## Stat 151 Fall 2015

## Homework 4 Solutions

November 9, 2015

1. (a) We have iid observations  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  from a distribution with unknown variance  $\sigma^2$ . We shall use bootstrap to calculate a confidence interval for  $\sigma$ 

```
Algorithm 1 1 – \alpha bootstrap confidence interval of \sigma
```

```
Input X = (X_1, ..., X_n), B (number of bootstraps), \alpha

for k \in 1 : B do

Construct X^* = SRSWOR(X, n)

Calculate \sigma^{(i)} = SD(X^*)

end for

Output confidence interval of \sigma - \{\alpha/2 \text{ quantile } of\sigma^{()}, (1 - \alpha/2) \text{ quantile } of\sigma^{()}\}
```

(b) A 95% bootstrap confidence interval of  $\sigma$  should cover the true value of  $\sigma$  95% of the time. We shall now validate this by repeating this entire experiment M=1000 on datasets of size n=100. We shall further set B=1000 meaning that from each dataset we draw B bootstraps to compute confidence intervals for  $\sigma$ . After M replications we count the number of confidence intervals that covered the true value  $\sigma$ . For the sake of experimentation we set  $X_i \sim N(5,1)$ .

```
n = 100
M = 1000
B = 1000
count = 0
#pb = txtProgressBar(min =
for (i in 1:M){
 x = rnorm(n, 5, 1)
  sigvec = array(0,dim = B)
  for (j in 1:B){
    xstar = sample(x,replace
                                TRUE)
    sigvec[j] = sd(xstar)
  ci = quantile(sigvec, c(0.025, 0.975))
  if ((ci[1]<=1)&&(ci[2]>=1))
    count = count + 1
  #setTxtProgressBar(pb
print(count)
## [1] 932
```

We see that 932 out of 1000 replications contain the true  $\sigma$  which is fairly close to the expected coverage of 950 out of 1000.

2. Let us begin with creating a new dataframe with only the relevant variables

```
load('twoyear.RData')
tyd = data[,c('lwage','jc','univ','exper')]
```

(a) To perform t-test to check whether  $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ , we notice that the model

$$lwage = \beta_0 + \beta_1 jc + \beta_2 univ + \beta_3 exper$$

can be rewritten as

$$lwage = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)jc + \beta_2(jc + univ) + \beta_3 exper$$

in which we need to perform a t-test to check whether the coefficient of jc is 0, this test can be read off from the output of lm

```
lm1 = lm(lwage ~ jc + I(jc + univ) + exper, data = tyd)
summary(lm1)$coefficients[2,4]
## [1] 0.142244
```

which shows a p-value of 14.2% which fails to reject the test at 95% level.

(b) The null model is

$$lwage = \beta_0 + \beta_1(jc + univ) + \beta_3 exper$$

comparing the null model with the full model using anova gives us the desired F-test, alternatively we also know that this F-statistic can be obtained simply by squaring the relevant t-statistic from previous subquestion and the corresponding p-value will be exactly the same

```
M = lm(lwage ~ jc + univ + exper, data = tyd)
m = lm(lwage \sim I(jc + univ) + exper, data = tyd)
anova_result = anova(m, M)
print(anova_result)
## Analysis of Variance Table
##
## Model 1: lwage ~ I(jc + univ) + exper
## Model 2: lwage ~ jc + univ + exper
    Res.Df
               RSS Df Sum of Sq
##
## 1
       6760 1250.9
                         0.39853 2.154 0.1422
## 2
       6759 1250.5 1
anova_result$F[2]
## [1] 2.154016
```

giving a F-statistic of 2.154 with the same p-value of 14.2% which fails to reject at 95%

(c) Going back to modified model in part (a)

$$lwage = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)jc + \beta_2(jc + univ) + \beta_3 exper$$

we know that we need to test if the coefficient of jc is 0 or not, which we can do using permutation test as discussed in lecture/section

```
N = 1000 #number of permutations
null.stats = array(0,dim = N)
#pb = txtProgressBar(min = 0, max = N, style = 3)
for(i in 1:N){
   null.stats[i] = summary(lm(lwage ~ sample(jc) + I(jc + univ) + exper, data = tyd))$coefficients[2,3]
   #setTxtProgressBar(pb, i)
}
true.tstat = summary(lm(lwage ~ jc + I(jc + univ) + exper, data = tyd))$coefficients[2,3]
pval = mean(abs(true.tstat) <= abs(null.stats))
cat('p-value based on permutation test is ',pval)
## p-value based on permutation test is 0.131</pre>
```

giving a p-value of 13.1%

## (d) Using the modified model

```
lwage = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)jc + \beta_2(jc + univ) + \beta_3 exper
```

and denoting by  $\gamma = \beta_1 - \beta_2$  we wish to construct a confidence interval of  $\gamma$ . In the algorithm, y denotes a column populated by lwage, X denotes a matrix with 3 columns, respectively populated by jc, jc+univ, exper. We shall use residual bootstrap

## Algorithm 2 $1 - \alpha$ residual bootstrap confidence interval of $\gamma$

```
Input y, X, B (number of bootstraps), \alpha

Construct \hat{y} and \hat{e}, the vectors of fitted values and residuals upon regressing y on X

for k \in 1 : B do

Construct y^* = \hat{y} + SRSWOR(\hat{e}, n)

Calculate \gamma^{(i)} the estimated coefficient of jc upon regressing y^* on X

end for

Output confidence interval of \gamma - \{\alpha/2 \text{ quantile } of \gamma^{()}, (1 - \alpha/2) \text{ quantile } of \gamma^{()}\}
```

```
B = 2000
boot.gamma = array(0,dim = B)
#pb = txtProgressBar(min = 0, max = B, style = 3)
lm1 = lm(lwage ~ jc + univ + exper,data = tyd)
yhat = lm1$fitted.values
ehat = lm1$residuals
for(i in 1:B){
    lwage.star = yhat + sample(ehat)
    boot.gamma[i] = summary(lm(lwage.star ~ tyd$jc + I(tyd$jc + tyd$univ) + tyd$exper))$coefficients[2,1]
    #setTxtProgressBar(pb, i)
}
ci = quantile(boot.gamma,c(0.025,0.975))
cat('The bootstrap confidence interval is ',ci)
## The bootstrap confidence interval is -0.02331413 0.003787554
```

As we see above the bootstrap confidence interval contains 0.

```
(b) B = 2000
boot.betas = matrix(0,B,4)
#pb = txtProgressBar(min = 0, max = B, style = 3)
lm3 = lm(sr ~ pop15 + pop75 + dpi + ddpi, data = savings)
yhat = lm3$fitted.values
ehat = lm3$residuals
for(i in 1:B){
    sr.star = yhat + sample(ehat)
    boot.betas[i,] = summary(lm(sr.star ~ savings$pop15 + savings$pop75 + savings$dpi + savings$ddpi))$coe
    #setTxtProgressBar(pb, i)
}
cis = matrix(0,4,2)
```

The bootstrap and theoretical confidence intervals approximately match in this instance, with the possible exception of  $\beta_2$  corresponding to pop75 which seems to have shrinked a little.