# COMPUTING PRESSURE REDUCTION CONSTANTS USING INDICATOR VARIABLES

Bernard Augustine (1) Suitland House 4500 Silver Hill Road Suitland, MD 20746

#### ABSTRACT

Since computers are an integral part of a weather station, more standard procedures can be automated. A procedure is now available for calculating sea-level pressure for manned and unmanned weather stations. Each weather station has a unique equation that is used to compute reduction constants. Sea-level pressure is calculated by multiplying station pressure by the reduction constant (2). This paper discusses an alternative method for computing reduction constants.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

There are two reasons for writing this paper:

- (a) To discuss the indicator variable technique for developing models;
- (b) To use this technique to develop a single regression model that can compute a reduction constant for more than one weather station.

#### 2. METHODOLOGY

The independent variables used in regression models are quantitative; i.e., they are actual numerical values. However, many variables cannot be defined numerically (e.g., marital status, sex, race, color, shape, religion, etc.). These are qualitative variables and serve to identify class membership. It is necessary to examine a method to quantify the levels of a qualitative variable for regression analysis. The qualitative variables are commonly referred to as indicator variables and take the values 0 and 1. If a qualitative variable has n levels, it is represented by n-l indicator variables. For example, if three weather stations are grouped geographically, there will be two indicator variables each being assigned the value 0 or 1. If this rule is violated, a computational difficulty - multicollinearity - occurs. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss multicollinearity, but its importance cannot be over emphasized. Serious errors will produce unwanted results.

## 3. EXAMPLE

The following three weather stations are grouped geographically:

(a) Big Piney, Wyoming (BPI)

- (b) Cody, Wyoming (COD)
- (c) Wendover, Utah (ENV)

The indicator variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are defined as:

- $x_1 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the station is BPI} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
- $X_2 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the station is COD} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

To illustrate the indicator variable process, consider the data in Table 1 where:

- T is the independent variable (12 hour mean temperature)
- 2)  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are the indicator variables
- 3)  $y^l$  is the dependent variable (reduction constant)

0.1011	constant,			
		TABLE 1		
T	x <sub>1</sub>	x <sub>2</sub>	У	
-50 -40 -30 -20 -10 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 -50 -40 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 -30	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0.3294 0.3228 0.3168 0.3113 0.3064 0.3020 0.2977 0.2936 0.2895 0.2848 0.2810 0.2779 0.2751 0.2727 0.2707 0.2365 0.2324 0.2284 0.2250 0.2217 0.2128 0.2128 0.2128 0.2100 0.2070 0.2041 0.2016 0.1995 0.1977 0.1959 0.1950 0.1860	

-20	0		0	0.1826
-10	0		0	0.1797
0	0		0	0.1773
10	0	CI-PIC I TO SEE	0	0.1751
20	0		0	0.1727
30	0	SPACE AND A	0	0.1704
40	0	ROLDOY DON	0	0.1685
50	0		0	0.1670
60	inch coo		0	0.1656
70	0	tet egtolog	0	0.1642
80	0.00		0	0.1628
90	056 . 560		0	0.1620
100	0		0	0.1613

It is desired to find the best set of independent variables to predict the reduction constants. Therefore, an interaction effect must be included in the model. The interaction effect involves a cross-product term between the independent variables and the indicator variables. In this case, the cross-product terms are  $\text{Tx}_1$ ,  $\text{Tx}_2$ ,  $\text{T}^2\text{x}_1$ , and  $\text{T}^2\text{x}_2$ . If the cross-product terms are not significant, they are not included in the model. The regression analysis is done by using the statistical computer package SAS (Statistical Analysis System).

The results of fitting the model are:

$$y = b_0 - b_1 r + b_2 r^2 + b_3 x_1 + b_4 x_2 - b_5 r x_1 - b_6 r x_2 - b_7 r^2 x_2$$
 (1.0)

where:

 $b_0 = 0.17721023$   $b_1 = 0.00027178$   $b_2 = 1.1887078 \times 10^{-6}$ 

 $b_3 = 0.12486728$   $b_4 = 0.04124339$   $b_5 = 0.00019448$ 

 $b_6 = 4.7676655 \times 10^{-5}$   $b_7 = 4.0631989 \times 10^{-7}$ 

To solve reduction constants for station BFI, use:  $^{2}$ 

 $y = b_0 - b_1 r + b_2 r^2 + b_3 x_1 - b_5 r x_1$  because  $x_2 = 0$  (1.1)

To solve reduction constants for station COD, use:  $y = b_0 - b_1 r + b_2 r^2 + b_4 x_2 - b_6 r x_2 - b_7 r^2 x_2 \quad \text{because } x_1 = 0 \quad (1.2)$ 

Po solve reduction constants for station ENV, use:  $y = b_0 - b_1 T + b_2 T^2$  because both  $x_1$  and  $x_2 = 0$  (1.3)

Table 2 shows the results of five other groups of weather stations. Included are the station name, call letters, significant variables and their regression coefficients.

The constant  $b_0$  is the intercept.

INDICATOR VARIABLES	STATION NAME	CALL LETTERS
x <sub>1</sub>	Clayton, New Mexico	CAO
x <sub>2</sub>	Deming, New Mexico	DMN
x3	Douglas, Arizona	DUG

TABLE 2

x <sub>4</sub>	Winslow, Arizona	INW
х5	Junction, Texas	JCT
х6	Marfa, Texas	MRF
x <sub>7</sub>	Prescott, Arizona	PRC
х8	Truth or Consequences	TCS
х9	Caliente, Arizona	P38
A	Page, Arizona	PGA

1	х9	Caliente, Arizona	P38
1		Page, Arizona	PGA
OLIVER ALL DES	Parameter	Regression	Coefficients
	Intercept	0.18606296	
1000	T	-0.00044666	
	T <sup>2</sup>	1.8289148E-06	
	x <sub>1</sub>	0.02453614	
	x <sub>2</sub>	-0.00635929	
	x <sub>3</sub>	-0.01649633	
	x <sub>4</sub>	0.02090837	
	x <sub>5</sub>	-0.11830744	
	x <sub>6</sub>	0.01594893	
	x <sub>7</sub>	0.02810267	
	x <sub>8</sub>	0.01837490	
	x <sub>9</sub>	-0.00278536	
	Tx <sub>1</sub>	0.00011796	
	Tx2	0.00017853	
	rx3	0.00020567	
	Px4	0.00013467	
	Tx <sub>5</sub>	0.00035055	
	rx <sub>6</sub>	0.00012151	
	Tx <sub>7</sub>	0.00014068	
	Tx <sub>8</sub>	0.00013679	
	Tx <sub>9</sub>	0.00016779	
TO STATE	r2x1	-9.4330045E-07	
	r <sup>2</sup> x <sub>2</sub>	-1.1593344E-06	
	T2x3	-1.3199238E-06	
	$r^2x_h$	-1.0491946E-06	

-1.5973964E-06 -7.8462579E-07

1 <sup>2</sup> x <sub>7</sub>	-1.2479958E-06		Tx3	0.00008338	
T <sup>2</sup> x <sub>8</sub>	-1.0407030E-06		T <sup>2</sup> x <sub>1</sub>	-0.00000030	
T <sup>2</sup> x <sub>9</sub>	-9.6294037E-07		7 <sup>2</sup> x4	0.00000045	
9	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		TNDTGNMOD		CALL
INDICATOR VARIABLES	STATION NAME	CALL LETTERS	INDICATOR VARIABLES	STATION NAME	LETTERS
x <sub>1</sub>	Greenville, Maine	6B2	x <sub>1</sub>	Aniak, Alaska	ANI
x <sub>2</sub>	Johnbury, Vermont	9 B2	x <sub>2</sub>	Big Delta, Alaska	BIG
x <sub>3</sub>	Worcester, Massachusetts		х3	Cape Decision, Alaska	CDE
A-3	Rome, Georgia	RMG	x 4	Nenana, Alaska	ENN
The Intid			x <sub>5</sub>	Fort Yukon, Alaska	FYU
Parameter	Regression Coe	efficient	х6	Gulkana, Alaska	GKN
Intercept	0.02505938		х7	Illiama, Alaska	ILI
T T <sup>2</sup>	-3.8256313E-05		х8	Middleton Island, Alaska	MDO
T~	1.2106106E-07			Port Heiden, Alaska	PTH
<sup>x</sup> 1	0.01604374		Parameter	Regression Co	efficient
x <sub>2</sub>	0.01604374		Intercept	0.00375817	
<sup>x</sup> 3	0.01548032		Т	-5.0274260E-06	
Tx <sub>1</sub>	-1.7049487E-05		r <sup>2</sup>	1.6202833E-08	
rx <sub>2</sub>	-2.2802562E-06			-0.00033310	
Tx <sub>3</sub>	-1.7665513E-05		X <sub>1</sub>	0.04926333	
INDICATOR		CALL	x <sub>2</sub>	-0.00178684	
VARIABLES	STATION NAME	LETTERS	x <sub>3</sub>	0.01102643	
x <sub>1</sub>	Blue Canyon, California	BLU	x <sub>4</sub>	0.01406149	
x <sub>2</sub>	Meacham, Oregon	MEH	<b>x</b> <sub>5</sub>	0.06186686	
х3	Mount Shasta, California		x <sub>6</sub>	0.00262816	
x <sub>4</sub>	Sandberg, California	SDB	x <sub>7</sub>	-0.00116935	
	Sexton Summit, Oregon	SXT	x <sub>8</sub>	-0.00010611	
Parameter	Regression Co	efficient	Tx <sub>3</sub>	1.4689853E-06	
Intercept	0.16275247		Tx <sub>4</sub>	-1.5963286E-05	
T	-0,00030873		Tx <sub>5</sub>	-2.0043523E-05	
T <sup>2</sup>	0.00000073		Tx <sub>6</sub>	-0.00012322	
x <sub>1</sub>	0.06578299		Tx <sub>7</sub>	-3.6784392E-06	
x <sub>2</sub>	0.00936228		Tx <sub>8</sub>	1.0552560E-06	
х <sub>3</sub>	-0.01417618		T <sup>2</sup> x <sub>2</sub>	2.8712619E-07	
x <sub>4</sub>	0.02709380		T <sup>2</sup> x <sub>4</sub>	4.8038654E-08	
Tx <sub>1</sub>	-0.00009081		1 ^4	4.00,00,345-00	

		manufacture of the state of the	
$T^2x$	6.2099541 <sub>E</sub> -08	Parameter	Regression Coefficient
$T^2x$	2.6046168Ŀ-07	Intercept	0.12261314
******		T	-0.00016899
	ICATOR CALL IABLES STATION NAME LETT	11-0	3.1476108E-07
x <sub>1</sub>	Chamberlain, South Dakota CHB	x <sub>1</sub>	-0.05258632
x <sub>2</sub>	Warroad, Minnesota D45	x <sub>2</sub>	-0.07984645
х3	Marseilles, Illinois MMO	x3	-0.09382217
x4	Poplar Bluff, Missouri PO2	x <sub>4</sub>	-0.10797337
x5	Devils Lake, North Dakota Pll	*5	-0.06307131
x6	Roseglen, North Dakota P24	<b>x</b> 6	-0.03947410
x7	Medicine Lodge, Kansas P28	*7	-0.06161888
x8	Pequot Lake, Minnesota P39	x <sub>8</sub>	-0.07129986
x9	Redig, South Dakota REJ	x <sub>9</sub>	0.00256523
x <sub>10</sub>	Sidney, Nebraska SNY	x10	0.05959343
x11	Valentine, Nebraska VTN	x <sub>11</sub>	-0.01600669
	Elkhart, Kansas 1K5	Tx <sub>1</sub>	6.7954851E-05
		Tx <sub>2</sub>	9.9562546E-05
		Tx3	0.00011157
		Tx4	0.00012494
	NOTES AND REFERENCES	Tx 5	8.0444190E-05
Univ	Bernard Augustine is a graduate of Marsh ersity, Huntington, West Virginia. He	has Tx <sub>6</sub>	5.2752462E-05
Mr.	with the Communications Division since 19 Augustine has a wide variety of experien	nce Tx7	7.3588753E-05
to t	the National Weather Service. Before com he Washington, D.C., area, he worked in wea	th- Tx <sub>8</sub>	8.9498260E-05
Beck.	stations at Barter Island and Nome, Alas. ley and Huntington, West Virginia; and No		-8.5144597E-05
	, Virginia.	Tx <sub>11</sub>	1.9748260E-05
2.	Augustine, Bernard G, 1981: "Computer Gene	er-	

Moving?	If you have moved and not notified us, or offered to pay forwarding costs for magazines, the NATIONAL WEATHER DIGEST will not reach you. Additionally, we must pay the cost for returned Digests as well as remailing them out again. To save a lot of work and inconvenience, please notify us immediately of any change of address, and send it to the National Weather Association, 4400 Stamp Road, Room 404, Temple Hills, MD 20748. Thank you very much.
	NEW ADDRESS:

6:2, p.34.

2. Augustine, Bernard G, 1981: "Computer Generated Sea-Level Pressure," National Weather Digest,