

Assignment 1

Rin Meng
Student ID: 51940633

October 2, 2024

1. (a) The linear regression model can be written as,

$$P = \beta_0 + \beta_1 C + \epsilon$$

where,

- P is the prime interest rate
- C is the core inflation rate
- β_0 is the intercept of the regression line
- β_1 is the slope of the regression line
- ϵ is the error term

Assumptions of the linear regression model are,

- Linearity:** The relationship between P and C is linear
- Independence:** The error term ϵ is independent of C
- Normality:** The error term ϵ is normally distributed
- Homoscedasticity:** The error term ϵ has a constant variance across all levels of C

2. **Remark:** from ch2A.pdf slide 9 and 13,

- $\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x}$
- $\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}}$
- $S_{xy} = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})$
- $S_{xx} = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2$

Let e_i be the i th residual term. Then for each observation, we can see that the residual for each observation i is defined as:

$$e_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$$

then we can say that the predicted value \hat{y}_i is equivalent to

$$\hat{y}_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i$$

(a) $\sum_{i=1}^n e_i = 0$

Proof. LHS:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n e_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_1 x_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y} + \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} - \hat{\beta}_1 x_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n y_i - n\bar{y} + \hat{\beta}_1 n\bar{x} - \hat{\beta}_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \\ &= n\bar{y} - n\bar{y} + \hat{\beta}_1 n\bar{x} - \hat{\beta}_1 n\bar{x} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$LHS = 0 = RHS$$

\therefore It is true that the sum of residuals e_i is zero. □

(b) $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i e_i = 0$

Proof. LHS:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n x_i e_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i (y_i - \hat{y}_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i (y_i - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_1 x_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i y_i - x_i (\bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x}) - \hat{\beta}_1 x_i^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i y_i - x_i \bar{y} + x_i \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} - \hat{\beta}_1 x_i^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i (y_i - \bar{y}) + \hat{\beta}_1 (\bar{x} x_i - x_i^2)) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - \bar{y} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - \hat{\beta}_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - \bar{x} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - n \bar{x} \bar{y} \right) - \hat{\beta}_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n \bar{x}^2 \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - n \bar{x} \bar{y} - n \bar{x} \bar{y} + n \bar{x} \bar{y} \right) - \hat{\beta}_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n \bar{x} \bar{x} - n \bar{x} \bar{x} + n \bar{x} \bar{x} \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - n \bar{x} \bar{y} - n \bar{x} \bar{y} + n \bar{x} \bar{y} \right) - \hat{\beta}_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - 2n \bar{x} \bar{x} + n \bar{x} \bar{x} \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - \bar{y} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - \bar{x} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + n \bar{x} \bar{y} \right) - \hat{\beta}_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - 2\bar{x} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + n \bar{x}^2 \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i y_i - \bar{y} x_i - \bar{x} y_i + \bar{x} \bar{y}) - \hat{\beta}_1 \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i^2 - 2\bar{x} x_i + \bar{x}^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i (y_i - \bar{y}) + \bar{x} (y_i - \bar{y})) - \hat{\beta}_1 \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i + \bar{x}) (y_i - \bar{y}) - \hat{\beta}_1 \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \\
&= S_{xy} - \hat{\beta}_1 S_{xx} \\
&= S_{xy} - \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} S_{xx} \\
&= S_{xy} - S_{xy} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

$$LHS = 0 = RHS$$

□

∴ It is true that the independent variables x_i is completely uncorrelated to the residuals e_i .

$$(c) \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{y}_i e_i = 0$$

Proof. LHS:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{y}_i e_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{y}_i (y_i - \hat{y}_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i \hat{y}_i - \hat{y}_i^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i (\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i) - (\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i)^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i (\bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i) - (\bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i)^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i \bar{y} - y_i \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} + y_i \hat{\beta}_1 x_i \\
&\quad - (\bar{y}^2 - 2\hat{\beta}_1 \bar{y} \bar{x} + \hat{\beta}_1^2 \bar{x}^2 + 2\hat{\beta}_1 \bar{y} x_i - 2\hat{\beta}_1^2 \bar{x} x_i + \hat{\beta}_1^2 x_i^2)) \\
&= (\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \bar{y} - \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \hat{\beta}_1 x_i \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{y}^2 - 2\hat{\beta}_1 \bar{y} \bar{x} + \hat{\beta}_1^2 \bar{x}^2 + 2\hat{\beta}_1 \bar{y} x_i - 2\hat{\beta}_1^2 \bar{x} x_i + \hat{\beta}_1^2 x_i^2)) \\
&= (n\bar{y}^2 - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{y} \bar{x} + \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{y} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \\
&\quad - (\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{y}^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n 2\hat{\beta}_1 \bar{y} \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}_1^2 \bar{x}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n 2\hat{\beta}_1 \bar{y} x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n 2\hat{\beta}_1^2 \bar{x} x_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}_1^2 x_i^2)) \\
&= (n\bar{y}^2 - (n\bar{y}^2 - 2\hat{\beta}_1 n\bar{y} \bar{x} + \hat{\beta}_1^2 n\bar{x}^2 + 2\hat{\beta}_1 n\bar{y} \bar{x} - 2\hat{\beta}_1^2 n\bar{x} \bar{x} + \hat{\beta}_1^2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2))
\end{aligned}$$

proof continued.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{y}_i e_i &= (n\bar{y}^2 - (n\bar{y}^2 - \hat{\beta}_1^2 n\bar{x}^2 + \hat{\beta}_1^2 n\bar{x}^2)) \\
&= (n\bar{y}^2 - n\bar{y}^2) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

$$LHS = 0 = RHS$$

□

∴ It is true that the predicted values \hat{y}_i is completely orthogonal to the residuals e_i .

3. (a) It is given that:

- $\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}}$
- $S_{xy} = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})$
- $S_{xx} = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2$
- $y_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i + \epsilon_i$
- $\bar{y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \bar{x}$

We want to show that

$$\hat{\beta}_1 \sim N(\beta_1, \frac{\sigma^2}{S_{xx}})$$

Where β_1 is the mean of the distribution and $\frac{\sigma^2}{S_{xx}}$ is the variance.

Proof. Let $k_i = \frac{x_i - \bar{x}}{S_{xx}}$ then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\beta}_1 &= \sum k_i (y_i - \bar{y}) \\
E[\hat{\beta}_1] &= E \left[\sum k_i (y_i - \bar{y}) \right] \\
&= \sum k_i E[(y_i - \bar{y})] \\
&= \sum k_i E[(\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i + \epsilon_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 \bar{x})] \\
&= \sum k_i (E[\hat{\beta}_0] + E[\hat{\beta}_1 x_i] + E[\epsilon_i] - E[\beta_0] - E[\beta_1 \bar{x}])
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum k_i(0 + \beta_1 x_i + 0 - 0 - \beta_1 \bar{x}) \\
&= \sum k_i(\beta_1 x_i - \beta_1 \bar{x}) \\
&= \beta_1 \sum k_i(x_i - \bar{x}) \\
&= \beta_1 \sum \frac{x_i - \bar{x}}{S_{xx}}(x_i - \bar{x}) \\
&= \beta_1 \sum \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{(x_i - \bar{x})^2} \\
&= \beta_1
\end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore E[\hat{\beta}_1] = \beta_1$$

□

Using k_i from earlier, we can proof that $Var[\hat{\beta}_1] = \frac{\sigma^2}{S_{xx}}$

$$Var[\hat{\beta}_1] = Var[\sum k_i(y_i - \bar{y})]$$

$$Var[\hat{\beta}_1] = \sum Var[k_i(y_i - \bar{y})]$$

$$Var[\hat{\beta}_1] = \sum k_i^2 Var[(y_i - \bar{y})]$$

4. Given the model:

$$y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 i + \epsilon_i$$

(a) Let us derive the least-squares estimators for β_1 and β_2 .

$$\begin{aligned}
S(\beta_1, \beta_2) &= \sum (y_i - \beta_1 x_i - \beta_2 i)^2 \\
\frac{\delta S}{\delta \beta_1} &= -2 \sum (y_i - \beta_1 x_i - \beta_2 i) x_i = 0 \\
&= -2 \sum (y_i x_i - \beta_1 x_i^2 - \beta_2 i x_i) = 0 \\
\sum y_i x_i &= \beta_1 \sum x_i^2 + \beta_2 \sum x_i i \\
\frac{\delta S}{\delta \beta_2} &= -2 \sum (y_i - \beta_1 x_i - \beta_2 i) i = 0 \\
&= -2 \sum (y_i i - \beta_1 x_i i - \beta_2 i^2) = 0 \\
\sum y_i i &= \beta_1 \sum x_i i + \beta_2 \sum i^2
\end{aligned}$$

Solving for β_2

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum y_i x_i &= \beta_1 \sum x_i^2 + \beta_2 \sum x_i i \\
\beta_1 \sum x_i^2 &= \sum y_i x_i - \beta_2 \sum x_i i \\
\beta_1 &= \frac{\sum y_i x_i - \beta_2 \sum x_i i}{\sum x_i^2} \\
\sum y_i i &= \beta_1 \sum x_i i + \beta_2 \sum i^2 \\
\beta_1 \sum x_i i &= \sum y_i i - \beta_2 \sum i^2 \\
\beta_1 &= \frac{\sum y_i i - \beta_2 \sum i^2}{\sum x_i i}
\end{aligned}$$

Now set them equal to each other and solve for β_2

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\sum y_i x_i - \beta_2 \sum x_i i}{\sum x_i^2} &= \frac{\sum y_i i - \beta_2 \sum i^2}{\sum x_i i} \\
(\sum y_i x_i - \beta_2 \sum x_i i)(\sum x_i i) &= (\sum x_i^2)(\sum y_i i - \beta_2 \sum i^2) \\
\sum y_i x_i (\sum x_i i) - \beta_2 (\sum x_i i)^2 &= \sum y_i i (\sum x_i^2) - \beta_2 \sum i^2 (\sum x_i^2) \\
\beta_2 \sum i^2 \sum x_i^2 - \beta_2 (\sum x_i i)^2 &= \sum y_i i \sum x_i^2 - \sum y_i x_i \sum x_i i \\
\beta_2 (\sum i^2 \sum x_i^2 - (\sum x_i i)^2) &= \sum y_i i \sum x_i^2 - \sum y_i x_i \sum x_i i
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have:

$$\beta_2 = \frac{\sum y_i i \sum x_i^2 - \sum y_i x_i \sum x_i i}{\sum i^2 \sum x_i^2 - (\sum x_i i)^2}$$

Solving for β_1 using same approach:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum y_i x_i &= \beta_1 \sum x_i^2 + \beta_2 \sum x_i i \\
\beta_2 \sum x_i i &= \sum y_i x_i - \beta_1 \sum x_i^2 \\
\beta_2 &= \frac{\sum y_i x_i - \beta_1 \sum x_i^2}{\sum x_i i} \\
\sum y_i i &= \beta_1 \sum x_i i + \beta_2 \sum i^2 \\
\beta_2 \sum i^2 &= \sum y_i i - \beta_1 \sum x_i i \\
\beta_2 &= \frac{\sum y_i i - \beta_1 \sum x_i i}{\sum i^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Now set them equal to each other and solve for β_1

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\sum y_i x_i - \beta_1 \sum x_i^2}{\sum x_i i} &= \frac{\sum y_i i - \beta_1 \sum x_i i}{\sum i^2} \\
(\sum y_i x_i - \beta_1 \sum x_i^2)(\sum i^2) &= (\sum x_i i)(\sum y_i i - \beta_1 \sum x_i i) \\
\sum y_i x_i \sum i^2 - \beta_1 \sum x_i^2 \sum i^2 &= \sum y_i i \sum x_i i - \beta_1 (\sum x_i i)^2 \\
\beta_1 (\sum x_i i)^2 - \beta_1 \sum x_i^2 \sum i^2 &= \sum y_i i \sum x_i i - \sum y_i x_i \sum i^2 \\
\beta_1 ((\sum x_i i)^2 - \sum x_i^2 \sum i^2) &= \sum y_i i \sum x_i i - \sum y_i x_i \sum i^2
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have:

$$\beta_1 = \frac{\sum y_i i \sum x_i i - \sum y_i x_i \sum i^2}{(\sum x_i i)^2 - \sum x_i^2 \sum i^2}$$

To find the conditions where x_i makes the estimators not well-defined, we let $x_i = i$. so then we have our β_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_1 &= \frac{\sum y_i i \sum x_i i - \sum y_i x_i \sum i^2}{(\sum x_i)^2 - \sum x_i^2 \sum i^2} \\
&= \frac{\sum y_i i \sum i^2 - \sum y_i i \sum i^2}{(\sum i^2)^2 - \sum i^2 \sum i^2} \\
&= \frac{\sum y_i i \sum i^2 - \sum y_i i \sum i^2}{\sum i^2 \sum i^2 - \sum i^2 \sum i^2} \\
&= \frac{0}{0}
\end{aligned}$$

and then our β_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_2 &= \frac{\sum y_i i \sum x_i^2 - \sum y_i x_i \sum x_i i}{\sum i^2 \sum x_i^2 - (\sum x_i i)^2} \\
&= \frac{\sum y_i i \sum i^2 - \sum y_i i \sum i^2}{(\sum i^2)^2 - \sum i^2 \sum i^2} \\
&= \frac{\sum y_i i \sum i^2 - \sum y_i i \sum i^2}{\sum i^2 \sum i^2 - \sum i^2 \sum i^2} \\
&= \frac{0}{0}
\end{aligned}$$

\therefore The estimator β_1 and β_2 is not well-defined at $x_i = i$.

- (b) For the case where the coefficient estimators are well-defined, the unbiased estimator for σ^2 is:

$$E[\sum \epsilon^2] = (n-2)\sigma^2$$

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\sum \epsilon^2}{n-2}$$

Derived from, Question 3b.

[(a)]

5. *Proof.* We want to show that MSE is an unbiased estimator σ^2 then we want to show that:

$$E[MSE] = E \left[\frac{1}{n-1} \sum (y_i - \bar{y})^2 \right] = \sigma^2$$

so then we can start by recalling the model,

$$y_i = \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

then it is true that the sample mean is,

$$\bar{y} = \alpha + \bar{\epsilon}$$

then, $y_i - \bar{y}$ can be rewritten as,

$$y_i - \bar{y} = (\alpha + \epsilon_i) - (\alpha + \bar{\epsilon}) = \epsilon_i - \bar{\epsilon}$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E[MSE] &= E \left[\frac{1}{n-1} \sum (\epsilon_i - \bar{\epsilon})^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n-1} E \left[\left(\sum \epsilon_i^2 - \sum \bar{\epsilon}^2 \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n-1} (\sum E[\epsilon_i^2] - E[n\bar{\epsilon}^2]) \end{aligned}$$

We know that

$$E[\epsilon_i] = 0 \Rightarrow E[\epsilon_i^2] = Var[\epsilon_i] + E[\epsilon_i]^2 = \sigma^2$$

$$\sum E[\epsilon_i] = n\sigma^2$$

now we find that,

$$\begin{aligned}
E[n\bar{\epsilon}^2] &= nE[\bar{\epsilon}^2] \\
&\Rightarrow E[\bar{\epsilon}^2] = \text{Var}[\bar{\epsilon}] + E[\bar{\epsilon}]^2 \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \text{Var}[\bar{\epsilon}] = \text{Var}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum \epsilon_i\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum \text{Var}[\epsilon_i] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum \sigma^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} n\sigma^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \\
&\Leftrightarrow E[\bar{\epsilon}]^2 = E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum e_i\right]^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum E[e_i]\right)^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{n} \cdot 0\right)^2 = 0 \\
E[n\bar{\epsilon}^2] &= n \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{n} = \sigma^2
\end{aligned}$$

so then finally we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
E[MSE] &= \frac{1}{n-1}(n\sigma^2 - \sigma^2) \\
&= \frac{1}{n-1}(n-1)\sigma^2 \\
&= \sigma^2
\end{aligned}$$

$\therefore MSE$ is an unbiased estimator for σ^2 . □

6. (a) The linear regression model can be written as,

$$R = \beta_0 + \beta_1 W + \epsilon$$

Where,

- R is the rate of the spread of a wildfire m/s
- W is the wind speed km/h
- β_0 is the the rate of spread when $W = 0$
- β_1 is the slope the rate of spread increases with one-unit wind speed
- ϵ is the error term

(b) Assumptions that is made on the error term ϵ are:

- Independence:** The error term ϵ is independent of W
- $E[\epsilon] = 0$
- $Var[\epsilon] = \sigma^2$

(c) The expected value of R given that $W = x$ is:

$$E[R|W = x] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x \Leftrightarrow E[\epsilon] = 0$$

(d) The variance of R given that $W = x$ is:

$$Var[R|W = x] = Var(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \epsilon|x) = \sigma^2$$

(e) Given that W is a random variable with mean μ_W and variance σ_W^2 ,

- The unconditional expected value of R is:

$$E[R] = E[\beta_0 + \beta_1 W + \epsilon] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 E[W] + E[\epsilon] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mu_W$$

Here, μ_W is the mean of the wind speed. This contrasts with part (c) because in (c) we are looking for the expected value of R given $W = x$, and here we are looking for expected value of R given that W is a random variable.

- The unconditional variance of R is:

$$\begin{aligned} Var[R] &= Var[\beta_0 + \beta_1 W + \epsilon] = Var[\beta_0] + \beta_1^2 Var[W] + Var[\epsilon] \\ &= \beta_1^2 \sigma_W^2 + \sigma^2 \end{aligned}$$

This contrasts with part (d) because in (d) we are looking for the specific condition where speed is fixed at x and which equates to σ^2 . Now, we are including all of the variability of W instead of fixing it to a particular value.

- (f) If the rate of spread of a wildfire W is linearly related to the square root of wind speed \sqrt{W} , then the model will intuitively be:

$$R = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sqrt{W} + \epsilon$$

7. From Question 6, we have,

$$R : \{30, 32, 18, 35, 12\}$$

$$W : \{35, 40, 20, 50, 15\}$$

(a)

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta}_1 &= \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (W_i - \bar{W})(R_i - \bar{R})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (W_i - \bar{W})^2} \\ \bar{R} &= \frac{30 + 32 + 18 + 35 + 12}{5} = 25.4 \\ \bar{W} &= \frac{35 + 40 + 20 + 50 + 15}{5} = 32\end{aligned}$$

Calculating S_{xy} :

W_i	R_i	$W_i - \bar{W}$	$R_i - \bar{R}$	$(W_i - \bar{W})(R_i - \bar{R})$
35	30	$35 - 32 = 3$	$30 - 25.4 = 4.6$	$3 \cdot 4.6 = 13.8$
40	32	$40 - 32 = 8$	$32 - 25.4 = 6.6$	$8 \cdot 6.6 = 52.8$
20	18	$20 - 32 = -12$	$18 - 25.4 = -7.4$	$-12 \cdot -7.4 = 88.8$
50	35	$50 - 32 = 18$	$35 - 25.4 = 9.6$	$18 \cdot 9.6 = 172.8$
15	12	$15 - 32 = -17$	$12 - 25.4 = -13.4$	$-17 \cdot -13.4 = 227.8$

$$S_{xy} = 13.8 + 52.8 + 88.8 + 172.8 + 227.8 = 556$$

Calculating S_{xx} :

W_i	$W_i - \bar{W}$	$(W_i - \bar{W})^2$
35	$35 - 32 = 3$	$3^2 = 9$
40	$40 - 32 = 8$	$8^2 = 64$
20	$20 - 32 = -12$	$(-12)^2 = 144$
50	$50 - 32 = 18$	$18^2 = 324$
15	$15 - 32 = -17$	$(-17)^2 = 289$

$$S_{xx} = 9 + 64 + 144 + 324 + 289 = 830$$

Finally, we have:

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{556}{830} = 0.6707$$

(b) Recall from (a) that $\bar{R} = 25.4$ and $\bar{W} = 32$. We can now calculate $\hat{\beta}_0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta}_0 &= \bar{R} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{W} \\ &= 25.4 - 0.6707 \cdot 32 \\ &= 25.4 - 21.47 \\ &= 3.9376\end{aligned}$$

(c)

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n-2} \sum (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 = \frac{1}{5-2} \sum (R_i - \hat{R}_i)^2$$

With the values, our model is now:

$$\hat{R} = 3.9376 + 0.6707W$$

W_i	R_i	\hat{R}_i	$R_i - \hat{R}_i$	$(R_i - \hat{R}_i)^2$
35	30	27.4121	2.5879	6.6972
40	32	30.7656	1.2344	1.5237
20	18	17.3516	0.6484	0.4204
50	35	37.4726	-2.4726	6.1137
15	12	13.9981	-1.9981	3.9924

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{6.6972 + 1.5237 + 0.4204 + 6.1137 + 3.9924}{3} = \frac{18.7474}{6.2491} \simeq 6.25$$

(d)

```
R <- c(30, 32, 18, 35, 12)
W <- c(35, 40, 20, 50, 15)
speedwind <- data.frame(R, W)
```

(e) Code:

```
model <- lm(R ~ W, data = speedwind)
summary(model)
```

Summary returns:

```

Call:
lm(formula = R ~ W, data = speedwind)

Residuals:
    1      2      3      4      5 
2.5904  1.2410  0.6386 -2.4578 -2.0120 

Coefficients:
              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)   3.96386     2.99323   1.324  0.27726
W              0.66988     0.08677   7.720  0.00452 **
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 2.5 on 3 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.9521, Adjusted R-squared:  0.9361 
F-statistic:  59.6 on 1 and 3 DF,  p-value: 0.004518

```

Our β_0 value is 3.93766 and β_1 value is 3.96386 which is relatively close, and our β_1 value is 0.6707 which is also relatively close to the value we calculated at 0.66988. our residual standard error, σ is also on point at $\sigma = \sqrt{\sigma^2} = \sqrt{6.25} = 2.5$ compared to the output. Overall, our calculations are not far off from the output of the linear regression model in R.

End of Assignment 1.