

## ROBUSTNESS

Our model for simple linear regression has four assumptions:

1. Linear mean function:  $E(Y|x) = \eta_0 + \eta_1 x$
2. Constant variance of conditional distributions:  $\text{Var}(Y|x) = \sigma^2$  (constant variance)  
  
(Equivalently: Constant variance of conditional errors:  $\text{Var}(e|x) = \sigma^2$ )
3. Independence of observations:  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  are chosen independently from  $Y|x_1, Y|x_2, \dots, Y|x_n$ , respectively.
4.  $Y|x$  is normal for each  $x$  (or at least for each  $x_i$  and for each  $x$  where we wish to do inference.)

*Robustness* is the question of how valid our procedures are if the model doesn't exactly fit.

### ***Robustness to departures from linearity:***

- Not all relationships are linear, but sometimes a linear model can be useful even if the relationship is known not to be linear. (e.g., to check for an increasing or decreasing trend, or as a good-enough approximation.) However, results need to be interpreted
- Remember that a high  $R^2$  does *not* mean that the relationship is linear.
- Often we can transform to linearity to get a better model fit. [More later]
- *Outliers* (observations that don't fit the general pattern of the data) can have a strong influence on the least squares fit.

***Wise practice:*** *If there is just one predictor, always look at a scatter plot before calculating a simple linear regression -- and make decisions about transforming variables and whether or not to include outliers in the analysis.*

### ***Robustness to departures from constant variance:***

- $\hat{\eta}_0$  and  $\hat{\eta}_1$  are still unbiased estimators of  $\eta_0$  and  $\eta_1$ .
- Since the constant variance assumption was important in inference, the inference procedures are not reliable in the presence of non-constant variance ("heteroskedasticity").
- Possible remedies for nonconstant variance:

1. Transform to constant variance
2. Weighted least squares (Chapter 9)

***Robustness to departures from independence of observations:***

- $\hat{\eta}_0$  and  $\hat{\eta}_1$  are still unbiased estimators of  $\eta_0$  and  $\eta_1$ .
- Since independence of observations was used in developing inference procedures, the inference procedures are not reliable.
- However, if observations are "almost independent," it's probably OK to use inference procedures

*Important example:* We often sample with replacement, which does not give independent observations -- but with large sample sizes, the covariances are negligible.

***Robustness to departures from normality***

- $\hat{\eta}_0$  and  $\hat{\eta}_1$  are still unbiased estimators of  $\eta_0$  and  $\eta_1$ .
- Since normality of conditional distributions was used in developing inference procedures, the inference procedures might be questioned.
- However, if  $n$  is large, the Central Limit Theorem implies that the sampling distributions of the estimates are approximately normal.

*Empirical Rule of Thumb:* Inference for  $\hat{\eta}_0$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_1$ , and  $\hat{E}(Y|x)$  is approximately valid unless  $n$  is small and the distributions of the  $Y|x$ 's are strongly skewed or bimodal.

*However:*

- a. The inference procedures are not as powerful -- i.e., they are not as good at distinguishing between close values -- so they are less likely to show evidence against  $H_0$  when  $H_0$  is false.

*Thus:* Transforming to (or close to) normality is still desirable. [more later]

- b. Prediction is *less* robust -- since  $y$  may dominate in prediction.