

Exercise 2.1

Information on 74 automobiles was collected (in 1978) to study the relationship between gas mileage (mpg) and various features of the cars. We would like to investigate the relationship between mileage and whether the car is made in the U.S. (foreign: 0=made in U.S.; 1=made outside U.S.).

A simple linear regression model is fit, with foreign as the explanatory variable:

$$E[MPG] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 FOREIGN$$

```
. regress mpg foreign
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	74
Model	378.153515	1	378.153515	F(1, 72)	=	13.18
Residual	2065.30594	72	28.6848048	Prob > F	=	0.0005
Total	2443.45946	73	33.4720474	R-squared	=	0.1548
				Adj R-squared	=	0.1430
				Root MSE	=	5.3558

mpg	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
foreign	4.945804	1.362162	3.63	0.001	2.230384	7.661225
_cons	19.82692	.7427186	26.70	0.000	18.34634	21.30751

(a) Identify the value of $\hat{\beta}_1$ and interpret this value.

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = 4.95.$$

The estimated difference in mean mileage, foreign cars minus U.S.-made cars, is 4.95 MPG. (Mileage is higher for foreign cars.)

(b) Identify the value of $\hat{\beta}_0$ and interpret this value.

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = 19.8$$

The estimated mean mileage for U.S.-made cars is 19.8 miles per gallon.

(c) Is there a significant difference in mileage between foreign and domestic (not foreign) cars? Cite specific evidence from the Stata output in your answer.

Yes there is a significant difference in mean mileage, $p\text{-value} = 0.001$

(d) Suppose I am concerned about the normality assumption. I create a histogram of the mileage values and check to see if it is skewed. Is this an appropriate way to check the normality assumption? If not, describe a plot that could be used to check this assumption.

*It would **not** be appropriate to just look at a histogram of the mileage values themselves – the normality assumption says the **errors** are normally distributed. Thus we would need to create either a histogram or a Q-Q plot of the residuals in order to check this assumption.*

Exercise 2.2

A study compared the growth rate of 16 male and 16 female chicks. Growth, as measured by increase in weight in grams, was measured at day 7. Then a linear regression model was performed, using sex to predict weight gain. In the data set, the variable `male` takes the values 1 for male chicks and 0 for female chicks. Stata output is below.

```
. regress wtgain male
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	32
Model	3.78125262	1	3.78125262	F(1, 30)	=	0.09
Residual	1323.27866	30	44.1092886	Prob > F	=	0.7717
Total	1327.05991	31	42.8083842	R-squared	=	0.0028
				Adj R-squared	=	-0.0304
				Root MSE	=	6.6415

wtgain	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
male	.6875002	2.348119	0.29	0.772		
_cons	27.15625	1.660371	16.36	0.000	23.76532	30.54718

(a) Write the population regression line being estimated here (i.e., use β s not $\hat{\beta}$ s).

$$E(WTGAIN) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 MALE$$

(b) In terms of the β s, what is the expected mean weight of female chicks?

$$\beta_0$$

(c) In terms of the β s, what is the expected mean weight of male chicks?

$$\beta_0 + \beta_1$$

(d) What are the null and alternative hypotheses to test whether there is a significant difference in weight gain between male and female chicks?

$$H_0 : \beta_1 = 0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \beta_1 \neq 0$$

(e) For the test of the hypotheses you stated in (d), report the test statistic value, the distribution of the test statistic under the null hypothesis, and the p-value.

$$t = 0.29; \text{ Under } H_0, t \sim t_{30}; p\text{-value} = 0.772$$

(f) Write a one-sentence conclusion (in the context of the problem).

There is not a significant difference in mean weight gain between male and female chicks ($p=0.77$).

Exercise 2.3

A small study collected systolic blood pressure (SBP) from 32 men, along with several predictors of SBP. One predictor was smoking status, recorded as 1=smoker, 0=non-smoker. A two-sample t-test was performed to compare the mean SBP between smokers and non-smokers. Stata output from the t-test is below.

```
. ttest sbp, by(smok)
```

Two-sample t test with equal variances

Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
0	15	140.8	3.331237	12.90183	133.6552	147.9448
1	17	147.8235	3.689448	15.21198	140.0022	155.6448
combined	32	144.5313	2.545151	14.39755	139.3404	149.7221
diff		-7.023529	5.023498		-17.28288	3.235823
diff = mean(0) - mean(1)				t = -1.3981		
Ho: diff = 0				degrees of freedom = 30		
Ha: diff < 0		Ha: diff != 0		Ha: diff > 0		
Pr(T < t) = 0.0862		Pr(T > t) = 0.1723		Pr(T > t) = 0.9138		

(a) Is there evidence of a significant difference in mean SBP for the two groups?

No – $p\text{-value} = 0.1723$, there is no evidence of a significant difference in means.

(b) A linear regression was also performed using the smoking status variable to predict SBP. The output is below – but part of the output is missing (missing values labeled with letters A-E). Fill in the missing values, using the t-test output if necessary.

. regress sbp smk						
Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	32
Model	393.098162	1	393.098162	F(1, 30)	=	1.95
Residual	6032.87059	30	201.095686	Prob > F	=	__ (D) _
Total	6425.96875	31	207.289315	R-squared	=	__ (E) _
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0299
				Root MSE	=	14.181

sbp	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
smk	___ (A) __	5.023498	__ (B) _	__ (C) _	-3.235823	17.28288
_cons	140.8	3.661472	38.45	0.000	133.3223	148.2777

(A) 7.02 — this is the estimated difference in mean SBP, smokers minus non-smokers. From the t-test output, the mean difference for non-smokers minus smokers is -7.02 , so we just reverse the sign

(B) 1.398 — test statistic for the “slope” is the same as for the t-test, but with the sign reversed

(C) 0.1723 — p-value for the test of the “slope” is the same as the two-sided t-test p-value

(D) 0.1723

The p-value for the overall F-test is the same as the p-value for the test of the “slope” when there is only one predictor variable.

(E) $R^2 = \frac{MSS}{TSS} = \frac{393.098162}{6425.96875} = 0.0612$