What is the difference between standardized and unstandardized regression coefficients?

Authored by

stats writer

December 22, 2025

RECOMMENDED CITATION

stats writer (2025). *What is the difference between standardized and unstandardized regression coefficients?*. PSYCHOLOGICAL SCALES. Retrieved from https://scales.arabpsychology.com/?p=108365

The core distinction between standardized regression coefficients and unstandardized regression coefficients lies in their basis of calculation and interpretability. Standardized coefficients represent the change in the response variable, measured in standard deviation units, associated with a one-standard-deviation change in the predictor variable. This essential adjustment to a common scale facilitates direct comparison of the relative influence of independent variables, regardless of their original units of measurement.

Conversely, unstandardized regression coefficients are calculated using the raw data and reflect the magnitude of change in the response variable for a one-unit change in the predictor variable. Because these coefficients retain the original measurement scales, they are crucial for prediction and practical application within the context of the variables' native units, but they cannot be used reliably to compare the relative strength of different predictors if those predictors utilize vastly different scales.

The Role of Regression Coefficients in Statistical Modeling

Multiple linear regression (MLR) is a foundational statistical technique used to model the linear relationship between two or more independent, or predictor variables, and a single dependent, or response variable. The output of an MLR analysis provides coefficients that quantify this relationship, essentially defining the slope of the relationship between each predictor and the outcome when all other predictors are held constant.

When regression analysis is performed using the raw, unmanipulated data, the resulting coefficients are inherently **unstandardized**. These coefficients are calculated directly from the original units of measurement, allowing researchers to determine the precise expected change in the response variable for a one-unit shift in the predictor. This method is standard practice when the goal is empirical prediction or specific, unit-based interpretation.

The need for standardization arises precisely when the predictor variables themselves are measured across vastly different measurement scales. For instance, comparing the effect of "age in years" versus "income in thousands of dollars" results in coefficients that are incomparable based on magnitude alone. Standardizing the data before running the regression transforms the variables onto a common scale, yielding **standardized** coefficients that reflect relative importance rather than absolute unit change.

Case Study: Comparing Predictors with Different Scales

To illustrate the practical implications of choosing between standardized and unstandardized coefficients, we can examine a simple dataset modeling house prices. This dataset contains information on 12 houses, focusing on three key variables: the house's **age** (in years), its **square footage** (a measure of size), and the resulting selling **price** (the response variable).

The initial step involves visualizing the raw input data, which clearly shows the disparate scales of the independent variables. Age is measured in small integer units (e.g., 4 to 44), while square footage is measured in much larger units (e.g., 1,200 to 2,800). This disparity in scale is precisely why interpreting raw coefficients can be misleading regarding the variables' relative impact.

Age	Sq. Footage	Price
4	2600	$ 280,000
7	2800	$ 340,000
10	1700	$ 195,000
15	1300	$ 180,000
16	1500	$ 150,000
18	1800	$ 200,000
24	1200	$ 180,000
28	2200	$ 240,000
30	1800	$ 200,000
35	1900	$ 180,000
40	2100	$ 260,000
44	1300	$ 140,000

We perform a multiple linear regression analysis using **age** and **square footage** as the predictor variables influencing **price**. The initial output provides the unstandardized coefficients, which are essential for forming the predictive equation, but less useful for determining which factor--age or size--is the strongest determinant of price.

Interpreting Unstandardized Regression Output

Following the initial regression run on the raw data, the output table below presents the unstandardized coefficients. These values define the relationship between the predictors and the response variable in their original units. It is critical to understand that the magnitude of these numbers is inextricably tied to the scale of measurement for the associated predictor variable.

	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*
Intercept	34736.543	37184.321	0.934	0.375
Age	-409.833	612.458	-0.669	0.520
Sq. Footage	100.866	15.747	6.405	0.000

Based purely on the absolute value of the coefficients, we observe a coefficient of **-409.833** for **age** and **100.866** for **square footage**. A superficial interpretation might suggest that age has a far larger numerical effect on house price due to the significantly larger coefficient magnitude. The unstandardized coefficient for age implies that for every one-year increase in age, the price decreases by approximately $409.83, assuming square footage remains constant.

The Impact of Differing Measurement Scales

The deceptive magnitude of the unstandardized coefficients reveals a critical statistical reality: the raw value of a coefficient often reflects the unit scale of the predictor variable rather than its intrinsic predictive power. For instance, a small change in a predictor measured in tiny units (like age) requires a large coefficient to register an impact on the response variable, whereas a predictor measured in massive units (like square footage) requires only a small coefficient.

The fundamental problem here is the vast difference in the range and variance of our predictors:

The values for **age** span a relatively small range, from 4 to 44 units.
The values for **square footage** span a much larger range, from 1,200 to 2,800 units.

This scale mismatch makes direct comparison invalid. Furthermore, note the associated inferential statistics: despite the large negative coefficient for age, its corresponding p-value (p=0.520) indicates that this relationship is not statistically significant. In contrast, the much smaller coefficient for square footage yields a highly significant p-value (p=0.000). This contrast underscores the limitations of using raw coefficient magnitude alone to gauge influence.

The Process of Data Standardization using Z-Scores

To overcome the scale problem and enable a meaningful comparison of relative influence, we must **standardize** the data. Standardization transforms each variable so that it has a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. This process ensures that all variables are placed on a common, unit-less metric.

The most common method of standardization is converting the raw data points into z-scores. A z-score measures how many standard deviations an individual observation is above or below the mean of its respective variable. By applying this transformation to the Age and Square Footage variables, we generate a standardized dataset:

Raw Data

Age	Sq. Footage	Price
4	2600	$ 280,000
7	2800	$ 340,000
10	1700	$ 195,000
15	1300	$ 180,000
16	1500	$ 150,000
18	1800	$ 200,000
24	1200	$ 180,000
28	2200	$ 240,000
30	1800	$ 200,000
35	1900	$ 180,000
40	2100	$ 260,000
44	1300	$ 140,000

→

Standardized Data

Age	Sq. Footage	Price
-1.425	1.479	1.175
-1.195	1.873	2.212
-0.965	-0.296	-0.295
-0.581	-1.084	-0.555
-0.505	-0.690	-1.074
-0.351	-0.099	-0.209
0.109	-1.281	-0.555
0.415	0.690	0.483
0.569	-0.099	-0.209
0.952	0.099	-0.555
1.335	0.493	0.829
1.642	-1.084	-1.247

Analyzing the Standardized Regression Output

Upon performing multiple linear regression using the newly standardized dataset, the resulting coefficients--the **standardized regression coefficients**--provide an entirely different perspective on the importance of the predictor variables. Since the scale dependency has been removed, the absolute magnitude of these coefficients can now be directly compared to gauge relative predictive strength.

	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*
Intercept	0.000	0.123	0.000	1.000
Age	-0.092	0.138	-0.669	0.520
Sq. Footage	0.885	0.138	6.405	0.000

In this standardized model, the coefficients are interpreted in terms of standard deviation units:

The standardized coefficient for **age** is **-0.092**. This indicates that a one standard deviation increase in age is associated with a 0.092 standard deviation decrease in house price, holding square footage constant.
The standardized coefficient for **square footage** is **0.885**. This shows that a one standard deviation increase in square footage is associated with a substantial 0.885 standard deviation increase in house price, holding age constant.

This analysis fundamentally shifts our conclusion. When standardized, **square footage** (0.885) is revealed to have a vastly greater relative effect on house price than **age** (-0.092). The initial misleading impression created by the unstandardized coefficients is entirely corrected by standardization. It is important to observe that while the coefficient values changed dramatically, the p-values for each predictor remain identical, confirming that standardization only affects the measurement scale, not the statistical significance of the predictor.

The Primary Utility of Unstandardized Coefficients

The choice between standardized and unstandardized coefficients is dependent entirely on the research question and the goal of the statistical modeling exercise. Generally, **unstandardized regression coefficients** are the default choice and are invaluable when the objective is prediction or when specific, real-world unit interpretations are required. They maintain the original meaning of the measurement scale, making the results directly applicable to practitioners or policymakers who operate within those units.

In our housing example, the unstandardized regression coefficients provided a clear, actionable relationship in currency units. Using the raw coefficients allows for the calculation of an exact predicted price based on the inputs:

We interpreted that a one-year increase in age was associated with an average **$409** decrease in house price (though not statistically significant).
We determined that a one square foot increase in size was associated with an average **$100** increase in house price, a relationship that was highly statistically significant.

This specificity is the primary strength of unstandardized coefficients. They allow us to answer questions like: "If we increase the dosage by 1 milligram, how much will the blood pressure change in mmHg?" or "If the marketing budget increases by $10,000, what is the expected revenue lift in dollars?" For accurate forecasting and direct policy application, unstandardized coefficients are indispensable.

The Comparative Power of Standardized Coefficients

Standardized regression coefficients excel in a very different domain: assessing the relative importance of predictor variables within the model. When a researcher needs to understand which of several predictors exerts the strongest influence on the response variable, standardization provides the necessary neutral ground for comparison. By converting all variables to the standard deviation metric, the coefficients become unitless and directly comparable, enabling rank-ordering of predictor strength.

This approach is particularly valuable in social sciences, psychology, and complex economic modeling where predictors often include variables like age, questionnaire scores (on 5-point scales), and income (in thousands). Without standardization, the predictor with the smallest measurement unit would almost always appear to have the largest coefficient, regardless of its true predictive power.

However, the key trade-off for this enhanced comparative power is a loss of intuitive interpretability. Interpreting the effect of a "one standard deviation increase" is far less intuitive for domain experts than interpreting the effect of a "one-unit increase" (e.g., one year or one dollar). This diminished practical interpretability is the main drawback associated with using standardized coefficients.

How to Calculate Z-Scores in Excel

How to Read and Interpret a Regression Table
How to Interpret Regression Coefficients
How to Perform Multiple Linear Regression in Excel