Series 2

1. The following R-code generates an artificial dataset with predictors x1, x2 and response y.

```
> set.seed(0)
> n<-100
> z1<-rnorm(n)
> z2<-rnorm(n)
> M=matrix(c(1,1,0.2,-0.2),2,2)
> X=t(M%*%rbind(z1,z2))
> beta<-c(0.1,-0.2)
> x1=X[,1]
> x2=X[,2]
> y=5+beta[1]*x1+beta[2]*x2 +rnorm(n)
```

- a) Create a plot of the observations of the two predictor variables x1 and x2.
- b) Fit a linear model fit1<-lm(y~x1+x2) and print the summary using summary(fit1).
- c) Recompute the t-value corresponding to $\hat{\beta}_1$ by hand using the estimate $\hat{\beta}_1$ and its estimated standard error $\operatorname{se}(\hat{\beta}_1)$.
- d) Give the definition of a p-value. Then compute the p-value corresponding to $\hat{\beta}_1$ using the t-value from part c) and the quantile function of the t-distribution pt().

 Note: You need to provide the correct number of degrees of freedom.
- e) Report the p-value of the overall F-test and reproduce it using anova().
- f) The overall F-test is significant. However, the p-values for x1 and x2 are not significant. Explain how this can be true.
- g) Report the residual standard error, interpret it, and recompute it based on residuals(fit1).
- h) Report the R^2 value, interpret it, and recompute it using residuals(fit1).
- i) Assume now that we only observed the values for x1 and y whereas x2 is a hidden predictor that we do not observe. Fit the model fit3<-lm(y~x1) and print the summary summary(fit3). Compare the estimated coefficient corresponding to x1 to the one in part b). Interpret the coefficient of x1 in both models.
- 2. In this exercise, we will code a categorical variable by hand. The dataset Carseats contains the number of child car seat sales and several predictors in 400 locations. We will only use the quantitative predictor advertising (local advertising budget for company at each location in thousands of dollars) and the qualitative predictor shelveloc (a factor with levels 'Bad', 'Good' and 'Medium' indicating the quality of the shelving location for the car seats at each site). Consider the following R code:

```
> # prepare data
> library(ISLR)
> data(Carseats) #use ?Carseats for an explaination of the dataset
> shelveloc=Carseats$ShelveLoc
> sales=Carseats$Sales
> advertising=Carseats$Advertising
> # fit using automatic coding
> fit<-lm(sales~shelveloc+advertising)
> summary(fit)
```

a) Encode the factor variable shelveloc in the same way as done automatically by R by constructing appropriate predictors a1 and a2. a1 shall be 1 when the level of shelveloc is medium and a2 shall be 1 if its level is good. The so-called contrast coding in this case can be seen in Table 1. Fit the model fit_a<-lm(sales~a1+a2+advertising). Verify that fit and fit_a are indeed equal and give an interpretation of the coefficients corresponding to a1 and a2.

R-hint:

- > # boolean vectors for easy construction of a1, a2, b1,...
- > bad<- levels(shelveloc)[1]==shelveloc
- > medium<- levels(shelveloc)[2]==shelveloc</pre>
- > good<- levels(shelveloc)[3]==shelveloc
- > a1<-medium*1

Table 1: Contrast codings in a), b), c)

shelveloc	a1	a2	shelveloc	b1	b2	shelveloc	c1	c2	сЗ
bad	0	0	bad	1	0	bad	1	0	0
medium	1	0	medium	0	0	medium	0	1	0
good	0	1	good	0	1	good	0	0	1

- b) Construct predictor variables b1 and b2 according to the contrast coding in Table 1 and fit the model fit_b<-lm(sales~b1+b2+advertising). Give an interpretation of the coefficients of b1 and b2.
- c) Construct predictor variables c1, c2 and c3 according to Table 1.

 Then fit the model fit_c<-lm(sales~c1+c2+c3+advertising). This causes a problem. Why?
- d) Remove the intercept by using fit_c<-lm(-1+...). Interpret the coefficients corresponding to c1, c2 and c3.</p>
- e) Show that the fitted values are the same for fit_a, fit_b and fit_c.

Note: Due to rounding errors the values are not *exactly* the same. Show that they are very close. R-hint: max(abs(fitted(fit_a)-fitted(fit_b)))

- f) We now want to know if distinguishing between all three categories is significantly better than distinguishing only between "bad" (level bad) and "not bad" (level medium or good) each time also accounting for advertising. In which of the summaries of the fits fit_a, fit_b, fit_c can we see this directly? Explain.
- g) Suppose we used the coding from fit_a. Conduct a partial F-test to check if we need to distinguish between medium and good by fitting a model fit_d with a new dummy variable.
- 3. The dataset airline contains the monthly number of flight passengers in the USA in the years 1949-1960 ranging from January 1949 to December 1960. Read the data with the command:

airline <- scan("http://stat.ethz.ch/Teaching/Datasets/airline.dat")

- a) Plot the data against time and describe what you observe.
- b) Compute the logarithm of the data and plot against time. Comment on the difference.
- c) Define a linear model of the form

$$\log(y_t) = \beta t + \sum_{j=1}^{12} \gamma_j x_{tj} + \epsilon_t$$

where the month is coded in the predictors $x_{.,1}, \ldots x_{.,12}$, i.e. for $j \in \{1, \cdots, 12\}$

$$x_{tj} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \text{ corresponds to the } j\text{-th month in a year} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and $t \in \{1, \dots, 144\}$ is the month index starting with 1 for January 1949. Construct appropriate predictors $t, x1, \dots, x12$ and fit this model in R.

R-hint: You should not use an intercept parameter (see 2 c)). Use -1 in the model formula of lm() to exclude the intercept.

R-hint: x1 < -rep(c(1, rep(0, 11)), 12) and t < -1:144.

- d) Plot the fitted values and residuals against time. Do you think that the model assumptions hold?
- e) Give an interpretation of the parameter β in the above model if we consider the original scale. **Hint:** How does a model prediction $\widehat{y}_t := \exp(\widehat{\log(y_t)})$ change if we increase t by 12?
- f) Conduct a partial F-test to check whether we can use four predictors indicating the seasons s_1, \dots, s_4 (s_1 for spring (month 3,4,5),..., s_4 for winter (month 12,1,2)) instead of twelve indicators x_1, \dots, x_{12} encoding the month.

R-hint: Construct appropriate predictors $s1, \dots, s4$ for the seasons.

Preliminary discussion: Friday, March 9.

Deadline: Friday, March 16.