

APPLIED STATISTICS(50015)

ASSIGNMENT-6

NARASIMHA NAIDU MOPIDEVI

KSU ID: 811229705

E-MAIL: nmopidev@kent.edu

5.1 For a factor X with d categories, the one-factor mean function is $E(Y|U_2, \dots, U_d) = \beta_0 + \beta_2 U_2 + \dots + \beta_d U_d$ (5.17) where U_j is a dummy variable equal to 1 for the jth level of the factor and 0 otherwise.

5.1.1 Show that $\mu_1 = \beta_0$ is the mean for the first level of X and that $\mu_j = \beta_0 + \beta_j$ is the mean for all the remaining levels, $j = 2, \dots, d$.

Sol: Now, The given model is state as below as:

$$E(Y|U_2, \dots, U_d) = \beta_0 + \beta_2 U_2 + \dots + \beta_d U_d$$

Also, given U_j is a dummy variable which is equal to 0 and one.

Let us assume that U_j be 0.

$$U_j = 0 \text{ for all } j=2,3,\dots,d$$

$$\text{Therefore, } E(Y|U_2, U_3, \dots, U_d) = \beta_0 + \beta_2 U_2 + \beta_3 U_3 + \dots + \beta_d U_d$$

$$E(Y|U_2=0, U_3=0, \dots, U_d=0) = \beta_0 + \beta_2(0) + \beta_3(0) + \dots + \beta_d(0)$$

$$E(Y|U_2=0, U_3=0, \dots, U_d=0) = \beta_0$$

$$E(Y|U_1) = \beta_0$$

So, $\mu_1 = \beta_0$

Let us assume that U_j be 1 for all $j=2,3,4,\dots,d$

Therefore,

$$E(Y|U_2, U_3, \dots, U_d) = \beta_0 + \beta_2 U_2 + \beta_3 U_3 + \dots + \beta_d U_d$$

$$E(Y|U_2=1, U_3=1, \dots, U_d=1) = \beta_0 + \beta_2(1) + \beta_3(1) + \dots + \beta_d(1)$$

$$E(Y|U_j=1, U_k=0, k \neq j) = \beta_0 + \beta_d(1)$$

$$E(Y|U_d) = \beta_0 + \beta_d$$

Thus, $\mu_j = \beta_0 + \beta_d$

5.3 (Data file: UN11)

5.3.1 In the fit of $\text{lifeExpF} \sim \text{group}$, verify the results of Table 5.2.

Sol:

```
> library("lsmeans")
```

Loading required package: emmeans

The 'lsmeans' package is now basically a front end for 'emmeans'.

Users are encouraged to switch the rest of the way.

See `help('transition')` for more information, including how to convert old 'lsmeans' objects and scripts to work with 'emmeans'.

Warning messages:

1: package 'lsmeans' was built under R version 4.2.2

2: package 'emmeans' was built under R version 4.2.2

```
> naidu<-lm(lifeExpF~group,UN11)
```

```
> lsmeans(naidu,pairwise~group)
```

```
$lsmeans
```

group	lsmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
-------	--------	----	----	----------	----------

Oecd	82.4	1.128	196	80.2	84.7
------	------	-------	-----	------	------

Other	75.3	0.586	196	74.2	76.5
-------	------	-------	-----	------	------

Africa	59.8	0.863	196	58.1	61.5
--------	------	-------	-----	------	------

Confidence level used: 0.95

```
$contrasts
```

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
----------	----------	----	----	---------	---------

oecd - other	7.12	1.27	196	5.602	<.0001
oecd - africa	22.67	1.42	196	15.968	<.0001
other - africa	15.55	1.04	196	14.918	<.0001

P value adjustment: tukey method for comparing a family of 3 estimates

```
> library("lsmeans")
Loading required package: emmeans
The 'lsmeans' package is now basically a front end for 'emmeans'.
Users are encouraged to switch the rest of the way.
See help('transition') for more information, including how to
convert old 'lsmeans' objects and scripts to work with 'emmeans'.
warning messages:
1: package 'lsmeans' was built under R version 4.2.2
2: package 'emmeans' was built under R version 4.2.2
> naidu<-lm(lifeExpF~group,UN11)
> lsmeans(naidu,pairwise~group)
$lsmeans
  group lsmean   SE  df lower.CL upper.CL
oecd    82.4 1.128 196    80.2    84.7
other    75.3 0.586 196    74.2    76.5
africa   59.8 0.863 196    58.1    61.5

Confidence level used: 0.95

$contrasts
  contrast      estimate   SE  df t.ratio p.value
oecd - other      7.12 1.27 196   5.602 <.0001
oecd - africa    22.67 1.42 196  15.968 <.0001
other - africa    15.55 1.04 196  14.918 <.0001

P value adjustment: tukey method for comparing a family of 3 estimates
> |
```

Thus, the values are verified.

5.3.2 Compare all adjusted mean differences in the levels of group in the model $\text{lifeExpF} \sim \text{group} + \log(\text{ppgpd})$ with the results in Table 5.2.

Sol:

```
> library(lsmeans)
```

Loading required package: emmeans

The 'lsmeans' package is now basically a front end for 'emmeans'.

Users are encouraged to switch the rest of the way.

See `help('transition')` for more information, including how to convert old 'lsmeans' objects and scripts to work with 'emmeans'.

Warning messages:

1: package 'lsmeans' was built under R version 4.2.2

2: package 'emmeans' was built under R version 4.2.2

```
> siddhu<-lm(lifeExpF~group+log(ppgdp),UN11)
```

```
> lsmeans(siddhu,pairwise~group)
```

```
$lsmeans
```

group	lsmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
-------	--------	----	----	----------	----------

Oecd	79.6	0.959	195	77.7	81.5
------	------	-------	-----	------	------

Other	78.1	0.550	195	77.0	79.2
-------	------	-------	-----	------	------

Africa	67.5	1.038	195	65.4	69.5
--------	------	-------	-----	------	------

Confidence level used: 0.95

```
$contrasts
```

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
----------	----------	----	----	---------	---------

oecd - other	1.53	1.174	195	1.308	0.3927
--------------	------	-------	-----	-------	--------

oecd - africa	12.17	1.557	195	7.814	<.0001
---------------	-------	-------	-----	-------	--------

other - africa	10.64	0.979	195	10.862	<.0001
----------------	-------	-------	-----	--------	--------

P value adjustment: tukey method for comparing a family of 3 estimates

Hence the difference between the values are given:

Oecd and other =7.12

Oecd and Africa =22.67

Other and Africa =15.55

Hence, the mean values are much higher than the values in the above model.

```
> library(lsmmeans)
Loading required package: emmeans
The 'lsmmeans' package is now basically a front end for 'emmeans'.
Users are encouraged to switch the rest of the way.
See help('transition') for more information, including how to
convert old 'lsmmeans' objects and scripts to work with 'emmeans'.
Warning messages:
1: package 'lsmmeans' was built under R version 4.2.2
2: package 'emmeans' was built under R version 4.2.2
> siddhu<-lm(lifeExpF~group+log(ppgdp),UN11)
> lsmmeans(siddhu, pairwise~group)
$lsmmeans
  group  lsmean    SE  df lower.CL upper.CL
oecd    79.6 0.959 195    77.7    81.5
other   78.1 0.550 195    77.0    79.2
africa  67.5 1.038 195    65.4    69.5

Confidence level used: 0.95

$contrasts
  contrast      estimate    SE  df t.ratio p.value
oecd - other      1.53 1.174 195   1.308 0.3927
oecd - africa    12.17 1.557 195   7.814 <.0001
other - africa    10.64 0.979 195  10.862 <.0001

P value adjustment: tukey method for comparing a family of 3 estimates
> |
```

5.5 Interpreting parameters with factors and interactions Suppose we have a regression problem with a factor A with two levels (a1, a2) and a factor B with three levels (b1, b2, b3), so there are six treatment combinations. Table 5.8 Minnesota Agricultural Land Sales Variable Definition acrePrice Sale price in dollars per acre, adjusted to a common date within year year Year of sale acres Size of property, acres tillable Percentage of farm rated arable improvements Percentage of property value due to buildings and other improvements financing Type of financing either title transfer or seller finance crp Enrolled of any part of the acreage is enrolled in the U.S. Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), and none otherwise crpPct Percentage of land in CRP productivity A numeric score between 1 and 100 with larger values indicating more productive land, calculated by the University of Minnesota problems 125 5.7 Suppose the response is Y, and further that $E(Y|A = a_i, B = b_j) = \mu_{ij}$. The estimated μ_{ij} are the quantities that are used in effects plots. The purpose of this problem is to relate the μ_{ij} to the parameters that are actually fit in models with factors and interactions.

5.5.2 The model in Problem 5.5.1 has six regression coefficients, including an intercept. Express the β s as functions of the μ_{ij} .

Sol: The given model is depicted as:

$$E(Y | A = a_i, B = b_j) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A_2 + \beta_2 B_2 + \beta_3 B_3 + \beta_4 A_2 B_2 + \beta_5 A_2 B_3$$

So, The six coefficient regression expressions are given:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{11} &= E(Y | A = a_1, B = b_1) = \beta_0 & - 1 \\ \mu_{12} &= E(Y | A = a_1, B = b_2) = \beta_0 + \beta_2 B_2 & - 2 \\ \mu_{13} &= E(Y | A = a_1, B = b_3) = \beta_0 + \beta_3 B_3 & - 3 \\ \mu_{21} &= E(Y | A = a_2, B = b_1) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A_2 & - 4 \\ \mu_{22} &= E(Y | A = a_2, B = b_2) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A_2 + \beta_2 B_2 + \beta_4 A_2 B_2 & - 5 \\ \mu_{23} &= E(Y | A = a_2, B = b_3) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A_2 + \beta_3 B_3 + \beta_5 A_2 B_3 & - 6\end{aligned}$$

In the above 6 expressions, we can derive the 6 unknowns:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_0 &= \mu_{11} \\ \beta_1 &= \mu_{21} - \mu_{11} \\ \beta_2 &= \mu_{12} - \mu_{11} \\ \beta_3 &= \mu_{13} - \mu_{11} \\ \beta_4 &= \mu_{11} - \mu_{21} - \mu_{12} + \mu_{22} \\ \beta_5 &= \mu_{11} - \mu_{13} - \mu_{21} + \mu_{23}\end{aligned}$$

Hence, The intercept it can be used to directly translate the set of factor levels into a mean. All primary effects are different from the mean and μ_{11} in such a way.

5.10 (Data file: MinnLand) Refer to Problem 5.4. Another variable in this data file is the region, a factor with six levels that are geographic identifiers.

5.10.1 Assuming both year and region are factors, consider the two mean functions given in Wilkinson–Rogers notation as: (a) $\log(\text{acrePrice}) \sim \text{year} + \text{region}$ (b) $\log(\text{acrePrice}) \sim \text{year} + \text{region} + \text{year}:\text{region}$ Explain the difference between these two models (no fitting is required for this problem).

Sol: The second model into the account of relationship between year and region. It indicates that combined influence of a year and area is greater than the product of those two factors' separate effects.