Student Name:

Student Number:

McGill University Faculty of Science FINAL EXAMINATION

MATH 533 Regression and Analysis of Variance December 9th, 2008 9 a.m. - 12 Noon

Calculators are allowed.

One 8.5"  $\times$  11" two-sided sheet of notes is allowed.

All language dictionaries are allowed.

Answer all your questions in the exam booklet provided.

You must do BOTH of the first two questions (Questions 1 and 2) and TWO of the remaining THREE questions (Questions 3 through 5). You will receive points from the two questions with the highest marks from Questions 3, 4, and 5.

Question 6 is worth 10 bonus points. You will not lose points on the exam for any work on this question, you can only add points for any correct work that you provide.

There are 13 pages to this exam. The total number of marks for the exam is 100, although it is possible score as high as 110 due to the bonus question.

Examiner: Professor Russell Steele Associate Examiner: Professor David Stephens

# Question 1: (30 points)

The data for this analysis concern salary and other characteristics of all faculty in a small Midwestern college collected in the early 1980s for presentation in legal proceedings for which discrimination against women in salary was at issue. All persons in the data hold tenured or tenure track positions; temporary faculty are not included. The data were collected from personnel files and consist of the following quantities:

- Sex: 1 for female and 0 for male
- Rank:, 1 for Assistant Professor, 2 for Associate Professor, and 3 for Full Professor
- Year: Number of years in current rank
- Salary: Academic year salary in dollars
- (a) Test for significance of gender, without controlling for the other variables. Refer clearly to the part(s) of the output that you are using for your tests. Use a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.10$  for the test.
- (b) Test for a significant of gender after controlling for rank and number of years in current rank. Use a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.10$  for the test. Is your answer the same as in part (a)? Explain why or why not.
- (c) Interpret the coefficients for rank in the model in part (b).
- (d) Assess the validity of the model assumptions and the potential for misleading results due to influential points for model (2).
- (e) Test whether the association of gender with the response depends on the rank.

# Question 2: (20 points)

Suppose that two objects,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  with unknown weights  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  respectively are measured on a balance using the following scheme, all of these actions being repeated twice (i.e. there are six measurements):

- Both objects on the balance (resulting in weights  $Y_{11}$  and  $Y_{12}$ )
- Only  $A_1$  on the balance (resulting in weights  $Y_{21}$  and  $Y_{22}$ )
- Only  $A_2$  on the balance (resulting in weights  $Y_{31}$  and  $Y_{32}$ )

Assume that the  $Y_{ij}$ 's are independent, normally distributed random variables with common variance  $\sigma^2$ . Also assume that the balance may not be properly tared, i.e. it may add (or subtract) a fixed amount,  $\beta_0$ , to the true weight each time an object is placed on the scale.

- (a) Write down a design matrix, X that could be used to find least squares estimates for  $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2)$  using  $Y = (Y_{11}, Y_{12}, Y_{21}, Y_{22}, Y_{31}, Y_{32})$ . [Hint: Consider the expectation of  $Y_{ij}$  is for each case.]
- (b) Describe how you would use the model you have written in part (a) to test the hypothesis that the two objects have the same actual weights.

### Question 3: (25 points)

Assume that the true regression model is

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}_1 \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{X}_2 \boldsymbol{\gamma} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon},$$

where  $\epsilon_i$  are independent, but you underfit the model using only the columns of  $X_1$ , i.e. you fit the model:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}_1 \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*.$$

- (a) Find the variance-covariance for  $\hat{\beta}^*$ , i.e. the OLS estimates from underspecified model.
- (b) Using your answer from part (a), show that the variance for a single  $\hat{\beta}^*{}_i$  from fitting the smaller, underfit model will be smaller than the variance for the same coefficient fitting the true model, *i.e.* $\hat{\beta}$ . (Hint: re-order the matrix  $\mathbf{X}_1$  so the column corresponding to the j-th covariate is in the first column and use the result below for finding inverses of symmetric, partitioned matrices. Also, notice that the form of the variance should look very familiar to a common expression from throughout the course.)

If we partition the symmetric  $\mathbf{C}$  as:

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11} & \mathbf{C}_{12} \\ \mathbf{C}_{12}^t & \mathbf{C}_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$
 then we can write  $\mathbf{C}^{-1}$  as:  
$$\mathbf{C}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{11}^{-1} & \mathbf{D}_{12} \\ \mathbf{D}_{12}^t & \mathbf{D}_{22}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$
 where

where

- $D_{11} = C_{11} C_{12}C_{22}^{-1}C_{12}^{t}$
- $D_{22} = C_{22} C_{12}^t C_{11}^{-1} C_{12}$
- $D_{12} = -C_{11}^{-1}C_{12}D_{22}^{-1}$
- $D_{12}^t = -C_{22}^{-1}C_{12}^tD_{11}^{-1}$

## Question 4: (25 points)

Assume that the model for the data is the standard multiple linear regression model,

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\beta + \epsilon$$

where **X** is  $(p \times 1)$ , **y** is  $(n \times 1)$ ,  $\epsilon$  is  $(n \times 1)$ , and the  $\epsilon_i$  are independent and identically distributed and  $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ ,

- (a) Write down an expression for what Myers calls the studentized (or internally standardized PRESS) residual for the *i*th observation.
- (b) Write down an expression for the *R*-student (or externally studentized PRESS) residual for the *i*th observation and give its distribution under the model hypothesized above (you do not have to derive it if you know it).
- (c) First two results from probability:
  - If U has a t-distribution with  $\nu$  degrees of freedom, then  $\eta = U^2$  has an F-distribution with 1 and  $\nu$  degrees of freedom.
  - If W has an F-distribution with m and n degrees of freedom, then

$$\xi = \frac{m}{n} W / (1 + \frac{m}{n} W)$$

has a Beta distribution with parameters m/2 and n/2.

Now use these two results to show that the square of the studentized (internally standardized PRESS) residual is proportional to a beta random variable with parameters 1/2 and (n - p - 2)/2. (Hint: remember that residual mean square calculated without the *i*-th observation can be written as

$$s_{-i}^{2} = \frac{(n-p)s^{2} - e_{i}^{2}/(1-h_{ii})}{n-p-1}$$

where  $s^2$  is the residual mean square from the regression using all observations,  $e_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$ , and  $h_{ii}$  is the *i*-th diagonal of the hat matrix. )

### Question 5: (25 points)

Assume that the model for the data is the standard multiple linear regression model,

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\beta + \epsilon$$

where the  $\epsilon_i$  are independent and identically distributed and  $\epsilon_i \sim N(0,\sigma^2)$ . Let H be the hat matrix for a regression of  $\mathbf{y}$  on  $\mathbf{X}$ . Let  $X_{(i)}$  be the design matrix with the *i*-th row removed and let  $x_i$  be the *i*-th row of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

The following result will be useful in your calculations:

$$(X^{t}X)_{(i)}^{-1} = \left(I + \frac{1}{h_{ii}}(X^{t}X)^{-1}x_{i}x_{i}^{t}\right)(X^{t}X)^{-1}$$

- (a) Find an expression for  $h_{jk(i)}$ , the (j, k)th element of  $H_{(i)}$ , the hat matrix for the regression using  $\mathbf{X}_{(i)}$  instead of  $\mathbf{X}$ . In particular, write  $h_{jk(i)}$  in terms of elements of the hat matrix for the whole data set (H). (Hint: Use the result above.)
- (b) Assume now that the j-th row of **X** is identical to the i-th row of **X**, i.e. that the i-th and j-th covariate vectors are identical. Find an expression for the j-th diagonal element of H in terms of the diagonal element of  $H_{(i)}$  that corresponds to observation j.
- (c) Using your answer to part (b), describe what problems could arise in trying to diagnose the leverage (and thus the influence) of observations i and j when they have identical covariate vectors. (Hint: think about what happens to  $h_{jj}$  in H when  $h_{jj(i)}$  is large. This is called *masking* of observation influence.)

## BONUS: Question 6 (up to 10 extra marks)

Assume that  $y_i \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma^2 \mu_i^4)$  where  $\mu_i = \beta_0 + x_i \beta_1$ . Find the variance stabilizing transformation for  $y_i$ .

```
> ### Regression output for Question 1
>
> #### Model (1)
>
> model1<-lm(Salary~Sex,data=salary)</pre>
> summary(model1)
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
                            938 26.330
(Intercept)
               24697
                                          <2e-16 ***
               -3340
                           1808 -1.847
                                          0.0706 .
Sex1
___
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1
                                                    1
Residual standard error: 5782 on 50 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.0639, Adjusted R-squared: 0.04518
F-statistic: 3.413 on 1 and 50 DF, p-value: 0.0706
> anova(model1)
Analysis of Variance Table
Response: Salary
          Df
                           Mean Sq F value Pr(>F)
                 Sum Sq
             114106220 114106220
Sex
           1
                                     3.413 0.0706 .
Residuals 50 1671623638
                          33432473
____
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
>
>
```

```
> ### Model (2)
>
> model2<-lm(Salary~Sex+Rank+Year,data=salary)</pre>
> summary(model2)
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
                         797.49 19.946 < 2e-16 ***
(Intercept) 15906.81
Sex1
              524.15
                         834.69
                                0.628
                                           0.533
Rank2
            4373.92
                         906.12 4.827 1.51e-05 ***
Rank3
            9483.84
                         912.79 10.390 9.19e-14 ***
Year
              390.94
                         75.38 5.186 4.47e-06 ***
___
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1
                                                   1
Residual standard error: 2418 on 47 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.8462, Adjusted R-squared: 0.8331
F-statistic: 64.64 on 4 and 47 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
> anova(model2)
Analysis of Variance Table
Response: Salary
          Df
                           Mean Sq F value
                 Sum Sq
                                              Pr(>F)
Sex
           1
             114106220
                         114106220 19.524 5.819e-05 ***
Rank
           2 1239752324
                         619876162 106.063 < 2.2e-16 ***
Year
                         157183229 26.895 4.473e-06 ***
           1
             157183229
Residuals 47 274688086
                           5844427
___
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1
                                                 1
>
>
```

```
> ### Model (3)
>
> model3<-lm(Salary~Rank+Year,data=salary)</pre>
> summary(model3)
Coefficients:
           Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
                        638.68 25.370 < 2e-16 ***
(Intercept) 16203.27
Rank2
            4262.28
                        882.89 4.828 1.45e-05 ***
Rank3
            9454.52
                        905.83 10.437 6.12e-14 ***
Year
            375.70
                         70.92 5.298 2.90e-06 ***
___
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1
                                                  1
Residual standard error: 2402 on 48 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.8449, Adjusted R-squared: 0.8352
F-statistic: 87.15 on 3 and 48 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
> anova(model3)
Analysis of Variance Table
Response: Salary
         Df
                Sum Sq Mean Sq F value
                                             Pr(>F)
Rank
          2 1346783800 673391900 116.692 < 2.2e-16 ***
             161953324 161953324 28.065 2.905e-06 ***
Year
          1
Residuals 48 276992734
                          5770682
___
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
>
>
```

```
> ## Model (4)
>
> model4<-lm(Salary~Rank*Sex + Year,data=salary)</pre>
> summary(model4)
Coefficients:
           Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
                        855.91 18.638 < 2e-16 ***
(Intercept) 15952.10
Rank2
            4383.11
                       1063.99 4.119 0.000161 ***
Rank3
                      1133.16 7.921 4.49e-10 ***
            8975.97
Sex1
            244.50
                       1159.16 0.211 0.833894
Year
             409.90
                         78.21 5.241 4.10e-06 ***
                       2188.78 -0.484 0.630791
Rank2:Sex1 -1059.19
Rank3:Sex1 1582.95
                       1836.99 0.862 0.393417
___
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1
                                                  1
Residual standard error: 2432 on 45 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.8509, Adjusted R-squared: 0.831
F-statistic: 42.8 on 6 and 45 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
> anova(model4)
Analysis of Variance Table
Response: Salary
         Df
                Sum Sq
                          Mean Sq F value
                                              Pr(>F)
          2 1346783800 673391900 113.8150 < 2.2e-16 ***
Rank
Sex
               7074743
                          7074743
                                    1.1958
                                              0.2800
          1
Year
          1
                        157183229 26.5667 5.494e-06 ***
             157183229
Rank:Sex
          2
               8443427
                          4221713
                                   0.7135
                                              0.4954
Residuals 45 266244659
                          5916548
___
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1
                                                  1
```

```
> ### Comparisons
> anova(model1,model2)
Analysis of Variance Table
Model 1: Salary ~ Sex
Model 2: Salary ~ Sex + Rank + Year
  Res.Df
               RSS Df Sum of Sq F
                                          Pr(>F)
1
     50 1671623638
2
     47 274688086 3 1396935552 79.673 < 2.2e-16 ***
___
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
> anova(model3,model2)
Analysis of Variance Table
Model 1: Salary ~ Rank + Year
Model 2: Salary ~ Sex + Rank + Year
  Res.Df
              RSS Df Sum of Sq F Pr(>F)
1
     48 276992734
2
     47 274688086 1
                       2304648 0.3943 0.5331
> anova(model1,model3)
Analysis of Variance Table
Model 1: Salary ~ Sex
Model 2: Salary ~ Rank + Year
 Res.Df
               RSS Df Sum of Sq F
                                          Pr(>F)
1
     50 1671623638
2
     48 276992734 2 1394630904 120.84 < 2.2e-16 ***
___
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
```

```
> anova(model4,model1)
Analysis of Variance Table
Model 1: Salary ~ Rank * Sex + Year
Model 2: Salary ~ Sex
  Res.Df
                 RSS Df
                          Sum of Sq
                                        F
                                             Pr(>F)
1
      45
           266244659
2
      50 1671623638 -5 -1405378979 47.507 < 2.2e-16 ***
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1
                                                 1
> anova(model4,model2)
Analysis of Variance Table
Model 1: Salary ~ Rank * Sex + Year
Model 2: Salary ~ Sex + Rank + Year
  Res.Df
              RSS Df Sum of Sq
                                    F Pr(>F)
1
      45 266244659
2
      47 274688086 -2 -8443427 0.7135 0.4954
> anova(model4,model3)
Analysis of Variance Table
Model 1: Salary ~ Rank * Sex + Year
Model 2: Salary ~ Rank + Year
  Res.Df
              RSS Df Sum of Sq
                                    F Pr(>F)
1
      45 266244659
2
      48 276992734 -3 -10748075 0.6055 0.6148
> ## Influence measures
> summary(influence.measures(model2))
Potentially influential observations of
 lm(formula = Salary ~ Sex + Rank + Year, data = salary) :
   dfb.1_ dfb.Sex1 dfb.Rnk2 dfb.Rnk3 dfb.Year dffit
                                                      cov.r
                                                              cook.d hat
1 -0.13
         0.05
                  -0.06
                           -0.05
                                     0.27
                                              0.31
                                                      1.41_* 0.02
                                                                     0.24
7 -0.01 -0.09
                  -0.06
                           -0.15
                                      0.12
                                              -0.21
                                                       1.32_* 0.01
                                                                     0.18
24 -0.61
                           0.95
                                     0.03
         1.28_*
                   0.35
                                               1.76_* 0.16_* 0.42
                                                                     0.12
```



Figure 1: Regression diagnostics for Model 2