

The main diagonal element of $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$ corresponding to β_2 is $C_{22} = 0.00000123$, so the t statistic (3.29) becomes

$$t_0 = \frac{\hat{\beta}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2 C_{22}}} = \frac{0.01438}{\sqrt{(10.6239)(0.00000123)}} = 3.98$$

Since $t_{0.025,22} = 2.074$, we reject $H_0: \beta_2 = 0$ and conclude that the regressor x_2 (distance) contributes significantly to the model given that x_1 (cases) is also in the model. This t test is also provided in the Minitab output (Table 3.4), and the P value reported is 0.001. ■

We may also directly determine the contribution to the regression sum of squares of a regressor, for example, x_j , given that other regressors $x_i (i \neq j)$ are included in the model by using the **extra-sum-of-squares method**. This procedure can also be used to investigate the contribution of a **subset** of the regressor variables to the model.

Consider the regression model with k regressors

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$$

where \mathbf{y} is $n \times 1$, \mathbf{X} is $n \times p$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is $p \times 1$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is $n \times 1$, and $p = k + 1$. We would like to determine if some subset of $r < k$ regressors contributes significantly to the regression model. Let the vector of regression coefficients be partitioned as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1$ is $(p - r) \times 1$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_2$ is $r \times 1$. We wish to test the hypotheses

$$H_0: \boldsymbol{\beta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \quad H_1: \boldsymbol{\beta}_2 \neq \mathbf{0} \quad (3.30)$$

The model may be written as

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \mathbf{X}_1\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \mathbf{X}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \quad (3.31)$$

where the $n \times (p - r)$ matrix \mathbf{X}_1 represents the columns of \mathbf{X} associated with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1$ and the $n \times r$ matrix \mathbf{X}_2 represents the columns of \mathbf{X} associated with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_2$. This is called the **full model**.

For the full model, we know that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{y}$. The regression sum of squares for this model is

$$SS_R(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}'\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{y} \quad (p \text{ degrees of freedom})$$

and

$$MS_{\text{Res}} = \frac{\mathbf{y}'\mathbf{y} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}'\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{y}}{n - p}$$

To find the contribution of the terms in β_2 to the regression, fit the model assuming that the null hypothesis $H_0: \beta_2 = \mathbf{0}$ is true. This **reduced model** is

$$y = \mathbf{X}_1\beta_1 + \varepsilon \quad (3.32)$$

The least-squares estimator of β_1 in the reduced model is $\hat{\beta}_1 = (\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1'y$. The regression sum of squares is

$$SS_R(\beta_1) = \hat{\beta}_1'\mathbf{X}_1'y \quad (p-r \text{ degrees of freedom}) \quad (3.33)$$

The regression sum of squares due to β_2 given that β_1 is already in the model is

$$SS_R(\beta_2|\beta_1) = SS_R(\beta) - SS_R(\beta_1) \quad (3.34)$$

with $p - (p - r) = r$ degrees of freedom. This sum of squares is called the **extra sum of squares due to β_2** because it measures the increase in the regression sum of squares that results from adding the regressors $x_{k-r+1}, x_{k-r+2}, \dots, x_k$ to a model that already contains x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-r} . Now $SS_R(\beta_2|\beta_1)$ is independent of MS_{Res} , and the null hypothesis $\beta_2 = \mathbf{0}$ may be tested by the statistic

$$F_0 = \frac{SS_R(\beta_2|\beta_1)/r}{MS_{Res}} \quad (3.35)$$

If $\beta_2 \neq \mathbf{0}$, then F_0 follows a noncentral F distribution with a noncentrality parameter of

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \beta_2' \mathbf{X}_2' [\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{X}_1(\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1'] \mathbf{X}_2 \beta_2$$

This result is quite important. If there is multicollinearity in the data, there are situations where β_2 is markedly nonzero, but this test actually has almost no power (ability to indicate this difference) because of a near-collinear relationship between \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 . In this situation, λ is nearly zero even though β_2 is truly important. This relationship also points out that the maximal power for this test occurs when \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 are orthogonal to one another. By orthogonal we mean that $\mathbf{X}_2'\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{0}$.

If $F_0 > F_{\alpha, r, n-p}$, we reject H_0 , concluding that at least one of the parameters in β is not zero, and consequently at least one of the regressors $x_{k-r+1}, x_{k-r+2}, \dots, x_k$ in \mathbf{X}_2 contribute significantly to the regression model. Some authors call the test in (3.35) a **partial F test** because it measures the contribution of the regressors in \mathbf{X}_2 given that the other regressors in \mathbf{X}_1 are in the model. To illustrate the usefulness of this procedure, consider the model

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \varepsilon$$

The sums of squares

$$SS_R(\beta_1|\beta_0, \beta_2, \beta_3), \quad SS_R(\beta_2|\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_3), \quad SS_R(\beta_3|\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2)$$