

Homework 4, MATH455: Due Monday, 03/05/2018

Your Name: (replace this)

March 6, 2018

Instructions: The homework assignment editing this \LaTeX document. Download the \LaTeX source from the class web page and study it to learn more about \LaTeX . Replace the text with appropriate information. Run “pdflatex” on this document.

You will submit this assignment in two parts:

1. Print out the PDF file and bring it to class, and
2. Send an e-mail to:

gang@math.binghamton.edu

before class on the due date with two attachments:

- The \LaTeX source file, and
- The generated PDF document.

Please complete the following:

1. Read chapter 3 and finish questions 3.2, 3.4 (on pages 49-50) in this chapter.

```
data(cheddar)
cheeseMod = lm(taste~Acetic+H2S+Lactic,cheddar)
summary(cheeseMod)
Call:
lm(formula = taste ~ Acetic + H2S + Lactic, data = cheddar)
```

```
Residuals:
Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-17.390  -6.612  -1.009   4.908  25.449
```

```
Coefficients:
Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -28.8768    19.7354  -1.463  0.15540
Acetic       0.3277     4.4598   0.073  0.94198
H2S          3.9118     1.2484   3.133  0.00425 **
Lactic       19.6705     8.6291   2.280  0.03108 *
---
Signif. codes:  0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
```

```
Residual standard error: 10.13 on 26 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.6518, Adjusted R-squared:  0.6116
F-statistic: 16.22 on 3 and 26 DF,  p-value: 3.81e-06
```

Accordingly, H2S and Lactic are the two parameters significant at the 5 percent level.
After applying the exponential function to both Acetic and H2S, we get the following results

```
> cheeseModP = lm(taste~exp(Acetic)+exp(H2S)+Lactic,cheddar)
> summary(cheeseModP)

Call:
lm(formula = taste ~ exp(Acetic) + exp(H2S) + Lactic, data = cheddar)

Residuals:
Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-16.209  -7.266  -1.651   7.385  26.335

Coefficients:
Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -1.897e+01  1.127e+01  -1.684  0.1042
exp(Acetic)  1.891e-02  1.562e-02   1.210  0.2371
exp(H2S)      7.668e-04  4.188e-04   1.831  0.0786 .
```

```
Lactic          2.501e+01  9.062e+00  2.760  0.0105 *
---
```

```
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

```
Residual standard error: 11.19 on 26 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.5754, Adjusted R-squared:  0.5264
F-statistic: 11.75 on 3 and 26 DF,  p-value: 4.746e-05
```

Thus, only Lactic remains statistically significant.

We can not operate the f-test on these data sets

```
anova(cheeseMod,cheeseModP)Analysis of Variance Table
```

```
Model 1: taste ~ Acetic + H2S + Lactic
```

```
Model 2: taste ~ exp(Acetic) + exp(H2S) + Lactic
```

```
Res.Df    RSS Df Sum of Sq F Pr(>F)
```

```
1      26 2668.4
```

```
2      26 3253.6  0      -585.2
```

This is because our degrees of freedom are the same, and thus we are dividing by zero and will be unable to compute anything.

According to our summary, H2S=3.9118, thus for every increase of .01, we increase taste by .039 approximately.

```
> log(10)
```

```
[1] 2.302585
```

```
> log(10.01)
```

```
[1] 2.303585
```

```
> log(10.01)/log(10)
```

```
[1] 1.000434
```

So about a .04 percent increase given an additive of .01 on the log scale.

```
> scores = lm(total~expend+ratio+salary,sat)
```

```
> scoresSZ = lm(total~expend+ratio,sat)
```

```
> scoresNull=lm(total~1,sat)
```

```
> anova(scores,scoresSZ)
```

```
Analysis of Variance Table
```

```
Model 1: total ~ expend + ratio + salary
```

```
Model 2: total ~ expend + ratio
```

```
Res.Df    RSS Df Sum of Sq      F Pr(>F)
```

```
1      46 216812
```

```
2      47 233443 -1      -16631 3.5285 0.06667 .
```

```
---
```

```
Signif. codes:  0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
> anova(scores,scoresNull)
Analysis of Variance Table
```

```
Model 1: total ~ expend + ratio + salary
```

```
Model 2: total ~ 1
```

```
Res.Df    RSS Df Sum of Sq      F   Pr(>F)
1       46 216812
2       49 274308 -3      -57496 4.0662 0.01209 *
```

```
---
```

```
Signif. codes:  0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
```

Accordingly, it appears that with $H_0 : \beta_{salary} = 0$, we can not reject that null hypothesis and salary may not be indicative. Meanwhile, all three parameters do seem to have some indication on total score.

```
> anova(tscores,scores)
Analysis of Variance Table
```

```
Model 1: total ~ expend + ratio + salary + takers
```

```
Model 2: total ~ expend + ratio + salary
```

```
Res.Df    RSS Df Sum of Sq      F   Pr(>F)
1       45  48124
2       46 216812 -1    -168688 157.74 2.607e-16 ***
```

```
---
```

```
Signif. codes:  0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
```

```
> summary(tscores)
```

```
Call:
```

```
lm(formula = total ~ expend + ratio + salary + takers, data = sat)
```

```
Residuals:
```

```
Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-90.531 -20.855  -1.746   15.979   66.571
```

```
Coefficients:
```

```
Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) 1045.9715     52.8698   19.784 < 2e-16 ***
expend         4.4626     10.5465    0.423  0.674
ratio        -3.6242      3.2154   -1.127  0.266
salary         1.6379      2.3872    0.686  0.496
takers        -2.9045      0.2313  -12.559 2.61e-16 ***
```

```
---
```

```
Signif. codes:  0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
```

Residual standard error: 32.7 on 45 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared: 0.8246, Adjusted R-squared: 0.809
F-statistic: 52.88 on 4 and 45 DF, p-value: $< 2.2e-16$

as we can see, the t-value demonstrated in summary is the same as the F value provided by anova, which demonstrates their equivalence

2. Read chapter 4 and finish questions 4.1, 4.5 (on pages 56-58) in this chapter.
3. Read chapter 7.3 and finish question 7.8 (on page 111) in this chapter.