

Exhibit K

Reference Guide on Multiple Regression

DANIEL L. RUBINFELD

Daniel L. Rubinfeld, Ph.D., is Robert L. Bridges Professor of Law and Professor of Economics Emeritus, University of California, Berkeley, and Visiting Professor of Law at New York University Law School.

CONTENTS

- I. Introduction and Overview, 305
- II. Research Design: Model Specification, 311
 - A. What Is the Specific Question That Is Under Investigation by the Expert? 311
 - B. What Model Should Be Used to Evaluate the Question at Issue? 311
 1. Choosing the dependent variable, 312
 2. Choosing the explanatory variable that is relevant to the question at issue, 313
 3. Choosing the additional explanatory variables, 313
 4. Choosing the functional form of the multiple regression model, 316
 5. Choosing multiple regression as a method of analysis, 317
- III. Interpreting Multiple Regression Results, 318
 - A. What Is the Practical, as Opposed to the Statistical, Significance of Regression Results? 318
 1. When should statistical tests be used? 319
 2. What is the appropriate level of statistical significance? 320
 3. Should statistical tests be one-tailed or two-tailed? 321
 - B. Are the Regression Results Robust? 322
 1. What evidence exists that the explanatory variable causes changes in the dependent variable? 322
 2. To what extent are the explanatory variables correlated with each other? 324
 3. To what extent are individual errors in the regression model independent? 325
 4. To what extent are the regression results sensitive to individual data points? 326
 5. To what extent are the data subject to measurement error? 327

Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence

- IV. The Expert, 328
 - A. Who Should Be Qualified as an Expert? 328
 - B. Should the Court Appoint a Neutral Expert? 329
- V. Presentation of Statistical Evidence, 330
 - A. What Disagreements Exist Regarding Data on Which the Analysis Is Based? 330
 - B. Which Database Information and Analytical Procedures Will Aid in Resolving Disputes over Statistical Studies? 331
- Appendix: The Basics of Multiple Regression, 333
 - A. Introduction, 333
 - B. Linear Regression Model, 336
 - 1. Specifying the regression model, 337
 - 2. Regression line, 337
 - C. Interpreting Regression Results, 339
 - D. Determining the Precision of the Regression Results, 340
 - 1. Standard errors of the coefficients and *t*-statistics, 340
 - 2. Goodness-of-fit, 344
 - 3. Sensitivity of least squares regression results, 345
 - E. Reading Multiple Regression Computer Output, 346
 - F. Forecasting, 348
 - G. A Hypothetical Example, 350
- Glossary of Terms, 352
- References on Multiple Regression, 357

Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence

Not all possible variables that might influence the dependent variable can be included if the analysis is to be successful; some cannot be measured, and others may make little difference.³⁰ If a preliminary analysis shows the unexplained portion of the multiple regression to be unacceptably high, the expert may seek to discover whether some previously undetected variable is missing from the analysis.³¹

Failure to include a major explanatory variable that is correlated with the variable of interest in a regression model may cause an included variable to be credited with an effect that actually is caused by the excluded variable.³² In general, omitted variables that are correlated with the dependent variable reduce the probative value of the regression analysis. The importance of omitting a relevant variable depends on the strength of the relationship between the omitted variable and the dependent variable and the strength of the correlation between the omitted variable and the explanatory variables of interest. Other things being equal, the greater the correlation between the omitted variable and the variable of interest, the greater the bias caused by the omission. As a result, the omission of an important variable may lead to inferences made from regression analyses that do not assist the trier of fact.³³

discrimination), *cert. denied*, 504 U.S. 913 (1992). Whether a particular variable reflects “legitimate” considerations or itself reflects or incorporates illegitimate biases is a recurring theme in discrimination cases. *See, e.g.*, *Smith v. Virginia Commonwealth Univ.*, 84 F.3d 672, 677 (4th Cir. 1996) (en banc) (suggesting that whether “performance factors” should have been included in a regression analysis was a question of material fact); *id.* at 681–82 (Luttig, J., concurring in part) (suggesting that the failure of the regression analysis to include “performance factors” rendered it so incomplete as to be inadmissible); *id.* at 690–91 (Michael, J., dissenting) (suggesting that the regression analysis properly excluded “performance factors”); *see also* *Diehl v. Xerox Corp.*, 933 F. Supp. 1157, 1168 (W.D.N.Y. 1996).

30. The summary effect of the excluded variables shows up as a random error term in the regression model, as does any modeling error. *See* Appendix, *infra*, for details. *But see* David W. Peterson, *Reference Guide on Multiple Regression*, 36 *Jurimetrics J.* 213, 214 n.2 (1996) (review essay) (asserting that “the presumption that the combined effect of the explanatory variables omitted from the model are uncorrelated with the included explanatory variables” is “a knife-edge condition . . . not likely to occur”).

31. A very low R -squared (R^2) is one indication of an unexplained portion of the multiple regression model that is unacceptably high. However, the inference that one makes from a particular value of R^2 will depend, of necessity, on the context of the particular issues under study and the particular dataset that is being analyzed. For reasons discussed in the Appendix, a low R^2 does not necessarily imply a poor model (and vice versa).

32. Technically, the omission of explanatory variables that are correlated with the variable of interest can cause biased estimates of regression parameters.

33. *See* *Bazemore v. Friday*, 751 F.2d 662, 671–72 (4th Cir. 1984) (upholding the district court’s refusal to accept a multiple regression analysis as proof of discrimination by a preponderance of the evidence, the court of appeals stated that, although the regression used four variable factors (race, education, tenure, and job title), the failure to use other factors, including pay increases that varied by county, precluded their introduction into evidence), *aff’d in part, vacated in part*, 478 U.S. 385 (1986).

Note, however, that in *Sobel v. Yeshiva University*, 839 F.2d 18, 33, 34 (2d Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 490 U.S. 1105 (1989), the court made clear that “a [Title VII] defendant challenging the validity of