11.1 Introduction

Up until now, we have modeled a random variable with a pdf or pmf that depended on parameters to be estimated. In many situations, some of which follow, a random variable can be modeled not only with unknown parameters but also with known (and sometimes controllable) covariates. This chapter describes the methodologies of analysis of variance (ANOVA) and regression analysis. They are based on an underlying assumption of a linear relationship and form a large core of the statistical methods that are used in practice.

The analysis of variance (commonly referred to as the ANOVA) is one of the most widely used statistical techniques. A basic idea of the ANOVA, that of partitioning variation, is a fundamental idea of experimental statistics. The ANOVA belies its name in that it is not concerned with analyzing variances but rather with analyzing variation in means.

We will study a common type of ANOVA, the oneway ANOVA. For a thorough treatment of the different facets of ANOVA designs, there is the classic text by Cochran and Cox (1957) or the more modern, but still somewhat classic, treatments by Dean and Voss (1999) and Kuehl (2000). The text by Neter, Wasserman, and Whitmore (1993) provides a guide to overall strategies in experimental statistics.

The technique of regression, in particular linear regression, probably wins the prize as the most popular statistical tool. There are all forms of regression: linear, nonlinear, simple, multiple, parametric, nonparametric, etc. In this chapter we will look at the simplest case, linear regression with one predictor variable. (This is usually called simple linear regression, as opposed to multiple linear regression, which deals with many predictor variables.)

A major purpose of regression is to explore the dependence of one variable on others. In simple linear regression, the mean of a random variable, $Y$, is modeled as a function of another observable variable, $x$, by the relationship $EY = \alpha + \beta x$. In general, the function that gives $EY$ as a function of $x$ is called the population regression function.
11.2 Oneway Analysis of Variance

In its simplest form, the ANOVA is a method of estimating the means of several populations, populations often assumed to be normally distributed. The heart of the ANOVA, however, lies in the topic of statistical design. How can we get the most information on the most populations with the fewest observations? The ANOVA design question is not our major concern, however; we will be concerned with inference, that is, with estimation and testing, in the ANOVA.

Classic ANOVA had testing as its main goal—in particular, testing what is known as "the ANOVA null hypothesis." But more recently, especially in the light of greater computing power, experimenters have realized that testing one hypothesis (a somewhat ludicrous one at that, as we shall see) does not make for good experimental inference. Thus, although we will derive the test of the ANOVA null, it is far from the most important part of an analysis of variance. More important is estimation, both point and interval. In particular, inference based on contrasts (to be defined) is of major importance.

In the one-way analysis of variance (also known as the one-way classification) we assume that data, $Y_{ij}$, are observed according to a model

$$(11.2.1) \quad Y_{ij} = \theta_i + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n_i,$$

where the $\theta_i$ are unknown parameters and the $\epsilon_{ij}$ are error random variables.

**Example 11.2.1 (Oneway ANOVA)** Schematically, the data, $y_{ij}$, from a one-way ANOVA will look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>\ldots</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$y_{11}$</td>
<td>$y_{12}$</td>
<td>$y_{13}$</td>
<td>\cdots</td>
<td>$y_{1k}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_{1n_1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_{21}$</td>
<td>$y_{22}$</td>
<td>$y_{23}$</td>
<td>\cdots</td>
<td>$y_{2k}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_{2n_2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\cdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_{kn_k}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that we do not assume that there are equal numbers of observations in each treatment group.

As an example, consider the following experiment performed to assess the relative effects of three toxins and a control on the liver of a certain species of trout. The data are the amounts of deterioration (in standard units) of the liver in each sacrificed fish.
Without loss of generality we can assume that \( E \epsilon_{ij} = 0 \), since if not, we can rescale the \( \epsilon_{ij} \) and absorb the leftover mean into \( \theta_i \). Thus it follows that

\[
EY_{ij} = \theta_i, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n_i,
\]

so the \( \theta_i \)'s are the means of the \( Y_{ij} \)'s. The \( \theta_i \)'s are usually referred to as treatment means, since the index often corresponds to different treatments or to levels of a particular treatment, such as dosage levels of a particular drug.

There is an alternative model to (11.2.1), sometimes called the overparameterized model, which can be written as

\[
Y_{ij} = \mu + \tau_i + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n_i,
\]

where, again, \( E \epsilon_{ij} = 0 \). It follows from this model that

\[
EY_{ij} = \mu + \tau_i.
\]

In this formulation we think of \( \mu \) as a grand mean, that is, the common mean level of the treatments. The parameters \( \tau_i \) then denote the unique effect due to treatment \( i \), the deviation from the mean level that is caused by the treatment. However, we cannot estimate both \( \tau_i \) and \( \mu \) separately, because there are problems with identifiability.

**Definition 11.2.2** A parameter \( \theta \) for a family of distributions \( \{f(x|\theta) : \theta \in \Theta\} \) is identifiable if distinct values of \( \theta \) correspond to distinct pdfs or pmfs. That is, if \( \theta \neq \theta' \), then \( f(x|\theta) \neq f(x|\theta') \).

Identifiability is a property of the model, not of an estimator or estimation procedure. However, if the model is not identifiable, then there is difficulty in doing inference. For example, if \( f(x|\theta) = f(x|\theta') \), then observations from both distributions look exactly the same and we would have no way of knowing whether the true value of the parameter was \( \theta \) or \( \theta' \). In particular, both \( \theta \) and \( \theta' \) would give the likelihood function the same value.

Realize that problems with identifiability can usually be solved by redefining the model. One reason that we have not encountered identifiability problems before is that our models have not only made intuitive sense but also were identifiable (for example, modeling a normal population in terms of its mean and variance). Here, however, we have a model, (11.2.2), that makes intuitive sense but is not identifiable. In Chapter 12 we will see a parameterization of the bivariate normal distribution that models a situation well but is not identifiable.
In the parameterization of (11.2.2), there are $k + 1$ parameters, $(\mu, \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k)$, but only $k$ means, $EY_{ij}, i = 1, \ldots, k$. Without any further restriction on the parameters, more than one set of values for $(\mu, \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k)$ will lead to the same distribution. It is common in this model to add the restriction that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \tau_i = 0$, which effectively reduces the number of parameters to $k$ and makes the model identifiable. The restriction also has the effect of giving the $\tau_i$s an interpretation as deviations from an overall mean level. (See Exercise 11.5.)

For the one-way ANOVA the model (11.2.1), the cell means model, which has a more straightforward interpretation, is the one that we prefer to use. In more complicated ANOVAs, however, there is sometimes an interpretive advantage in model (11.2.2).

### 11.2.1 Model and Distribution Assumptions

Under model (11.2.1), a minimum assumption that is needed before any estimation can be done is that $E \epsilon_{ij} = 0$ and $\text{Var} \epsilon_{ij} < \infty$ for all $i, j$. Under these assumptions, we can do some estimation of the $\theta_i$s (as in Exercise 7.41). However, to do any confidence interval estimation or testing, we need distributional assumptions. Here are the classic ANOVA assumptions.

**One-way ANOVA assumptions**

Random variables $Y_{ij}$ are observed according to the model

$$Y_{ij} = \theta_i + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n_i,$$

where

(i) $E \epsilon_{ij} = 0$, $\text{Var} \epsilon_{ij} = \sigma_i^2 < \infty$, for all $i, j$. $\text{Cov}(\epsilon_{ij}, \epsilon_{i'j'}) = 0$ for all $i, i', j,$ and $j'$ unless $i = i'$ and $j = j'$.

(ii) The $\epsilon_{ij}$ are independent and normally distributed (normal errors).

(iii) $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$ for all $i$ (equality of variance, also known as homoscedasticity).

Without assumption (ii) we could do only point estimation and possibly look for estimators that minimize variance within a class, but we could not do interval estimation or testing. If we assume some distribution other than normal, intervals and tests can be quite difficult (but still possible) to derive. Of course, with reasonable sample sizes and populations that are not too asymmetric, we have the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) to rely on.

The equality of variance assumption is also quite important. Interestingly, its importance is linked to the normality assumption. In general, if it is suspected that the data badly violate the ANOVA assumptions, a first course of attack is usually to try to transform the data nonlinearly. This is done as an attempt to more closely satisfy the ANOVA assumptions, a generally easier alternative than finding another model for the untransformed data. A number of common transformations can be found in Snedecor and Cochran (1989); also see Exercises 11.1 and 11.2. (Other research on transformations has been concerned with the Box-Cox family of power transformations. See Exercise 11.3.)
The classic paper of Box (1954) shows that the robustness of the ANOVA to the assumption of normality depends on how equal the variances are (equal being better). The problem of estimating means when variances are unequal, known as the Behrens–Fisher problem, has a rich statistical history which can be traced back to Fisher (1935, 1939). A full account of the Behrens–Fisher problem can be found in Stuart, Ord, and Arnold (1999).

For the remainder of this chapter we will do what is done in most of the experimental situations and we will assume that the three classic assumptions hold. If the data are such that transformations and the CLT are needed, we assume that such measures have been taken.

11.2.2 The Classic ANOVA Hypothesis

The classic ANOVA test is a test of the null hypothesis

\[ H_0 : \theta_1 = \theta_2 = \cdots = \theta_k, \]

a hypothesis that, in many cases, is silly, uninteresting, and not true. An experimenter would not usually believe that the different treatments have exactly the same mean. More reasonably, an experiment is done to find out which treatments are better (for example, have a higher mean), and the real interest in the ANOVA is not in testing but in estimation. (There are some specialized situations where there is interest in the ANOVA null in its own right.) Most situations are like the following.

Example 11.2.3 (The ANOVA hypothesis) The ANOVA evolved as a method of analyzing agricultural experiments. For example, in a study of the effect of various fertilizers on the zinc content of spinach plants \( (x_{ij}) \), five treatments are investigated. Each treatment consists of a mixture of fertilizer material (magnesium, potassium, and zinc) and the data look like the layout of Example 11.2.1. The five treatments, in pounds per acre, are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Magnesium</th>
<th>Potassium</th>
<th>Zinc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classic ANOVA null hypothesis is really of no interest since the experimenter is sure that the different fertilizer mixtures have some different effects. The interest is in quantifying these effects.

We will spend some time with the ANOVA null but mostly use it as a means to an end. Recall the connection between testing and interval estimation established in Chapter 9. By using this connection, we can derive confidence regions by deriving, then inverting, appropriate tests (an easier route here).
The alternative to the ANOVA null is simply that the means are not all equal; that is, we test

\[(11.2.3) \quad H_0: \quad \theta_1 = \theta_2 = \cdots = \theta_k \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1: \quad \theta_i \neq \theta_j, \text{ for some } i, j.\]

Equivalently, we can specify \(H_1\) as \(H_1: \text{not } H_0\). Realize that if \(H_0\) is rejected, we can conclude only that there is some difference in the \(\theta_i\)'s, but we can make no inference as to where this difference might be. (Note that if \(H_1\) is accepted, we are not saying that all of the \(\theta_i\)'s are different, merely that at least two are.)

One problem with the ANOVA hypotheses, a problem shared by many multivariate hypotheses, is that the interpretation of the hypotheses is not easy. What would be more useful, rather than concluding just that some \(\theta_i\)'s are different, is a statistical description of the \(\theta_i\)'s. Such a description can be obtained by breaking down the ANOVA hypotheses into smaller, more easily describable pieces.

We have already encountered methods for breaking down complicated hypotheses into smaller, more easily understood pieces—the union–intersection and intersection–union methods of Chapter 8. For the ANOVA, the union–intersection method is best suited, as the ANOVA null is the intersection of more easily understood univariate hypotheses, hypotheses expressed in terms of contrasts. Furthermore, in the cases we will consider, the resulting tests based on the union–intersection method are identical to LRT's (see Exercise 11.13). Hence, they enjoy all the properties of likelihood tests.

**Definition 11.2.4** Let \(t = (t_1, \ldots, t_k)\) be a set of variables, either parameters or statistics, and let \(a = (a_1, \ldots, a_k)\) be known constants. The function

\[(11.2.4) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i t_i\]

is called a linear combination of the \(t_i\)'s. If, furthermore, \(\sum a_i = 0\), it is called a contrast.

Contrasts are important because they can be used to compare treatment means. For example, if we have means \(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k\) and constants \(a = (1, -1, 0, \ldots, 0)\), then

\[\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i = \theta_1 - \theta_2\]

is a contrast that compares \(\theta_1\) to \(\theta_2\). (See Exercise 11.10 for more about contrasts.)

The power of the union–intersection approach is increased understanding. The individual null hypotheses, of which the ANOVA null hypothesis is the intersection, are quite easy to visualize.

**Theorem 11.2.5** Let \(\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k)\) be arbitrary parameters. Then

\[\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \cdots = \theta_k \iff \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i = 0 \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathcal{A},\]

where \(\mathcal{A}\) is the set of constants satisfying \(\mathcal{A} = \{a = (a_1, \ldots, a_k): \sum a_i = 0\}\); that is, all contrasts must satisfy \(\sum a_i \theta_i = 0\).
Section 11.2
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Proof: If \( \theta_1 = \cdots = \theta_k = \theta \), then

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta = \theta \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i = 0, \quad \text{(because } a \text{ satisfies } \sum a_i = 0)\]

proving one implication \( \Rightarrow \). To prove the other implication, consider the set of \( a_i \in \mathcal{A} \) given by

\[
a_1 = (1, -1, 0, \ldots, 0), \quad a_2 = (0, 1, -1, 0, \ldots, 0), \quad \ldots, \quad a_{k-1} = (0, \ldots, 0, 1, -1).
\]

(The set \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{k-1}) \) spans the elements of \( \mathcal{A} \). That is, any \( a \in \mathcal{A} \) can be written as a linear combination of \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{k-1}) \).) Forming contrasts with these \( a_i \)'s, we get that

\[
a_1 \Rightarrow \theta_1 = \theta_2, \quad a_2 \Rightarrow \theta_2 = \theta_3, \quad \ldots, \quad a_{k-1} \Rightarrow \theta_{k-1} = \theta_k,
\]

which, taken together, imply that \( \theta_1 = \cdots = \theta_k \), proving the theorem. \( \square \)

It immediately follows from Theorem 11.2.5 that the ANOVA null can be expressed as a hypothesis about contrasts. That is, the null hypothesis is true if and only if the hypothesis

\[
H_0: \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i = 0 \quad \text{for all } (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \text{ such that } \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i = 0
\]

is true. Moreover, if \( H_0 \) is false, we now know that there must be at least one nonzero contrast. That is, the ANOVA alternative, \( H_1: \) not all \( \theta_i \)'s equal, is equivalent to the alternative

\[
H_1: \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i \neq 0 \quad \text{for some } (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \text{ such that } \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i = 0.
\]

Thus, we have gained in that the use of contrasts leaves us with hypotheses that are a little easier to understand and perhaps are a little easier to interpret. The real gain, however, is that the use of contrasts now allows us to think and operate in a univariate manner.

11.2.3 Inferences Regarding Linear Combinations of Means

Linear combinations, in particular contrasts, play an extremely important role in the analysis of variance. Through understanding and analyzing the contrasts, we can make meaningful inferences about the \( \theta_i \)'s. In the previous section we showed that the ANOVA null is really a statement about contrasts. In fact, most interesting inferences in an ANOVA can be expressed as contrasts or sets of contrasts. We start simply with inference about a single linear combination.

Working under the oneway ANOVA assumptions, we have that

\[
Y_{ij} \sim N(\theta_i, \sigma^2), \quad i = 1, \ldots, k, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n_i.
\]
Therefore, 

\[ \bar{Y}_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{ij} \sim n(\theta_i, \sigma^2/n_i), \quad i = 1, \ldots, k. \]

*A note on notation:* It is a common convention that if a subscript is replaced by a dot (dot), it means that subscript has been summed over. Thus, \( \bar{Y}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{ij} \) and \( Y_{.j} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} Y_{ij} \). The addition of a “bar” indicates that a mean is taken, as in \( \bar{Y}_i \) above. If both subscripts are summed over and the overall mean (called the *grand mean*) is calculated, we will break this rule to keep notation a little simpler and write \( \bar{Y} = (1/N) \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{ij} \), where \( N = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \).

For any constants \( \alpha = (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i \) is also normal (see Exercise 11.8) with

\[
E \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i \right) = \sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{a_i^2}{n_i},
\]

and furthermore

\[
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2/n_i}} \sim n(0, 1).
\]

Although this is nice, we are usually in the situation of wanting to make inferences about the \( \theta_i \)'s without knowledge of \( \sigma \). Therefore, we want to replace \( \sigma \) with an estimate. In each population, if we denote the sample variance by \( S_i^2 \), that is,

\[
S_i^2 = \frac{1}{n_i - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_i)^2, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k,
\]

then \( S_i^2 \) is an estimate of \( \sigma^2 \) and \( (n_i - 1)S_i^2 / \sigma^2 \sim \chi^2_{n_i - 1} \). Furthermore, under the ANOVA assumptions, since each \( S_i^2 \) estimates the same \( \sigma^2 \), we can improve the estimators by combining them. We thus use the pooled estimator of \( \sigma^2 \), \( S_p^2 \), given by

\[
(11.2.5) \quad S_p^2 = \frac{1}{N - k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1)S_i^2 = \frac{1}{N - k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_i)^2.
\]

Note that \( N - k = \sum (n_i - 1) \). Since the \( S_i^2 \)'s are independent, Lemma 5.3.2 shows that \( (N - k)S_p^2 / \sigma^2 \sim \chi^2_{N - k} \). Also, \( S_p^2 \) is independent of each \( \bar{Y}_i \). (see Exercise 11.6) and thus

\[
(11.2.6) \quad \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i}{\sqrt{S_p^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2/n_i}} \sim t_{N - k},
\]

Student's t with \( N - k \) degrees of freedom.
To test
\[
H_0: \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1: \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i \neq 0
\]
at level \( \alpha \), we would reject \( H_0 \) if
\[
\left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i}{\sqrt{S_p^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{a_i^2}{n_i}}} \right| > t_{N-k,\alpha/2}.
\]

(Exercise 11.9 shows some other tests involving linear combinations.) Furthermore, (11.2.6) defines a pivot that can be inverted to give an interval estimator of \( \sum a_i \theta_i \).

With probability \( 1 - \alpha \),
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i - t_{N-k,\alpha/2} \sqrt{S_p^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{a_i^2}{n_i}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i + t_{N-k,\alpha/2} \sqrt{S_p^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{a_i^2}{n_i}}
\]

(11.2.8)

**Example 11.2.6 (ANOVA contrasts)** Special values of \( a \) will give particular tests or confidence intervals. For example, to compare treatments 1 and 2, take \( a = (1, -1, 0, \ldots, 0) \). Then, using (11.2.6), to test \( H_0 : \theta_1 = \theta_2 \) versus \( H_1 : \theta_1 \neq \theta_2 \), we would reject \( H_0 \) if
\[
\left| \frac{\bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_2}{\sqrt{S_p^2 \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}} \right| > t_{N-k,\alpha/2}.
\]

Note, the difference between this test and the two-sample \( t \) test (see Exercise 8.41) is that here information from treatments 3, \ldots, \( k \), as well as treatments 1 and 2, is used to estimate \( \sigma^2 \).

Alternatively, to compare treatment 1 to the average of treatments 2 and 3 (for example, treatment 1 might be a control, 2 and 3 might be experimental treatments, and we are looking for some overall effect), we would take \( a = (1, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, \ldots, 0) \) and reject \( H_0 : \theta_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\theta_2 + \theta_3) \) if
\[
\left| \frac{\bar{Y}_1 - \frac{1}{2}\bar{Y}_2 - \frac{1}{2}\bar{Y}_3}{\sqrt{S_p^2 \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} + \frac{1}{4n_3} \right)}} \right| > t_{N-k,\alpha/2}.
\]

Using either (11.2.6) or (11.2.8), we have a way of testing or estimating any linear combination in the ANOVA. By judiciously choosing our linear combination we can
learn much about the treatment means. For example, if we look at the contrasts \( \theta_1 - \theta_2, \theta_2 - \theta_3, \) and \( \theta_1 - \theta_3, \) we can learn something about the ordering of the \( \theta_i \)s. (Of course, we have to be careful of the overall \( \alpha \) level when doing a number of tests or intervals, but we can use the Bonferroni Inequality. See Example 11.2.9.)

We also must use some care in drawing formal conclusions from combinations of contrasts. Consider the hypotheses

\[
H_0: \quad \theta_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\theta_2 + \theta_3) \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1: \quad \theta_1 < \frac{1}{2}(\theta_2 + \theta_3)
\]

and

\[
H_0: \quad \theta_2 = \theta_3 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1: \quad \theta_2 < \theta_3.
\]

If we reject both null hypotheses, we can conclude that \( \theta_3 \) is greater than both \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \), although we can draw no formal conclusion about the ordering of \( \theta_2 \) and \( \theta_1 \) from these two tests. (See Exercise 11.10.)

Now we will use these univariate results about linear combinations and the relationship between the ANOVA null hypothesis and contrasts given in Theorem 11.2.5 to derive a test of the ANOVA null hypothesis.

### 11.2.4 The ANOVA F Test

In the previous section we saw how to deal with single linear combinations and, in particular, contrasts in the ANOVA. Also, in Section 11.2, we saw that the ANOVA null hypothesis is equivalent to a hypothesis about contrasts. In this section we will use this equivalence, together with the union–intersection methodology of Chapter 8, to derive a test of the ANOVA hypothesis.

From Theorem 11.2.5, the ANOVA hypothesis test can be written

\[
H_0: \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i = 0 \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathcal{A} \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1: \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i \neq 0 \quad \text{for some } a \in \mathcal{A},
\]

where \( \mathcal{A} = \{a = (a_1, \ldots, a_k): \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i = 0\} \). To see this more clearly as a union–intersection test, define, for each \( a \), the set

\[
\Theta_a = \{\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k): \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \theta_i = 0\}.
\]

Then we have

\[
\theta \in \{\theta: \theta_1 = \theta_2 = \cdots = \theta_k\} \Leftrightarrow \theta \in \Theta_a \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathcal{A} \Leftrightarrow \theta \in \bigcap_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \Theta_a,
\]

showing that the ANOVA null can be written as an intersection.

Now, recalling the union–intersection methodology from Section 8.2.3, we would reject \( H_0: \theta \in \cap_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \Theta_a \) (and, hence, the ANOVA null) if we can reject

\[
H_{0a}: \quad \theta \in \Theta_a \quad \text{versus} \quad H_{1a}: \quad \theta \notin \Theta_a.
\]
for any \( a \). We test \( H_a \) with the \( t \) statistic of (11.2.6),

\[
T_a = \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i}{\sqrt{S_P \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2 / n_i}} \right|
\]

We then reject \( H_a \) if \( T_a > k \) for some constant \( k \). From the union–intersection methodology, it follows that if we could reject for any \( a \), we could reject for the \( a \) that maximizes \( T_a \). Thus, the union–intersection test of the ANOVA null is to reject \( H_0 \) if \( \sup_a T_a > k \), where \( k \) is chosen so that \( P_{H_0}(\sup_a T_a > k) = \alpha \).

Calculation of \( \sup_a T_a \) is not straightforward, although with a little care it is not difficult. The calculation is that of a constrained maximum, similar to problems previously encountered (see, for example, Exercise 7.41, where a constrained minimum is calculated). We will attack the problem in a manner similar to what we have done previously and use the Cauchy–Schwarz Inequality. (Alternatively, a method such as Lagrange multipliers could be used, but then we would have to use second-order conditions to verify that a maximum has been found.)

Most of the technical maximization arguments will be given in the following lemma and the lemma will then be applied to obtain the supremum of \( T_a \). The lemma is just a statement about constrained maxima of quadratic functions. The proof of the lemma may be skipped by the faint-hearted.

**Lemma 11.2.7** Let \( (v_1, \ldots, v_k) \) be constants and let \( (c_1, \ldots, c_k) \) be positive constants. Then, for \( A = \{a = (a_1, \ldots, a_k) : \sum a_i = 0\} \),

\[
\max_{a \in A} \left\{ \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i v_i \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2 / c_i} \right\} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i (v_i - \bar{v}_c)^2,
\]

where \( \bar{v}_c = \sum c_i v_i / \sum c_i \). The maximum is attained at any \( a \) of the form \( a_i = K c_i (v_i - \bar{v}_c) \), where \( K \) is a nonzero constant.

**Proof:** Define \( B = \{b = (b_1, \ldots, b_k) : \sum b_i = 0 \text{ and } \sum b_i^2 / c_i = 1\} \). For any \( a \in A \), define \( b = (b_1, \ldots, b_k) \) by

\[
b_i = \frac{a_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2 / c_i}}
\]

and note that \( b \in B \). For any \( a \in A \),

\[
\frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i v_i \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2 / c_i} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i v_i \right)^2.
\]

We will find an upper bound on \( (\sum b_i v_i)^2 \) for \( b \in B \), and then we will show that the maximizing \( a \) given in the lemma achieves the upper bound.

Since we are dealing with the sum of products, the Cauchy–Schwarz Inequality (see Section 4.7) is a natural thing to try, but we have to be careful to build in the
constraints involving the $c_i$s. We can do this in the following way. Define $C = \sum c_i$ and write
\[
\frac{1}{C^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^k b_i v_i \right)^2 = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \frac{b_i}{c_i} \right) (v_i) \left( \frac{c_i}{C} \right) \right\}^2.
\]
This is the square of a covariance for a probability measure defined by the ratio $c_i/C$. Formally, if we define random variables $B$ and $V$ by
\[
P\left( B = \frac{b_i}{c_i}, V = v_i \right) = \frac{c_i}{C}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k,
\]
then $EB = \sum (b_i/c_i)(c_i/C) = \sum b_i/C = 0$. Thus,
\[
\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \frac{b_i}{c_i} \right) (v_i) \left( \frac{c_i}{C} \right) \right\}^2 = (EBV)^2
\]
\[
= (\text{Cov}(B, V))^2 
\]
\[
\leq (\text{Var} B)(\text{Var} V) \quad \text{(Cauchy–Schwarz Inequality)}
\]
\[
= \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \frac{b_i}{c_i} \right)^2 \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^k (v_i - \bar{v}_c)^2 \right) \left( \frac{c_i}{C} \right). 
\]
Using the fact that $\sum b_i^2/c_i = 1$ and canceling common terms, we obtain
\[
(11.2.11) \quad \left( \sum_{i=1}^k b_i v_i \right)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^k c_i (v_i - \bar{v}_c)^2 \quad \text{for any } b \in B.
\]
Finally, we see that if $a_i = KC_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c)$ for any nonzero constant $K$, then $a \in A$ and
\[
b_i = \frac{Kc_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k (Kc_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c))^2/c_i}} = \frac{c_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k c_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c)^2}}.
\]
Since $\sum c_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c) = 0$,
\[
\sum_{i=1}^k b_i v_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k c_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c)v_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k c_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c)^2}}
\]
\[
= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k c_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c)^2}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k c_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c)^2}} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k c_i(v_i - \bar{v}_c)^2},
\]
and the inequality in (11.2.11) is an equality. Thus, the upper bound is attained and the function is maximized at such an $a$. \[\square\]
Returning to $T_a$ of (11.2.9), we see that maximizing $T_a$ is equivalent to maximizing $T_a^2$. We have

$$
T_a^2 = \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{\theta}_i \right)^2}{S_p^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2 / n_i} = \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{U}_i \right)^2}{S_p^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2 / n_i} = (\bar{U}_i - \bar{\theta}_i).
$$

Noting that $S_p^2$ has no effect on the maximization, we can apply Lemma 11.2.7 to the above expression to get the following theorem.

**Theorem 11.2.8** For $T_a$ defined in expression (11.2.9),

$$
(11.2.12) \quad \sup_{a} T_a^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \left( (\bar{Y}_i - \bar{\bar{Y}}) - (\bar{\theta}_i - \bar{\theta}) \right)^2}{S_p^2}.
$$

where $\bar{\bar{Y}} = \sum n_i \bar{Y}_i / \sum n_i$ and $\bar{\theta} = \sum n_i \theta_i / \sum n_i$. Furthermore, under the ANOVA assumptions,

$$
(11.2.13) \quad \sup_{a} \sum_{i=1}^{k} T_a^2 \sim (k-1)F_{k-1,N-k},
$$

that is, $\sup_{a} \sum_{i=1}^{k} T_a^2 / (k-1)$ has an $F$ distribution with $k-1$ and $N-k$ degrees of freedom. (Recall that $N = \sum n_i$.)

**Proof:** To prove (11.2.12), use Lemma 11.2.7 and identify $v_i$ with $U_i$ and $c_i$ with $n_i$. The result is immediate.

To prove (11.2.13), we must show that the numerator and denominator of (11.2.12) are independent chi squared random variables, each divided by its degrees of freedom. From the ANOVA assumptions two things follow. The numerator and denominator are independent and $S_p^2 \sim \sigma^2 \chi^2_{N-k}/(N-k)$. A little work must be done to show that

$$
\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \left( (\bar{Y}_i - \bar{\bar{Y}}) - (\bar{\theta}_i - \bar{\theta}) \right)^2 \sim \chi^2_{k-1}.
$$

This can be done, however, and is left as an exercise. (See Exercise 11.7.)

If $H_0: \theta_1 = \theta_2 = \ldots = \theta_k$ is true, $\bar{\theta}_i = \bar{\bar{\theta}}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and the $\bar{\theta}_i - \bar{\bar{\theta}}$ terms drop out of (11.2.12). Thus, for an $\alpha$ level test of the ANOVA hypotheses

$$
H_0: \quad \theta_1 = \theta_2 = \ldots = \theta_k \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1: \quad \theta_i \neq \theta_j \quad \text{for some } i, j,
$$

we reject $H_0$ if

$$
(11.2.14) \quad \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \left( \bar{Y}_i - \bar{\bar{Y}} \right)^2}{S_p^2} > (k-1)F_{k-1,N-k,\alpha}.
$$
This rejection region is usually written as

\[ \text{reject } H_0 \text{ if } F = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \left( \bar{y}_i - \bar{y} \right)^2}{S_p^2} \frac{(k - 1)}{F_{k-1,N-k,\alpha}}. \]

and the test statistic \( F \) is called the ANOVA \( F \) statistic.

### 11.2.5 Simultaneous Estimation of Contrasts

We have already seen how to estimate and test a single contrast in the ANOVA; the \( t \) statistic and interval are given in (11.2.6) and (11.2.8). However, in the ANOVA we are often in the position of wanting to make more than one inference and we know that the simultaneous inference from many \( \alpha \) level tests is not necessarily at level \( \alpha \). In the context of the ANOVA this problem has already been mentioned.

**Example 11.2.9 (Pairwise differences)** Many times there is interest in pairwise differences of means. Thus, if an ANOVA has means \( \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k \), there may be interest in interval estimates of \( \theta_1 - \theta_2, \theta_2 - \theta_3, \theta_3 - \theta_4 \), etc. With the Bonferroni Inequality, we can build a simultaneous inference statement. Define

\[ C_{ij} = \left\{ \theta_i - \theta_j : \theta_i - \theta_j \in \bar{y}_i - \bar{y}_j \pm t_{N-k,\alpha/\sqrt{n_i n_j}} S_p\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_i} + \frac{1}{n_j}} \right\}. \]

Then \( P(C_{ij}) = 1 - \alpha \) for each \( C_{ij} \), but, for example, \( P(C_{12} \cap C_{23}) < 1 - \alpha \). However, this last inference is the kind that we want to make in the ANOVA.

Recall the Bonferroni inequality, given in expression (1.2.10), which states that for any sets \( A_1, \ldots, A_n \),

\[ P\left( \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} A_i \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} P(A_i) - (n - 1). \]

In this case we want to bound \( P(\bigcap_{i,j} C_{ij}) \), the probability that all of the pairwise intervals cover their respective differences.

If we want to make a simultaneous \( 1 - \alpha \) statement about the coverage of \( m \) confidence sets, then, from the Bonferroni inequality, we can construct each confidence set to be of level \( \gamma \), where \( \gamma \) satisfies

\[ 1 - \alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma - (m - 1), \]

or, equivalently,

\[ \gamma = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{m}. \]

A slight generalization is also possible in that it is not necessary to require each individual inference at the same level. We can construct each confidence set to be of
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level \gamma_i, where \gamma_i satisfies

\[ 1 - \alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_i - (m - 1). \]

In an ANOVA with \( k \) treatments, simultaneous inference on all \( k(k - 1)/2 \) pairwise differences can be made with confidence \( 1 - \alpha \) if each \( t \) interval has confidence \( 1 - 2\alpha/[k(k - 1)]. \)

An alternative and quite elegant approach to simultaneous inference is given by Scheffé (1959). Scheffé’s procedure, sometimes called the S method, allows for simultaneous confidence intervals (or tests) on all contrasts. (Exercise 11.14 shows that Scheffé’s method can also be used to set up simultaneous intervals for any linear combination, not just for contrasts.) The procedure allows us to set a confidence coefficient that will be valid for all contrast intervals simultaneously, not just a specified group. The Scheffé procedure would be preferred if a large number of contrasts are to be examined. If the number of contrasts is small, the Bonferroni bound will almost certainly be smaller. (See the Miscellaneous section for a discussion of other types of multiple comparison procedures.)

The proof that the Scheffé procedure has simultaneous \( 1 - \alpha \) coverage on all contrasts follows easily from the union–intersection nature of the ANOVA test.

**Theorem 11.2.10** Under the ANOVA assumptions, if \( \sqrt{M} = \sqrt{(k - 1)F_{k-1,N-k,\alpha}} \), then the probability is \( 1 - \alpha \) that

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i - M \sqrt{\frac{k}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{a_i^2}{n_i}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \beta_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i + M \sqrt{\frac{k}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{a_i^2}{n_i}} \]

simultaneously for all \( \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A} = \{ \mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_k) : \sum a_i = 0 \} \).

**Proof:** The simultaneous probability statement requires \( M \) to satisfy

\[ P \left( \left| \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \bar{Y}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \beta_i \right| \leq M \sqrt{\frac{k}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{a_i^2}{n_i}} \text{ for all } \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A} \right) = 1 - \alpha \]

or, equivalently,

\[ P(T_a^2 \leq M^2 \text{ for all } \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}) = 1 - \alpha, \]

where \( T_a \) is defined in (11.2.9). However, since

\[ P(T_a^2 \leq M^2 \text{ for all } \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}) = P \left( \sup_{\sum a_i = 0} T_a^2 \leq M^2 \right), \]

Theorem 11.2.8 shows that choosing \( M^2 = (k-1)F_{k-1,N-k,\alpha} \) satisfies the probability requirement.
One of the real strengths of the Scheffé procedure is that it allows legitimate "data snooping." That is, in classic statistics it is taboo to test hypotheses that have been suggested by the data, since this can bias the results and, hence, invalidate the inference. (We normally would not test \( H_0 : \theta_1 = \theta_2 \) just because we noticed that \( Y_1 \) was different from \( Y_2 \). See Exercise 11.18.) However, with Scheffé's procedure such a strategy is legitimate. The intervals or tests are valid for all contrasts. Whether they have been suggested by the data makes no difference. They already have been taken care of by the Scheffé procedure.

Of course, we must pay for all of the inferential power offered by the Scheffé procedure. The payment is in the form of the lengths of the intervals. In order to guarantee the simultaneous confidence level, the intervals may be quite long. For example, it can be shown (see Exercise 11.15) that if we compare the \( t \) and \( F \) distributions, for any \( \nu, \alpha, \) and \( k \), the cutoff points satisfy

\[
 t_{\nu, \alpha/2} \leq \sqrt{(k - 1)F_{k-1, \nu, \alpha}},
\]

and so the Scheffé intervals are always wider, sometimes much wider, than the single-contrast intervals (another argument in favor of the doctrine that nothing substitutes for careful planning and preparation in experimentation). The interval length phenomenon carries over to testing. It also follows from the above inequality that Scheffé tests are less powerful than \( t \) tests.

### 11.2.6 Partitioning Sums of Squares

The ANOVA provides a useful way of thinking about the way in which different treatments affect a measured variable—the idea of allocating variation to different sources. The basic idea of allocating variation can be summarized in the following identity.

**Theorem 11.2.11** For any numbers \( y_{ij} \), \( i = 1, \ldots, k \), and \( j = 1, \ldots, n_i \),

\[
(11.2.15) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \bar{y})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i (\bar{y}_i - \bar{y})^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \bar{y}_i)^2,
\]

where \( \bar{y}_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} y_{ij} \) and \( \bar{y} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \bar{y}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i} \).

**Proof:** The proof is quite simple and relies only on the fact that, when we are dealing with means, the cross-term often disappears. Write

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \bar{y})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_{ij} - \bar{y}_i + \bar{y}_i - \bar{y})^2,
\]

expand the right-hand side, and regroup terms. (See Exercise 11.21.) \( \square \)

The sums in (11.2.15) are called *sums of squares* and are thought of as measuring variation in the data ascribable to different sources. (They are sometimes called *corrected sums of squares*, where the word *corrected* refers to the fact that a mean has
been subtracted.) In particular, the terms in the oneway ANOVA model,

$$Y_{ij} = \theta_i + \epsilon_{ij},$$

are in one-to-one correspondence with the terms in (11.2.15). Equation (11.2.15) shows how to allocate variation to the treatments (variation between treatments) and to random error (variation within treatments). The left-hand side of (11.2.15) measures variation without regard to categorization by treatments, while the two terms on the right-hand side measure variation due only to treatments and variation due only to random error, respectively. The fact that these sources of variation satisfy the above identity shows that the variation in the data, measured by sums of squares, is additive in the same way as the ANOVA model.

One reason it is easier to deal with sums of squares is that, under normality, corrected sums of squares are chi squared random variables and we have already seen that independent chi squareds can be added to get new chi squareds.

Under the ANOVA assumptions, in particular if $Y_{ij} \sim n(\theta_i, \sigma^2)$, it is easy to show that

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_i)^2 \sim \chi^2_{n_i - 1},$$

because for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_i)^2 \sim \chi^2_{n_i - 1}$, all independent, and, for independent chi squared random variables, $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi^2_{n_i - 1} \sim \chi^2_{N - k}$. Furthermore, if $\theta_i = \theta_j$ for every $i, j$, then

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}^2)^2 \sim \chi^2_{n_i - 1} \text{ and } \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y})^2 \sim \chi^2_{N - 1}.$$

Thus, under $H_0$: $\theta_1 = \cdots = \theta_k$, the sum of squares partitioning of (11.2.15) is a partitioning of chi squared random variables. When scaled, the left-hand side is distributed as a $\chi^2_{N - 1}$, and the right-hand side is the sum of two independent random variables distributed, respectively, as $\chi^2_{k - 1}$ and $\chi^2_{N - k}$. Note that the $\chi^2$ partitioning is true only if the terms on the right-hand side of (11.2.15) are independent, which follows in this case from the normality in the ANOVA assumptions. The partitioning of $\chi^2$s does hold in a slightly more general context, and a characterization of this is sometimes referred to as Cochran's Theorem. (See Searle 1971 and also the Miscellanea section.)

In general, it is possible to partition a sum of squares into sums of squares of uncorrelated contrasts, each with 1 degree of freedom. If the sum of squares has $\nu$ degrees of freedom and is $\chi^2_\nu$, it is possible to partition it into $\nu$ independent terms, each of which is $\chi^2_1$.

The quantity $(\sum a_i Y_i)^2/(\sum a_i^2/n_i)$ is called the contrast sum of squares for a treatment contrast $\sum a_i Y_i$. In an oneway ANOVA it is always possible to find sets of constants $a^{(l)} = (a_1^{(l)}, \ldots, a_k^{(l)})$, $l = 1, \ldots, k - 1$, to satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n_i} a_i^{(1)^2} / n_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n_i} a_i^{(2)^2} / n_i + \cdots + \sum_{i=1}^{n_i} a_i^{(k-1)^2} / n_i.$$
Table 11.2.1. ANOVA table for one-way classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between treatment groups</td>
<td>k - 1</td>
<td>SSB = \sum n_i (\bar{y}_i - \bar{y})^2</td>
<td>MSB = SSB / (k - 1)</td>
<td>F = \frac{MSB}{MSW}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within treatment groups</td>
<td>N - k</td>
<td>SSW = \sum \sum (y_{ij} - \bar{y}_i)^2</td>
<td>MSW = SSW / (N - k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N - 1</td>
<td>SST = \sum \sum (y_{ij} - \bar{y})^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

(11.2.18) \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{a_l^2}{n_i} = 0 \text{ for all } l \neq l'.

Thus, the individual contrast sums of squares are all uncorrelated and hence independent under normality (Lemma 5.3.3). When suitably normalized, the left-hand side of (11.2.18) is distributed as a \chi^2_{k-1}, and the right-hand side is k - 1 \chi^2_s. (Such contrasts are called orthogonal contrasts. See Exercises 11.10 and 11.11.)

It is common to summarize the results of an ANOVA F test in a standard form, called an ANOVA table, shown in Table 11.2.1. The table also gives a number of useful, intermediate statistics. The headings should be self-explanatory.

**Example 11.2.12 (Continuation of Example 11.2.1)** The ANOVA table for the fish toxin data is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>995.90</td>
<td>331.97</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>196.83</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1186.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F statistic of 26.09 is highly significant, showing that there is strong evidence the toxins produce different effects.

It follows from equation (11.2.15) that the sum of squares column "adds"—that is, SSB + SSW = SST. Similarly, the degrees of freedom column adds. The mean square column, however, does not, as these are means rather than sums.
The ANOVA table contains no new statistics; it merely gives an orderly form for calculation and presentation. The $F$ statistic is exactly the same as derived before and, moreover, MSW is the usual pooled, unbiased estimator of $\sigma^2$, $S^2_p$ of (11.2.5) (see Exercise 11.22).

### 11.3 Simple Linear Regression

In the analysis of variance we looked at how one factor (variable) influenced the means of a response variable. We now turn to simple linear regression, where we try to better understand the functional dependence of one variable on another. In particular, in simple linear regression we have a relationship of the form

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta x_i + \epsilon_i,$$

where $Y_i$ is a random variable and $x_i$ is another observable variable. The quantities $\alpha$ and $\beta$, the intercept and slope of the regression, are assumed to be fixed and unknown parameters and $\epsilon_i$ is, necessarily, a random variable. It is also common to suppose that $E\epsilon_i = 0$ (otherwise we could just rescale the excess into $\alpha$), so that, from (11.3.1), we have

$$EY_i = \alpha + \beta x_i.$$

In general, the function that gives $EY$ as a function of $x$ is called the population regression function. Equation (11.3.2) defines the population regression function for simple linear regression.

One main purpose of regression is to predict $Y_i$ from knowledge of $x_i$ using a relationship like (11.3.2). In common usage this is often interpreted as saying that $Y_i$ depends on $x_i$. It is common to refer to $Y_i$ as the dependent variable and to refer to $x_i$ as the independent variable. This terminology is confusing, however, since this use of the word independent is different from our previous usage. (The $x_i$s are not necessarily random variables, so they cannot be statistically "independent" according to our usual meaning.) We will not use this confusing terminology but will use alternative, more descriptive terminology, referring to $Y_i$ as the response variable and to $x_i$ as the predictor variable.

Actually, to keep straight the fact that our inferences about the relationship between $Y_i$ and $x_i$ assume knowledge of $x_i$, we could write (11.3.2) as

$$E(Y_i | x_i) = \alpha + \beta x_i.$$

We will tend to use (11.3.3) to reinforce the conditional aspect of any inferences.

Recall that in Chapter 4 we encountered the word regression in connection with conditional expectations (see Exercise 4.13). There, the regression of $Y$ on $X$ was defined as $E(Y | X)$, the conditional expectation of $Y$ given $X = x$. More generally, the word regression is used in statistics to signify a relationship between variables. When we refer to regression that is linear, we can mean that the conditional expectation of $Y$ given $X = x$ is a linear function of $x$. Note that, in equation (11.3.3), it does not matter whether $x_i$ is fixed and known or it is a realization of the observable random
variable $X_i$. In either case, equation (11.3.3) has the same interpretation. This will not be the case in Section 11.3.4, however, when we will be concerned with inference using the joint distribution of $X_i$ and $Y_i$.

The term linear regression refers to a specification that is linear in the parameters. Thus, the specifications $E(Y_i|x_i) = \alpha + \beta x_i^2$ and $E(\log Y_i|x_i) = \alpha + \beta (1/x_i)$ both specify linear regressions. The first specifies a linear relationship between $Y_i$ and $z_i^2$, and the second between $\log Y_i$ and $1/x_i$. In contrast, the specification $E(Y_i|x_i) = \alpha + \beta x_i$ does not specify a linear regression.

The term regression has an interesting history, dating back to the work of Sir Francis Galton in the 1800s. (See Freedman et al. 1991 for more details or Stigler 1986 for an in-depth historical treatment.) Galton investigated the relationship between heights of fathers and heights of sons. He found, not surprisingly, that tall fathers tend to have tall sons and short fathers tend to have short sons. However, he also found that very tall fathers tend to have shorter sons and very short fathers tend to have taller sons. (Think about it—it makes sense.) Galton called this phenomenon regression toward the mean (employing the usual meaning of regression, “to go back”), and from this usage we get the present use of the word regression.

**Example 11.3.1 (Predicting grape crops)** A more modern use of regression is to predict crop yields of grapes. In July, the grape vines produce clusters of berries, and a count of these clusters can be used to predict the final crop yield at harvest time. Typical data are like the following, which give the cluster counts and yields (tons/acre) for a number of years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yield (Y)</th>
<th>Cluster count (x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>116.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>82.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>110.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>115.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>80.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>125.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>116.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>117.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>93.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>107.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>122.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data from 1972 are missing because the crop was destroyed by a hurricane. A plot of these data would show that there is a strong linear relationship.

When we write an equation like (11.3.3) we are implicitly making the assumption that the regression of $Y$ on $X$ is linear. That is, the conditional expectation of $Y$, given that $X = x$, is a linear function of $x$. This assumption may not be justified, because there may be no underlying theory to support a linear relationship. However, since a linear relationship is so convenient to work with, we might want to assume...
that the regression of $Y$ on $X$ can be adequately approximated by a linear function. Thus, we really do not expect (11.3.3) to hold, but instead we hope that

\begin{equation}
E(Y_i|x_i) = \alpha + \beta x_i
\end{equation}

is a reasonable approximation. If we start from the (rather strong) assumption that the pair $(X_i, Y_i)$ has a bivariate normal distribution, it immediately follows that the regression of $Y$ on $X$ is linear. In this case, the conditional expectation $E(Y|x)$ is linear in the parameters (see Definition 4.5.10 and the subsequent discussion).

There is one final distinction to be made. When we do a regression analysis, that is, when we investigate the relationship between a predictor and a response variable, there are two steps to the analysis. The first step is a totally data-oriented one, in which we attempt only to summarize the observed data. (This step is always done, since we almost always calculate sample means and variances or some other summary statistic. However, this part of the analysis now tends to get more complicated.) It is important to keep in mind that this “data fitting” step is not a matter of statistical inference. Since we are interested only in the data at hand, we do not have to make any assumptions about parameters.

The second step in the regression analysis is the statistical one, in which we attempt to infer conclusions about the relationship in the population, that is, about the population regression function. To do this, we need to make assumptions about the population. In particular, if we want to make inferences about the slope and intercept of a population linear relationship, we need to assume that there are parameters that correspond to these quantities.

In a simple linear regression problem, we observe data consisting of $n$ pairs of observations, $(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$. In this section, we will consider a number of different models for these data. The different models will entail different assumptions about whether $x$ or $y$ or both are observed values of random variables $X$ or $Y$.

In each model we will be interested in investigating a linear relationship between $x$ and $y$. The $n$ data points will not fall exactly on a straight line, but we will be interested in summarizing the sample information by fitting a line to the observed data points. We will find that many different approaches lead us to the same line.

Based on the data $(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$, define the following quantities. The sample means are

\begin{equation}
\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i.
\end{equation}

The sums of squares are

\begin{equation}
S_{xx} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \quad \text{and} \quad S_{yy} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \bar{y})^2,
\end{equation}

and the sum of cross-products is

\begin{equation}
S_{xy} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y}).
\end{equation}
Then the most common estimates of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in (11.3.4), which we will subsequently justify under various models, are denoted by $a$ and $b$, respectively, and are given by

$$
(11.3.8) \quad b = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} \quad \text{and} \quad a = \bar{y} - b \bar{x}.
$$

11.3.1 Least Squares: A Mathematical Solution.

Our first derivation of estimates for $\alpha$ and $\beta$ makes no statistical assumptions about the observations $(x_i, y_i)$. Simply consider $(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ as $n$ pairs of numbers plotted in a scatterplot as in Figure 11.3.1. (The 24 data points pictured in Figure 11.3.1 are listed in Table 11.3.1.) Think of drawing through this cloud of points a straight line that comes “as close as possible” to all the points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$y$</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$y$</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$y$</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$y$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{x} = 1.95 \quad \bar{y} = 3.18 \quad S_{xx} = 22.82 \quad S_{xy} = 43.62 \quad S_{yy} = 15.48$
For any line \( y = c + dx \), the residual sum of squares (RSS) is defined to be

\[
\text{RSS} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - (c + dx_i))^2.
\]

The RSS measures the vertical distance from each data point to the line \( c + dx \) and then sums the squares of these distances. (Two such distances are shown in Figure 11.3.1.) The least squares estimates of \( a \) and \( b \) are defined to be those values \( a \) and \( b \) such that the line \( a + bx \) minimizes RSS. That is, the least squares estimates, \( a \) and \( b \), satisfy

\[
\min_{a, b} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - (c + dx_i))^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - (a + bx_i))^2.
\]

This function of two variables, \( c \) and \( d \), can be minimized in the following way. For any fixed value of \( d \), the value of \( c \) that gives the minimum value can be found by writing

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - (c + dx_i))^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} ((y_i - dx_i) - c)^2.
\]

From Theorem 5.2.4, the minimizing value of \( c \) is

\[
(11.3.9) \quad c = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - dx_i) = \bar{y} - \bar{x}.
\]

Thus, for a given value of \( d \), the minimum value of RSS is

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} ((y_i - dx_i) - (\bar{y} - \bar{x}))^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} ((y_i - \bar{y}) - d(x_i - \bar{x}))^2 = S_{yy} - 2dS_{yx} + d^2S_{xx}.
\]

The value of \( d \) that gives the overall minimum value of RSS is obtained by setting the derivative of this quadratic function of \( d \) equal to 0. The minimizing value is

\[
(11.3.10) \quad d = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}}.
\]

This value is, indeed, a minimum since the coefficient of \( d^2 \) is positive. Thus, by (11.3.9) and (11.3.10), \( a \) and \( b \) from (11.3.9) are the values of \( a \) and \( d \) that minimize the residual sum of squares.

The RSS is only one of many reasonable ways of measuring the distance from the line \( c + dx \) to the data points. For example, rather than using vertical distances we could use horizontal distances. This is equivalent to graphing the \( y \) variable on the horizontal axis and the \( x \) variable on the vertical axis and using vertical distances as we did above. Using the above results (interchanging the roles of \( x \) and \( y \)), we find the least squares line is \( \hat{x} = a' + b'y \), where

\[
b' = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{yy}} \quad \text{and} \quad a' = \bar{y} - b'\bar{x}.
\]

Reexpressing the line so that \( \hat{y} \) is a function of \( x \), we obtain \( \hat{y} = -(a'/b') + (1/b')x \).
Usually the line obtained by considering horizontal distances is different from the line obtained by considering vertical distances. From the values in Table 11.3.1, the regression of \( y \) on \( x \) (vertical distances) is \( \hat{y} = 1.85 + .68x \). The regression of \( x \) on \( y \) (horizontal distances) is \( \hat{x} = -2.31 + 2.82y \). In Figure 12.2.2, these two lines are shown (along with a third line discussed in Section 12.2). If these two lines were the same, then the slopes would be the same and \( b/(1/b') \) would equal 1. But, in fact, \( b/(1/b') \leq 1 \) with equality only in special cases. Note that

\[
\frac{b}{1/b'} = bb' = \frac{(S_{xy})^2}{S_{xx}S_{yy}}.
\]

Using the version of Hölder's Inequality in (4.7.9) with \( p = q = 2, a_i = x_i - \bar{x}, \) and \( b_i = y_i - \bar{y}, \) we see that \( (S_{xy})^2 \leq S_{xx}S_{yy} \) and, hence, the ratio is less than 1.

If \( x \) is the predictor variable, \( y \) is the response variable, and we think of predicting \( y \) from \( x \), then the vertical distance measured in RSS is reasonable. It measures the distance from \( y_i \) to the predicted value of \( \hat{y}_i = c + \hat{a}x_i \). But if we do not make this distinction between \( x \) and \( y \), then it is unsettling that another reasonable criterion, horizontal distance, gives a different line.

The least squares method should be considered only as a method of “fitting a line” to a set of data, not as a method of statistical inference. We have no basis for constructing confidence intervals or testing hypotheses because, in this section, we have not used any statistical model for the data. When we think of \( a \) and \( b \) in the context of this section, it might be better to call them least squares solutions rather than least squares estimates because they are the solutions of the mathematical problem of minimizing the RSS rather than estimates derived from a statistical model. But, as we shall see, these least squares solutions have optimality properties in certain statistical models.

### 11.3.2 Best Linear Unbiased Estimators: A Statistical Solution

In this section we show that the estimates \( a \) and \( b \) from (11.3.8) are optimal in the class of linear unbiased estimates under a fairly general statistical model. The model is described as follows. Assume that the values \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) are known, fixed values. (Think of them as values the experimenter has chosen and set in a laboratory experiment.) The values \( y_1, \ldots, y_n \) are observed values of uncorrelated random variables \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \). The linear relationship assumed between the \( x \)s and the \( y \)s is

\[
(11.3.11) \quad EY_i = \alpha + \beta x_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,
\]

where we also assume that

\[
(11.3.12) \quad \text{Var} Y_i = \sigma^2.
\]

There is no subscript in \( \sigma^2 \) because we are assuming that all the \( Y_i \)s have the same (unknown) variance. These assumptions about the first two moments of the \( Y_i \)s are the only assumptions we need to make to proceed with the derivation in this subsection. For example, we do not need to specify a probability distribution for the \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \).
The model in (11.3.11) and (11.3.12) can also be expressed in this way. We assume that

\begin{equation}
Y_i = \alpha + \beta x_i + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,
\end{equation}

where \( \epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n \) are uncorrelated random variables with

\begin{equation}
\text{E} \epsilon_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var} \epsilon_i = \sigma^2.
\end{equation}

The \( \epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n \) are called the random errors. Since \( Y_i \) depends only on \( \epsilon_i \) and the \( \epsilon_i \)'s are uncorrelated, the \( Y_i \)'s are uncorrelated. Also, from (11.3.13) and (11.3.14), the expressions for \( \text{E} Y_i \) and \( \text{Var} Y_i \) in (11.3.11) and (11.3.12) are easily verified.

To derive estimators for the parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), we restrict attention to the class of linear estimators. An estimator is a linear estimator if it is of the form

\begin{equation}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i Y_i,
\end{equation}

where \( d_1, \ldots, d_n \) are known, fixed constants. (Exercise 7.39 concerns linear estimators of a population mean.) Among the class of linear estimators, we further restrict attention to unbiased estimators. This restricts the values of \( d_1, \ldots, d_n \) that can be used.

An unbiased estimator of the slope \( \beta \) must satisfy

\[ \text{E} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i Y_i = \beta, \]

regardless of the true value of the parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). This implies that

\[ \beta = \text{E} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i Y_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \text{E} Y_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i (\alpha + \beta x_i) \]

\[ = \alpha \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \right) + \beta \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i x_i \right). \]

This equality is true for all \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) if and only if

\begin{equation}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i x_i = 1.
\end{equation}

Thus, \( d_1, \ldots, d_n \) must satisfy (11.3.16) in order for the estimator to be an unbiased estimator of \( \beta \).

In Chapter 7 we called an unbiased estimator "best" if it had the smallest variance among all unbiased estimators. Similarly, an estimator is the best linear unbiased estimator (BLUE) if it is the linear unbiased estimator with the smallest variance. We will now show that the choice of \( d_i = (x_i - \bar{x})/S_{xx} \) that defines the estimator \( b = S_{xy}/S_{xx} \) is the best choice in that it results in the linear unbiased estimator of \( \beta \).
with the smallest variance. (The $d_i$s must be known, fixed constants but the $x_i$s are known, fixed constants, so this choice of $d_i$s is legitimate.)

A note on notation: The notation $S_{xy}$ stresses the fact that $S_{xy}$ is a random variable that is a function of the random variables $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$. $S_{xy}$ also depends on the nonrandom quantities $x_1, \ldots, x_n$.

Because $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ are uncorrelated with equal variance $\sigma^2$, the variance of any linear estimator is given by

$$\text{Var} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i Y_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2 \text{Var} Y_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2 \sigma^2 = \sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2.$$  

The BLUE of $\beta$ is, therefore, defined by constants $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ that satisfy (11.3.16) and have the minimum value of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2$. (The presence of $\sigma^2$ has no effect on the minimization over linear estimators since it appears as a multiple of the variance of every linear estimator.)

The minimizing values of the constants $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ can now be found by using Lemma 11.2.7. To apply the lemma to our minimization problem, make the following correspondences, where the left-hand sides are notation from Lemma 11.2.7 and the right-hand sides are our current notation. Let

$$k = n, \quad v_i = x_i, \quad c_i = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad a_i = d_i,$$

which implies $v_c = \bar{x}$. If $d_i$ is of the form

$$d_i = K c_i (v_i - \bar{v}_c) = K(x_i - \bar{x}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

then, by Lemma 11.2.7, $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ maximize

$$\frac{(\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i x_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2}$$

among all $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ that satisfy $\sum d_i = 0$. Furthermore, since

$$\{(d_1, \ldots, d_n) : \sum d_i = 0, \sum d_i x_i = 1\} \subset \{(d_1, \ldots, d_n) : \sum d_i = 0\},$$

if $d_i$s of the form (11.3.17) also satisfy (11.3.16), they certainly maximize (11.3.18) among all $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ that satisfy (11.3.16). (Since the set over which the maximum is taken is smaller, the maximum cannot be larger.) Now, using (11.3.17), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i x_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} K(x_i - \bar{x}) x_i = KS_x x.$$

The second constraint in (11.3.16) is satisfied if $K = \frac{1}{S_{xx}}$. Therefore, with $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ defined by

$$d_i = \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})}{S_{xx}}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$
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Figure 11.3.2. Geometric description of the BLUE

both constraints of (11.3.16) are satisfied and this set of \( d_i \)'s produces the maximum.  
Finally, note that for all \( d_1, \ldots, d_n \) that satisfy (11.3.16),

\[
\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i x_i \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2}.
\]

Thus, for \( d_1, \ldots, d_n \) that satisfy (11.3.16), maximization of (11.3.18) is equivalent to minimization of \( \sum d_i^2 \). Hence, we can conclude that the \( d_i \)s defined in (11.3.19) give the minimum value of \( \sum d_i^2 \) among all \( d_i \)s that satisfy (11.3.16), and the linear unbiased estimator defined by these \( d_i \)s, namely,

\[
b = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})}{S_{xx}} y_i = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}},
\]

is the BLUE of \( \beta \).

A geometric description of this construction of the BLUE of \( \beta \) is given in Figure 11.3.2, where we take \( n = 3 \). The figure shows three-dimensional space with coordinates \( d_1, d_2, \) and \( d_3 \). The two planes represent the vectors \( (d_1, d_2, d_3) \) that satisfy the two linear constraints in (11.3.16), and the line where the two planes intersect consists of the vectors \( (d_1, d_2, d_3) \) that satisfy both equalities. For any point on the line, \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2 \) is the square of the distance from the point to the origin \( \mathbf{0} \). The vector \( (d_1, d_2, d_3) \) that defines the BLUE is the point on the line that is closest to \( \mathbf{0} \). The sphere in the figure is the smallest sphere that intersects the line, and the point of intersection is the point \( (d_1, d_2, d_3) \) that defines the BLUE of \( \beta \). This, we have shown, is the point with \( d_i = (x_i - \bar{x})/S_{xx} \).

The variance of \( b \) is

(11.3.20) \[ \text{Var } b = \frac{\sigma^2}{S_{xx}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})^2}. \]

Since \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) are values chosen by the experimenter, they can be chosen to make \( S_{xx} \) large and the variance of the estimator small. That is, the experimenter can design
the experiment to make the estimator more precise. Suppose that all the $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ must be chosen in an interval $[e, f]$. Then, if $n$ is even, the choice of $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ that makes $S_{xx}$ as large as possible is to take half of the $x_i$s equal to $e$ and half equal to $f$ (see Exercise 11.26). This would be the best design in that it would give the most precise estimate of the slope $\beta$ if the experimenter were certain that the model described by (11.3.11) and (11.3.12) was correct. In practice, however, this design is seldom used because an experimenter is hardly ever certain of the model. This two-point design gives information about the value of $E(Y|x)$ at only two values, $x = e$ and $x = f$. If the population regression function $E(Y|x)$, which gives the mean of $Y$ as a function of $x$, is nonlinear, it could never be detected from data obtained using the “optimal” two-point design.

We have shown that $b$ is the BLUE of $\beta$. A similar analysis will show that $\alpha$ is the BLUE of the intercept $\alpha$. The constants $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ that define a linear estimator of $\alpha$ must satisfy

\[(11.3.21) \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i x_i = 0.\]

The details of this derivation are left as Exercise 11.27. The fact that least squares estimators are BLUES holds in other linear models also. This general result is called the Gauss–Markov Theorem (see Christensen 1996; Lehmann and Casella 1998, Section 3.4, or the more general treatment in Harville 1981).

11.3.9 Models and Distribution Assumptions

In this section, we will introduce two more models for paired data $(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ that are called simple linear regression models.

To obtain the least squares estimates in Section 11.3.1, we used no statistical model. We simply solved a mathematical minimization problem. Thus, we could not derive any statistical properties about the estimators obtained by this method because there were no probability models to work with. There are not really any parameters for which we could construct hypothesis tests or confidence intervals.

In Section 11.3.2 we made some statistical assumptions about the data. Specifically, we made assumptions about the first two moments, the mean, variance, and covariance of the data. These are all statistical assumptions related to probability models for the data, and we derived statistical properties for the estimators. The properties of unbiasedness and minimum variance, which we proved for the estimators $\alpha$ and $b$ of the parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$, are statistical properties.

To obtain these properties we did not have to specify a complete probability model for the data, only assumptions about the first two moments. We were able to obtain a general optimality property under these minimal assumptions, but the optimality was only in a restricted class of estimators—linear unbiased estimators. We were not able to derive exact tests and confidence intervals under this model because the model does not specify enough about the probability distribution of the data. We now present two statistical models that completely specify the probabilistic structure of the data.
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Conditional normal model

The conditional normal model is the most common simple linear regression model and the most straightforward to analyze. The observed data are the n pairs, \((x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\). The values of the predictor variable, \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\), are considered to be known, fixed constants. As in Section 11.3.2, think of them as being chosen and set by the experimenter. The values of the response variable, \(y_1, \ldots, y_n\), are observed values of random variables, \(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\). The random variables \(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\) are assumed to be independent. Furthermore, the distribution of the \(Y_i\)'s is normal, specifically,

\[(11.3.22) \quad Y_i \sim n(\alpha + \beta x_i, \sigma^2), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.\]

Thus the population regression function is a linear function of \(x\), that is, \(E(Y|x) = \alpha + \beta x\), and all the \(Y_i\)'s have the same variance, \(\sigma^2\). The conditional normal model can be expressed similar to (11.3.13) and (11.3.14), namely,

\[(11.3.23) \quad Y_i = \alpha + \beta x_i + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,\]

where \(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n\) are iid \(n(0, \sigma^2)\) random variables.

The conditional normal model is a special case of the model considered in Section 11.3.2. The population regression function, \(E(Y|x) = \alpha + \beta x\), and the variance, \(\text{Var} Y = \sigma^2\), are as in that model. The uncorrelatedness of \(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\) (or, equivalently, \(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n\)) has been strengthened to independence. And, of course, rather than just the first two moments of the distribution of \(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\), the exact form of the probability distribution is now specified.

The joint pdf of \(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\) is the product of the marginal pdfs because of the independence. It is given by

\[f(y|\alpha, \beta, \sigma^2) = f(y_1, \ldots, y_n|\alpha, \beta, \sigma^2)\]

\[= \prod_{i=1}^{n} f(y_i|\alpha, \beta, \sigma^2)\]

\[= \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma}} \exp \left[-\frac{(y_i - (\alpha + \beta x_i))^2}{(2\sigma^2)}\right]\]

\[= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}\sigma^n} \exp \left[-\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \alpha - \beta x_i)^2\right)}{(2\sigma^2)}\right].\]

(11.3.24)

It is this joint probability distribution that will be used to develop the statistical procedures in Sections 11.3.4 and 11.3.5. For example, the expression in (11.3.24) will be used to find MLSEs of \(\alpha, \beta, \text{ and } \sigma^2\).

Bivariate normal model

In all the previous models we have discussed, the values of the predictor variable, \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\), have been fixed, known constants. But sometimes these values are actually observed values of random variables, \(X_1, \ldots, X_n\). In Galton's example in Section 11.3,
$x_1, \ldots, x_n$ were observed heights of fathers. But the experimenter certainly did not choose these heights before collecting the data. Thus it is necessary to consider models in which the predictor variable, as well as the response variable, is random. One such model that is fairly simple is the bivariate normal model. A more complex model is discussed in Section 12.2.

In the bivariate normal model the data $(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ are observed values of the bivariate random vectors $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$. The random vectors are independent and the joint distribution of $(X_i, Y_i)$ is assumed to be bivariate normal. Specifically, it is assumed that

$$(X_i, Y_i) \sim \text{bivariate normal}(\mu_X, \mu_Y, \sigma_X^2, \sigma_Y^2, \rho).$$

The joint pdf and various properties of a bivariate normal distribution are given in Definition 4.5.10 and the subsequent discussion. The joint pdf of all the data $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$ is the product of these bivariate pdfs.

In a simple linear regression analysis, we are still thinking of $x$ as the predictor variable and $y$ as the response variable. That is, we are most interested in predicting the value of $y$ having observed the value of $x$. This naturally leads to basing inference on the conditional distribution of $Y$ given $X = x$. For a bivariate normal model, the conditional distribution of $Y$ given $X = x$ is normal. The population regression function is now a true conditional expectation, as the notation suggests, and is

$$E(Y|x) = \mu_Y + \rho \frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X} (x - \mu_X) = \left[ \mu_Y - \rho \frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X} \mu_X \right] + \left[ \rho \frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X} \right] x.$$

(11.3.25)

The bivariate normal model implies that the population regression is a linear function of $x$. We need not assume this as in the previous models. Here $E(Y|x) = \alpha + \beta x$, where $\beta = \rho \frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X}$ and $\alpha = \mu_Y - \rho \frac{\sigma_Y}{\sigma_X} \mu_X$. Also, as in the conditional normal model, the conditional variance of the response variable $Y$ does not depend on $x$,

$$\text{Var}(Y|x) = \sigma_Y^2 (1 - \rho^2).$$

(11.3.26)

For the bivariate normal model, the linear regression analysis is almost always carried out using the conditional distribution of $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ given $X = x_1, \ldots, X_n = x_n$, rather than the unconditional distribution of $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$. But then we are in the same situation as the conditional normal model described above. The fact that $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are observed values of random variables is immaterial if we condition on these values and, in general, in simple linear regression we do not use the fact of bivariate normality except to define the conditional distribution. (Indeed, for the most part, the marginal distribution of $X$ is of no consequence whatsoever. In linear regression it is the conditional distribution that matters.) Inference based on point estimators, intervals, or tests is the same for the two models. See Brown (1990b) for an alternative view.

11.3.4 Estimation and Testing with Normal Errors

In this and the next subsections we develop inference procedures under the conditional normal model, the regression model defined by (11.3.22) or (11.3.23).
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First, we find the maximum likelihood estimates of the three parameters, \( \alpha, \beta \), and \( \sigma^2 \). Using the joint pdf in (11.3.24), we see that the log likelihood function is

\[
\log L(\alpha, \beta, \sigma^2 | x, y) = -\frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{n}{2} \log \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \alpha - \beta x_i)^2.
\]

For any fixed value of \( \sigma^2 \), \( \log L \) is maximized as a function of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) by those values, \( \hat{\alpha} \) and \( \hat{\beta} \), that minimize

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \alpha - \beta x_i)^2.
\]

But this function is just the RSS from Section 11.3.1! There we found that the minimizing values are

\[
\hat{\beta} = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\alpha} = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta} \bar{x} = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta} \bar{x}.
\]

Thus, the least squares estimators of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are also the MLEs of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). The values \( \hat{\alpha} \) and \( \hat{\beta} \) are the maximizing values for any fixed value of \( \sigma^2 \). Now, substituting in the log likelihood, to find the MLE of \( \sigma^2 \) we need to maximize

\[
-
\frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{n}{2} \log \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} x_i)^2.
\]

This maximization is similar to finding the MLE of \( \sigma^2 \) in ordinary normal sampling (see Example 7.2.11), and we leave the details to Exercise 11.28. The MLE of \( \sigma^2 \), under the conditional normal model, is

\[
\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} x_i)^2,
\]

the RSS, evaluated at the least squares line, divided by the sample size. Henceforth, when we refer to RSS we mean the RSS evaluated at the least squares line.

In Section 11.3.2, we showed that \( \hat{\alpha} \) and \( \hat{\beta} \) were linear unbiased estimators of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). However, \( \hat{\sigma}^2 \) is not an unbiased estimator of \( \sigma^2 \). For the calculation of \( E\hat{\sigma}^2 \) and in many subsequent calculations, the following lemma will be useful.

**Lemma 11.3.2** Let \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \) be uncorrelated random variables with \( \text{Var} Y_i = \sigma^2 \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Let \( c_1, \ldots, c_n \) and \( d_1, \ldots, d_n \) be two sets of constants. Then

\[
\text{Cov} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i Y_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i Y_i \right) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i d_i \right) \sigma^2.
\]

**Proof:** This type of result has been encountered before. It is similar to Lemma 5.3.3 and Exercise 11.11. However, here we do not need either normality or independence of \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \). \( \square \)
We next find the bias in \( \sigma^2 \). From (11.3.23) we have
\[
\epsilon_i = Y_i - \alpha - \beta x_i.
\]
We define the residuals from the regression to be
\[
\hat{\epsilon}_i = Y_i - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} x_i,
\]
and thus
\[
\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\epsilon}_i^2 = \frac{1}{n} \text{RSS}.
\]
It can be calculated (see Exercise 11.29) that
\[
E\hat{\epsilon}_i = 0,
\]
and a lengthy calculation (also in Exercise 11.29) gives
\[
\text{Var} \hat{\epsilon}_i = E\hat{\epsilon}_i^2 = \left( \frac{n-2}{n} + \frac{1}{S_{xx}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j^2 + x_i^2 - 2(x_i - \bar{x})^2 - 2x_i \bar{x} \right) \right) \sigma^2.
\]

Thus,
\[
E\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} E\hat{\epsilon}_i^2
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{n-2}{n} + \frac{1}{S_{xx}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j^2 + x_i^2 - 2(x_i - \bar{x})^2 - 2x_i \bar{x} \right) \right] \sigma^2
\]
\[
= \left[ \frac{n-2}{n} + \frac{1}{nS_{xx}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 - 2S_{xx} - 2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \right)^2 \right) \right] \sigma^2
\]
\[
= \left( \frac{n-2}{n} + 0 \right) \sigma^2
\]
\[
= \frac{n-2}{n} \sigma^2.
\]
The MLE \( \hat{\sigma}^2 \) is a biased estimator of \( \sigma^2 \). The more commonly used estimator of \( \sigma^2 \), which is unbiased, is
\[
S^2 = \frac{n}{n-2} \hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} x_i)^2 = \frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\epsilon}_i^2.
\]
To develop estimation and testing procedures, based on these estimators, we need to know their sampling distributions. These are summarized in the following theorem.
Theorem 11.3.3 Under the conditional normal regression model (11.3.22), the sampling distributions of the estimators $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and $S^2$ are

$$
\hat{\alpha} \sim n \left( \alpha, \frac{\sigma^2}{nS_{xx}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 \right), \quad \hat{\beta} \sim n \left( \beta, \frac{\sigma^2}{S_{xx}} \right),
$$

with

$$
\text{Cov}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) = \frac{-\sigma^2 \bar{x}}{S_{xx}}.
$$

Furthermore, $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$ and $S^2$ are independent and

$$
\frac{(n-2)S^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2_{n-2}.
$$

Proof: We first show that $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ have the indicated normal distributions. The estimators $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are both linear functions of the independent normal random variables $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$. Thus, by Corollary 4.6.10, they both have normal distributions. Specifically, in Section 11.3.2, we showed that $\hat{\beta} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i Y_i$, where the $d_i$ are given in (11.3.19), and we also showed that

$$
E\hat{\beta} = \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}\hat{\beta} = \frac{\sigma^2}{S_{xx}}.
$$

The estimator $\hat{\alpha} = \bar{Y} - \hat{\beta} \bar{x}$ can be expressed as $\hat{\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i Y_i$, where

$$
c_i = \frac{1}{n} - \frac{(x_i - \bar{x}) \bar{x}}{S_{xx}},
$$

and thus it is straightforward to verify that

$$
E\hat{\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i EY_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{n} - \frac{(x_i - \bar{x}) \bar{x}}{S_{xx}} \right) (\alpha + \beta x_i) = \alpha,
$$

$$
\text{Var}\hat{\alpha} = \sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i^2 = \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{nS_{xx}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 \right),
$$

showing that $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ have the specified distributions. Also, Cov$(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$ is easily calculated using Lemma 11.3.2. Details are left to Exercise 11.30.

We next show that $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are independent of $S^2$, a fact that will follow from Lemma 11.3.2 and Lemma 5.3.3. From the definition of $\hat{\epsilon}_i$ in (11.3.27), we can write

$$
(11.3.30) \quad \hat{\epsilon}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} [(\delta_{ij} - (c_j + d_j x_i)) Y_i,
$$

where

$$
\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } i = j, \\
0 & \text{if } i \neq j
\end{cases}, \quad c_j = \frac{1}{n} - \frac{(x_j - \bar{x}) \bar{x}}{S_{xx}}, \quad \text{and} \quad d_j = \frac{(x_j - \bar{x})}{S_{xx}}.
$$
Since \( \hat{\alpha} = \sum c_i Y_i \) and \( \hat{\beta} = \sum d_i Y_i \), application of Lemma 11.3.2 together with some algebra will show that

\[
\text{Cov}(\hat{\epsilon}_i, \hat{\alpha}) = \text{Cov}(\hat{\epsilon}_i, \hat{\beta}) = 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

Details are left to Exercise 11.31. Thus, it follows from Lemma 5.3.3 that, under normal sampling, \( S^2 = \sum \hat{\epsilon}_i^2 / (n - 2) \) is independent of \( \hat{\alpha} \) and \( \hat{\beta} \).

To prove that \((n - 2)S^2/\sigma^2 \sim \chi^2_{n-2}\), we write \((n - 2)S^2\) as the sum of \( n - 2 \) independent random variables, each of which has a \( \chi^2_1 \) distribution. That is, we find constants \( a_{ij}, i = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( j = 1, \ldots, n - 2 \), that satisfy

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\epsilon}_i^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ij} Y_i \right)^2,
\]

where

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ij} = 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n - 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ij} a_{ij'} = 0, \quad j \neq j'.
\]

The details are somewhat involved because of the general nature of the \( x_i \)'s. We omit details.

The RSS from the linear regression contains information about the worth of a polynomial fit of a higher order, over and above a linear fit. Since, in this model, we assume that the population regression is linear, the variation in this higher-order fit is just random variation. Robson (1939) gives a general recursion formula for finding coefficients for such higher-order polynomial fits, a formula that can be adapted to explicitly find the \( a_{ij} \)'s of (11.3.31). Alternatively, Cochran's Theorem (see Miscellaneous 11.5.1) can be used to establish that \( \sum \hat{\epsilon}_i^2 / \sigma^2 \sim \chi^2_{n-2} \).

Inferences regarding the two parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are usually based on the following two Student's \( t \) distributions. Their derivations follow immediately from the normal and \( \chi^2 \) distributions and the independence in Theorem 11.3.3. We have

\[
\frac{\hat{\alpha} - \alpha}{S/\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 / (nS_{xx})}} \sim t_{n-2}
\]

and

\[
\frac{\hat{\beta} - \beta}{S/\sqrt{S_{xx}}} \sim t_{n-2}.
\]

The joint distribution of these two \( t \) statistics is called a bivariate Student's \( t \) distribution. This distribution is derived in a manner analogous to the univariate case. We use the fact that the joint distribution of \( \hat{\alpha} \) and \( \hat{\beta} \) is bivariate normal and the same variance estimate \( S \) is used in both univariate \( t \) statistics. This joint distribution would be used if we wanted to do simultaneous inference regarding \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). However, we shall deal only with the inferences regarding one parameter at a time.

Usually there is more interest in \( \beta \) than in \( \alpha \). The parameter \( \alpha \) is the expected value of \( Y \) at \( x = 0 \), \( E(Y|x = 0) \). Depending on the problem, this may or may not...
be an interesting quantity. In particular, the value $x = 0$ may not be a reasonable value for the predictor variable. However, $\beta$ is the rate of change of $E(Y|x)$ as a function of $x$. That is, $\beta$ is the amount that $E(Y|x)$ changes if $x$ is changed by one unit. Thus, this parameter relates to the entire range of $x$ values and contains the information about whatever linear relationship exists between $Y$ and $x$. (See Exercise 11.33.) Furthermore, the value $\beta = 0$ is of particular interest.

If $\beta = 0$, then $E(Y|x) = \alpha + \beta x = \alpha$ and $Y \sim n(\alpha, \sigma^2)$, which does not depend on $x$. In a well-thought-out experiment leading to a regression analysis we do not expect this to be the case, but we would be interested in knowing this if it were true.

The test that $\beta = 0$ is quite similar to the ANOVA test that all treatments are equal. In the ANOVA the null hypothesis states that the treatments are unrelated to the response in any way, while in linear regression the null hypothesis $\beta = 0$ states that the treatments (or) are unrelated to the response in a linear way.

To test

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

using (11.3.33), we reject $H_0$ at level $\alpha$ if

$$\left| \frac{\hat{\beta} - 0}{S/\sqrt{S_{xx}}} \right| > t_{n-2,\alpha/2}$$

or, equivalently, if

$$\frac{\hat{\beta}^2}{S^2/S_{xx}} > F_{1, n-2, \alpha}.$$ 

Recalling the formula for $\hat{\beta}$ and that $RSS = \sum e_i^2$, we have

$$\frac{\hat{\beta}^2}{S^2/S_{xx}} = \frac{RSS/(n-2)}{RSS/(n-2)} = \frac{\text{Regression sum of squares}}{\text{Residual sum of squares/df}}$$

This last formula is summarized in the regression ANOVA table, which is like the ANOVA tables encountered in Section 11.2. For simple linear regression, the table, resulting in the test given in (11.3.35), is given in Table 11.3.2. Note that the table involves only a hypothesis about $\beta$. The parameter $\alpha$ and the estimate $\hat{\alpha}$ play the same role here as the grand mean did in Section 11.2. They merely serve to locate the overall level of the data and are “corrected” for in the sums of squares.

Example 11.3.4 (Continuation of Example 11.3.1) The regression ANOVA for the grape crop yield data follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>$F$ statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>50.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows a highly significant slope of the regression line.
Table 11.3.2. ANOVA table for single linear regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression (slope)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reg. SS = $S_{xy}/S_{xx}$</td>
<td>MS(Reg) = Reg. SS</td>
<td>$F = \frac{MS(Reg)}{MS(Resid)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>$n - 2$</td>
<td>RSS = $\sum \hat{e}_i^2$</td>
<td>MS(Resid) = RSS/(n - 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$n - 1$</td>
<td>SST = $\sum (y_i - \bar{y})^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We draw one final parallel with the analysis of variance. It may not be obvious from Table 11.3.2, but the partitioning of the sum of squares of the ANOVA has an analogue in regression. We have

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \bar{y})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2,
\]

(11.3.36)

where $\hat{y}_i = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_i$. Notice the similarity of these sums of squares to those in ANOVA.

The total sum of squares is, of course, the same. The RSS measures deviation of the fitted line from the observed values, and the regression sum of squares, analogous to the ANOVA treatment sum of squares, measures the deviation of predicted values ("treatment means") from the grand mean. Also, as in the ANOVA, the sum of squares identity is valid because of the disappearance of the cross-term (see Exercise 11.34). The total and residual sums of squares in (11.3.36) are clearly the same as in Table 11.3.2. But the regression sum of squares looks different. However, they are equal (see Exercise 11.34); that is,

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2 = \frac{S_{xy}^2}{S_{xx}}.
\]

The expression $S_{xy}^2/S_{xx}$ is easier to use for computing and provides the link with the $t$ test. But $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2$ is the more easily interpreted expression.

A statistic that is used to quantify how well the fitted line describes the data is the coefficient of determination. It is defined as the ratio of the regression sum of squares to the total sum of squares. It is usually referred to as $r^2$ and can be written in the various forms

\[
r^2 = \frac{\text{Regression sum of squares}}{\text{Total sum of squares}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \bar{y})^2} = \frac{S_{xy}^2}{S_{xx}S_{yy}}.
\]

The coefficient of determination measures the proportion of the total variation in $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ (measured by $S_{yy}$) that is explained by the fitted line (measured by the
regression sum of squares. From (11.3.36), $0 \leq r^2 \leq 1$. If $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ all fall exactly on the fitted line, then $y_i = \hat{y}_i$ for all $i$ and $r^2 = 1$. If $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are not close to the fitted line, then the residual sum of squares will be large and $r^2$ will be near 0. The coefficient of determination can also be (perhaps more straightforwardly) derived as the square of the sample correlation coefficient of the $n$ pairs $(y_1, x_1), \ldots, (y_n, x_n)$ or of the $n$ pairs $(y_1, \hat{y}_1), \ldots, (y_n, \hat{y}_n)$.

Expression (11.3.33) can be used to construct a $100(1-\alpha)\%$ confidence interval for $\beta$ given by

$$\hat{\beta} - t_{n-2,\alpha/2} \frac{S}{\sqrt{S_{xx}}} \leq \beta \leq \hat{\beta} + t_{n-2,\alpha/2} \frac{S}{\sqrt{S_{xx}}}.$$  

(11.3.37)

Also, a level $\alpha$ test of $H_0 : \beta = \beta_0$ versus $H_1 : \beta \neq \beta_0$ rejects $H_0$ if

$$\left| \frac{\hat{\beta} - \beta_0}{S/\sqrt{S_{xx}}} \right| > t_{n-2,\alpha/2}.$$  

(11.3.38)

As mentioned above, it is common to test $H_0 : \beta = 0$ versus $H_1 : \beta \neq 0$ to determine if there is some linear relationship between the predictor and response variables. However, the above test is more general, since any value of $\beta_0$ can be specified. The regression ANOVA, which is locked into a "recipe," can test only $H_0 : \beta = 0$.

11.3.5 Estimation and Prediction at a Specified $x = x_0$

Associated with a specified value of the predictor variable, say $x = x_0$, there is a population of $Y$ values. In fact, according to the conditional normal model, a random observation from this population is $Y \sim n(\alpha + \beta x_0, \sigma^2)$. After observing the regression data $(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ and estimating the parameters $\alpha, \beta$, and $\sigma^2$, perhaps the experimenter is going to set $x = x_0$ and obtain a new observation, call it $Y_0$. There might be interest in estimating the mean of the population from which this observation will be drawn, or even predicting what this observation will be. We will now discuss these types of inferences.

We assume that $(x_1, Y_1), \ldots, (x_n, Y_n)$ satisfy the conditional normal regression model, and based on these $n$ observations we have the estimates $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}$, and $S_{xx}$. Let $x_0$ be a specified value of the predictor variable. First, consider estimating the mean of the $Y$ population associated with $x_0$, that is, $E(Y|x_0) = \alpha + \beta x_0$. The obvious choice for our point estimator is $\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0$. This is an unbiased estimator since $E(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0) = E\hat{\alpha} + (E\hat{\beta}) x_0 = \alpha + \beta x_0$. Using the moments given in Theorem 11.3.3, we can also calculate

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0) = \text{Var} \hat{\alpha} + (\text{Var} \hat{\beta}) x_0^2 + 2x_0 \text{Cov}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$$

$$= \frac{\sigma^2}{nS_{xx}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 + \frac{\sigma^2 x_0^2}{S_{xx}} - \frac{2\sigma^2 x_0 \bar{x}}{S_{xx}}$$

$$= \frac{\sigma^2}{S_{xx}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 - \bar{x}^2 + \bar{x}^2 - 2x_0 \bar{x} + x_0^2 \right)$$

(11.3.39)
\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0 &= \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 - \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \right)^2 \right] + (x_0 - \bar{x})^2 \right) \left( \text{recombine terms} \right) \\
&= \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}} \right) \cdot \left( \sum x_i^2 - \frac{1}{n} (\sum x_i)^2 = S_{xx} \right)
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, since \( \hat{\alpha} \) and \( \hat{\beta} \) are both linear functions of \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \), so is \( \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0 \). Thus \( \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0 \) has a normal distribution, specifically,

\[(11.3.39) \quad \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0 \sim n \left( \alpha + \beta x_0, \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}} \right) \right).
\]

By Theorem 11.3.3, \((\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})\) and \(S^2\) are independent. Thus \(S^2\) is also independent of \(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0\) (Theorem 4.6.12) and

\[
\frac{\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0 - (\alpha + \beta x_0)}{S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}}} \sim t_{n-2}.
\]

This pivot can be inverted to give the 100(1 - \(\alpha\))% confidence interval for \(\alpha + \beta x_0\),

\[
(11.3.40) \quad \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0 - t_{n-2,\alpha/2} S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}} \leq \alpha + \beta x_0 \leq \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0 + t_{n-2,\alpha/2} S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}}.
\]

The length of the confidence interval for \(\alpha + \beta x_0\) depends on the values of \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\) through the value of \((x_0 - \bar{x})^2/S_{xx}\). It is clear that the length of the interval is shorter if \(x_0\) is near \(\bar{x}\) and minimized at \(x_0 = \bar{x}\). Thus, in designing the experiment, the experimenter should choose the values \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\) so that the value \(x_0\), at which the mean is to be estimated, is at or near \(\bar{x}\). It is only reasonable that we can estimate more precisely near the center of the data we observed.

A type of inference we have not discussed until now is prediction of an, as yet, unobserved random variable \(Y\), a type of inference that is of interest in a regression setting. For example, suppose that \(x\) is a college applicant’s measure of high school performance. A college admissions officer might want to use \(x\) to predict \(Y\), the student’s grade point average after one year of college. Clearly, \(Y\) has not been observed yet since the student has not even been admitted! The college has data on former students, \((x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\), giving their high school performances and one-year GPAs. These data might be used to predict the new student’s GPA.

**Definition 11.3.5** A 100(1 - \(\alpha\))% prediction interval for an unobserved random variable \(Y\) based on the observed data \(X\) is a random interval \([L(X), U(X)]\) with the property that

\[
P_\theta(L(X) \leq Y \leq U(X)) \geq 1 - \alpha
\]

for all values of the parameter \(\theta\).
Note the similarity in the definitions of a prediction interval and a confidence interval. The difference is that a prediction interval is an interval on a random variable, rather than a parameter. Intuitively, since a random variable is more variable than a parameter (which is constant), we expect a prediction interval to be wider than a confidence interval of the same level. In the special case of linear regression, we see that this is the case.

We assume that the new observation \( Y_0 \) to be taken at \( x = x_0 \) has a \( n(\alpha + \beta x_0, \sigma^2) \) distribution, independent of the previous data, \( (x_1, Y_1), \ldots, (x_n, Y_n) \). The estimators \( \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \) and \( S^2 \) are calculated from the previous data and, thus, \( Y_0 \) is independent of \( \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \) and \( S^2 \). Using (11.3.39), we find that \( Y_0 - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0) \) has a normal distribution with mean \( E(Y_0 - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0)) = \alpha + \beta x_0 - (\alpha + \beta x_0) = 0 \) and variance

\[
\text{Var}(Y_0 - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0)) = \text{Var} Y_0 + \text{Var}(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0) = \sigma^2 + \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_x^2} \right).
\]

Using the independence of \( S^2 \) and \( Y_0 - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0) \), we see that

\[
T = \frac{Y_0 - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0)}{S \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_x^2}}} \sim t_{n-2},
\]

which can be rearranged in the usual way to obtain the 100(1 - \( \alpha \))% prediction interval,

\[
\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0 - t_{n-2, \alpha/2} S \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_x^2}} < Y_0 < \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0 + t_{n-2, \alpha/2} S \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_x^2}}.
\]

(11.3.41)

Since the endpoints of this interval depend only on the observed data, (11.3.41) defines a prediction interval for the new observation \( Y_0 \).

11.3.6 Simultaneous Estimation and Confidence Bands

In the previous section we looked at prediction at a single value \( x_0 \). In some circumstances, however, there may be interest in prediction at many \( x_0 \)s. For example, in the previously mentioned grade point average prediction problem, an admissions officer probably has interest in predicting the grade point average of many applicants, which naturally leads to prediction at many \( x_0 \)s.

The problem encountered is the (by now) familiar problem of simultaneous inference. That is, how do we control the overall confidence level for the simultaneous inference? In the previous section, we saw that a 1 - \( \alpha \) confidence interval for the mean of the \( Y \) population associated with \( x_0 \), that is, \( E(Y|x_0) = \alpha + \beta x_0 \), is given by
\[ \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0 - t_{n-2,\alpha/2} S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}} \]

\[ < \alpha + \beta x_0 < \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_0 + t_{n-2,\alpha/2} S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}} . \]

Now suppose that we want to make an inference about the \( Y \) population mean at a number of \( x_0 \) values. For example, we might want intervals for \( E(Y|x_0), i = 1, \ldots, m \). We know that if we set up \( m \) intervals as above, each at level \( 1 - \alpha \), the overall inference will not be at the \( 1 - \alpha \) level.

A simple and reasonably good solution is to use the Bonferroni Inequality, as used in Example 11.2.9. Using the inequality, we can state that the probability is at least \( 1 - \alpha \) that

\[ \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_{0i} - t_{n-2,\alpha/(2m)} S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_{0i} - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}} \]

\[ < \alpha + \beta x_{0i} < \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x_{0i} + t_{n-2,\alpha/(2m)} S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_{0i} - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}} \]  

simultaneously for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \). (See Exercise 11.39.)

We can take simultaneous inference in regression one step further. Realize that our assumption about the population regression line implies that the equation \( E(Y|x) = \alpha + \beta x \) holds for all \( x \); hence, we should be able to make inferences at all \( x \). Thus, we want to make a statement like (11.3.42), but we want it to hold for all \( x \). As might be expected, as he did for the ANOVA, Scheffé derived a solution for this problem. We summarize the result for the case of simple linear regression in the following theorem.

**Theorem 11.3.6** Under the conditional normal regression model (11.3.22), the probability is at least \( 1 - \alpha \) that

\[ \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x - M_\alpha S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}} \]

\[ < \alpha + \beta x < \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x + M_\alpha S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}} \]  

simultaneously for all \( x \), where \( M_\alpha = \sqrt{2F_{2,n-2,\alpha}} \).

**Proof:** If we rearrange terms, it should be clear that the conclusion of the theorem is true if we can find a constant \( M_\alpha \) that satisfies

\[ P \left( \frac{(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x - (\alpha + \beta x))^2}{S^2 \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}} \right]} \leq M_\alpha^2 \text{ for all } x \right) = 1 - \alpha \]

or, equivalently,
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\[ P \left( \max_x \left( \frac{(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x) - (\alpha + \beta x)^2}{S^2 \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}} \right]} \right) \leq M^2_\alpha \right) = 1 - \alpha. \]

The parameterization given in Exercise 11.32, which results in independent estimators for \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), makes the above maximization easier. Write

\[ \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x = \bar{Y} + \hat{\beta}(x - \bar{x}), \]

\[ \alpha + \beta x = \mu_Y + \beta(x - \bar{x}), \quad (\mu_Y = E \bar{Y} = \alpha + \beta \bar{x}) \]

and, for notational convenience, define \( t = x - \bar{x} \). We then have

\[ \frac{(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x) - (\alpha + \beta x)^2}{S^2 \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}} \right]} = \frac{(\bar{Y} - \mu_Y) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta)t^2}{S^2 \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{t^2}{S_{xx}} \right]}, \]

and we want to find \( M_\alpha \) to satisfy

\[ P \left( \max_t \left( \frac{(\bar{Y} - \mu_Y) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta)t^2}{S^2 \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{t^2}{S_{xx}} \right]} \leq M^2_\alpha \right) \right) = 1 - \alpha. \]

Note that \( S^2 \) plays no role in the maximization, merely being a constant. Applying the result of Exercise 11.40, a direct application of calculus, we obtain

\[ \max_t \frac{(\bar{Y} - \mu_Y) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta)t^2}{S^2 \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{t^2}{S_{xx}} \right]} = \frac{n(\bar{Y} - \mu_Y)^2 + S_{xx}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)^2}{S^2} \]

(11.3.44)

\[ = \frac{(\bar{Y} - \mu_Y)^2}{\sigma^2/n} + \frac{(\hat{\beta} - \beta)^2}{S^2/S_{xx}}. \quad \text{(multiply by \( \sigma^2/\sigma^2 \))} \]

From Theorem 11.3.3 and Exercise 11.32, we see that this last expression is the quotient of independent chi squared random variables, the denominator being divided by its degrees of freedom. The numerator is the sum of two independent random variables, each of which has a \( \chi^2 \) distribution. Thus the numerator is distributed as \( \chi^2 \), the distribution of the quotient is

\[ \frac{(\bar{Y} - \mu_Y)^2}{\sigma^2/n} + \frac{(\hat{\beta} - \beta)^2}{S^2/S_{xx}} \sim 2F_{2, n-2}, \]

and

\[ P \left( \max_t \frac{(\bar{Y} - \mu_Y) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta)t^2}{S^2 \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{t^2}{S_{xx}} \right]} \leq M^2_\alpha \right) = 1 - \alpha \]

if \( M_\alpha = \sqrt{2F_{2, n-2}} \), proving the theorem. \( \square \)
Since (11.3.43) is true for all \( z \), it actually gives a confidence band on the entire population regression line. That is, as a confidence interval covers a single-valued parameter, a confidence band covers an entire line with a band. An example of the Scheffé band is given in Figure 11.3.3, along with two Bonferroni intervals and a single \( t \) interval. Notice that, although it is not the case in Figure 11.3.3, it is possible for the Bonferroni intervals to be wider than the Scheffé bands, even though the Bonferroni inference (necessarily) pertains to fewer intervals. This will be the case whenever

\[
t_{n-2,\alpha/(2m)} > 2F_{2,n-2,\alpha},
\]

where \( m \) is defined as in (11.3.42). The inequality will always be satisfied for large enough \( m \), so there will always be a point where it pays to switch from Bonferroni to Scheffé, even if there is interest in only a finite number of \( z \)s. This "phenomenon," that we seem to get something for nothing, occurs because the Bonferroni Inequality is an all-purpose bound while the Scheffé band is an exact solution for the problem at hand. (The actual coverage probability for the Bonferroni intervals is higher than \( 1 - \alpha \).) There are many variations on the Scheffé band. Some variations have different shapes and some guarantee coverage for only a particular interval of \( x \) values. See the Miscellanea section for a discussion of these alternative bands.

In theory, the proof of Theorem 11.3.6, with suitable modifications, can result in simultaneous prediction intervals. (In fact, the maximization of the function in Exercise 11.40 gives the result almost immediately.) The problem, however, is that the resulting statistic does not have a particularly nice distribution.

Finally, we note a problem about using procedures like the Scheffé band to make inferences at \( x \) values that are outside the range of the observed \( z \)s. Such procedures...
are based on the assumption that we know the population regression function is linear for all $x$. Although it may be reasonable to assume the regression function is linear over the range of $x$s observed, extrapolation to $x$s outside the observed range is usually unwise. (Since there are no data outside the observed range, we cannot check whether the regression becomes nonlinear.) This caveat also applies to the procedures in Section 11.3.5.

11.4 Exercises

11.1 An ANOVA variance-stabilizing transformation stabilizes variances in the following approximate way. Let $Y$ have mean $\theta$ and variance $\upsilon(\theta)$.

(a) Use arguments as in Section 10.1.3 to show that a one-term Taylor series approximation of the variance of $g(Y)$ is given by $\text{Var}(g(Y)) = \left[ \frac{dg(\theta)}{d\theta} \right]^2 \upsilon(\theta)$.

(b) Show that the approximate variance of $g^*(Y)$ is independent of $\theta$, where $g^*(y) = \int [1/\sqrt{\upsilon(y)}] dy$.

11.2 Verify that the following transformations are approximately variance-stabilizing in the sense of Exercise 11.1.

(a) $Y \sim \text{Poisson}, g^*(y) = \sqrt{y}$
(b) $Y \sim \text{Binomial}(n, p), g^*(y) = \sin^{-1}(\sqrt{y/n})$
(c) $Y$ has variance $\upsilon(\theta) = K\theta^2$ for some constant $K, g^*(y) = \log(y)$.

(Conditions for the existence of variance-stabilizing transformations go back at least to Curtiss 1943, with refinements given by Bar-Lev and Enis 1988, 1990.)

11.3 The Box–Cox family of power transformations (Box and Cox 1964) is defined by

$$g_\lambda^*(y) = \begin{cases} (y^\lambda - 1)/\lambda & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0 \\ \log y & \text{if } \lambda = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda$ is a free parameter.

(a) Show that, for each $y, g_\lambda^*(y)$ is continuous in $\lambda$. In particular, show that

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 0} (y^\lambda - 1)/\lambda = \log y.$$ 

(b) Find the function $\upsilon(\theta)$, the approximate variance of $Y$, that $g_\lambda^*(y)$ stabilizes. (Note that $\upsilon(\theta)$ will most likely also depend on $\lambda$.)

Analysis of transformed data in general and the Box–Cox power transformation in particular has been the topic of some controversy in the statistical literature. See Bickel and Doksum (1981), Box and Cox (1982), and Hinkley and Runger (1984).

11.4 A most famous (and useful) variance-stabilizing transformation is Fisher’s $z$-transformation, which we have already encountered in Exercise 10.17. Here we will look at a few more details. Suppose that $(X, Y)$ are bivariate normal with correlation coefficient $\rho$ and sample correlation $\tau$.

(a) Starting from Exercise 10.17, part (d), use the Delta Method to show that

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[ \log \left( \frac{1+\tau}{1-\tau} \right) - \log \left( \frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho} \right) \right]$$

is approximately normal with mean 0 and variance $1/n$. 
(b) Fisher actually used a somewhat more accurate expansion (Stuart and Ord 1987, Section 16.33) and established that the quantity in part (a) is approximately normal with

\[ \text{mean} = \frac{1}{2(n-1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{variance} = \frac{1}{n-1} + \frac{4-\rho^2}{2(n-1)^2}. \]

Show that for small \( \rho \) and moderate \( n \), we can approximate this mean and variance by 0 and 1/(n-3), which is the most popular form of Fisher's z-transformation.

11.5 Suppose that random variables \( Y_{ij} \) are observed according to the overparameterized one-way ANOVA model in Section 11.2.2. Show that, without some restriction on the parameters, this model is not identifiable by exhibiting two distinct collections of parameters that lead to exactly the same distribution of the \( Y_{ij} \).

11.6 Under the one-way ANOVA assumptions

(a) Show that the set of statistics \( (\bar{Y}_1, \bar{Y}_2, \ldots, \bar{Y}_k, S^2) \) is sufficient for \( (\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_k, \sigma^2) \).

(b) Show that \( S^2 = \frac{1}{N-k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1)S_i^2 \) is independent of each \( \bar{Y}_i \), \( i = 1, \ldots, k \).
(See Lemma 5.3.3).

(c) If \( \sigma^2 \) is known, explain how the ANOVA data are equivalent to their canonical version in Miscellanea 11.5.6.

11.7 Complete the proof of Theorem 11.2.8 by showing that

\[ \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2 \sim \chi^2_{k-1}. \]

(Hint: Define \( U_i = Y_i - \bar{Y}, i = 1, \ldots, k \). Show that \( U_i \) are independent \( \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2/n_i) \).
Then adapt the induction argument of Lemma 5.3.2 to show that \( \sum n_i (U_i - \bar{U})^2/\sigma^2 \sim \chi^2_{k-1}, \) where \( \bar{U} = \sum n_i U_i / \sum n_i \).

11.8 Show that under the one-way ANOVA assumptions, for any set of constants \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \), the quantity \( \sum a_i Y_i \) is normally distributed with mean \( \sum a_i \theta_i \) and variance \( \sigma^2 \sum a_i^2/n_i \). (See Corollary 4.6.10.)

11.9 Using an argument similar to that which led to the \( t \) test in Section 11.2.7, show how to construct a \( t \) test for

(a) \( H_0: \sum a_i \theta = \delta \) versus \( H_1: \sum a_i \theta \neq \delta \).

(b) \( H_0: \sum a_i \theta \leq \delta \) versus \( H_1: \sum a_i \theta > \delta \), where \( \delta \) is a specified constant.

11.10 Suppose we have a one-way ANOVA with five treatments. Denote the treatment means by \( \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_5 \), where \( \theta_1 \) is a control and \( \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_5 \) are alternative new treatments, and assume that an equal number of observations per treatment is taken. Consider the four contrasts \( \sum a_i \theta_i \) defined by

\[ a_1 = \left( 1, -\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{4} \right), \]

\[ a_2 = \left( 0, 1, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{3} \right), \]

\[ a_3 = \left( 0, 0, 1, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} \right), \]

\[ a_4 = \left( 0, 0, 0, 1, -1 \right). \]
(a) Argue that the results of the four $t$ tests using these contrasts can lead to conclusions about the ordering of $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k$. What conclusions might be made?
(b) Show that any two contrasts $\sum a_i \bar{Y}_i$ formed from the four $a_i$s in part (a) are uncorrelated. (Recall that these are called orthogonal contrasts.)
(c) For the fertilizer experiment of Example 11.2.3, the following contrasts were planned:

$$a_1 = (-1,1,0,0,0),$$
$$a_2 = \left(0,-1,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},0\right),$$
$$a_3 = (0,0,1,-1,0),$$
$$a_4 = (0,0,0,0,1).$$

Show that these contrasts are not orthogonal. Interpret these contrasts in the context of the fertilizer experiment, and argue that they are a sensible set of contrasts.

11.11 For any sets of constants $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ and $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_k)$, show that under the oneway ANOVA assumptions,

$$\text{Cov}(\sum a_i \bar{Y}_i, \sum b_i \bar{Y}_i) = \sigma^2 \sum a_i b_i / n_i.$$  

Hence, in the oneway ANOVA, contrasts are uncorrelated (orthogonal) if $\sum c_i b_i / n_i = 0$.

11.12 Suppose that we have a oneway ANOVA with equal numbers of observations on each treatment, that is, $n_i = n, i = 1, \ldots, k$. In this case the $F$ test can be considered an average $t$ test.

(a) Show that a $t$ test of $H_0: \theta_i = \theta_{i'}$ versus $H_1: \theta_i \neq \theta_{i'}$ can be based on the statistic

$$t_{ii'} = \frac{\bar{Y}_i - \bar{Y}_{i'}}{S_p^2(2/n)}.$$  

(b) Show that

$$\frac{1}{k(k-1)} \sum_{i,i'} t_{ii'}^2 = F,$$

where $F$ is the usual ANOVA $F$ statistic. (Hint: See Exercise 5.8(d).) (Communicated by George McCabe, who learned it from John Tukey.)

11.13 Under the oneway ANOVA assumptions, show that the likelihood ratio test of $H_0: \theta_1 = \theta_2 = \cdots = \theta_k$ is given by the $F$ test of (11.2.14).

11.14 The Scheffé simultaneous interval procedure actually works for all linear combinations, not just contrasts. Show that under the oneway ANOVA assumptions, if $M = \sqrt{kF_{k,N-k,\alpha}}$ (note the change in the numerator degrees of freedom), then the probability is $1 - \alpha$ that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \bar{Y}_i - M \sqrt{S_p^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{a_i^2}{n_i}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \theta_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \bar{Y}_i + M \sqrt{S_p^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{a_i^2}{n_i}}.$$
simultaneously for all \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \). It is probably easiest to proceed by first establishing, in the spirit of Lemma 11.2.7, that if \( v_1, \ldots, v_k \) are constants and \( c_1, \ldots, c_k \) are positive constants, then

\[
\max_{\mathbf{a}} \left\{ \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i v_i \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2 / c_i} \right\} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i v_i^2.
\]

The proof of Theorem 11.2.10 can then be adapted to establish the result.

11.15 (a) Show that for the \( t \) and \( F \) distributions, for any \( \nu, \alpha, \) and \( k \),

\[
t_{\nu, \alpha/2} \leq \sqrt{(k - 1)F_{k-1, \nu, \alpha}}.
\]

(Recall the relationship between the \( t \) and the \( F \). This inequality is a consequence of the fact that the distributions \( kF_{k, \nu} \) are stochastically increasing in \( k \) for fixed \( \nu \) but is actually a weaker statement. See Exercise 5.19.)

(b) Explain how the above inequality shows that the simultaneous Scheffé intervals are always wider than the single-contrast intervals.

(c) Show that it also follows from the above inequality that Scheffé tests are less powerful than \( t \) tests.

11.16 In Theorem 11.2.5 we saw that the ANOVA null is equivalent to all contrasts being 0. We can also write the ANOVA null as the intersection over another set of hypotheses.

(a) Show that the hypotheses

\[ H_0: \ \theta_1 = \theta_2 = \cdots = \theta_k \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1: \ \theta_i \neq \theta_j \text{ for some } i, j \]

and the hypotheses

\[ H_0: \ \theta_i - \theta_j = 0 \text{ for all } i, j \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1: \ \theta_i - \theta_j \neq 0 \text{ for some } i, j \]

are equivalent.

(b) Express \( H_0 \) and \( H_1 \) of the ANOVA test as unions and intersections of the sets

\[ \Theta_{ij} = \{ \theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k): \theta_i - \theta_j = 0 \}. \]

Describe how these expressions can be used to construct another (different) union-intersection test of the ANOVA null hypothesis. (See Miscellaneous 11.5.2.)

11.17 A multiple comparison procedure called the Protected LSD (Protected Least Significant Difference) is performed as follows. If the ANOVA \( F \) test rejects \( H_0 \) at level \( \alpha \), then for each pair of means \( \theta_i \) and \( \theta_j \), declare the means different if

\[
\frac{|\bar{y}_i - \bar{y}_j|}{\sqrt{\frac{s^2}{n_i} + \frac{s^2}{n_j}}} > t_{\alpha/2, N-k}.
\]

Note that each \( t \) test is done at the same \( \alpha \) level as the ANOVA \( F \) test. Here we are using an experimentwise \( \alpha \) level, where

\[
\text{experimentwise } \alpha = \mathcal{P}\left( \begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{at least one false assertion of difference} & \text{all the means are equal} \\
\end{array} \right) .
\]
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(a) Prove that no matter how many means are in the experiment, simultaneous inference from the Protected LSD is made at level $\alpha$.

(b) The ordinary (or unprotected) LSD simply does the individual $t$ tests, at level $\alpha$, no matter what the outcome of the ANOVA $F$ test. Show that the ordinary LSD can have an experimentwise error rate greater than $\alpha$. (The unprotected LSD does maintain a comparisonwise error rate of $\alpha$.)

(c) Perform the LSD procedure on the fish toxin data of Example 11.2.1. What are the conclusions?

11.18 Demonstrate that "data snooping," that is, testing hypotheses that are suggested by the data, is generally not a good practice.

(a) Show that, for any random variable $Y$ and constants $a$ and $b$ with $a > b$ and $P(Y > b) < 1$, $P(Y > a|Y > b) > P(Y > a)$.

(b) Apply the inequality in part (a) to the size of a data-suggested hypothesis test by letting $Y$ be a test statistic and $a$ be a cutoff point.

11.19 Let $X_i \sim \text{gamma}(\lambda_i, 1)$ independently for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Define $Y_i = X_i - \lambda_i / \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} X_j \right)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$, and $Y_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$. Find the joint and marginal distributions of $Y_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$.

(b) Connect your results to any distributions that are commonly employed in the ANOVA.

11.20 Assume the one-way ANOVA null hypothesis is true.

(a) Show that $\sum n_i (\bar{Y}_i - \bar{Y})^2 / (k - 1)$ gives an unbiased estimate of $\sigma^2$.

(b) Show how to use the method of Example 5.3.5 to derive the ANOVA $F$ test.

11.21 (a) Illustrate the partitioning of the sums of squares in the ANOVA by calculating the complete ANOVA table for the following data. To determine diet quality, male weanling rats were fed diets with various protein levels. Each of 15 rats was randomly assigned to one of three diets, and their weight gain in grams was recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diet</th>
<th>Protein level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Analytically verify the partitioning of the ANOVA sums of squares by completing the proof of Theorem 11.2.1.

(c) Illustrate the relationship between the $t$ and $F$ statistics, given in Exercise 11.12(b), using the data of part (a).

11.22 Calculate the expected values of MSB and MSW given in the one-way ANOVA table. (Such expectations are formally known as expected mean squares and can be used to help identify $F$ tests in complicated ANOVAs. An algorithm exists for calculating expected mean squares. See, for example, Kirk 1982 for details about the algorithm.)
11.23 Use the model in Miscellanea 11.5.3.
(a) Show that the mean and variance of \( Y_{ij} \) are \( EY_{ij} = \mu + \tau_i \) and \( \text{Var} Y_{ij} = \sigma^2 + \sigma^2 \).
(b) If \( \sum a_i = 0 \), show that the unconditional variance of \( \sum a_i Y_i \) is \( \text{Var} (\sum a_i Y_i) = \frac{1}{\rho} (\sigma^2 + \sigma^2) (1 - \rho) \sum a_i^2 \), where \( \rho = \text{intraclasse correlation} \).

11.24 The form of the Stein estimator of Miscellanea 11.5.6 can be justified somewhat by an empirical Bayes argument given in Efron and Morris (1972), which can be quite useful in data analysis. Such an argument may have been known by Stein (1956), although he makes no mention of it. Let \( X_i \sim n(\theta_i, 1), i = 1, \ldots, p \), and \( \theta_i \) be iid \( n(0, \tau^2) \).
(a) Show that the \( X_i \)'s, marginally, are iid \( n(0, \tau^2 + 1) \), and, hence, \( \sum X_i^2 / (\tau^2 + 1) \sim \chi^2_p \).
(b) Using the marginal distribution, show that \( E(1 - (p - 2) / \sum X_i^2) = \tau^2 / (\tau^2 + 1) \) if \( p \geq 3 \). Thus, the Stein estimator of Miscellanea 11.5.6 is an empirical Bayes version of the Bayes estimator \( \delta_i^*(X) = [\tau^2 / (\tau^2 + 1)] X_i \).
(c) Show that the argument fails if \( p < 3 \) by showing that \( E(1/Y) = \infty \) if \( Y \sim \chi^2_p \) with \( p < 3 \).

11.25 In Section 11.3.1, we found the least squares estimators of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) by a two-stage minimization. This minimization can also be done using partial derivatives.
(a) Compute \( \frac{d\text{RSS}}{dc} \) and \( \frac{d\text{RSS}}{db} \) and set them equal to 0. Show that the resulting two equations can be written as
\[
nc + \left( \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right) d = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \quad \text{and} \quad \left( \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right) c + \left( \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right) d = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i.
\]
(These equations are called the normal equations for this minimization problem.)
(b) Show that \( c = \alpha \) and \( d = \beta \) are the solutions to the normal equations.
(c) Check the second partial derivative condition to verify that the point \( c = \alpha \) and \( d = \beta \) is indeed the minimum of RSS.

11.26 Suppose \( n \) is an even number. The values of the predictor variable, \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \), all must be chosen to be in the interval \( [e, f] \). Show that the choice that maximizes \( S_{xx} \) is for half of the \( x_i \) equal to \( e \) and the other half equal to \( f \). (This was the choice mentioned in Section 11.3.2 that minimizes \( \text{Var} b \).)

11.27 Observations \( (x_i, Y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n \), follow the model \( Y_i = \alpha + \beta x_i + \varepsilon_i \), where \( E\varepsilon_i = 0 \), \( \text{Var} \varepsilon_i = \sigma^2 \), and \( \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j) = 0 \) if \( i \neq j \). Find the best linear unbiased estimator of \( \alpha \).

11.28 Show that in the conditional normal model for simple linear regression, the MLE of \( \sigma^2 \) is given by
\[
\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} x_i)^2.
\]

11.29 Consider the residuals \( \hat{\varepsilon}_1, \ldots, \hat{\varepsilon}_n \) defined in Section 11.3.4 by \( \hat{\varepsilon}_i = Y_i - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} x_i \).
(a) Show that \( E\hat{\varepsilon}_i = 0 \).
(b) Verify that
\[
\text{Var} \hat{\varepsilon}_i = \text{Var} Y_i + \text{Var} \hat{\alpha} + x_i^2 \text{Var} \hat{\beta} - 2 \text{Cov}(Y_i, \hat{\alpha}) - 2x_i \text{Cov}(Y_i, \hat{\beta}) + 2x_i \text{Cov}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}).
\]
(c) Use Lemma 11.3.2 to show that
\[
\text{Cov}(Y_i, \hat{\alpha}) = \sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Cov}(Y_i, \hat{\beta}) = \sigma^2 \frac{\bar{x} - \bar{y}}{S_{xx}},
\]
and use these to verify (11.3.28).

**11.30** Fill in the details about the distribution of $\hat{\alpha}$ left out of the proof of Theorem 11.3.3.

(a) Show that the estimator $\hat{\alpha} = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}\bar{x}$ can be expressed as $\hat{\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i Y_i$, where
\[
c_i = \frac{1}{n} - \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})\bar{y}}{S_{xx}}.
\]

(b) Verify that
\[
E\hat{\alpha} = \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}(\hat{\alpha}) = \sigma^2 \left[ \frac{1}{n S_{xx}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 \right].
\]

(c) Verify that
\[
\text{Cov}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) = \frac{\sigma^2 \bar{x}}{S_{xx}}.
\]

**11.31** Verify the claim in Theorem 11.3.3, that $\hat{\epsilon}_i$ is uncorrelated with $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$. (Show that $\hat{\epsilon}_i = \sum c_j y_j$, where the $c_j$s are given by (11.3.30). Then, using the facts that we can write $\hat{\alpha} = \sum c_j y_j$ and $\hat{\beta} = \sum d_j y_j$, verify that $\sum c_j c_j = \sum d_j d_j = 0$ and apply Lemma 11.3.2.)

**11.32** Observations $(x_i, Y_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, are made according to the model
\[
Y_i = \alpha + \beta x_i + \epsilon_i,
\]
where $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are fixed constants and $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n$ are iid $n(0, \sigma^2)$. The model is then reparameterized as
\[
Y_i = \alpha' + \beta'(x_i - \bar{x}) + \epsilon_i.
\]
Let $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ denote the MLEs of $\alpha$ and $\beta$, respectively, and $\hat{\alpha}'$ and $\hat{\beta}'$ denote the MLEs of $\alpha'$ and $\beta'$, respectively.

(a) Show that $\hat{\beta}' = \hat{\beta}$.

(b) Show that $\hat{\alpha}' \neq \hat{\alpha}$. In fact, show that $\hat{\alpha}' = \bar{Y}$. Find the distribution of $\hat{\alpha}'$.

(c) Show that $\hat{\alpha}'$ and $\hat{\beta}'$ are uncorrelated and, hence, independent under normality.

**11.33** Observations $(X_i, Y_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, are made from a bivariate normal population with parameters $(\mu_x, \mu_y, \sigma^2_x, \sigma^2_y, \rho)$, and the model $Y_i = \alpha + \beta x_i + \epsilon_i$ is going to be fit.

(a) Argue that the hypothesis $H_0 : \beta = 0$ is true if and only if the hypothesis $H_0 : \rho = 0$ is true. (See (11.3.25).)

(b) Show algebraically that
\[
\frac{\hat{\beta}}{S/\sqrt{S_{xx}}} = \sqrt{n-2} \frac{r}{\sqrt{1-r^2}},
\]
where $r$ is the sample correlation coefficient, the MLE of $\rho$. 
(c) Show how to test $H_0: \rho = 0$, given only $r^2$ and $n$, using Student's $t$ with $n - 2$ degrees of freedom (see (11.3.33)). (Fisher derived an approximate confidence interval for $\rho$, using a variance-stabilizing transformation. See Exercise 11.4.)

11.34 (a) Illustrate the partitioning of the sum of squares for simple linear regression by calculating the regression ANOVA table for the following data. Parents are often interested in predicting the eventual heights of their children. The following is a portion of the data taken from a study that might have been suggested by Galton's analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height (inches) at age 2 ($x$)</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (inches) as an adult ($y$)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Analytically establish the partitioning of the sum of squares for simple linear regression by verifying (11.3.36).

(c) Prove that the two expressions for the regression sum of squares are, in fact, equal; that is, show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2 = \frac{S_{xy}^2}{S_{xx}}.$$

(d) Show that the coefficient of determination, $r^2$, given by

$$r^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \bar{y})^2}$$

can be derived as the square of the sample correlation coefficient either of the $n$ pairs $(y_1, x_1), \ldots, (y_n, x_n)$ or of the $n$ pairs $(y_1, \hat{y}_1), \ldots, (y_n, \hat{y}_n)$.

11.35 Observations $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ are described by the relationship $Y_i = \theta x_i + \epsilon_i$, where $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are fixed constants and $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n$ are iid $n(0, \sigma^2)$.

(a) Find the least squares estimator of $\theta$.

(b) Find the MLE of $\theta$.

(c) Find the best unbiased estimator of $\theta$.

11.36 Observations $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ are made according to the model $Y_i = \alpha + \beta x_i + \epsilon_i$, where $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are fixed constants and $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n$ are iid $n(0, \sigma^2)$. Let $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ denote MLE's of $\alpha$ and $\beta$.

(a) Assume that $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are observed values of iid random variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ with distribution $n(\mu_X, \sigma_X^2)$. Prove that when we take expectations over the joint distribution of $X$ and $Y$, we still get $E\hat{\alpha} = \alpha$ and $E\hat{\beta} = \beta$.

(b) The phenomenon of part (a) does not carry over to the covariance. Calculate the unconditional covariance of $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ (using the joint distribution of $X$ and $Y$).

11.37 We observe random variables $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ that are mutually independent, each with a normal distribution with variance $\sigma^2$. Furthermore, $EY_i = \beta x_i$, where $\beta$ is an unknown parameter and $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are fixed constants not all equal to 0.

(a) Find the MLE of $\beta$. Compute its mean and variance.

(b) Compute the Cramér–Rao Lower Bound for the variance of an unbiased estimator of $\beta$.

(c) Find a best unbiased estimator of $\beta$. 
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(d) If you could place the values \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) anywhere within a given nondegenerate closed interval \([A, B]\), where would you place these values? Justify your answer.

(e) For a given positive value \( r \), the maximum probability estimator of \( \beta \) with respect to \( r \) is the value of \( D \) that maximizes the integral

\[
\int_{D-r}^{D+r} f(y_1, \ldots, y_n|\beta) d\beta,
\]

where \( f(y_1, \ldots, y_n|\beta) \) is the joint pdf of \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \). Find this estimator.

11.38 An ecologist takes data \((x_i, Y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\), where \( x_i \) is the size of an area and \( Y_i \) is the number of moss plants in the area. We model the data by \( Y_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\theta x_i), Y_i \)'s independent.

(a) Show that the least squares estimator of \( \theta \) is \( \sum x_i Y_i / \sum x_i^2 \). Show that this estimator has variance \( \theta \sum x_i^2 / (\sum x_i^2)^2 \). Also, compute its bias.

(b) Show that the MLE of \( \theta \) is \( \sum Y_i / \sum x_i \) and has variance \( \theta / \sum x_i \). Compute its bias.

(c) Find a best unbiased estimator of \( \theta \) and show that its variance attains the Cramer–Rao Lower Bound.

11.39 Verify that the simultaneous confidence intervals in (11.3.42) have the claimed coverage probability.

11.40 (a) Prove that if \( a, b, c, \) and \( d \) are constants, with \( c > 0 \) and \( d > 0 \), then

\[
\max_{t} \frac{(a + bt)^2}{c + dt^2} = \frac{a^2}{c} + \frac{b^2}{d}.
\]

(b) Use part (a) to verify equation (11.3.44) and hence fill in the gap in Theorem 11.3.6.

(c) Use part (a) to find a Scheffé–type simultaneous band using the prediction intervals of (11.3.41). That is, rewriting the prediction intervals as was done in Theorem 11.3.6, show that

\[
\max_{t} \left( \frac{(\bar{Y} - \mu) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta)t}{S^2 \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{t^2}{S^2} \right]} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \frac{(\bar{Y} - \mu)^2 + S^2(\hat{\beta} - \beta)^2}{S^2}.
\]

(d) The distribution of the maximum is not easy to write down, but we could approximate it. Approximate the statistic by using moment matching, as done in Example 7.2.3.

11.41 In the discussion in Example 12.4.2, note that there was one observation from the potoroo data that had a missing value. Suppose that on the 24th animal it was observed that \( O_2 = 16.3 \).

(a) Write down the observed data and expected complete data log likelihood functions.

(b) Describe the E step and the M step of an EM algorithm to find the MLEs.

(c) Find the MLEs using all 24 observations.

(d) Actually, the \( O_2 \) reading on the 24th animal was not observed, but rather the \( CO_2 \) was observed to be 4.2 (and the \( O_2 \) was missing). Set up the EM algorithm in this case and find the MLEs. (This is a much harder problem, as you now have to take expectations over the \( z_x \). This means you have to formulate the regression problem using the bivariate normal distribution.)
11.5 Miscellaneous

11.5.1 Cochran's Theorem

Sums of squares of normal random variables, when properly scaled and centered, are distributed as chi squared random variables. This type of result is first due to Cochran (1934). Cochran's Theorem gives necessary and sufficient conditions on the scaling required for squared and summed iid normal random variables to be distributed as a chi squared random variable. The conditions are not difficult, but they are best stated in terms of properties of matrices and will not be treated here. It is an immediate consequence of Cochran's Theorem that in the oneway ANOVA, the $\chi^2$ random variables partition as discussed in Section 11.2.6. Furthermore, another consequence is that in the Randomized Complete Blocks ANOVA (see Miscellanea 11.5.3), the mean squares all have chi squared distributions.

Cochran's Theorem has been generalized to the extent that necessary and sufficient conditions are known for the distribution of squared normals (not necessarily iid) to be chi squared. See Stuart and Ord (1987, Chapter 15) for details.

11.5.2 Multiple Comparisons

We have seen two ways of doing simultaneous inference in this chapter: the Scheffé procedure and use of the Bonferroni Inequality. There is a plethora of other simultaneous inference procedures. Most are concerned with inference on pairwise comparisons, that is, differences between means. These procedures can be applied to estimate treatment means in the oneway ANOVA.

A method due to Tukey (see Miller 1981), sometimes known as the Q method, applies a Scheffé-type maximization argument but over only pairwise differences, not all contrasts. The Q distribution is the distribution of

$$Q = \max_{i,j} \frac{|Y_i - \bar{Y}_j| - (\theta_i - \theta_j)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (1/n_i + 1/n_j)}},$$

where $n_i = n$ for all i. (Hayter 1984 has shown that if $n_i \neq n_j$ and the $n$ above is replaced by the harmonic mean $n_h$, where $1/n_h = \frac{1}{2}((1/n_i)+(1/n_j))$, the resulting procedure is conservative.) The Q method is an improvement over Scheffé's S method in that if there is interest only in pairwise differences, the Q method is more powerful (shorter intervals). This is easy to see because, by definition, the Q maximization will produce a smaller maximum than the S method.

Other types of multiple comparison procedures that deal with pairwise differences are more powerful than the S method. Some procedures are the LSD (Least Significant Difference) Procedure, Protected LSD, Duncan's Procedure, and Student–Neumann–Keuls' Procedure. These last two are multiple range procedures. The cutoff point to which comparisons are made changes between comparisons.

One difficulty in fully understanding multiple comparison procedures is that the definition of Type I Error is not inviolate. Some of these procedures have changed the definition of Type I Error for multiple comparisons, so exactly what is meant
by "a level" is not always clear. Some of the types of error rates considered are
called experimentwise error rate, comparisonwise error rate, and familywise error rate. Miller (1981) and Hsu (1996) are good references for this topic. A humorous
but illuminating treatment of this subject is given in Carmer and Walker (1982).

11.5.3 Randomized Complete Block Designs

Section 11.2 was concerned with a oneway classification of the data; that is, there was only one categorization (treatment) in the experiment. In general, the ANOVA
allows for many types of categorization, with one of the most commonly used
ANOVA s being the Randomized Complete Block (RCB) ANOVA.

A block (or blocking factor) is categorization that is in an experiment for the ex-
press purpose of removing variation. In contrast to a treatment, there is usually no
interest in finding block differences. The practice of blocking originated in agricu-
lture, where experimenters took advantage of similar growing conditions to control
experimental variances. To model this, the actual blocks in the experiment were
considered to be a random sample from a large population of blocks (which makes
them a random factor).

RCB ANOVA assumptions

Random variables $Y_{ij}$ are observed according to the model

$$Y_{ij} | b = \mu + \tau_i + b_j + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k, \quad j = 1, \ldots, r,$$

where:

(i) The random variables $\epsilon_{ij} \sim \text{iid } N(0, \sigma^2)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $j = 1, \ldots, r$
(normal errors with equal variances).

(ii) The random variables $B_1, \ldots, B_r$, whose realized (but unobserved) values are
the blocks $b_1, \ldots, b_r$, are iid $N(0, \sigma_B^2)$ and are independent of $\epsilon_{ij}$ for all $i, j$.

The mean and variance of $Y_{ij}$ are

$$EY_{ij} = \mu + \tau_i \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}Y_{ij} = \sigma_B^2 + \sigma^2.$$

Moreover, although the $Y_{ij}$'s are uncorrelated conditionally, there is correlation in
the blocks unconditionally. The correlation between $Y_{ij}$ and $Y_{i'j}$ in block $j$, with
$i \neq i'$, is

$$\frac{\text{Cov}(Y_{ij}, Y_{i'j})}{\sqrt{\text{Var}Y_{ij}}\sqrt{\text{Var}Y_{i'j}}} = \frac{\sigma_B^2}{\sigma_B^2 + \sigma^2},$$

a quantity called the intraclass correlation. Thus, the model implies not only that
there is correlation in the blocks but also that there is positive correlation. This
is a consequence of the additive model and the assumption that the $\epsilon$s and $B$s are
independent (see Exercise 11.23). Even though the $Y_{ij}$'s are not independent, the
intraclass correlation structure still results in an analysis of variance where ratios
of mean squares have the $F$ distribution (see Miscellanea 11.5.1).
11.5.4 Other Types of Analyses of Variance

The two types of ANOVAs that we have considered, one-way ANOVAs and RCB ANOVAs, are the simplest types. For example, an extension of a complete block design is an incomplete block design. Sometimes there are physical constraints that prohibit putting all treatments in each block and an incomplete block design is needed. Deciding how to arrange the treatments in such a design is both difficult and critical. Of course, as the design gets more complicated, so does the analysis.

Study of the subject of statistical design, which is concerned with getting the most information from the fewest observations, leads to more complicated and more efficient ANOVAs in many situations. ANOVAs based on designs such as fractional factorials, Latin squares, and balanced incomplete blocks can be efficient methods of gathering much information about a phenomenon. Good overall references for this subject are Cochran and Cox (1957), Dean and Voss (1999), and Kuehl (2000).

11.5.5 Shapes of Confidence Bands

Confidence bands come in many shapes, not just the hyperbolic shape defined by the Scheffé band. For example, Gafarian (1964) showed how to construct a straight-line band over a finite interval. Gafarian-type bands allow statements of the form

\[ P(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x - d_\alpha \leq \alpha + \beta x \leq \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x + d_\alpha \text{ for all } x \in [a, b]) = 1 - \alpha. \]

Gafarian gave tables of \(d_\alpha\). A finite-width band must, necessarily, apply only to a finite range of \(x\). Any band of level \(1 - \alpha\) must have infinite length as \(|x| \to \infty\).

Casella and Strawderman (1980), among others, showed how to construct Scheffé-type bands over finite intervals, thereby reducing width while maintaining the same confidence as the infinite Scheffé band. Naiman (1983) compared performance of straight-line and Scheffé bands over finite intervals. Under his criterion, one of average width, the Scheffé band is superior. In some cases, an experimenter might be more comfortable with the interpretation of a straight-line band, however.

Shapes other than straight-line and hyperbolic are possible. Piegorsch (1985) investigated and characterized the shapes that are admissible in the sense that their probability statements cannot be improved upon. He obtained “growth conditions” that must be satisfied by an admissible band. Naiman (1983, 1984, 1987) and Naiman and Wynn (1992, 1997) have developed this theory to a very high level, establishing useful inequalities and geometric identities to further improve inferences.

11.5.6 Stein’s Paradox

One part of the analysis of variance is concerned with the simultaneous estimation of a collection of normal means. Developments in this particular problem, starting with Stein (1956), have had a profound effect on both the theory and applications of point estimation.

A canonical version of the analysis of variance is to observe \(X = (X_1, \ldots, X_p)\), independent normal random variables with \(X_i \sim n(\theta_i, 1)\), \(i = 1, \ldots, p\), with the objective being the estimation of \(\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_p)\). Our usual estimate of \(\theta_i\) would
be $X_i$, but Stein (1956) established the surprising result that, if $p \geq 3$, the estimator of $\theta_i$ given by
\[ \delta_i^S(X) = \left(1 - \frac{p - 2}{\sum_{i=1}^{p} X_i^2}\right) X_i \]
is a better estimator of $\theta_i$ in the sense that
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{p} E_\theta (X_i - \theta_i)^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^{p} E_\theta (\delta_i^S(X) - \theta_i)^2. \]
That is, the summed mean squared of Stein's estimator is always smaller, and usually strictly smaller, than that of $X$.

Notice that the estimators are being compared using the sum of the component-wise mean squared errors, and each $\delta_i^S$ can be a function of the entire vector $(X_1, \ldots, X_p)$. Thus, all of the data can be used in estimating each mean. Since the $X_i$s are independent, we might think that restricting $\delta_i^S$ to be just a function of $X_i$ would be enough. However, by summing the mean squared errors, we tie the components together.

In the oneway ANOVA we observe
\[ \bar{Y}_i \sim n \left( \theta_i, \frac{\sigma^2}{n_i} \right), \quad i = 1, \ldots, k, \]independent,
where the $\bar{Y}_i$s are the cell means. The Stein estimator takes the form
\[ \delta_i^S(\bar{Y}_1, \ldots, \bar{Y}_k) = \left(1 - \frac{(k - 2)\sigma^2}{\sum \bar{Y}_j^2}\right) \bar{Y}_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k. \]

This Stein-type estimator can further be improved by choosing a meaningful place toward which to shrink (the above estimator shrinks toward 0). One such estimator, due to Lindley (1962), shrinks toward the grand mean of the observations. It is given by
\[ \delta_i^S(\bar{Y}_1, \ldots, \bar{Y}_k) = \bar{Y} + \left(1 - \frac{(k - 3)\sigma^2}{\sum n_j (\bar{Y}_j - \bar{Y})^2}\right) (\bar{Y}_i - \bar{Y}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, k. \]

Other choices of a shrinkage target might be even more appropriate. Discussion of this, including methods for improving on confidence statements, such as the Scheffé $S$ method, is given in Casella and Hwang (1987). Morris (1983) also discusses applications of these types of estimators.

There have been many theoretical developments using Stein-type estimators, not only in point estimation but also in confidence set estimation, where it has been shown that recentering at a Stein estimator can result in increased coverage probability and reduced size. There is also a strong connection between Stein estimators and empirical Bayes estimators (see Miscellanea 7.5.6), first uncovered in a series
of papers by Efron and Morris (1972, 1973, 1975), where the components of $\theta$ are tied together using a common prior distribution. An introduction to the theory and some applications of Stein estimators is given in Lehmann and Casella (1998, Chapter 5).