

9/15/25

Agenda:

- Global F-test (ANOVA)
 - Partial F-test
 - t-test for individual slopes
 - coding labs
-

Global F-test:

Idea: check if any of our predictors X_1, \dots, X_{p-1} are significant predictors of Y

$$H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_{p-1} = 0$$

vs.

$$H_1: \text{at least one } \beta_j \neq 0$$



$$H_0: Y_i = \underline{\beta_0} + \varepsilon_i$$

"null model"
"reduced model"
(intercept only)

$$\rightarrow H_1: Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \dots + \beta_{p-1} X_{i,p-1} + \varepsilon_i$$

"full model"

Before:

SLR:

$$F = \frac{SSR/1}{SSE/n-2} = \frac{(SST - SSE)/1}{SSE/n-2}$$

SSE_r points to SSR
 SSE_{full} points to SSE

MLR: "Global F-test"

$p = \#$ of betas in the model

↓

$$F = \frac{(SSE_r - SSE_F)/(p-1)}{SSE_F/(n-p)} \quad H_0 \sim F_{p-1, n-p}$$

Decision:

If $F > F_{p-1, n-p}^*(\alpha)$ then reject H_0 & conclude
at least one of X_1, \dots, X_{p-1} is a significant pred. of y .

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & X_{11} & \dots & X_{(p-1)1} \\ 1 & X_{12} & & X_{(p-1)2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & X_{1n} & & X_{(p-1)n} \end{bmatrix}$$

$n \times p$

$$F = \frac{\chi^2_{df1}/df_1}{\chi^2_{df2}/df_2}$$

And a general F-test for any reduced vs full model
looks like:

$$F = \frac{(SSE_r - SSE_F)/(df_{SSE_r} - df_{SSE_F})}{SSE_F/df_{SSE_F}}$$

ANOVA Table

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Regression	$(SSE_D - SSE_F)$	$df_{SSE_D} - df_{SSE_F}$	$\frac{SSE_D - SSE_F}{df_{SSE_D} - df_{SSE_F}}$	
Error	SSE_F	df_{SSE_F}	$\frac{SSE_F}{df_{SSE_F}}$	

Partial F-test

Idea: test only a subset of predictors, say
 X_r, \dots, X_{p-1}

$$H_0: \beta_r = \beta_{r+1} = \dots = \beta_{p-1} = 0$$

vs.

H_1 : at least one of $\{\beta_j\}_{j=r}^{p-1}$ is not zero.



"reduced model"

r parameters

$$H_0: Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \dots + \beta_{r-1} X_{r-1,i} + \varepsilon_i$$

vs.

$$H_1: Y_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \beta_j X_{ji} + \varepsilon_i$$

"full model"

p params

$$\Downarrow \quad H_0: Y = X\beta^* + \varepsilon \quad \text{where } \beta^* = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{r-1} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

vs.

$$H_1: Y = X\beta + \varepsilon \quad \text{where } \beta = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{r-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$F = \frac{(SSE_R - SSE_F) / (p - r)}{(SSE_F) / (n - p)} \stackrel{H_0}{\sim} F_{p-r, n-p}$$

Decision:

If $F > F_{p-r, n-p}^{*}(1-\alpha)$ then reject H_0 & say we have evidence that one of $\{X_r, \dots, X_{p-1}\}$ is a sig. pred of Y conditional on X_1, \dots, X_{r-1} being in the model

EX:

Y_i = shoe size

X_{1i} = height

X_{2i} = weight

$$H_0: Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{height}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

$$\Downarrow$$

$$H_1: Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{height}_i + \beta_2 \text{weight}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}) = \begin{bmatrix} \# & \# & \# \\ \# & \# & \# \\ \# & \# & \# \end{bmatrix}$$

Specific Prediction F-test

$$H_0: \beta_{p-1} = 0$$

exact same F-stat, except

$$H_1: \beta_{p-1} \neq 0$$

$$p-r=1$$

$$F = \frac{(SSE_R - SSE_F)/1}{SSE_F/(n-p)} \stackrel{H_0}{\sim} F_{1, n-p}$$

\updownarrow relates to a t-stat on β_{p-1} :

$$t = \frac{\hat{\beta}_{p-1} - 0}{\widehat{SE}(\hat{\beta}_{p-1})}$$

$$\text{where } \widehat{SE}(\hat{\beta}_{p-1}) = \sqrt{\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\beta}_{p-1})}$$

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\beta}_{p-1}) = \hat{\sigma}^2 [(X^T X)^{-1}]_{p,p}$$

$$\hat{\beta} \sim N(\beta, \sigma^2 (X^T X)^{-1})$$

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}) = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_0) & & & \\ & \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1) & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{p-1}) \end{bmatrix} = \sigma^2 (X^T X)^{-1}$$

Decision for t-test:

If $|t| > t_{n-p}^*(1-\alpha/2)$ then reject H_0 & claim that

X_{p-1} is a sig. predictor of Y conditional on
 X_1, \dots, X_{p-2} already being in the model.

Adjusted R^2

Recall that R^2 comes from the ANOVA breakdown,

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{SSE}{SST}$$

(fact)

m1 $Y \sim X_1$

m2 $Y \sim X_1 + X_2$

m3 $Y \sim X_1 + X_2 + X_3$



R^2 is always
non-decreasing.

R^2 will always pick the biggest model (pay attn
to nesting) so it's not useful to judge / do model
selection.

It doesn't take into account the "cost" of losing

degrees of freedom that happens when we estimate unnecessary coefficients.

So we can adjust the R^2 def to try to penalize extra unnecessary coefficients;

$$R_a^2 = 1 - \frac{SSE / (n-p)}{SST / (n-1)} = 1 - \frac{MSE}{MST}$$

Advantage R_a^2 doesn't always increase as predictors are added \Leftrightarrow can be for model selection
 \Leftrightarrow higher R_a^2 is better.