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Module MS236 GENERAL LINEAR MODELS

Attempt THREE questions.
If any candidate attempts more than THREE questions only the best THREE solutions will be taken into account. Cambridge Tables will be provided.

## Question 1

Experience with a certain type of plastic indicates that a relationship exists between the hardness $(Y)$ (measured in Brinell units) of items moulded from the plastic and the elapsed time $(x)$ in hours since termination of the moulding process. Twelve batches of the plastic were made and from each batch one test item was moulded and the hardness measured at some specific point in time. The results are shown below

| $i$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x_{i}$ | 32 | 48 | 72 | 64 | 48 | 16 | 40 | 48 | 48 | 24 | 80 | 56 |
| $y_{i}$ | 230 | 262 | 323 | 298 | 255 | 199 | 248 | 279 | 267 | 214 | 359 | 305 |

(a) Assuming a simple linear regression model $Y_{i}=\alpha+\beta x_{i}+\varepsilon_{i}$, find the least squares estimates of $\alpha$ and $\beta$.
(b) Show that the variances of the parameters $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\alpha}$ are:

$$
\operatorname{Var}[\hat{\beta}]=\frac{\sigma^{2}}{S_{x x}} \text { and } \operatorname{Var}[\hat{\alpha}]=\sigma^{2}\left[\frac{1}{n}+\frac{\bar{x}^{2}}{S_{x x}}\right]
$$

Evaluate the standard error of the estimates for this data set.
(c) Find a $95 \%$ confidence interval for the mean value of $Y$ when $x=56$.
[Hint: The variance for the least squares predictor when $x=x_{0}$ is $\left.\sigma^{2}\left[\frac{1}{n}+\frac{\left(x_{0}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}}{S_{x x}}\right]\right]$
(d) On analysing these data using R a researcher tried fitting successively the null model $(\operatorname{lm}(y \sim 1))$ ), a simple linear regression model $(\operatorname{lm}(y \sim x))$ and a model including a quadratic term $(\operatorname{lm}(y \sim x+x * x))$. The resulting deviances were 23379, 952.25 and 821.46. Write down an appropriate ANOVA table and test the hypothesis that the quadratic term is unnecessary.

## Question 2

The multiple regression model with an intercept term and $p-1$ explanatory variables can be written in the form

$$
Y=X \beta+\varepsilon
$$

where $X$ is an $n \times p$ matrix of rank $p$. Identify $X$ and $\beta$ for this model.
Write down the normal equations and the least squares estimates in terms of $X, Y$ and $\hat{\beta}$. Why is it necessary to assume that $X$ is of rank $p$ ?
A random sample of 15 applicants for a clerical job were given two aptitude tests with resultant scores $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$. After a period of training each was given a Job Proficiency Score $(Y)$. It is hoped to predict Proficiency Scores on the basis of the aptitude tests using a regression model. The table of deviances is as follows:

| Variables included | Deviance |
| :---: | ---: |
| none | 2562.1 |
| $X_{1}$ | 110.3 |
| $X_{2}$ | 196.4 |
| $X_{1}, X_{2}$ | 15.5 |

Show that the overall regression on $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$ is significant and that neither $X_{1}$ nor $X_{2}$ can be dropped.
The statistician analyzing the data suggests that a linear model might not be appropriate since two moderate scores may indicate a different Proficiency than one high and one low score. He therefore includes the variable $X_{3}=X_{1} X_{2}$.

| Variables included | Deviance |
| :---: | ---: |
| $X_{3}$ | 16.1 |
| $X_{1}, X_{3}$ | 15.8 |
| $X_{2}, X_{3}$ | 16.0 |

Show that the regression on $X_{3}$ is significant but adding $X_{1}$ or $X_{2}$ does not significantly decrease the deviance using the initial estimate of $\sigma^{2}$ above.
What criteria can be used to compare the competing models

$$
\begin{gathered}
I: Y=\alpha+\beta X_{1}+\beta_{2} X_{2}+\varepsilon \\
I I: Y=\alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime} X_{3}+\varepsilon
\end{gathered}
$$

## Question 3

The following data were obtained from a calibration check on laboratories $A, B$ and $C$. Each laboratory was sent samples of standard wire, yielding 13 data points in all. The wire breaking strengths in kilograms are given below:

| $A$ | 58 | 63 | 60 | 67 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $B$ | 70 | 69 | 68 | 70 | 73 |
| $C$ | 61 | 68 | 62 | 53 |  |

Let $Y_{i j}$ denote the breaking strength of the $j$ th wire in laboratory $i$. Then $\sum y_{i j}=842$ and $\sum y_{i j}^{2}=54934$.
(a) Construct a one-way analysis of variance table. Test the hyppothesis that the three laboratories each give the same mean breaking strength and report your conclusions.
(b) Prior to running the experiment two contrasts were proposed, one to compare laboratories $A$ and $C$ and the other to compare laboratories $A$ and $C$ together against laboratory $B$. Write down the two contrasts and show that they are othogonal.
(c) Test the significance of the first contrast in (b) at the $5 \%$ level.
(d) Calculate the raw residuals from fitting the one-way analysis of variance model and plot them against laboratory. Comment on your plot.

## Question 4

## Question 5

An experimenter wanted to compare the effects of two fertilisers on four different types of wheat. She had available 24 plots, each of one third of an acre. She allocated each of the eight combinations of fertiliser and wheat to three plots in a completely randomised design. The yields were as follows, measured in bushels per plot.

|  | Wheat type |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FertiliserBrand | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| 1 | 19.4 | 25.0 | 24.8 | 23.1 | 280.8 |
|  | 20.6 | 24.0 | 26.0 | 24.3 |  |
|  | 20.0 | 24.5 | 25.4 | 23.7 |  |
| 2 | 22.6 | 25.6 | 27.6 | 25.4 | 302.1 |
|  | 21.6 | 26.8 | 26.4 | 24.5 |  |
|  | 22.1 | 26.2 | 27.0 | 26.3 |  |
| Totals | 126.3 | 152.1 | 157.2 | 147.3 | 582.9 |

The total sum of squares $C S(y, y)=117.37$.
Write down the full linear model for such a study, stating clearly the assumptions underlying the model. 5
Give the full analysis of variance table and perform any necessary tests. Interpret your results. Which model is most suitable for these data? 14
Sketch the interaction plot and comment on whether this confirms the results you have found. 6

| Obs | Supplier |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 1 | 23.46 | 23.59 | 23.51 | 23.28 | 23.29 |  |
| 2 | 23.48 | 23.46 | 23.64 | 23.40 | 23.46 |  |
| 3 | 23.56 | 23.42 | 23.46 | 23.37 | 23.37 |  |
| 4 | 23.39 | 23.49 | 23.52 | 23.46 | 23.32 |  |
| 5 | 23.40 | 23.50 | 23.49 | 23.39 | 23.38 |  |
| Total | 117.29 | 117.46 | 117.62 | 116.9 | 116.82 |  |

## Question 6

In the 1840's and 1850's the Scottish physicist James Forbes was interested in developing a method for estimating altitude on a hillside from measurement of the boiling point of water there. The temperature at which water boils is affected by atmospheric pressure, which in turn is affected by altitude. As part of this study Forbes collected the following data on atmospheric pressure ( $y$ measured in degrees Fahrenheit) at 17 locations in Scotland and in the Alps.

| $y$ | $x$ | $y$ | $x$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20.79 | 194.5 | 20.79 | 194.3 |
| 22.40 | 197.9 | 22.67 | 198.4 |
| 23.15 | 199.4 | 23.35 | 199.4 |
| 23.89 | 200.9 | 23.99 | 201.1 |
| 24.02 | 201.4 | 24.01 | 201.3 |
| 25.14 | 203.6 | 26.57 | 204.6 |
| 28.49 | 209.5 | 27.76 | 208.6 |
| 29.04 | 210.7 | 29.88 | 211.9 |
| 30.66 | 212.2 |  |  |

A statistician fitted a series of models to these data. Some extracts from the output are given below.
(a) Model 1 is a simple linear regression model. Write down this model and any necessary assumptions.
(b) On the basis of the output it was decided to try omitting observation 12 to give Model 2. Explain why this was done and how it was achieved in R.
(c) On the basis of the output it was decided to include a quadratic term in $x$. Explain why this was done.
(d) What hypothesis is the Analysis of Variance Table for Model 3 testing?
(e) Justify Model 3 as a better model than Model 2.
(f) In Model $4 y$ is transformed to $\log _{e} y$ (ly). Why is this transformed considered?
(g) Would you use Model 3 or Model 4 for prediction? Justify your answer.
(h) Predict the value of $y$ for another location with $x=200.2$ using model 4. Explain how you would calculate a $95 \%$ prediction interval. (You should give the necessary formula but do not evaluate it.)
(i) Define Cook's distance. How do we use it to determine if any observation has very high influence?

```
> y<-c(20.79,22.40,23.15,23.89,24.02,25.14,28.49,29.04,30.06,20.79,22.67,23.35,23.99,24
> x<-c(194.5,197.9,199.4,200.9,201.4,203.6,209.5,210.7,212.2,194.3,198.4,199.9,201.1,2(
> model1.fit<-lm(y~x)
> summary(model1.fit)
```

Call: $\operatorname{lm}($ formula $=y ~ \sim ~ x) ~$
Residuals:

| Min | $1 Q$ | Median | 3Q | Max |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| -0.25717 | -0.11246 | -0.05102 | 0.14283 | 0.64994 |

Coefficients:
$\begin{array}{rrrrr} & \text { Estimate } & \text { Std. Error t value } & \operatorname{Pr}(>|\mathrm{t}|) \\ \text { (Intercept) }-81.06373 & 2.05182 & -39.51 & <2 \mathrm{e}-16 * * * \mathrm{x}\end{array}$
$0.52289 \quad 0.01011 \quad 51.74<2 e-16 * * *$
Signif. codes: $0{ }^{\prime} * * * ’ 0.001$ '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Residual standard error: 0.2328 on 15 degrees of freedom Multiple
R-Squared: 0.9944, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9941 F-statistic:
2677 on 1 and $15 \mathrm{DF}, \mathrm{p}$-value: < $2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$
> anova(model1.fit)
Analysis of Variance Table
Response: y
Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value $\operatorname{Pr}(>F)$
$\mathrm{x} \quad 1145.125145 .125 \quad 2677.1<2.2 \mathrm{e}-16 * * *$ Residuals 15
$0.813 \quad 0.054$
Signif. codes: $0{ }^{\prime} * * *$ ' $0.001^{\prime} * * ’ 0.01^{\prime} *$ ' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' , 1
> model1.hat<-lm.influence(model1.fit)\$hat
> model1.res<model1.fit\$residuals
Error: Object "model1.res" not found
> model1.res<-model1.fit\$residuals
> SRES1<-model1.res/sqrt(deviance(model1.fit)*(1-model1.hat)/model1.fit\$df)
> FITS1<-model1.fit\$fitted
> plot(FITS1, SRES1)
> title("Model 1:Standardised residuls versus fitted values")
> qqnorm(SRES1)
> qqline(SRES1)
$>$
$>x 2<-x[c(1: 14,16: 17)]$
$>y 2<-y[c(1: 14,16: 17)]$
$>$ model2.fit<-lm(y2~x2)

```
> x2;y2
```

    [1] 194.5197 .9199 .4200 .9201 .4203 .6209 .5210 .7212 .2194 .3198 .4199 .9
    [13] 201.1201 .3208 .6211 .9
[1] 20.7922 .4023 .1523 .8924 .0225 .1428 .4929 .0430 .0620 .7922 .6723 .35
[13] 23.9924 .0127 .7629 .88
> summay (model2.fit)
Error: couldn't find function "summay"
> summary(model2.fit)
Call: $\operatorname{lm}($ formula $=\mathrm{y} 2$ ~ x 2$)$
Residuals:

| Min | 1Q | Median | 3Q | Max |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| -0.21493 | -0.09546 | -0.01500 | 0.09049 | 0.27793 |

## Coefficients:

```
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -80.667294 1.419984 -56.81 <2e-16 *** x2
0.520738 0.006997 74.42 <2e-16 ***
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1' ' 1
Residual standard error: 0.1608 on 14 degrees of freedom Multiple
R-Squared: 0.9975, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9973 F-statistic:
5538 on 1 and 14 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
> anova(model2.fit)
Analysis of Variance Table
Response: y2
            Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F)
x2 1 143.150 143.150 5538.2 < 2.2e-16 *** Residuals 14
0.362 0.026
---
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
> model2.hat<-lm.influence(model2.fit)$hat
> model2.res<-model2.fit$residuals
> SRES2<-model2.res/sqrt(deviance(model2.fit)*(1-model2.hat)/model2.fit$df)
> FITS2<-model2.fit$fitted
> plot(FITS2,SRES2)
> title("Model 2:Standardised residuls versus fitted values")
> qqnorm(SRES2)
> qqline(SRES2)
>
> xsq=x2*x2
> model3.fit<-lm(y~}x2+xsq
```

```
Error in model.frame(formula, rownames, variables, varnames,
extras, extranames, :
    variable lengths differ
> model3.fit<-lm(y2~ x2+xsq)
> summary(model3.fit
+ )
Call: lm(formula = y2 ~ x2 + xsq)
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & 1Q & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-0.145936 & -0.054387 & 0.009275 & 0.054030 & 0.070662
\end{tabular}
```

Coefficients:
Estimate Std. Error t value $\operatorname{Pr}(>|t|)$
(Intercept) 116.59183225 .0790664 .6490 .000455 *** x2
$-1.4164660 .246236-5.7526 .68 \mathrm{e}-05 * *$ xsq 0.004752
$0.0006047 .8682 .68 \mathrm{e}-06$ ***
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 ' $* *$ ' 0.01 ' $*$ ' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Residual standard error: 0.06951 on 13 degrees of freedom Multiple
R-Squared: 0.9996, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9995 F-statistic:
$1.485 \mathrm{e}+04$ on 2 and $13 \mathrm{DF}, \mathrm{p}$-value: < $2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$
> anova(model3.fit)
Analysis of Variance Table
Response: y2
Df Sum Sq Mean Sq $F$ value $\operatorname{Pr}(>F)$
x2 $1143.150143 .15029630 .638<2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$ *** xsq 1
$0.299 \quad 0.29961 .9032 .682 e-06$ *** Residuals 130.0630 .005
Signif. codes: 0 (***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
$>$ model3.hat<-lm.influence(model3.fit)\$hat
> model3.res<-model3.fit\$residuals
> SRES3<-model3.res/sqrt(deviance(model3.fit)*(1-model3.hat)/model3.fit\$df)
> FITS3<-model3.fit\$fitted
> plot(FITS3,SRES3)
> title("Model 3:Standardised residuls versus fitted values")
> qqnorm(SRES3)
> qqline(SRES3)
$>\operatorname{ly<-log}(\mathrm{y} 2)$
$>$ model4.fit<-lm(ly ${ }^{\sim}$ x)
$>$ summary(model4.fit)

```
Call: \(\operatorname{lm}(\) formula \(=1 y ~ \sim ~ x 2) ~\)
```

Residuals:

| Min | 1Q | Median | 3Q | Max |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| -0.0048082 | -0.0014595 | 0.0004546 | 0.0020358 | 0.0031219 |

Coefficients:
Estimate Std. Error t value $\operatorname{Pr}(>|t|)$
(Intercept) $-0.95176620 .0231021-41.25 .16 \mathrm{e}-16$ *** x2
$0.02051860 .0001138 \quad 180.2<2 \mathrm{e}-16$ ***
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Residual standard error: 0.002616 on 14 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.9996, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9995
F-statistic: 3.249e+04 on 1 and 14 DF, $p$-value: < $2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$
> anova(model4.fit)
Analysis of Variance Table
Response: ly
Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value $\operatorname{Pr}(>F)$
$x 2 \quad 10.2222520 .222252 \quad 32485<2.2 e-16$ *** Residuals 14
0.0000960 .000007
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
$>$ model4.hat<-lm.influence(model4.fit)\$hat
> model4.res<-model4.fit\$residuals
> SRES4<-model4.res/sqrt(deviance(model4.fit)*(1-model4.hat)/model4.fit\$df)
> FITS4<-model4.fit\$fitted
$>$ plot(FITS4,SRES4)
> title("Model 4:Standardised residuls versus fitted values")
> qqnorm(SRES4)
> qqline(SRES4)
>

