HW#9 Solution (week11 HW)

Due 11/14/2019

HW 23.6 cash offers - CH19PR10.txt

```
HW6 = read.table(url(
   "https://raw.githubusercontent.com/npmldabook/Stat3119/master/Week-11/CH19PR10.txt"))
names(HW6) = c("response", "age", "gender", "units")
# to make six treatments
HW6$Treatment = HW6$gender*(HW6$age+2)
HW6$age = as.factor(HW6$age); HW6$gender = as.factor(HW6$gender)
HW6$Treatment = as.factor( HW6$Treatment)
HW6B = HW6[-c(16, 33),] #dim(HW6B) #34,5
```

a.
$$Y_{ijk} = \mu_{..} + \alpha_i + \beta_j + (\alpha\beta)_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijk}$$

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu_{..} + \alpha_1 X_{ijk1} + \alpha_2 X_{ijk2} + \beta_1 X_{ijk3} + (\alpha\beta)_{11} X_{ijk1} X_{ijk3}$$

$$+ (\alpha\beta)_{21} X_{ijk2} X_{ijk3} + \epsilon_{ijk}$$

$$1 \text{ if case from level 1 for factor } A$$

$$X_{ijk1} = -1 \text{ if case from level 3 for factor } A$$

$$0 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$1 \text{ if case from level 2 for factor } A$$

$$X_{ijk2} = -1 \text{ if case from level 3 for factor } A$$

$$0 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$X_{ijk3} = 1 \text{ if case from level 1 for factor } B$$

$$-1 \text{ if case from level 2 for factor } B$$

b. β entries: μ_{..}, α₁, α₂, β₁, (αβ)₁₁, (αβ)₂₁

X entries:

A	B	Freq.		X_1	X_2	X_3	X_1X_3	X_2X_3
1	1	6	1	1	0	1	1	0
1	2	6	1	1	0	-1	-1	0
2	1	5	1	0	1	1	0	1
2	2	6	1		1	-1	0	-1
3	1	6	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1
3	2	5	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1

c. Xβ entries:

d. $Y_{ijk} = \mu_{..} + \alpha_1 X_{ijk1} + \alpha_2 X_{ijk2} + \beta_1 X_{ijk3} + \epsilon_{ijk}$

e. Full model:

$$\begin{split} \hat{Y} &= 23.56667 - 2.06667X_1 + 4.16667X_2 + .36667X_3 - .20000X_1X_3 - .30000X_2X_3,\\ SSE(F) &= 71.3333 \\ &\frac{\text{Reduced model:}}{\hat{Y}} = 23.59091 - 2.09091X_1 + 4.16911X_2 + .36022X_3,\\ SSE(R) &= 75.5210 \\ &H_0\colon (\alpha\beta)_{11} = (\alpha\beta)_{21} = 0,\ H_a\colon \text{not both } (\alpha\beta)_{11}\ \text{and } (\alpha\beta)_{21}\ \text{equal zero.}\\ &F^* = (4.1877/2) \div (71.3333/28) = .82,\ F(.95;2,28) = 3.34.\\ &\text{If } F^* \leq 3.34\ \text{conclude } H_0,\ \text{otherwise } H_a.\ \text{Conclude } H_0.\ P\text{-value} = .45 \end{split}$$
 f.
$$&\frac{A\ \text{effects:}}{\hat{Y}} = 23.50000 + .17677X_3 - .01010X_1X_3 - .49495X_2X_3,\\ &SSE(R) = 359.9394 \\ &H_0\colon \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0,\ H_a\colon \text{not both } \alpha_1\ \text{and } \alpha_2\ \text{equal zero.}\\ &F^* = (288.6061/2) \div (71.3333/28) = 56.64,\ F(.95;2,28) = 3.34.\\ &\text{If } F^* \leq 3.34\ \text{conclude } H_0,\ \text{otherwise } H_a.\ \text{Conclude } H_a.\ P\text{-value} = 0 + \\ &B\ \text{effects:}\\ &\hat{Y} = 23.56667 - 2.06667X_1 + 4.13229X_2 - .17708X_1X_3 - .31146X_2X_3,\\ &SSE(R) = 75.8708 \\ &H_0\colon \beta_1 = 0,\ H_a\colon \beta_1 \neq 0.\\ &F^* = (4.5375/1) \div (71.3333/28) = 1.78,\ F(.95;1,28) = 4.20.\\ &\text{If } F^* \leq 4.20\ \text{conclude } H_0,\ \text{otherwise } H_a.\ \text{Conclude } H_0.\ P\text{-value} = .19 \end{aligned}$$

e) Full model

Testing interaction effects

```
Reduced.NoAB = lm(response \sim IndicatorA1 + IndicatorA2 + IndicatorB1 , data=HW6B)
coef(Reduced.NoAB)
## (Intercept) IndicatorA1 IndicatorA2 IndicatorB1
## 23.5909091 -2.0909091 4.1691105
# anova to compare the two models
anova(Reduced.NoAB, LM.full)
## Analysis of Variance Table
## Model 1: response ~ IndicatorA1 + IndicatorA2 + IndicatorB1
## Model 2: response ~ IndicatorA1 + IndicatorA2 + IndicatorB1 + IndicatorA1:IndicatorB1 +
      IndicatorA2:IndicatorB1
   Res.Df
              RSS Df Sum of Sq
                                    F Pr(>F)
## 1
        30 75.521
## 2
        28 71.333 2 4.1877 0.8219 0.4499
f) Testing effect A and B
Reduced.NoA = lm( response~ IndicatorB1 +
                   IndicatorA1:IndicatorB1 + IndicatorA2:IndicatorB1, data=HW6B )
coef (Reduced.NoA)
                                      IndicatorB1 IndicatorB1:IndicatorA1
##
               (Intercept)
              23.50000000
##
                                       0.17676768
                                                              -0.01010101
## IndicatorB1:IndicatorA2
              -0.49494949
# anova to compare the two models
anova(Reduced.NoA, LM.full)
## Analysis of Variance Table
##
## Model 1: response ~ IndicatorB1 + IndicatorA1:IndicatorB1 + IndicatorA2:IndicatorB1
## Model 2: response ~ IndicatorA1 + IndicatorA2 + IndicatorB1 + IndicatorA1:IndicatorB1 +
##
      IndicatorA2:IndicatorB1
    Res.Df
              RSS Df Sum of Sq
## 1
        30 359.94
## 2
        28 71.33 2
                      288.61 56.642 1.442e-10 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Reduced.NoB = lm( response~ IndicatorA1 + IndicatorA2
                   IndicatorA1:IndicatorB1 + IndicatorA2:IndicatorB1, data=HW6B )
coef(Reduced.NoB)
```

```
IndicatorA2
##
                 (Intercept)
                                             IndicatorA1
                  23.5666667
                                                                            4.1322917
##
                                              -2.0666667
## IndicatorA1:IndicatorB1 IndicatorA2:IndicatorB1
                  -0.1770833
                                              -0.3114583
##
# anova to compare the two models
anova(Reduced.NoB, LM.full)
## Analysis of Variance Table
## Model 1: response ~ IndicatorA1 + IndicatorA2 + IndicatorA1:IndicatorB1 +
        IndicatorA2:IndicatorB1
## Model 2: response ~ IndicatorA1 + IndicatorA2 + IndicatorB1 + IndicatorA1:IndicatorB1 +
        IndicatorA2:IndicatorB1
     Res.Df
                 RSS Df Sum of Sq
                                           F Pr(>F)
##
## 1
          29 75.871
## 2
          28 71.333 1
                            4.5375 1.7811 0.1928
   g. \hat{D}_1 = \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2 = -6.23334, \hat{D}_2 = \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_3 = 2\hat{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_2 = .03333, \hat{D}_3 = \hat{\alpha}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_3 = .03333
        2\hat{\alpha}_2 + \hat{\alpha}_1 = 6.26667, \ s^2\{\hat{\alpha}_1\} = .14625, \ s^2\{\hat{\alpha}_2\} = .15333, \ s\{\hat{\alpha}_1, \hat{\alpha}_2\} = -.07313,
        s\{\hat{D}_1\} = .6677, \ s\{\hat{D}_2\} = .6677, \ s\{\hat{D}_3\} = .6834, \ q(.90; 3, 28) = 3.026, \ T = 2.140
              -6.23334 \pm 2.140(.6677) -7.662 \le D_1 \le -4.804
                  .03333 \pm 2.140(.6677) -1.396 \le D_2 \le 1.462
                6.26667 \pm 2.140(.6834) 4.804 \le D_3 \le 7.729
  h. \hat{L} = .3\bar{Y}_{12} + .6\bar{Y}_{22} + .1\bar{Y}_{32} = .3(21.33333) + .6(27.66667) + .1(20.60000) = 25.06000,
        s\{L\} = .4429, t(.975; 28) = 2.048, 25.06000 \pm 2.048(.4429), 24.153 \le L \le 25.967
R analysis (g)
library(emmeans)
LM.full2 = lm( response~ gender*age, data=HW6B )
fit.emm <- emmeans( LM.full2, ~ age)</pre>
## NOTE: Results may be misleading due to involvement in interactions
# CI with adjustment for MCP
confint(pairs(fit.emm), adjust = "tukey", level=0.9)
## contrast estimate
                             SE df lower.CL upper.CL
## 1 - 2
            -6.2333 0.668 28
                                     -7.66
                                                  -4.80
## 1 - 3
              0.0333 0.668 28
                                       -1.40
                                                   1.46
## 2 - 3
               6.2667 0.683 28
                                       4.80
                                                   7.73
## Results are averaged over the levels of: gender
## Confidence level used: 0.9
## Conf-level adjustment: tukey method for comparing a family of 3 estimates
```

R analysis (f)

```
HW18 = read.table(
   url("https://raw.githubusercontent.com/npmldabook/Stat3119/master/Week-11/CH21PR05.txt"))
HW18 = HW18[-6,]
names(HW18) = c("Response", "block", "Training")
dim(HW18)

## [1] 29 3
table(HW18$block,HW18$Training)
```

```
##
##
       1 2 3
##
    1 1 1 1
    2 1 1 0
##
    3 1 1 1
##
##
    4 1 1 1
##
    5 1 1 1
##
    6 1 1 1
    7 1 1 1
##
##
    8 1 1 1
   9 1 1 1
##
   10 1 1 1
```

a.
$$Y_{ij} = \mu_{..} + \rho_i + \tau_j + \epsilon_{ij}$$

$$Y_{ij} = \mu_{..} + \rho_1 X_{ij1} + \rho_2 X_{ij2} + \rho_3 X_{ij3} + \rho_4 X_{ij4} + \rho_5 X_{ij5} + \rho_6 X_{ij6}$$

$$+ \rho_7 X_{ij7} + \rho_8 X_{ij8} + \rho_9 X_{ij9} + \tau_1 X_{ij10} + \tau_2 X_{ij11} + \epsilon_{ij}$$

$$1 \text{ if experimental unit from block 1}$$

$$X_{ij1} = -1 \text{ if experimental unit from block 10}$$

$$0 \text{ otherwise}$$

 X_{ij2}, \dots, X_{ij9} are defined similarly

 $X_{ij10} = 1$ if experimental unit received treatment 1 0 otherwise

 $X_{ij11} = -1$ if experimental unit received treatment 2 0 otherwise

b.
$$Y_{ij} = \mu_{..} + \rho_1 X_{ij1} + \rho_2 X_{ij2} + \rho_3 X_{ij3} + \rho_4 X_{ij4} + \rho_5 X_{ij5} + \rho_6 X_{ij6} + \rho_7 X_{ij7} + \rho_8 X_{ij8} + \rho_9 X_{ij9} + \epsilon_{ij}$$

c. Full model:
$$\hat{Y} = 77.15556 + 4.84444X_1 + 4.40000X_2 + 2.17778X_3 + 3.17778X_4 + 1.17778X_5 + .84444X_6 - 1.15556X_7 - 3.82222X_8 - 4.15556X_9 - 6.55556X_{10} - 2.55556X_{11}$$

SSE(F) = 110.6667

Reduced model:
$$\hat{Y} = 76.70000 + 5.30000X_1 + .30000X_2 + 2.63333X_3 + 3.63333X_4 + 1.63333X_5 + 1.30000X_6 - .70000X_7 - 3.36667X_8 - 3.70000X_9$$

SSE(R) = 1,311.3333

 H_0 : $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0$, H_a : not both τ_1 and τ_2 equal zero.

$$F^* = (1, 200.6666/2) \div (110.6667/17) = 92.22, F(.95; 2, 17) = 3.59.$$

If $F^* \leq 3.59$ conclude H_0 , otherwise H_a . Conclude H_a .

d.
$$\hat{L} = \hat{\tau}_2 - \hat{\tau}_3 = 2\hat{\tau}_2 + \hat{\tau}_1 = -11.66667$$
, $s^2\{\hat{\tau}_i\} = .44604$ $(i = 1, 2)$, $s\{\hat{\tau}_1, \hat{\tau}_2\} = -.20494$, $s\{\hat{L}\} = 1.1876$, $t(.975; 17) = 2.11$, $-11.66667 \pm 2.11(1.1876)$, $-14.17 \le L \le -9.16$

(a)

```
attach(HW18)
I.B1= (block=='1')*1+ (block=='10')*(-1)
I.B2= (block=='2')*1+ (block=='10')*(-1)
I.B3= (block=='3')*1+ (block=='10')*(-1)
I.B4= (block=='4')*1+ (block=='10')*(-1)
I.B5= (block=='5')*1+ (block=='10')*(-1)
I.B6= (block=='6')*1+ (block=='10')*(-1)
I.B7= (block=='7')*1+ (block=='10')*(-1)
I.B8= (block=='8')*1+ (block=='10')*(-1)
I.B9= (block=='9')*1+ (block=='10')*(-1)
I.T1= (Training=='1')*1+ (Training=='3')*(-1)
I.T2= (Training=='2')*1+ (Training=='3')*(-1)
LM2.full <- lm(Response~ I.B1+I.B2+I.B3+I.B4+I.B5+I.B6+I.B7+I.B8+I.B9+
              I.T1+I.T2
coef(LM2.full)
## (Intercept)
                     I.B1
                                 I.B2
                                             I.B3
                                                         I.B4
                                                                     I.B5
## 77.155556
               4.844444
                            4.4000000
                                        2.1777778
                                                    3.1777778
                                                                1.1777778
##
          I.B6
                     I.B7
                                  I.B8
                                             I.B9
                                                         I.T1
                                                                     I.T2
   0.8444444 -1.1555556 -3.8222222 -4.1555556 -6.5555556 -2.5555556
(b-c)
LM2.reduced <- lm(Response~ I.B1+I.B2+I.B3+I.B4+I.B5+I.B6+I.B7+I.B8+I.B9 )
anova(LM2.full,LM2.reduced )
## Analysis of Variance Table
## Model 1: Response ~ I.B1 + I.B2 + I.B3 + I.B4 + I.B5 + I.B6 + I.B7 + I.B8 +
       I.B9 + I.T1 + I.T2
## Model 2: Response ~ I.B1 + I.B2 + I.B3 + I.B4 + I.B5 + I.B6 + I.B7 + I.B8 +
##
       I.B9
    Res.Df
##
                RSS Df Sum of Sq
                                    F
                                         Pr(>F)
        17 110.67
## 2
         19 1311.33 -2 -1200.7 92.22 7.474e-10 ***
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
(d) get the variance=0.446 and covariance =-0.205 from variance and covariance matrix.
round(vcov(LM2.full)[11:12, 11:12],3)
         I.T1
                I.T2
## I.T1 0.446 -0.205
## I.T2 -0.205 0.446
```

HW 23.20: cash offer, same data as problem 23.6

25.050 0.428 30 58.534 <.0001

0.383 0.605 30 0.633 0.5313

L1

L

```
23.20. See Problem 19.10a. L_1 = .3\mu_{11} + .6\mu_{21} + .1\mu_{31}, L_2 = .3\mu_{12} + .6\mu_{22} + .1\mu_{32}.

H_0: L_1 = L_2, H_a: L_1 \neq L_2.

\hat{L}_1 - \hat{L}_2 = 25.43332 - 25.05001 = .38331, MSE = 2.3889, s{<math>\hat{L}_1 - \hat{L}_2} = .6052, t^* = .38331/.6052 = .63, t(.975; 30) = 2.042.

If |t^*| \leq 2.042 conclude H_0, otherwise H_a. Conclude H_0. P-value = .53
```