the area and the number of species for these islands with a scatterplot, akin to the top figure in Display 8.2 (page 209).

```
> xyplot(Species ~ Area, data=case0801)
```



It appears that the relationship with the observed values may not be linear, therefore we need to check the normality assumption to determine if transformations are necessary.

```
> densityplot(~ Area, data=case0801)
> densityplot(~ Species, data=case0801)
```




Since neither of these appear to be approximately normal, we log transformed both the variables.

```
> case0801$logarea = with(case0801, log(Area))
> case0801$logspecies = with(case0801, log(Species))
```

Then we can create a log-log-scatterplot for these two variables, akin to the bottom figure in Display 8.2 (page 209).

```
> xyplot(logspecies ~ logarea, type = c("p", "r"), data=case0801)
```



2.2 Simple Linear Model

We first fit the model for $\mu\{\log(\text{Species})|\log(\text{Area})\} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \log(\text{Area})$.

```
> lm1 = lm(logspecies ~ logarea, data=case0801)
> summary(lm1)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = logspecies ~ logarea, data = case0801)
```

Residuals:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-0.002136	0.176975	-0.215487	0.000947	-0.029244	0.059543	0.009402

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	1.9365	0.0881	22.0	3.6e-06
logarea	0.2497	0.0121	20.6	5.0e-06

Residual standard error: 0.128 on 5 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.988, Adjusted R-squared: 0.986

F-statistic: 425 on 1 and 5 DF, p-value: 4.96e-06

Thus our estimated equation becomes, $\hat{\mu}\{\log(\text{Species})|\log(\text{Area})\} = 1.94 + 0.25 * \log(\text{Area})$.

Next we calculate the 95% confidence interval for the estimates, note that the `logarea` 95% confidence interval is interpreted in the “Statistical Conclusion” on page 208:

```
> confint(lm1)
                2.5 % 97.5 %
(Intercept) 1.7100 2.1631
logarea      0.2186 0.2808
```

To interpret this log-log model the *Sleuth* notes that if $\hat{\mu}\{\log(Y)|\log(X)\} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \log(X)$ then $\text{Median}\{Y|X\} = \exp(\beta_0)X^{\beta_1}$ (page 216). For this example the researchers are interested in a doubling effect (2^{β_1}). Therefore to obtain the 95% confidence interval for the multiplicative factor in the median we used the following code:

```
> 2^confint(lm1)
                2.5 % 97.5 %
(Intercept) 3.272  4.479
logarea      1.164  1.215
```


Thus for this model the estimated median number of species is 1.19 ($2^{0.25}$) with a 95% confidence interval between (1.16, 1.21). These match the numbers found on page 217.

2.3 Assessment of Assumptions

First we will have to assume independence from the information given. As seen in the above density plots, the observations for each variable were not normally distributed, once we performed a log transformation the distribution of the values became more approximately normal.


Next we can check for linearity.

```
> plot(lm1, which=2)
```



Lastly we can assess the assumption of equal variance.

```
> plot(lm1, which=1)
```



3 Breakdown Times for Insulating Fluid Under Different Voltages

How does the distribution of breakdown time depend on voltage? This is the question addressed in case study 8.2 in the *Sleuth*.

3.1 Summary statistics and graphical display

We begin by reading the data and summarizing the variables.


```
> summary(case0802)
```

Time	Voltage	Group
Min. : 0.1	Min. :26.0	Group1: 3
1st Qu.: 1.6	1st Qu.:31.5	Group2: 5
Median : 6.9	Median :34.0	Group3:11
Mean : 98.6	Mean :33.1	Group4:15
3rd Qu.: 38.4	3rd Qu.:36.0	Group5:19
Max. :2323.7	Max. :38.0	Group6:15
		Group7: 8

A total of 76 samples of insulating fluids are included in this data. Each sample was placed in one of 7 groups representing different degrees of voltage. Each group varied in sample size as shown in Display 8.2 (page 209).


Before we can fit the simple linear regression model we need to assess the assumption of normality through density plots.

```
> histogram(~ Time, type='density', density=TRUE, nint=10, data=case0802)
```




It appears that the distribution of `Time` is highly skewed with a long right tail. Therefore one possible transformation would be to take the log of the `Time` observations.

```
> case0802$logtime=with(case0802, log(Time))  
> histogram(~ logtime, type='density', density=TRUE, nint=10, data=case0802)
```



Now the observations are approximately normally distributed.


```
> histogram(~ Voltage, type='density', density=TRUE, nint=10, data=case0802)
```



The distribution of `Voltage` seems to be approximately normal.

Next we can observe the relationship between `log(Time)` and `Voltage`, the following figure is akin to Display 8.4 (page 211).

```
> xyplot(logtime ~ Voltage, groups=Group, auto.key=TRUE, data=case0802)
```



3.2 Simple linear regression models

The model that the researchers want to analyse is $\mu\{\log(\text{Time})|\text{Voltage}\} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{Voltage}$

```
> lm1 = lm(logtime ~ Voltage, data=case0802)
> summary(lm1)
```



```

Call:
lm(formula = logtime ~ Voltage, data = case0802)

Residuals:
    Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-4.029 -0.692  0.037  1.209  2.651

Coefficients:
              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)  18.9555     1.9100    9.92 3.1e-15
Voltage      -0.5074     0.0574   -8.84 3.3e-13

Residual standard error: 1.56 on 74 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.514, Adjusted R-squared:  0.507
F-statistic: 78.1 on 1 and 74 DF,  p-value: 3.34e-13

```

Therefore the estimated model is $\hat{\mu}\{\log(\text{Time})|\text{Voltage}\} = 18.96 + (-0.51) \cdot \log(\text{Area})$. The R^2 for the model is 51.36%, as discussed on page 222.

For the interpretation of the model we first exponentiate the estimated coefficients since the response variable is logged as shown on page 216.

```

> exp(coef(lm1))

(Intercept)      Voltage
 1.707e+08    6.021e-01

```

Thus a 1 kV increase in voltage is associated with a multiplicative change in median breakdown time of 0.6.

Next we can calculate the 95% confidence interval for β_0 and β_1 .

```

> confint(lm1)

              2.5 % 97.5 %
(Intercept) 15.1497 22.761
Voltage      -0.6217 -0.393

```

For the interpretation of the model we next need to exponentiate the above 95% confidence interval.

```

> exp(confint(lm1))

              2.5 %   97.5 %
(Intercept) 3.797e+06 7.675e+09
Voltage      5.370e-01 6.750e-01

```

Thus the 95% confidence interval for the multiplicative change in median breakdown time is (0.54, 0.68) as interpreted on page 216.

Next we can assess the fit using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The ANOVA results below match those in the top half of Display 8.8 (page 219).

```
> anova(lm1)

Analysis of Variance Table

Response: logtime
          Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F)
Voltage    1    190   190.2    78.1 3.3e-13
Residuals 74    180     2.4
```

We can then compare this with a model with separate means for each group.

```
> lm2 = lm(logtime ~ as.factor(Voltage), data=case0802)
> summary(lm2)

Call:
lm(formula = logtime ~ as.factor(Voltage), data = case0802)

Residuals:
    Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-3.868 -0.819  0.074  1.122  3.143

Coefficients:
              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)         5.624      0.916   6.14 4.7e-08
as.factor(Voltage)28 -0.294      1.159  -0.25 0.80019
as.factor(Voltage)30 -1.802      1.034  -1.74 0.08571
as.factor(Voltage)32 -3.395      1.004  -3.38 0.00118
as.factor(Voltage)34 -3.838      0.986  -3.89 0.00023
as.factor(Voltage)36 -4.722      1.004  -4.70 1.3e-05
as.factor(Voltage)38 -6.048      1.074  -5.63 3.6e-07

Residual standard error: 1.59 on 69 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.531, Adjusted R-squared:  0.49
F-statistic: 13 on 6 and 69 DF, p-value: 8.87e-10
```

This model has a F -statistic of 13 with a p -value < 0.0001 , as shown in the bottom half of Display 8.8 (page 218).

Another way of viewing this model is with the ANOVA.

```
> anova(lm2)

Analysis of Variance Table

Response: logtime
          Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F)
as.factor(Voltage) 6    196    32.7    13 8.9e-10
Residuals        69    174     2.5
```

Note that the values for the `Residuals` can also be found in the bottom half of Display 8.8 (page 219).

The F -statistic and its associated p -value for the lack-of-fit discussion on page 220 can be calculated by comparing the two models with an ANOVA.

```
> anova(lm1, lm2)

Analysis of Variance Table


Model 1: logtime ~ Voltage
Model 2: logtime ~ as.factor(Voltage)
  Res.Df RSS Df Sum of Sq  F Pr(>F)
1      74 180
2      69 174  5      6.33 0.5  0.77
```

3.3 Assessment of Assumptions

First we will have to assume independence for the information given. As seen in the above density plot the observations for `Time` was not normally distributed, once we performed a log transformation the distribution of the values became more approximately normal.


Next we can check for linearity, the following figure is akin to the right side graph in Display 8.14 (page 226).

```
> plot(lm1, which=2)
```



Lastly we can assess the assumption of equal variance.


```
> plot(lm1, which=1)
```



3.4 Other transformations

The *Sleuth* also discusses the use of a square root transformation for the breakdown time. The following figure is a scatterplot of the square root of breakdown time versus voltage, akin to the left figure in Display 8.7 (page 215).

```
> case0802$sqrttime = with(case0802, sqrt(Time))
> xyplot(sqrttime ~ Voltage, type=c("p", "r"), data=case0802)
```



We can assess this transformation by observing the residual plot based on the simple linear regression fit, akin to the right figure in Display 8.7 (page 215).

```
> lm3 = lm(sqrttime ~ Voltage, data=case0802)
> summary(lm3)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = sqrttime ~ Voltage, data = case0802)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-----	----	--------	----	-----

```
-15.285 -3.711 0.142 2.040 30.514
```

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	61.784	7.777	7.94	1.6e-11
Voltage	-1.696	0.234	-7.26	3.3e-10

Residual standard error: 6.35 on 74 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.416, Adjusted R-squared: 0.408

F-statistic: 52.7 on 1 and 74 DF, p-value: 3.25e-10

```
> plot(lm3, which = 1)
```

