

## 10. Logistic regression

Logistic regression . . . . .	2
Example: Chilean plebiscite data . . . . .	3
Why is the linear model not good for these data? . . . . .	4
Possible solutions. . . . .	5
Interpretation in terms of hidden variables . . . . .	6
Computation of the estimator . . . . .	7
Computation of the estimator (2). . . . .	8
Interpretation: $\pi_i$ , odds and log odds . . . . .	9
Interpretation . . . . .	10
Interpretation (2). . . . .	11
Multiple logistic regression . . . . .	12
Types of independent variables . . . . .	13
Testing with logistic regression . . . . .	14

## Logistic regression

- Logistic regression can be used when the dependent variable has two outcomes: yes/no, 0/1.
- Predict/describe  $E(Y_i|x_i)$ .
- Why can't we use linear regression?
- Testing with logistic regression

2 / 14

## Example: Chilean plebiscite data

- Some history:
  - ◆ 1973: Coup  $\Rightarrow$  military government of Pinochet
  - ◆ 1988: Referendum to decide the future of the government:  
Yes-vote = keep military government for 8 more years,  
No-vote = change to civilian government.
- Six months before plebiscite, national survey of 2700 randomly selected Chilean voters:
  - ◆ 868 planned to vote yes
  - ◆ 889 planned to vote no
  - ◆ 558 were undecided
  - ◆ 187 planned to abstain
  - ◆ 168 did not answer
- We only look at yes/no votes

3 / 14

## Why is the linear model not good for these data?

- Problems:
  - ◆ The model is only reasonable for a limited range. Outside this range we get fitted values that are smaller than zero or larger than one.
  - ◆ Nonparametric regression shows S-shaped fit, not a linear fit.
  - ◆  $Y_i$  can only take values 0 and 1. Errors are not normally distributed. However, for large sample sizes, the central limit theorem will save us.
  - ◆ The variance of the statistical errors is not constant.
- Why don't we have similar problems with 0-1 independent variables?

4 / 14

## Possible solutions

- Cut off the graph at zero and one.
  - ◆ Sometimes OK, if relationship is approximately linear in a certain range
- Use logistic regression:
  - ◆  $\text{logit}(u) = \log(u/(1 - u))$ .
  - ◆ If  $u \in (0, 1)$ , then  $\text{logit}(u) \in (-\infty, \infty)$
  - ◆ In principle, one could use logit transformation on the  $y$ -values, but one has to perturb them a little bit (how much?) since  $\text{logit}(0)$  and  $\text{logit}(1)$  are not defined
  - ◆ We perform the logit transformation on  $E(Y_i|x_i)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\text{logit}E(Y_i|x_i) &= \alpha + \beta x_i \\ \text{logit}P(Y_i = 1|x_i) &= \alpha + \beta x_i\end{aligned}$$

5 / 14

## Interpretation in terms of hidden variables

See board

6 / 14

## Computation of the estimator

- Write  $\text{logit}P_\theta(Y_i = 1|x_i) = \mathbf{x}_i^T \theta$ , where  $\theta = (\alpha, \beta)^T$
- Density of one observation:

$$\begin{aligned}P_\theta[Y_i = y_i|x_i] &= \left( \frac{P_\theta[Y_i = 1|x_i]}{P_\theta[Y_i = 0|x_i]} \right)^{y_i} P_\theta[Y_i = 0|x_i] \\ &= \exp[y_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \theta - \log(1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}_i^T \theta))]\end{aligned}$$

- Log likelihood:

$$\begin{aligned}l(\theta) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \log P_\theta(Y_i = y_i|x_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n [y_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \theta - \log(1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}_i^T \theta))]\end{aligned}$$

7 / 14

## Computation of the estimator (2)

- Maximizer is given by solution of:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - P_{\hat{\theta}}[Y_i = 1 | \mathbf{x}_i]) \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}$$

- Solve with iterative methods

8 / 14

## Interpretation: $\pi_i$ , odds and log odds

- Let  $\pi_i = P(Y = 1 | x_i)$  be the conditional probability that  $Y = 1$  given that  $X = x_i$ .
- Note that  $E(Y | x_i) = \pi_i$  (derivation on board).
- $\pi_i / (1 - \pi_i)$  are the *odds* that  $Y = 1$  given  $X = x_i$ .
- $\log(\pi_i / (1 - \pi_i))$  are the *log odds*.
- See table for log odds.

9 / 14

## Interpretation

$$\text{logit}(\pi_i) = \log\left(\frac{\pi_i}{1 - \pi_i}\right) = \alpha + \beta x_i.$$

- Logistic regression is an additive model for the log odds. This gives one interpretation for  $\beta$ : If  $X$  is increased by one, then the *log odds* are *increased* by  $\beta$ .
- Logistic regression is a multiplicative model for the odds:

$$\frac{\pi_i}{1 - \pi_i} = \exp(\alpha + \beta X_i) = \exp(\alpha) [\exp(\beta)]^{X_i}$$

This gives another interpretation for  $\beta$ : If  $X$  is increased by one, then the *odds* are *multiplied* by  $\exp(\beta)$ .

- Note that:

$$\pi_i = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[-(\alpha + \beta X_i)]}$$

10 / 14

## Interpretation (2)

■

$$\pi_i = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[-(\alpha + \beta X_i)]}$$

- Differentiating with respect to  $X_i$  (see derivation on board) gives that the slope at  $X_i$  is  $\pi_i(1 - \pi_i)\beta$ .
- Hence, the derivative of the fitted graph is  $\pi_i(1 - \pi_i)\beta$ . This gives a third interpretation for  $\beta$ . If  $X = x_i$ , and  $X$  is increased by  $\epsilon$  (small), then  $\pi_i$  will increase by  $\epsilon\pi_i(1 - \pi_i)\beta$ .
- See table of slopes. Note that the slopes are quite constant between  $\pi = 0.2$  and  $\pi = 0.8$ . In this range the S-curve is close to linear.
- We don't interpret  $\alpha$ .
- How does all this work for the Chile data?

11 / 14

## Multiple logistic regression

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi_i}{1 - \pi_i}\right) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_k X_{ik}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\pi_i}{1 - \pi_i} &= \exp(\alpha + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_k X_{ik}) \\ &= \exp(\alpha) \exp(\beta_1 X_{i1}) \dots \exp(\beta_k X_{ik}) \\ &= \exp(\alpha) [\exp(\beta_1)]^{X_{i1}} \dots [\exp(\beta_k)]^{X_{ik}}\end{aligned}$$

$$\pi_i = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[-(\alpha + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_k X_{ik})]}$$

12 / 14

## Types of independent variables

- The  $X$ 's can be as general as in linear regression:
  - ◆ quantitative variables
  - ◆ transformations of quantitative variables
  - ◆ dummy regressors for qualitative variables
  - ◆ interaction regressors

13 / 14

## Testing with logistic regression

- Wald test (analogous to t-test)
- Likelihood ratio test (analogous to F-test)
  - ◆ Full model  $m_1$
  - ◆ Null model  $m_0$  (special case of full model)
  - ◆ Compute likelihood for both models:  $L_1$  and  $L_0$ .  $L_1 \geq L_0$ . Why?

14 / 14