

行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

共線性對檢測調節效用的影響 研究成果報告(精簡版)

計畫類別：個別型
計畫編號：NSC 99-2410-H-009-004-
執行期間：99年08月01日至100年10月31日
執行單位：國立交通大學管理科學系(所)

計畫主持人：謝國文

公開資訊：本計畫可公開查詢

中華民國 100 年 11 月 05 日

中文摘要：調節複迴歸已廣泛應用於兩連續式變數交互作用分析，而兩變數和其交互乘項間的共線性對檢測的影響，自然地成為重要議題。本文試圖探索變數間相關程度對檢測調節效用的可能正面幫助，藉以釐清普遍以為共線性對調節複迴歸分析百害而無一利的誤解。針對簡單雙變數及三變數交互作用模式的理論解析和數據驗證，所獲結果有助於改變學者對變數間高度相關現象的憎惡，更提昇調節效用研究方法的實用價值。

英文摘要：Due to extensive applicability and computational ease, moderated multiple regression (MMR) has been widely employed to analyze interaction effects between two continuous predictor variables. Accordingly, considerable attention has been drawn toward the supposed multicollinearity problem between predictor variables and their cross-product term. This article attempts to clarify the misconception of multicollinearity in MMR studies. The counter-intuitive yet beneficial effects of multicollinearity on the ability to detect moderator relationships are explored. Comprehensive treatments and numerical investigations are presented for the simplest interaction model and more complex three-predictor setting. The obtained results provide critical insight that not only avoids misleading interpretation but also yields better understanding of the impact of intercorrelation among predictor variables on MMR analyses.

On the misconception of multicollinearity in detection of moderating effects:
Multicollinearity is not always detrimental

Gwown Shieh
Department of Management Science
National Chiao Tung University
Hsinchu, Taiwan 30050, R.O.C.
Email: gwshieh@mail.nctu.edu.tw

On the misconception of multicollinearity in detecting moderating effects:
Multicollinearity is not always detrimental

Abstract

Due to its extensive applicability and computational ease, moderated multiple regression (MMR) has been widely employed to analyze interaction effects between two continuous predictor variables. Accordingly, considerable attention has been drawn toward the supposed multicollinearity problem between predictor variables and their cross-product term. This article attempts to clarify the misconception of multicollinearity in MMR studies. The counter-intuitive yet beneficial effects of multicollinearity on the ability to detect moderator relationships are explored. Comprehensive treatments and numerical investigations are presented for the simplest interaction model and more complex three-predictor setting. The results provide critical insight that both helps avoid misleading interpretations and also yields better understanding for the impact of intercorrelation among predictor variables in MMR analyses.

Key words: moderation; multicollinearity; power

The use of moderated multiple regression (MMR) has become common across a wide variety of social science disciplines in the search for interaction effects. But despite its popularity, substantial concerns have been raised regarding the considerable difficulties of detecting moderation relationships that are strongly expected or theoretically supported. Numerous researchers have noted that the hypothesis tests of moderating effects often have low statistical power and yield erroneous conclusions, impeding the theoretical development and scientific advancement of moderation research. In response to this problem, design considerations and model characteristics pertaining to power issues in MMR applications have been examined both conceptually and empirically. Notably, Aguinis (1995) identified prominent factors that attenuate statistical power and proposed practical solutions to low-power situations, especially for models with continuous moderators. On the other hand, Aguinis and Stone-Romero (1997), and Stone-Romero, Alliger and Aguinis (1994) focused on the methodological artifacts and critical implications associated with statistical power of dichotomous moderators. Furthermore, the recent review by Aguinis et al. (2005) emphasized the importance of effect size and power in assessing moderating effects in the context of categorical moderators. In light of these discussions in the current literature, the responsible factors that stand out as being most crucial include sample size, magnitude of moderating effect, reliability of criterion and predictor variable scores, joint distribution of predictor variables, and intercorrelation of predictor variables.

In addition to the general treatment by Aguinis (1995) mentioned above, the multicollinearity problem in MMR has been examined by Cronbach (1987), Dunlap and Kemery (1987, 1988), Ganzach (1998), Morris, Sherman and Mansfield (1986), and among others. It should be evident that the intercorrelation among the continuous predictor variables and their cross-product term is inevitably relevant to the detection of interaction in general. Hence, no single study of MMR with continuous variables will be adequate without

considering the notion of multicollinearity. Accordingly, it is important to emphasize the distinction between essential and nonessential multicollinearity (Marquardt, 1980). Essential multicollinearity exists because of actual relationships between predictor variables, whereas the latter occurs merely due to the scaling or nonzero mean of predictor variable, and can be removed by centering predictor variables. Related issues can be found in Kromrey and Foster-Johnson (1998), Smith and Sasaki (1979) and Tate (1984). It is generally known that other remedies exist for coping with multicollinearity, as discussed in linear regression textbooks such as Cohen et al. (2003) and Kutner, Nachtsheim and Neter (2004). However, for clear understanding it is essential that researchers should direct the subtle formulation and evaluation of moderating effects with sound theory and consider the delicate interrelationships and significance within the response and predictor variables.

In line with the forgoing concerns, Dunlap and Kemery (1988) examined the effects of both predictor reliabilities and predictor correlations on the statistical power of MMR. Their Monte Carlo simulation results showed that, as anticipated, the power to detect moderating effects is diminished by predictor unreliability. However, the corresponding empirical evidence gives rise to the surprising contention that the ability to detect interaction effects increases with increasing correlation between predictor variables. Since their discussions were focused more on the major issue of measurement error, and numerical findings were obtained from somehow limited settings in the context of two-predictor interaction models, Dunlap and Kemery (1988) did not provide insight into the counterintuitive power behavior in relation to multicollinearity diagnostics. It seems that this particular result has been overlooked in the literature and a further explanation that incorporates the notion of multicollinearity does not exist to our knowledge. Accordingly, it is of practical importance to assess whether this situation persists over a broader range of model configurations without the complication of unreliability.

In order to enhance the methodological integrity and fundamental usefulness of MMR, this article aims to explore the implications of intercorrelations among the continuous predictors and to account for misconception in the detection of moderating effects. In particular, the distinct power performance of the interactive models involving two predictor variables is presented to highlight the possible misapprehension when researchers apply heuristics learned from regular linear regression to MMR. Moreover, similar treatment and in-depth discussion are extended to the three-variable interaction model. For completeness, the Appendix summarizes the main results from the significance test of regression coefficients in the context of multiple linear regression, with particular emphasis on the consideration of stochastic predictor variables. Informative figures and numerical results are presented to illustrate the essential features of MMR analyses.

Two-predictor interaction model

Most MMR research has focused on the occurrence of interactive effects between two continuous predictor variables that are usually conceptualized in terms of the model

$$Y_i = \beta_I + X_i\beta_X + Z_i\beta_Z + X_iZ_i\beta_{XZ} + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

where Y_i is the value of the response variable Y ; X_i and Z_i are the known constants of the predictors X and Z ; ε_i are *iid* $N(0, \sigma^2)$ random errors for $i = 1, \dots, N$; and β_I , β_X , β_Z , and β_{XZ} are unknown parameters. The existence of the regression coefficient β_{XZ} associated with the cross-product term in Equation (1) indicates that the linear relationship between the criterion variable and predictor variable is dependent on the level of the other predictor variable. In contrast, the simple additive model without the multiplicative term

$$Y_i = \beta_I + X_i\beta_X + Z_i\beta_Z + \varepsilon_i$$

reveals that the association or strength between the response variable and each of the predictor variable is unaffected by or immaterial to the value of other predictor variable. The objective

of MMR is to determine whether the underlying data structure can best be approximated by an additive or an interactive formulation. In practice, the detection of moderating effects is conducted with the partial F or partial t test for the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_{XZ} = 0$ versus $H_1: \beta_{XZ} \neq 0$ in the multiple linear regression framework.

It is generally known that the parameter estimation and hypothesis testing of multiple regression analysis can be plagued by the effects of multicollinearity. According to the fundamental properties of standard linear regression analysis presented in Appendix A, the estimated variances of the least squares coefficient estimators given in Equation (A5) are linked to the formal measure of variance inflation factor (VIF) for identifying the degree of multicollinearity. When a predictor variable has a strong linear association with other predictor variables, the associated VIF and variance estimate of regression coefficient estimator are excessively large. A commonly used rule of thumb is that a VIF of 10 or more is evidence of severe multicollinearity. Hence, the hypothesis testing of interaction effects is hampered and the power for detecting the moderation relationship is reduced because of the intercorrelation among the predictor variables.

Moreover, the adverse effects of multicollinearity on the linear regression analysis with the additive model are clearly apparent. Let $\hat{\beta}_X$ denote the least squares estimator of regression coefficient β_X , then the simple additive structure gives the following VIF of predictor variable X and estimated variance of $\hat{\beta}_X$:

$$VIF(X) = \frac{1}{1 - r^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{V}(\hat{\beta}_X) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2 \cdot VIF(X)}{S_X^2},$$

where $r = r(X, Z)$ is the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the two predictor variables X and Z , $\hat{\sigma}^2$ is the usual unbiased estimator of σ^2 , and $S_X^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \bar{X})^2$ is

the corrected sum of squares with $\bar{X} = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i / N$. Similar results can be readily obtained for the

second predictor variable Z . It is evident from the expressions just described that the degree of linear dependence between the two predictor variables measured by the simple correlation r has a significant influence on the multicollinearity index of VIF and the variance estimate $\hat{V}(\hat{\beta}_X)$. The great simplicity of the additive model both makes it possible to convey the notion of multicollinearity without the burden of complex formulas and also permits computational ease in empirical examination. For example, related implication and numerical illustration are well demonstrated in the acclaimed texts of Cohen et al. (2003, Section 10.5) and Kutner, Nachtsheim and Neter (2004, Section 7.6). This reinforces the general perception and common practice that researchers should fully understand the intercorrelations among the predictor variables and carefully attend to the potential multicollinearity problem in a multiple regression analysis.

In view of the continuous characteristics of measurements X and Z , it is clear that the sample values and data characteristics in a study vary from one application to another. Accordingly, the value of simple correlation coefficient r represents only a realization of r over the whole range of $[-1, 1]$. Hence, it is of theoretical importance to investigate the overall impact of any underlying correlation between the two predictor variables on the various properties of MMR. In fact, the intercorrelation structure among the predictor variables is one of the inherent characteristics determined by the joint distribution of predictor variables, which in turn represents an indispensable artifact for detecting moderating effects. To extend the concept and applicability of MMR, it is more appropriate to employ the random regression or unconditional setup in which not only are values of the response variable for each subject available after the observations are made, but the levels of predictor variables are also outcomes of the study. Thus the continuous predictor and moderator variables $\{(X_i, Z_i), i = 1, \dots, N\}$ in Equation (1) are random variables with a joint probability distribution. This assumption is closely related to the consideration of stochastic regressors arises with

considerable frequency in econometrics. The impacts of the intercorrelation relationship on multicollinearity diagnostics and statistical features for identifying interaction effects are presented in the following analytical and numerical investigation.

Because of the complex nature of the random formulation under study, a complete theoretical solution is not feasible and the investigation is conducted in two stages. In the first stage, statistical derivations are carried out to gain an understanding of some specific phenomena for random regression models, subsuming the prescribed additive and interactive models and other MMR as special cases. The second stage is a large-scale simulation study, in which pseudo-random data were generated with desired structural equations, and then analyzed to determine the overall power behavior for discovering the main and interaction effects and unconditional performance of commonly used multicollinearity measures.

First, the corresponding important statistical features for identifying interaction effects and multicollinearity diagnostics with the extra complication of stochastic predictor variables are described in Equations (A7)-(A9) of Appendix A. The resulting formulas are difficult to comprehend in generic expressions; however, they allow various distributions for regressor variables to be treated as variations on a common theme and they serve to tie together the notions of moderation and correlation. Nevertheless, they contain essential information as to whether a given correlation structure reduces the power for detecting moderation relation whenever the distribution of predictor variables is available. Regarding the distributional assumptions of the associated predictor variables, it is common to assume that the two continuous predictor variables have a joint bivariate normal distribution in illustrative and theoretical treatments of MMR such as McClelland and Judd (1993), O'Connor (2006), and Shieh (2009). The bivariate normality assumption not only provides a useful situation in its own right, but also has the advantage of naturally including the correlation between the two variables as a single free parameter. It is important to note that, although both X and Z are

normally distributed, the interaction term XZ is obviously not a normal random variable. As mentioned earlier, joint distribution of the predictor variables is one of the deterministic factors of detecting moderating effects, and so it may distort statistical power analysis and lead to invalid conclusions if one mistakenly applies a multinormal setup to the regressors of MMR.

In the second stage of numerical examination, the prescribed interactive models with bivariate normal predictor variables are used as the base for Monte Carlo assessment. Without loss of generality, the two predictors (X , Z) are assumed to have a bivariate normal distribution with mean $(0, 0)$, variance $(1, 1)$ and correlation ρ ranging from -0.9 to 0.9 in increments of 0.1 . Moreover, the parameters are chosen as $\beta_I = \beta_X = \beta_Z = \beta_{XZ} = 0.25$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$. With sample size $N = 100$ and selected model configurations, the estimates of unconditional magnitudes are then computed through simulation of 10,000 replicate data sets. For each replicate, N sets of predictor variables are generated from the selected bivariate normal distribution. These values in turn determine the mean responses for generating N normal outcomes with the underlying linear regression model. Then the sample variance, test statistic, VIF, and regressor correlation matrix determinant (RCMD) are calculated. The simulated power is the proportion of the 10,000 replicates whose test statistic $|t|$ values exceed the critical value with significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. In addition, the overall estimates of variance, VIF, and RCMD are the arithmetic means of the corresponding 10,000 replicated values. All calculations were performed using programs written with SAS/IML (SAS Institute, 2008). Detailed numerical results of the simulation studies are reported in Table 1. Specifically, the simulated values of unconditional variance, power, and VIF associated with predictor X are denoted by $v(\hat{\beta}_X)$, $\pi(t_X)$ and $\phi(X)$, respectively, while the corresponding values for product term XZ are presented by $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZ})$, $\pi(t_{XZ})$ and $\phi(XZ)$. The overall RCMD is denoted by δ in Table 1 as well. Since predictors X and Z are interchangeable under bivariate normal

distribution, the symmetric situations of predictor Z are omitted. For a concise visualization of the overall multicollinearity diagnostics with respect to the change of correlation ρ , Figure 1 depicts the relationship of simulated VIF for regressors X and XZ , and RCMD with ρ . In addition, Figure 2 presents the plot of simulated power of t_X and t_{XZ} against ρ for the tests of main and interaction effects, respectively.

It is clear from Table 1 that the effect of positive and negative correlation ρ is symmetric on all seven measurements of variance, power, VIF and determinant. In particular, Figure 1 reveals that the graphs of VIF measure $\phi(X)$ and determinant δ are symmetric with respect to $\rho = 0$ and the degrees of multicollinearity are increasing monotonous with increasing $|\rho|$. However, the VIF measure $\phi(XZ)$ remains almost constant. It should be noted that the unconditional variances have opposite patterns with respect to the correlation between X and Z . The overall $v(\hat{\beta}_X)$ is an increasing function of $|\rho|$, whereas $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZ})$ is decreasing with increasing magnitude of $|\rho|$. Moreover, the unconditional variance $v(\hat{\beta}_X)$ is larger than $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZ})$ for $|\rho| > 0.2$, and this situation is reversed for $|\rho| < 0.2$. The distinct behaviors of variances lead to power performance that is completely unexpected. As shown in Figure 2, the power function $\pi(t_X)$ decreases as the correlation becomes stronger, while the power of detecting interaction effects $\pi(t_{XZ})$ is essentially amplified for larger value of $|\rho|$. Hence, this particular exposition provides an obvious contradiction to the common impression that intercorrelation or multicollinearity between predictor variables is always detrimental to the power for detecting parameter effects. Consequently, researchers can make understandable but serious mistakes when they apply heuristics learned from simple additive models to MMR. Since the actual effect sizes of interaction terms in MMR applications are generally quite small, we also performed similar numerical computations for regression coefficients $\beta_I = \beta_X = \beta_Z = \beta_{XZ} = 0.10$ and sample size $N = 250$, while all other factors remained constant. The corresponding

results are presented in Table 2. Comparatively, the unconditional variances $v(\hat{\beta}_X)$ and $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZ})$, and power levels $\pi(t_X)$ and $\pi(t_{XZ})$ are much smaller than those in Table 1. However, the prescribed phenomena regarding their behavior relative to correlation ρ continue to exist in this case. In short, the advocated contention regarding the adverse relationship between multicollinearity and power in the literature for linear regression models does not generalize to MMR in a straightforward manner. The complex and yet important consequences of multiplicative components in MMR analyses will further be exemplified for three-predictor interaction models in the next section.

Three-predictor interaction model

In view of the counter-intuitive behavior in the most common procedure for detecting two-way interaction effects, it is prudent to extend the investigations to other widely useful MMR models. Particularly, the natural extension with three predictor variables represents another important application of MMR, in which the relation between the response variable Y and predictor variable X varies across levels of the other two predictor variables, Z and W , and their combinations. This results in the following three-predictor interaction model:

$$Y_i = \beta_I + X_i\beta_X + Z_i\beta_Z + W_i\beta_W + X_iZ_i\beta_{XZ} + X_iW_i\beta_{XW} + Z_iW_i\beta_{ZW} + X_iZ_iW_i\beta_{XZW} + \varepsilon_i, \quad (2)$$

where Y_i is the value of the response variable Y , X_i , Z_i and W_i are the known constants of the predictors X , Z and W ; ε_i are *iid* $N(0, \sigma^2)$ random errors for $i = 1, \dots, N$; and β_I , β_X , β_Z , β_W , β_{XZ} , β_{XW} , β_{ZW} , and β_{XZW} are unknown parameters. With the hierarchical or step-down approach, the regression coefficient β_{XZW} associated with the highest order product term of all three predictors XZW indicates the strength of the most essential moderating effect. On the other hand, the two-way interactions (β_{XZ} , β_{XW} , and β_{ZW}) and first-order effects (β_X , β_Z and β_W) represent conditional effects that can be examined to facilitate the interpretation of the underlying complex interaction structure. Readers can refer to Aiken and West (1991),

Dawson and Richter (2006), and Jaccard and Turrissi (2003) for further details. To provide an insight into MMR research, the focus here is on the potential misunderstanding of the influence of multicollinearity within the context of three-predictor interaction model. Similar to the two-predictor case, Monte Carlo simulation study was conducted to evaluate the influence of intercorrelations between predictor variables on the analysis of all first-, second- and third-order effects.

The empirical study involves multivariate normal predictor variables X , Z and W with null means $\mu_X = \mu_Z = \mu_W = 0$, unit variance $\sigma_X^2 = \sigma_Z^2 = \sigma_W^2 = 1$, correlation $\text{Cor}(X, Z) = \rho$ ranging from -0.9 to 0.9 in increments of 0.1 , and $\text{Cor}(X, W) = \text{Cor}(Z, W) = 0$. It should be clear from a theoretical standpoint that there are many situations with practical usefulness among sets of correlations. The designated correlation matrix of the three predictors represents merely a single possibility and serves the purpose well for demonstrating the concealed feature of MMR. Moreover, the model parameters in Equation (2) are chosen as $\beta_I = \beta_X = \beta_Z = \beta_W = \beta_{XZ} = \beta_{XW} = \beta_{ZW} = \beta_{XZW} = 0.25$, $\sigma^2 = 1$, and sample size $N = 100$. The simulation follows closely the previous numerical investigation, in which the Monte Carlo integration procedure was implemented to determine the unconditional measurements through 10,000 replicate data sets.

The corresponding simulated results for main effects, two-way interactions and three-way interaction are summarized in Tables 3-5, respectively. Due to the model's complexity, the resultant phenomenon can be made more comprehensible with the help of diagrams. The multicollinearity VIF measurements of regressors X , W , XZ , XW and XZW , denoted by $\phi(X)$, $\phi(W)$, $\phi(XZ)$, $\phi(XW)$, and $\phi(XZW)$, respectively, and RCMD δ are depicted in Figure 3. Alternatively, the respective simulated power levels $\pi(t_X)$, $\pi(t_W)$, $\pi(t_{XZ})$, $\pi(t_{ZW})$ and $\pi(t_{XZW})$ of t tests t_X , t_W , t_{XZ} , t_{ZW} and t_{XZW} are plotted in Figure 4. Because of the interchangeability between X and Z , and XW and ZW , the results associated with regressors Z

and ZW are not presented here. According to the visual information of Figure 3, all the diagrams of VIF values are concave while the RCMD curve is convex, but all are symmetric about $\rho = 0$. It follows from simple guideline that multicollinearity is declared to exist whenever any VIF value is at least equal to 10. Thus, the resultant degrees of multicollinearity are not severe according to the reported magnitudes of VIF values. In contrast, the small δ values for $|\rho| > 0.5$ indicate that the degree of multicollinearity is considered to be problematic. The patterns of the VIF and RCMD diagnostics are unquestionably clear that the levels of intercorrelation among the regressors increase with the strength of correlation between the two predictors X and Z . Consequently, the heuristic about the adverse effects of multicollinearity would suggest that the corresponding estimated variance of regression coefficients should be inflated and power of the resulting test of main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction will decline as the only present pairwise correlation ρ of X and Z increases in absolute size. The results show that the general notion is applicable only to the cases associated with regressors X , W and cross-product XW . In other words, the unconditional estimated variances $v(\hat{\beta}_X)$, $v(\hat{\beta}_W)$ and $v(\hat{\beta}_{XW})$ are convex functions of correlation ρ , and conversely, power levels $\pi(t_X)$, $\pi(t_W)$ and $\pi(t_{ZW})$ are concave with respect to correlation ρ . Nonetheless, the conventional account does not apply to the other two regressors in terms of product terms XZ and XZW . Surprisingly, the two variance estimates $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZ})$ and $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZW})$ are concave with respect to ρ , and in turn, the respective power functions $\pi(t_{XZ})$ and $\pi(t_{XZW})$ are convex, as shown in Figure 4. Thus, the established guidance about the detrimental impact of multicollinearity in the context additive multiple regression is not completely applicable to interaction models. As in the previous case of a two-predictor interaction model, the empirical investigation was extended to the setting with $\beta_I = \beta_X = \beta_Z = \beta_W = \beta_{XZ} = \beta_{XW} = \beta_{ZW} = \beta_{XZW} = 0.10$, and sample size $N = 250$. According the results summarized in Tables 6-8, it is clear that

the general contention described above can still apply in this situation with smaller effect size. Although these empirical examinations depend exclusively on simulation results, the assessments of the three-predictor interaction formulation illustrate the advocated caution and unfavorable perception of intercorrelations among predictor variables should not be applied indiscriminately. More importantly, the positive influence of correlation ρ on the detection of a three-way moderating effect raises a practical concern for MMR researchers to reevaluate the underlying predictor interrelationships and their impact on model selection and inference.

Numerical Example

In addition to the detailed empirical investigations employing Monte Carlo simulation study, it is instructive to exemplify the impact of multicollinearity on the detection of three-way interactions that might be encountered in applied work. The study of the importance of relationship in Kwong and Leung (2002) is used as an illustrative context. In that study they examined the compensatory effect between procedural justice and outcome favorability in determining people's reaction to a decision. Given the compensatory effect, procedural fairness has a particularly strong and positive impact on people's response to low outcomes. However, they argued that the compensatory effect is conditional upon other contextual variables and studied the three-way interaction in which the perceived importance of the relationship between people moderates the compensatory effect of procedural justice. They tested the hypothesis that the tendency for procedural justice to have a stronger and more positive impact on people's response when outcome is low versus high should be more pronounced for an important relationship than for an unimportant relationship. The study concluded that the interaction effect is operative only when the relationship with the other party is important to that person.

For the purpose of demonstration, the summary statistics and analysis results presented

in Tables 1 and 2 of Kwong and Leung (2002) were utilized to generate the two hypothetical data sets reported in Table 9. According to the formulation of Kwong and Leung (2002), the criterion variable (Y) represents the measurement of feeling or happiness, and the three predictor variables are interactional justice (X), outcome favorability (Z), and prior closeness (W). As noted in Aiken and West (1991, p. 36), the so-called nonessential multicollinearity can be removed by centering variables. Hence, the observed values of the three predictors in Table 9 were mean-centered in the following MMR analyses. With the 30 observations in Data 1, the simple correlations are $r(X, Z) = 0.4883$, $r(X, W) = 0.3541$, and $r(Z, W) = 0.2605$. The sample data was analyzed with a three-way interaction regression model. We are particularly concerned with the interaction term XZW , and the resulting test statistic is $t_{XZW} = -2.1873$ with p -value = 0.0396. Hence, the test of three-way interaction $H_0: \beta_{XZW} = 0$ can be rejected at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. However, close examination of the variance inflation factor associated with the cross-product term XZW shows that $VIF(XZW) = 11.94$ and regressor correlation matrix determinant $RCMD = 0.0098$. In practice, the VIF values in excess of 10 or the quantities $RCMD$ close to 0 are considered to be problematic. In these circumstances, the common procedure is to consider approaches to solving problem of multicollinearity before concluding that there is sufficient evidence to indicate an interaction. Accordingly, the collection of additional data provides a feasible solution and is commonly recommended. With the additional 20 observations presented in Data 2 of Table 9, the detection of three-way interaction was reanalyzed with a total of sample size $N = 50$. In this case, the three pairwise correlations are $r(X, Z) = 0.4799$, $r(X, W) = 0.2308$, and $r(Z, W) = 0.1868$. The magnitudes of these correlations are less than those calculated with Data 1. Moreover, the multicollinearity index VIF reduced to $VIF(XZW) = 2.99$, while regressor correlation matrix determinant changed into $RCMD = 0.1083$. Thus, the severity of multicollinearity is alleviated to some extent as intended by the inclusion of extra samples.

However, the resulting test statistic for the interaction effect is $t_{XZW} = -1.9104$ and the corresponding p -value = 0.0629. Unfortunately, we are unable to claim there is a significant moderation effect at a 0.05 level of significance for the expanded data.

Unlike the typical results of regression analyses, this numerical example reveals a contrasting and positive impact of predictor intercorrelations on the detection of moderating effects. Researchers using MMR should be aware of this tendency of power for the detection of moderator effects to be lost, at the expense of overemphasis on mitigation of multicollinearity between predictor variables. From the methodological standpoint, the techniques of multiple regression and other multivariate methods were developed to synthesize the complex information of correlated data in the first place. It seems paradoxical that the common practice has been overwhelmingly prone to remove or diminish intercorrelation and multicollinearity among variables, while the advanced methodologies are supposed to fully account for their intertwined structure in order to help advance social science theory.

Conclusion

It is well known that multicollinearity is closely related to the popular statistical tool of multiple linear regression. Hence, practitioners in applied research must become conversant with various diagnostic procedures for identifying, reducing or removing the cause and threat of multicollinearity. The simplest MMR is essentially a special case of multiple linear regression that allows particularly the relation between the response variable and a predictor variable to depend on the level of another predictor variable. The basic rationale of moderation can be readily extended to three-way interactions and more complex situations. In view of the apparent intercorrelated structure between the predictor variables and their combined higher order or cross-product terms in interaction models, the supposed adverse

effects associated with high or extreme multicollinearity are often encountered in many MMR applications. Unfortunately, it is subject to serious misunderstanding that predictor intercorrelations incur nothing but harm to the detection of moderation or interaction effects in MMR study.

This article focuses on the two most fundamental MMR models with two- and three-predictor interaction effects and explores the impact of intercorrelations on the multicollinearity diagnostics and power in testing for main and interaction effects under the convenient distributional assumption of bivariate or multivariate normal predictors. The extensive empirical results of Monte Carlo simulation studies showed that the power of detecting interaction effects may increase with greater correlation between predictor variables when all other factors are fixed. Hence, the detrimental effects of multicollinearity associated with additive multiple linear regression are not necessarily present with MMR analysis. Regarding the distributional configuration of predictor variables, normality is of course not the only situation of practical interest. There are also many useful assumptions to consider for the continuous predictor variables. More importantly, additional Monte Carlo simulations confirmed that the emphasized counter-intuitive phenomenon is not unique to the normality assumption of the predictor variables. In view of the indispensable role of the joint distribution of predictors, researchers should make a comprehensive appraisal of the underlying data characteristics and their impact on statistical power for the detection of moderating effects. Given the complex interrelationships that exist among predictor variables and cross-product terms in MMR studies, it is important to reorient the general idea about the presence of multicollinearity because the detection of interaction effects need not be hindered by increased correlation between predictor variables.

References

- Aguinis, H. (1995). Statistical power problems with moderated multiple regression in management research. *Journal of Management*, 21, 1141-1158.
- Aguinis, H., Beaty, J. C., Boik, R. J., & Pierce, C. A. (2005). Effect size and power in assessing moderating effects of categorical variables using multiple regression: A 30-year review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 94-107.
- Aguinis, H., & Stone-Romero, E. F. (1997). Methodological artifacts in moderated multiple regression and their effects on statistical power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 192-206.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Busemeyer, J. R., & Jones, L. E. (1983). Analysis of multiplicative combination rules when the causal variables are measured with error. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93, 549-562.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1987). Statistical tests for moderator variables: Flaws in analyses recently proposed. *Psychological Bulletin*, 102, 414-417.
- Darrow, A. L., & Kahl, D. R. (1982). A comparison of moderated regression techniques considering strength of effect. *Journal of Management*, 8, 35-47.
- Dawson, J. F., & Richter, A. W. (2006). Probing three-way interactions in moderated multiple regression: Development and application of a slope difference test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 917-926.
- Dunlap, W. P., & Kemery, E. R. (1987). Failure to detect moderating effects: Is multicollinearity the problem? *Psychological Bulletin*, 102, 418-420.
- Dunlap, W. P., & Kemery, E. R. (1988). Effects of predictor intercorrelations and reliabilities on moderated multiple regression. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 41, 248-258.
- Evans, M. G. (1985). A Monte Carlo study of the effects of correlated method variance in moderated multiple regression analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36, 305-323.
- Ganzach, Y. (1998). Nonlinearity, multicollinearity and the probability of type II error in detecting interaction. *Journal of Management*, 24, 615-622.
- Jaccard, J., & Turrisi, R. (2003). *Interaction effects in multiple regression* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jaccard, J., & Wan, C. K. (1995). Measurement error in the analysis of interaction effects between continuous predictors using multiple regression: Multiple indicator and structural equation approaches. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 348-357.
- Kromrey, J. D., & Foster-Johnson, L. (1998). Mean centering in moderated multiple regression: Much ado about nothing. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58, 42-67.
- Kwong, J. Y. Y., & Leung, K. (2002). A moderator of the interaction effect of procedural

- justice and outcome favorability: Importance of the relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 87, 278-299.
- Kutner, M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., & Neter, J. (2004). *Applied Linear Regression Models* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Marquardt, D. W. (1980). You should standardize the predictor variables in your regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 75, 87-91.
- McClelland, G. H., & Judd, C. M. (1993). Statistical difficulties of detecting interactions and moderator effects. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 376-390.
- Morris, J. H., Sherman, J. D., & Mansfield, E. R. (1986). Failures to detect moderating effects with ordinary least squares-moderated multiple regression: Some reasons and a remedy. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 282-288.
- O'Connor, B. P. (2006). Programs for problems created by continuous variable distributions in moderated multiple regression. *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 554-567.
- SAS Institute (2008). *SAS/IML user's guide, Version 9.2*. Cary, NC: author.
- Shieh, G. (2009). Detecting interaction effects in moderated multiple regression with continuous variables: Power and sample size considerations. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12, 510-528.
- Smith, K. W., & Sasaki, M. S. (1979). Decreasing multicollinearity: A method for models with multiplicative functions. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 8, 35-56.
- Stone-Romero, E. F., Alliger, G. M., & Aguinis, H. (1994). Type II error problems in the use of moderated multiple regression for the detection of moderating effects of dichotomous variables. *Journal of Management*, 20, 167-178.
- Tate, R. (1984). Limitations of centering for interactive models. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 13, 251-271.

Appendix A
Fundamental results of random regression models

Consider the standard multiple linear regression model with dependent variable Y and all the levels of p independent variables X_1, \dots, X_p fixed a priori:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_N)^\top$, Y_i is the value of the dependent variable Y ; $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{1}_N, \mathbf{X}_D)$ with $\mathbf{1}_N$ is the $N \times 1$ vector of all 1s, $\mathbf{X}_D = (\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_p)^\top$ is often called the design matrix, $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})^\top$, X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip} are the known constants of the p independent variables for $i = 1, \dots, N$; $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$ with $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p$ are unknown parameters; and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_N)^\top$ with ε_i are *iid* $N(0, \sigma^2)$ random variables.

Frequently, the inferences are concerned mainly with the regression coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$ in Equation (A1) and the corresponding ordinary least squares estimator is $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 = (\mathbf{X}_C^\top \mathbf{X}_C)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_C^\top \mathbf{Y}$, where $\mathbf{X}_C = (\mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{J}/N) \mathbf{X}_D$ is the centered form of \mathbf{X}_D , \mathbf{I}_N is the identity matrix of dimension N and \mathbf{J} is the $N \times N$ square matrix of 1s. With this formulation, it is easily seen that

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 | \mathbf{X}_D \sim N_p(\boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \sigma^2 \mathbf{S}_X^{-1}),$$

where $\mathbf{S}_X = \mathbf{X}_C^\top \mathbf{X}_C$. Note that $\hat{\sigma}^2 = SSE/(N - p - 1)$ is the usual unbiased estimator of σ^2 and SSE/σ^2 is distributed as $\chi^2(N - p - 1)$, a chi-square distribution with $N - p - 1$ degrees of freedom and is independent of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1$.

For convenience of illustration, it can be shown that

$$\hat{\beta}_k | \mathbf{X}_D \sim N(\beta_k, V(\hat{\beta}_k))$$

where

$$V(\hat{\beta}_k) = \frac{\sigma^2}{(1 - R_k^2) S_k^2},$$

R_k^2 is the coefficient of determination or R^2 in the regression of X_k on all other variables

$(X_1, \dots, X_{k-1}, X_{k+1}, \dots, X_p)$, and $S_k^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (X_{ik} - \bar{X}_k)^2}{N-1}$ is the corrected sum of squares with $\bar{X}_k =$

$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N X_{ik}}{N}$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$. The corresponding test for the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_k = 0$ versus $H_1: \beta_k \neq 0$

is based on

$$t_k = \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{\{\hat{V}(\hat{\beta}_k)\}^{1/2}}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where

$$\hat{V}(\hat{\beta}_k) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{(1 - R_k^2)S_k^2}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

If the null hypothesis $H_0: \beta_k = 0$ is true, the statistic t_k is distributed as $t(N - p - 1)$, a central t distribution with $N - p - 1$ degrees of freedom, and H_0 is rejected at the significance level α if $|t_{XZ}| > t_{N-p-1, \alpha/2}$, where $t_{N-p-1, \alpha/2}$ is the upper 100($\alpha/2$)th percentile of the t distribution $t(N - p - 1)$.

Note that variance inflation factor (VIF) is a formal measure for identifying the extent of multicollinearity. In this case, the VIF of X_k is

$$VIF(X_k) = \frac{1}{1 - R_k^2}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

For example, see Kutner, Nachtsheim and Neter (2004, Section 10.5). With the definition in Equation (A4), the variance of $\hat{\beta}_k$ is directly linked to the widely used multicollinearity diagnostic of VIF through

$$V(\hat{\beta}_k) = \frac{\sigma^2 \cdot VIF(X_k)}{S_k^2}.$$

Also, the corresponding estimated variance in Equation (A3) can be rewritten as

$$\hat{V}(\hat{\beta}_k) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2 \cdot VIF(X_k)}{S_k^2}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

When X_k has a substantial multicollinearity with the other predictor variables so that R_k^2 is substantially larger than 0, then $VIF(X_k)$ and $\hat{V}(\hat{\beta}_k)$ in Equations (A4) and (A5) are considerably inflated and even unbounded. The immediate and adverse consequence of large $\hat{V}(\hat{\beta}_k)$ is the t_k test in Equation (A2) may lead to false null hypotheses of no effect that disagree with prior knowledge and theoretical grounding. Another widely used multicollinearity diagnostic is the regressor correlation matrix determinant $|\mathbf{R}|$, where $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{X}_C^T \mathbf{X}_C) \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$ is the regressor correlation matrix with diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(S_1^2, S_2^2, \dots, S_p^2)$. The diagnostic of regressor correlation matrix determinant ranges from 0 when there is perfect multicollinearity, to 1 when there is no multicollinearity.

Moreover, the resulting power function for the test $H_0: \beta_k = 0$ versus $H_1: \beta_k \neq 0$ is

$$P\{|t_k| > t_{N-p-1, \alpha/2} \mid \mathbf{X}_D\} = P\{|t(N-p-1, \Lambda)| > t_{N-p-1, \alpha/2} \mid \mathbf{X}_D\}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

where $t(N-p-1, \Lambda)$ is the noncentral t distribution with $N-p-1$ degrees of freedom and noncentrality parameter

$$\Lambda = \frac{\beta_k}{\{V(\hat{\beta}_k)\}^{1/2}}.$$

Traditionally, the multiple regression model defined above is referred to as a fixed (conditional) model. The corresponding results would be specific to the particular values of the predictor variables that are observed or preset by the researcher. Under the random regression setup, the predictor variables \mathbf{X}_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, are assumed to have a joint probability density function $f(X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})$ and the form of $f(X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})$ does not depend on any of the unknown parameters $(\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)$ and σ^2 . It is conceivable that the extended consideration of random feature associated with predictors complicates the fundamental statistical properties of the inferential procedures. However, the estimates of parameters and tests of hypotheses are the same under both fixed and random formulations. Nonetheless, the

distinction between the two modeling approaches becomes important when unconditional or overall properties are to be evaluated.

Note that the observed values of \mathbf{X}_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, only represent one realization over the whole domain of (X_1, \dots, X_p) . Interestingly, the unconditional mean $E[\hat{\beta}_k]$ of $\hat{\beta}_k$ remains unbiased because

$$E[\hat{\beta}_k] = E_X[E_Y\{\hat{\beta}_k\}] = E_X[\beta_k] = \beta_k,$$

where the expectations $E_Y[\cdot]$ and $E_X[\cdot]$ are taken with respect to the *iid* probability distributions $f(Y_i)$ and $f(X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})$ of Y_i and $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})^T$, respectively, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Also, the unconditional variance $v(\hat{\beta}_k)$ of $\hat{\beta}_k$ is given by

$$v(\hat{\beta}_k) = E[(\hat{\beta}_k - \beta_k)^2] = E_X[E_Y\{(\hat{\beta}_k - \beta_k)^2\}] = \sigma^2 E_X\left[\frac{VIF(X_k)}{S_k^2}\right]. \quad (\text{A7})$$

The power function in the context of random regression is defined as the expected value of the conditional power function given in Equation (A6) as follows

$$\pi(t_k) = P\{|t_k| > t_{N-p-1, \alpha/2}\} = E_X[P\{|t(N-p-1, \Lambda)| > t_{N-p-1, \alpha/2}\}]. \quad (\text{A8})$$

Likewise, the unconditional multicollinearity diagnostics of VIF and determinant of regressor correlation matrix are expressed as $\phi(X_k)$ and δ , respectively, where

$$\phi(X_k) = E_X[VIF(X_k)] \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, p, \text{ and } \delta = E_X[\mathbf{R}]. \quad (\text{A9})$$

In general, there is no simple closed-form expression for the preceding quantities given in Equations (A7)-(A9) except in some special cases. Therefore, it is extremely cumbersome to evaluate the multi-dimensional integration with respect to the joint probability density distribution of (X_1, \dots, X_p) . Instead, Monte Carlo integration provides a computationally feasible and practically accurate solution. Finally, the corresponding hypothesis testing procedures and power functions for the two one-sided tests of $H_0: \beta_k \leq 0$ versus $H_1: \beta_k > 0$, and $H_0: \beta_k \geq 0$ versus $H_1: \beta_k < 0$ and even nonzero minimum effect can be readily established but the details are not given here.




Figure 1. The simulated multicollinearity measures of two-predictor interaction model




Figure 2. The simulated powers of two-predictor interaction model




Figure 3. The simulated multicollinearity measures of three-predictor interaction model




Figure 4. The simulated powers of three-predictor interaction model

Table 1. The simulated results of two-predictor interaction model with $\beta_X = \beta_{XZ} = 0.25$ and $N = 100$

ρ	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_X)$	Power $\pi(t_X)$	VIF ^a $\phi(X)$	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZ})$	Power $\pi(t_{XZ})$	VIF ^a $\phi(XZ)$	RCMD ^b δ
-0.9	0.0555	0.1858	5.4778	0.0067	0.8546	1.0641	0.1802
-0.8	0.0294	0.3078	2.8882	0.0074	0.8236	1.0641	0.3404
-0.7	0.0208	0.4094	2.0351	0.0082	0.7906	1.0633	0.4816
-0.6	0.0167	0.4898	1.6220	0.0089	0.7602	1.0634	0.6031
-0.5	0.0142	0.5532	1.3870	0.0095	0.7333	1.0630	0.7039
-0.4	0.0127	0.5978	1.2396	0.0102	0.7031	1.0642	0.7860
-0.3	0.0118	0.6317	1.1423	0.0108	0.6802	1.0625	0.8525
-0.2	0.0112	0.6541	1.0858	0.0112	0.6653	1.0628	0.8970
-0.1	0.0109	0.6651	1.0531	0.0116	0.6507	1.0643	0.9239
0	0.0107	0.6702	1.0423	0.0116	0.6500	1.0639	0.9337
0.1	0.0108	0.6661	1.0530	0.0115	0.6547	1.0630	0.9248
0.2	0.0112	0.6535	1.0845	0.0112	0.6632	1.0630	0.8978
0.3	0.0117	0.6324	1.1434	0.0107	0.6831	1.0629	0.8517
0.4	0.0127	0.5983	1.2361	0.0102	0.7038	1.0642	0.7877
0.5	0.0142	0.5524	1.3852	0.0096	0.7315	1.0623	0.7051
0.6	0.0166	0.4899	1.6232	0.0088	0.7609	1.0616	0.6030
0.7	0.0208	0.4094	2.0363	0.0082	0.7899	1.0640	0.4813
0.8	0.0294	0.3082	2.8870	0.0074	0.8253	1.0626	0.3408
0.9	0.0556	0.1855	5.4697	0.0068	0.8509	1.0643	0.1807

a. Variance inflation factor

b. Regressor correlation matrix determinant

Table 2. The simulated results of two-predictor interaction model with $\beta_X = \beta_{XZ} = 0.10$ and $N = 250$

ρ	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_X)$	Power $\pi(t_X)$	VIF ^a $\phi(X)$	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZ})$	Power $\pi(t_{XZ})$	VIF ^a $\phi(XZ)$	RCMD ^b δ
-0.9	0.0215	0.1048	5.3410	0.0024	0.5441	1.0247	0.1861
-0.8	0.0114	0.1553	2.8232	0.0026	0.5063	1.0246	0.3516
-0.7	0.0080	0.2004	1.9929	0.0029	0.4700	1.0247	0.4974
-0.6	0.0064	0.2393	1.5862	0.0032	0.4364	1.0240	0.6245
-0.5	0.0055	0.2723	1.3532	0.0034	0.4101	1.0245	0.7312
-0.4	0.0049	0.2985	1.2089	0.0037	0.3856	1.0241	0.8183
-0.3	0.0045	0.3185	1.1165	0.0039	0.3650	1.0248	0.8857
-0.2	0.0043	0.3325	1.0584	0.0041	0.3515	1.0249	0.9338
-0.1	0.0041	0.3422	1.0264	0.0042	0.3454	1.0242	0.9632
0	0.0041	0.3446	1.0162	0.0042	0.3416	1.0245	0.9727
0.1	0.0042	0.3416	1.0263	0.0042	0.3443	1.0244	0.9632
0.2	0.0043	0.3333	1.0584	0.0041	0.3529	1.0246	0.9341
0.3	0.0045	0.3188	1.1173	0.0039	0.3671	1.0244	0.8852
0.4	0.0049	0.2987	1.2093	0.0037	0.3861	1.0247	0.8178
0.5	0.0055	0.2721	1.3539	0.0034	0.4091	1.0248	0.7308
0.6	0.0064	0.2395	1.5865	0.0032	0.4376	1.0248	0.6240
0.7	0.0080	0.2005	1.9896	0.0029	0.4706	1.0242	0.4984
0.8	0.0113	0.1555	2.8185	0.0026	0.5057	1.0247	0.3522
0.9	0.0215	0.1047	5.3535	0.0024	0.5446	1.0244	0.1857

a. Variance inflation factor

b. Regressor correlation matrix determinant

Table 3. The simulated results for X and W of three-predictor interaction model with $\beta_X = \beta_W = 0.25$ and $N = 100$

ρ	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_X)$	Power $\pi(t_X)$	VIF ^a $\phi(X)$	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_W)$	Power $\pi(t_W)$	VIF ^a $\phi(W)$
-0.9	0.0593	0.1772	5.8344	0.0172	0.4809	1.6646
-0.8	0.0315	0.2914	3.0941	0.0164	0.4986	1.5907
-0.7	0.0224	0.3866	2.1862	0.0156	0.5188	1.5103
-0.6	0.0178	0.4641	1.7464	0.0148	0.5397	1.4297
-0.5	0.0154	0.5218	1.4945	0.0139	0.5638	1.3489
-0.4	0.0138	0.5646	1.3411	0.0132	0.5853	1.2794
-0.3	0.0127	0.5989	1.2387	0.0125	0.6062	1.2171
-0.2	0.0122	0.6184	1.1777	0.0121	0.6216	1.1718
-0.1	0.0118	0.6323	1.1430	0.0118	0.6319	1.1427
0	0.0117	0.6358	1.1333	0.0117	0.6354	1.1323
0.1	0.0118	0.6304	1.1439	0.0118	0.6310	1.1420
0.2	0.0121	0.6189	1.1760	0.0120	0.6231	1.1696
0.3	0.0128	0.5970	1.2396	0.0126	0.6046	1.2181
0.4	0.0138	0.5664	1.3409	0.0132	0.5858	1.2782
0.5	0.0153	0.5237	1.4920	0.0139	0.5631	1.3518
0.6	0.0179	0.4635	1.7449	0.0147	0.5401	1.4323
0.7	0.0223	0.3871	2.1868	0.0156	0.5192	1.5109
0.8	0.0315	0.2912	3.0974	0.0164	0.4997	1.5915
0.9	0.0594	0.1770	5.8503	0.0172	0.4802	1.6667

a. Variance inflation factor

Table 4. The simulated results for XZ and XW of three-predictor interaction model with $\beta_{XZ} = \beta_{XW} = 0.25$ and $N = 100$

ρ	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZ})$	Power $\pi(t_{XZ})$	VIF ^a $\phi(XZ)$	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_{XW})$	Power $\pi(t_{XW})$	VIF ^a $\phi(XW)$
-0.9	0.0080	0.7994	1.2692	0.0663	0.1696	6.3426
-0.8	0.0087	0.7666	1.2701	0.0354	0.2762	3.3766
-0.7	0.0096	0.7323	1.2693	0.0251	0.3654	2.3758
-0.6	0.0103	0.7026	1.2588	0.0202	0.4353	1.8955
-0.5	0.0112	0.6685	1.2550	0.0174	0.4882	1.6215
-0.4	0.0120	0.6419	1.2493	0.0157	0.5285	1.4525
-0.3	0.0125	0.6232	1.2407	0.0145	0.5596	1.3417
-0.2	0.0129	0.6076	1.2350	0.0138	0.5785	1.2786
-0.1	0.0132	0.5986	1.2291	0.0134	0.5905	1.2428
0	0.0133	0.5936	1.2282	0.0133	0.5937	1.2286
0.1	0.0132	0.5964	1.2329	0.0135	0.5893	1.2429
0.2	0.0130	0.6053	1.2333	0.0138	0.5792	1.2743
0.3	0.0126	0.6209	1.2398	0.0146	0.5562	1.3434
0.4	0.0118	0.6452	1.2497	0.0156	0.5304	1.4505
0.5	0.0112	0.6704	1.2562	0.0174	0.4901	1.6211
0.6	0.0105	0.6974	1.2591	0.0201	0.4370	1.8964
0.7	0.0096	0.7313	1.2694	0.0251	0.3656	2.3778
0.8	0.0087	0.7667	1.2747	0.0352	0.2774	3.3689
0.9	0.0080	0.7989	1.2692	0.0666	0.1692	6.3851

a. Variance inflation factor

Table 5. The simulated results for XZW of three-predictor interaction model with $\beta_{XZW} = 0.25$ and $N = 100$

ρ	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZW})$	Power $\pi(t_{XZW})$	VIF ^a $\phi(XZW)$	RCMD ^b δ
-0.9	0.0101	0.7237	2.0587	0.0152
-0.8	0.0110	0.6936	1.9699	0.0553
-0.7	0.0121	0.6593	1.8747	0.1154
-0.6	0.0130	0.6302	1.7652	0.1896
-0.5	0.0140	0.6009	1.6598	0.2735
-0.4	0.0149	0.5743	1.5712	0.3555
-0.3	0.0156	0.5588	1.4848	0.4355
-0.2	0.0160	0.5457	1.4225	0.4982
-0.1	0.0163	0.5365	1.3848	0.5405
0	0.0165	0.5305	1.3702	0.5552
0.1	0.0164	0.5355	1.3894	0.5382
0.2	0.0160	0.5429	1.4195	0.5011
0.3	0.0156	0.5560	1.4829	0.4359
0.4	0.0148	0.5770	1.5698	0.3566
0.5	0.0140	0.6009	1.6671	0.2722
0.6	0.0131	0.6273	1.7653	0.1900
0.7	0.0121	0.6594	1.8730	0.1156
0.8	0.0110	0.6940	1.9731	0.0548
0.9	0.0101	0.7244	2.0586	0.0150

a. Variance inflation factor

b. Regressor correlation matrix determinant

Table 6. The simulated results for X and W of three-predictor interaction model with $\beta_X = \beta_W = 0.10$ and $N = 250$

ρ	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_X)$	Power $\pi(t_X)$	VIF ^a $\phi(X)$	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_W)$	Power $\pi(t_W)$	VIF ^a $\phi(W)$
-0.9	0.0221	0.1034	5.4768	0.0062	0.2457	1.5380
-0.8	0.0117	0.1527	2.8933	0.0060	0.2544	1.4725
-0.7	0.0083	0.1962	2.0471	0.0057	0.2647	1.4026
-0.6	0.0066	0.2343	1.6328	0.0054	0.2765	1.3302
-0.5	0.0056	0.2655	1.3923	0.0051	0.2895	1.2577
-0.4	0.0050	0.2914	1.2469	0.0048	0.3021	1.1923
-0.3	0.0047	0.3107	1.1515	0.0046	0.3156	1.1335
-0.2	0.0044	0.3247	1.0921	0.0044	0.3260	1.0884
-0.1	0.0043	0.3288	1.0596	0.0043	0.3327	1.0599
0	0.0042	0.3353	1.0497	0.0042	0.3356	1.0493
0.1	0.0043	0.3329	1.0600	0.0043	0.3328	1.0600
0.2	0.0044	0.3244	1.0921	0.0044	0.3259	1.0880
0.3	0.0047	0.3107	1.1523	0.0046	0.3149	1.1337
0.4	0.0050	0.2912	1.2456	0.0048	0.3027	1.1923
0.5	0.0056	0.2658	1.3936	0.0051	0.2891	1.2579
0.6	0.0066	0.2338	1.6323	0.0054	0.2761	1.3315
0.7	0.0083	0.1962	2.0484	0.0057	0.2648	1.4023
0.8	0.0117	0.1527	2.8914	0.0060	0.2544	1.4723
0.9	0.0221	0.1034	5.4838	0.0062	0.2456	1.5405

a. Variance inflation factor

Table 7. The simulated results for XZ and XW of three-predictor interaction model with $\beta_{XZ} = \beta_{XW} = 0.10$ and $N = 250$

ρ	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZ})$	Power $\pi(t_{XZ})$	VIF ^a $\phi(XZ)$	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_{XW})$	Power $\pi(t_{XW})$	VIF ^a $\phi(XW)$
-0.9	0.0026	0.5156	1.1045	0.0232	0.1020	5.6767
-0.8	0.0028	0.4785	1.1053	0.0123	0.1498	3.0023
-0.7	0.0031	0.4437	1.1043	0.0087	0.1922	2.1172
-0.6	0.0034	0.4145	1.1029	0.0069	0.2290	1.6888
-0.5	0.0037	0.3860	1.0994	0.0059	0.2591	1.4407
-0.4	0.0039	0.3660	1.0966	0.0053	0.2829	1.2904
-0.3	0.0042	0.3479	1.0927	0.0049	0.3031	1.2920
-0.2	0.0043	0.3354	1.0889	0.0047	0.3155	1.1313
-0.1	0.0044	0.3291	1.0868	0.0046	0.3227	1.0985
0	0.0045	0.3256	1.0888	0.0045	0.3259	1.0876
0.1	0.0045	0.3277	1.0889	0.0045	0.3233	1.0988
0.2	0.0044	0.3352	1.0907	0.0047	0.3150	1.1306
0.3	0.0041	0.3495	1.0915	0.0049	0.3017	1.1936
0.4	0.0039	0.3654	1.0946	0.0053	0.2835	1.2898
0.5	0.0037	0.3874	1.0990	0.0060	0.2584	1.4416
0.6	0.0034	0.4128	1.1000	0.0070	0.2282	1.6901
0.7	0.0031	0.4444	1.1040	0.0087	0.1924	2.1185
0.8	0.0029	0.4766	1.1064	0.0123	0.1498	2.9962
0.9	0.0026	0.5149	1.1053	0.0231	0.1021	5.6860

a. Variance inflation factor

Table 8. The simulated results for XZW of three-predictor interaction model with $\beta_{XZW} = 0.10$ and $N = 250$

ρ	Variance $v(\hat{\beta}_{XZW})$	Power $\pi(t_{XZW})$	VIF ^a $\phi(XZW)$	RCMD ^b δ
-0.9	0.0029	0.4856	1.6918	0.0199
-0.8	0.0032	0.4535	1.6187	0.0740
-0.7	0.0035	0.4200	1.5440	0.1546
-0.6	0.0038	0.3927	1.4638	0.2551
-0.5	0.0041	0.3664	1.3817	0.3700
-0.4	0.0044	0.3476	1.3065	0.4862
-0.3	0.0046	0.3321	1.2394	0.5991
-0.2	0.0048	0.3196	1.1854	0.6935
-0.1	0.0049	0.3127	1.1522	0.7554
0	0.0050	0.3110	1.1425	0.7756
0.1	0.0050	0.3125	1.1545	0.7535
0.2	0.0048	0.3195	1.1864	0.6931
0.3	0.0046	0.3336	1.2382	0.5991
0.4	0.0044	0.3472	1.3040	0.4883
0.5	0.0041	0.3669	1.3806	0.3701
0.6	0.0038	0.3907	1.4602	0.2557
0.7	0.0035	0.4222	1.5425	0.1545
0.8	0.0032	0.4504	1.6206	0.0740
0.9	0.0029	0.4866	1.6914	0.0198

a. Variance inflation factor

b. Regressor correlation matrix determinant

Table 9. Hypothetical data sets

<i>Y</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>W</i>
Data 1 ($N = 30$)											
2.02	3.2	2.1	2.6	3.19	2.6	2.1	1.6	3.93	3.7	2.8	4.7
3.32	3.5	3.2	3.1	3.76	2.8	1.9	1.7	1.96	4.0	2.9	3.6
2.63	3.6	3.3	1.3	4.64	3.8	3.3	2.4	3.78	3.3	2.4	0.3
1.43	4.3	4.1	5.3	2.21	3.6	1.6	2.3	1.69	2.1	2.9	1.7
3.40	2.9	2.5	3.5	5.07	3.6	4.1	3.0	5.47	3.9	2.7	3.8
2.24	4.0	2.5	3.8	1.87	3.8	3.1	3.2	3.03	2.6	3.4	2.8
1.65	1.4	0.6	2.9	4.24	4.3	2.8	2.7	2.54	2.9	2.1	3.2
3.39	4.6	5.1	4.9	3.88	2.8	2.9	3.9	3.69	3.6	3.5	1.7
1.98	2.2	4.0	2.6	3.20	2.7	2.7	3.3	4.72	4.2	3.4	2.3
3.02	3.3	2.5	5.9	3.21	0.8	2.6	1.8	1.01	2.4	1.3	2.6
Data 2 ($N = 20$)											
3.62	4.2	3.6	2.3	3.99	2.5	1.4	1.1	3.76	2.1	1.7	3.7
1.35	2.9	1.2	0.9	5.34	4.6	4.1	2.1	3.68	2.9	3.2	4.4
4.08	3.8	3.1	1.7	3.52	2.2	2.9	1.9	0.99	3.0	1.7	3.4
1.57	2.2	2.5	1.5	2.24	2.1	2.4	2.9	2.86	2.5	2.9	3.9
3.39	3.7	2.6	3.6	2.95	2.7	2.0	3.5	3.30	2.4	3.1	2.6
5.12	5.2	3.9	2.3	3.42	2.7	4.0	3.4	2.13	2.6	2.5	3.0
3.31	2.5	3.7	1.9	2.66	4.0	2.4	4.7				

國科會補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

日期:2011/11/05

國科會補助計畫	計畫名稱: 共線性對檢測調節效用的影響
	計畫主持人: 謝國文
	計畫編號: 99-2410-H-009-004- 學門領域: 組織行為與理論
無研發成果推廣資料	

99 年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：謝國文		計畫編號：99-2410-H-009-004-					
計畫名稱：共線性對檢測調節效用的影響							
成果項目		量化			單位	備註（質化說明：如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）	
		實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數（含實際已達成數）	本計畫實際貢獻百分比			
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	0	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%		
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（本國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	1	1	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	0	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%	章/本	
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（外國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		

<p>其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)</p>	<p>無</p>
--	----------

	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
科 教 處 計 畫 加 填 項 目	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與(閱聽)人數	0	

國科會補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以 100 字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

論文： 已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利： 已獲得 申請中 無

技轉： 已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以 100 字為限）

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以 500 字為限）