## Stat 306: Finding Relationships in Data. Lecture 6 Section 2.6

## Recap from last lecture 2.5 (continued)

Step 0:From $\theta$ , define estimator, $\hat{\theta}$		he sample , as a iriable $\hat{\Theta}$ Step 2: Determine $E[\hat{\Theta}]$ (to confirm it's unbiased) $Var[\hat{\Theta}]$ (to calculate se)		Step 3: Define $se(\hat{\theta}) =$ estimate of $\sqrt{2}$	Var ( $\hat{\Theta}$ )	Step 4: Define $(1-\alpha)$ % C.I. = $\hat{\theta} \pm c \times se(\hat{\theta})$	
Population parameter or "something we would like to estimate"	Sample statistic ("estimator")	Estimator as a Random Variable	Expected Value of the estimator	Variance of the estimator	Standard Error of estimator	Confidence Interval	
β <sub>0</sub>	b <sub>0</sub>	B <sub>0</sub>	E[B <sub>0</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>0</sub> ]	se(b <sub>0</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_0$	
$\beta_1$	b <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>	E[B <sub>1</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>1</sub> ]	se(b <sub>1</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_1$	
σ <sup>2</sup>	s <sup>2</sup>	S <sup>2</sup>	E[S <sup>2</sup> ]	Var[S <sup>2</sup> ]	se(s <sup>2</sup> )	C.I. for $\sigma^2$	
$\mu_Y(x)$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$E(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	C.I. for $\mu_Y(x)$	

 Confused about homogeneity vs. non-consistent width of confidence intervals?



х

Probability density

Suppose we now want to make a prediction for a new value of x.

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged 50 years old (X=50) will have.



**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=50 years old will have.

this hypothetical new person aged 50 is sometimes called "an out-of-sample unit with value  $x^*$ ", Where  $x^*=50$ .

Our best estimate, also known as the "point prediction", would be equal to  $b_0 + b_1(50) = 45.1$ 

```
> xstar <- 50
> point_prediction <- beta0hat + beta1hat*xstar
> point_prediction
[1] 45.07117
```

```
> # x and n are fixed values
> x <- c(82, 45, 71, 22, 29, 9, 12, 18, 24)
> n <- 9
> # y is a realization of the random variable "Y", i.e. "observed data":
> y <- c(71, 54, 43, 45, 21, 11, 30, 45, 10)
> xbar <- (1/n)*sum(x)
> ybar <- (1/n)*sum(y)
> sx <- sqrt( sum((x-xbar)^2)/(n-1) )
> sy <- sqrt( sum((y-ybar)^2)/(n-1) )</pre>
> sxy <- (1/(n-1))*sum((x-xbar)*(y-ybar))</pre>
> rxy <- sxy/(sx*sy)
> beta1hat <- rxy*sy/sx</p>
> beta0hat <- ybar-beta1hat*xbar</p>
> residuals <- y - beta0hat - beta1hat*x</p>
> s <- sqrt( (1/(n-2))*sum(residuals^2))
> plot(y~x, xlim=c(0,100), ylim=c(0,100), pch=20, cex=3)
> abline(beta0hat, beta1hat)
                                                          100
> xstar <- 50
                                                          8
> point_prediction <- beta0hat + beta1hat*xstar</p>
                                                          00
> point_prediction
                                                        >
                                                          40
[1] 45.07117
> lines(x=c(xstar, xstar), c(0, 100))
                                                          20
```



80

100

40

0

20

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=50 years old will have.

 $\hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^*$  with error

(2.67)  $\hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^* - [\beta_0 + \beta_1 x^* + \epsilon(x^*)]$ =  $(\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1) x^* - \epsilon(x^*)$ 

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



The difference between our prediction and the truth is the error

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



The difference between our prediction and the truth is the error

This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



The difference between our prediction and the truth is the error

This has variance (2.68)  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$ since  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]=\operatorname{Var}\left[\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x^{*})\right]$  from (2.66).

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error iS

$$\hat{\sigma} imes \sqrt{1+rac{1}{n}+rac{(x^*-\overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}}\,,$$

Note this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

**Example**: Suppose we would like to predict how much money (Y), someone aged X=60 years old will have.



This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error is

$$\hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}},$$

Note this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Note that variances of estimators include  $\sigma^2$  in their equations. Estimated SEs replace the "population" quantity  $\sigma$  by a sample quantity  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

Next for the 95% prediction interval for  $Y(x^*)$  for an out-of-sample unit with value  $x^*$ , the point prediction is  $\hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^*$  with error

$$(2.67) \quad \hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^* - [\beta_0 + \beta_1 x^* + \epsilon(x^*)] = (\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1) x^* - \epsilon(x^*).$$

This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

since  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1)x^*\right] = \operatorname{Var}\left[\hat{\mu}_Y(x^*)\right]$  from (2.66). So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error is

(2.69) 
$$\hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}},$$

and this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Note that variances of estimators include  $\sigma^2$  in their equations. Estimated SEs replace the "population" quantity  $\sigma$  by a sample quantity  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

Next for the 95% prediction interval for  $Y(x^*)$  for an out-of-sample unit with value  $x^*$ , the point prediction is  $\hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^*$  with error

$$(2.67) \quad \hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^* - [\beta_0 + \beta_1 x^* + \epsilon(x^*)] = (\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1) x^* - \epsilon(x^*).$$

This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

since  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1)x^*\right] = \operatorname{Var}\left[\hat{\mu}_Y(x^*)\right]$  from (2.66). So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error is

(2.69) 
$$\operatorname{se}(\mathsf{E}) = \hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}},$$

and this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Note that variances of estimators include  $\sigma^2$  in their equations. Estimated SEs replace the "population" quantity  $\sigma$  by a sample quantity  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

Next for the 95% prediction interval for  $Y(x^*)$  for an out-of-sample unit with value  $x^*$ , the point prediction is  $\hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^*$  with error

$$(2.67) \quad \hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{B}_0 + \hat{B}_1 x^* - [\beta_0 + \beta_1 x^* + \epsilon(x^*)] = (\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1) x^* - \epsilon(x^*).$$

This has variance

(2.68) 
$$\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_{0}-\beta_{0})+(\hat{B}_{1}-\beta_{1})x^{*}\right]+\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon(x^{*})\right]=\sigma^{2}\left\{n^{-1}+\frac{(x^{*}-\overline{x})^{2}}{\left[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}\right]}\right\}+\sigma^{2},$$

since  $\operatorname{Var}\left[(\hat{B}_0 - \beta_0) + (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1)x^*\right] = \operatorname{Var}\left[\hat{\mu}_Y(x^*)\right]$  from (2.66). So the (estimated) SE of the prediction error is

(2.69) 
$$\operatorname{se}(\mathsf{E}) = \hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}},$$

and this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Note that variances of estimators include  $\sigma^2$  in their equations. Estimated SEs replace the "population" quantity  $\sigma$  by a sample quantity  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

The 95% prediction interval for  $Y(x^*)$  for a unit (not in sample) with value  $x^*$ :

(2.44) 
$$\hat{Y}(x^*) \pm t_{n-2,0.975} \times se(E), \ \hat{Y}(x^*) = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x^* = \hat{\mu}_Y(x^*),$$

where  $E = \hat{Y}(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{\mu}_Y(x^*) - Y(x^*) = \hat{\mu}_Y(x^*) - \beta_0 - \beta_1 x^* - \epsilon(x^*)$  is the prediction error.

> points(xstar, point\_prediction, col="pink", pch=18, cex=3)



```
> # 95% prediction interval:
> lowerPI <- point_prediction - qt(0.975,n-2) * s * sqrt(1/n + 1 + ((xstar-xbar)^2)/((n-1)*sx^2))
> upperPI <- point_prediction + qt(0.975,n-2) * s * sqrt(1/n + 1 + ((xstar-xbar)^2)/((n-1)*sx^2))
>
> c(lowerPI,upperPI)
[1] 5.61226 84.53007
>
> lines(x=c(xstar,xstar),y=c(lowerPI,upperPI), col="darkviolet",lwd=15)
```



### Age vs. Money

#### Sample statistics

bo	=	17.7
$b_1$	=	0.55
S	=	15.5
R <sup>2</sup>	=	0.49

We collected a random sample of individuals and for each determined their age (recorded in years) and the amount of money (in dollars) in their accounts. Analysis of the data was done using <u>linear regression</u>. For parameter  $\beta_1$ : 95% C.I. = [0.05, 1.05] *p*-value = 0.036

Results:We obtained a random sample of n = 9 subjects. There is a<br/>statistically significant association between age and money (p-value =0.036).<br/>For every additional year in age, an individual's amount of money increases<br/>on average by an estimated of \$0.55 (95% C.I. = [\$0.05, \$1.05]).

**Conclusions:** We found that, as hypothesized, age is associated with money. In our sample age accounted for about half of the variability observed in money (R<sup>2</sup>=0.49). We <u>predict</u> that a 50 year old will have \$45.1 (95% P.I. = [\$5.6, \$84.5]), whereas a 40 year old will have \$39.6 (95% P.I. = [\$0.8, \$78.4]).

The purpose of this observational study was to

demonstrate if, and to what extent, age is

associated with money.

#### **Small Print:** The analysis rests on the following assumptions:

**Objective:** 

Design and Methods:

- the observations are independently and identically distributed.
- the **response** variable, money, is normally distributed.
- Homoscedasticity of residuals or equal variance.
- the <u>relationship</u> between **response** and **predictor** variables is linear.

#### se(subpopulation mean) VS. se(prediction error)

Subpopulation mean:

$$se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x)) = \hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x-\overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}}$$

Whereas, the (estimated) SE of the prediction error is:

(2.69) 
$$\hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x^* - \overline{x})^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}},$$

and this does not decrease to 0 as  $n \to \infty$ .

## 2.6 Explanation of Student t quantiles in the interval estimates

- 2.6.1. History lesson about the t-test
- 2.6.2. Three important things to know about a normal random variable
- 2.6.3 Estimators as Random Variables (one more time!)
- 2.6.4 Explanation of Student t quantiles

## 2.6 Explanation of Student t quantiles in the interval estimates

#### **2.6.1.** History lesson about the t-test

2.6.2. Three important things to know about a normal random variable

2.6.3 Estimators as Random Variables (one more time!)

2.6.4 Explanation of Student t quantiles

## 2.6.1. History lesson about the t-test

Student is the publication pseudonym for William Gosset, who developed methods for inference of means for small samples while working at Guinness Brewery (Ireland) in early 1900s.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William\_Sealy\_Gosset



## William Sealy Gosset (aka "Student"):

"Is this batch of beer any different than the standard?"

"Let's have a taste test! ...t-test anyone?"



## 2.6 Explanation of Student t quantiles in the interval estimates

2.6.1. History lesson about the t-test

2.6.2. Three important things to know about a normal random variable

2.6.3 Estimators as Random Variables (one more time!)

2.6.4 Explanation of Student t quantiles

- Thing 1:
  - Linear combinations of independent normal random variables also have normal distributions! (see Appendix B)



#### • Thing 1:

 Linear combinations of independent normal random variables also have normal distributions! (see Appendix B)

For example:

Let:

W<sub>1</sub> be a normal random variable and W<sub>2</sub> be a normal random variable, **Then:** 

> $W_3 = aW_1 + bW_2$  is a normal r.v. for any numbers a and b.

### • Thing 2:

A normal random variable can be converted to a standard normal random variable.

$$W \sim Normal(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

$$\frac{W-\mu}{\sigma} \sim Normal(0,1)$$



$$Pr(-1.96 < \frac{W-\mu}{\sigma} < 1.96) = 0.95$$

$$Pr(-z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} < \frac{W-\mu}{\sigma} < z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) = 1 - \alpha$$

- Thing 2:
  - A normal random variable can be converted to a standard normal random variable.

$$W \sim Normal(\mu, \sigma^2)$$
  

$$Pr(-z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} < \frac{W-\mu}{\sigma} < z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) = 1 - \alpha$$
  

$$Pr(W - z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\sigma < \mu < W + z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\sigma) = 1 - \alpha$$

For example, with  $\alpha = 0.05$ :  $Pr(W - 1.96\sigma < \mu < W + 1.96\sigma) = 0.95$ 

- Thing 3:
  - If the variance is unknown, we must use the t distribution.

$$\frac{W-\mu}{\hat{\sigma}} \sim t_{n-2}$$

$$Pr(-z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} < \frac{W-\mu}{\hat{\sigma}} < z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \neq 1-\alpha$$

$$Pr(-t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} < \frac{W-\mu}{\hat{\sigma}} < t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) = 1-\alpha$$

$$Pr(-t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} < \frac{W-\mu}{\hat{\sigma}} < t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) = 0.95$$
for example, with  $n = 9$ :
$$Pr(-2.26 < \frac{W-\mu}{\hat{\sigma}} < 2.26) = 0.95$$



- Thing 3:
  - If the variance is unknown, we must use the t distribution.

$$rac{W-\mu}{\hat{\sigma}} \sim t_{n-2}$$



$$Pr(W - t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\hat{\sigma} < \mu < W + t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\hat{\sigma}) = 1 - \alpha$$

for example, with n = 9:  $Pr(W - 2.26\hat{\sigma} < \mu < W + 2.26\hat{\sigma}) = 0.95$ 

## 2.6 Explanation of Student t quantiles in the interval estimates

2.6.1. History lesson about the t-test

2.6.2. Three important things to know about a normal random variable

#### 2.6.3 Estimators as Random Variables (one more time!)

2.6.4 Explanation of Student t quantiles

Step 0:From $\theta$ , define estimator, $\hat{\theta}$		he sample , as a iriable $\hat{\Theta}$ Step 2: Determine $E[\hat{\Theta}]$ (to confirm it's unbiased) $Var[\hat{\Theta}]$ (to calculate se)		Step 3: Define $se(\hat{\theta}) =$ estimate of $\sqrt{2}$	Var ( $\hat{\Theta}$ )	Step 4: Define $(1-\alpha)$ % C.I. = $\hat{\theta} \pm c \times se(\hat{\theta})$	
Population parameter or "something we would like to estimate"	Sample statistic ("estimator")	Estimator as a Random Variable	Expected Value of the estimator	Variance of the estimator	Standard Error of estimator	Confidence Interval	
β <sub>0</sub>	b <sub>0</sub>	B <sub>0</sub>	E[B <sub>0</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>0</sub> ]	se(b <sub>0</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_0$	
$\beta_1$	b <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>	E[B <sub>1</sub> ]	Var[B <sub>1</sub> ]	se(b <sub>1</sub> )	C.I. for $\beta_1$	
σ <sup>2</sup>	s <sup>2</sup>	S <sup>2</sup>	E[S <sup>2</sup> ]	Var[S <sup>2</sup> ]	se(s <sup>2</sup> )	C.I. for $\sigma^2$	
$\mu_Y(x)$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$E(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	$se(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$	C.I. for $\mu_Y(x)$	



$$B_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i Y_i$$
 , where:  $a_i = rac{(x_i - ar{x})}{(n-1)s_x^2}$ 

and:  $E(\hat{B}_{1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i}E(Y_{i}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i}(\beta_{0} + \beta_{1}x_{i})$  $=\beta_1,$ 

and:

 $\operatorname{Var}(\hat{B}_1) = \frac{\sigma^2}{(n-1)s_{\pi}^2}$ 

Since  $B_1$  is a linear combination of the Y<sub>i</sub>s (Normal RVs), then (with Thing 1):

$$\hat{B}_1 \sim N\left(\beta_1, \sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}\right),$$

$$\frac{\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1}{\sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}} \sim N(0, 1).$$



Recall:

$$E[B_0] = E[\bar{Y} - B_1\bar{X}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}E[\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i] - \beta_1\bar{X}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_0 + \beta_1X_i) - \beta_1\bar{X}$$

$$= \beta_0 + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_1X_i - \beta_1\bar{X}$$

$$= \beta_0 + \beta_1\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \beta_1\bar{X}$$

$$= \beta_0 + \beta_1\bar{X} - \beta_1\bar{X}$$

$$= \beta_0$$

Also:  

$$Var(B_0) = Var(\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i/n) + \bar{X}^2 Var(B_1)$$
  
 $= \sigma^2(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^2})$ 

For the intercept, we can, again, make use of the fact that  $B_0$  is a linear combination of normal random variables **(Thing 1)**:

$$B_0 \sim N[\beta_0, \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)]$$





We have that:

$$E[\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)] = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}x$$
$$Var[\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)] = \sigma^{2} \left\{ n^{-1} + \frac{(x-\overline{x})^{2}}{[(n-1)s_{x}^{2}]} \right\}$$

And again, a linear combination of normal random variables is a normal random variable **(Thing 1)**:

$$\mu_Y(x) \sim Normal\left(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x, \sigma^2(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x-\bar{x})^2}{[(n-1)s_x^2]})\right)$$



## 2.6 Explanation of Student t quantiles in the interval estimates

- 2.6.1. History lesson about the t-test
- 2.6.2. Three important things to know about a normal random variable
- 2.6.3 Estimators as Random Variables (one more time!)

#### **2.6.4 Explanation of Student t quantiles**



$$B_0 \sim N[\beta_0, \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)]$$

With **Thing 2**, we have:

$$\frac{B_0 - \beta_0}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)}} \sim N(0, 1)$$

But we do not know the variance. We only have an estimate of the variance, so (with **Thing 3**):

$$\frac{B_0 - \beta_0}{SE(B_0)} \sim t_{n-2}$$

And therefore:

95% C.I. for  $\beta_0 =$ 

$$\bar{y} - b_1 \bar{X} - t_{n-2,0.975} \cdot s \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}\right)} ,$$
$$\bar{y} - b_1 \bar{X} + t_{n-2,0.975} \cdot s \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{X}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}\right)}$$

**Estimator** as a Random Variable  $B_0$  $B_1$ S<sup>2</sup>  $(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$ 

With **Thing 1**, we have:

$$\hat{B}_1 \sim N\left(\beta_1, \sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}\right),$$

With **Thing 2**, we have:

$$\frac{\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1}{\sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}} \sim N(0, 1).$$

But we do not know the variance, so with **Thing 3**, we have:

$$\frac{B_1 - \beta_1}{SE(B_1)} \sim t_{n-2}$$

#### And therefore:

$$Pr(b_1 - t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{(n-1)}s_x} < \beta_1 < b_1 + t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{(n-1)}s_x}) = 1 - \alpha$$

**Estimator** as a Random Variable  $B_0$  $B_1$  $S^2$  $(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$ 

With **Thing 1**, we have:

$$\hat{B}_1 \sim N\left(\beta_1, \sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}\right),$$

With **Thing 2**, we have:

$$\frac{\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1}{\sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}} \sim N(0, 1).$$

But we do not know the variance, so with **Thing 3**, we have:



#### And therefore:

$$Pr(b_1 - t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{(n-1)}s_x} < \beta_1 < b_1 + t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{(n-1)}s_x}) = 1 - \alpha$$

with  $\alpha$ =0.05:

$$Pr(b_1 - t_{n-2,0.975} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{(n-1)}s_x} < \beta_1 < b_1 + t_{n-2,0.975} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{(n-1)}s_x}) = 0.95$$



With **Thing 1**, we have:

$$\hat{B}_1 \sim N\left(\beta_1, \sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{(n-1)s_x^2}\right),$$

With **Thing 2**, we have:

$$\frac{\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1}{\sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}} \sim N(0, 1).$$

But we do not know the variance, so with **Thing 3**, we have:



And therefore:

**95% C.I. for** 
$$\beta_1 = [b_1 - t_{n-2,0.975} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n-1}s_x}, \quad b_1 + t_{n-2,0.975} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n-1}s_x}]$$

where: 
$$b_1=r_{xy}rac{s_y}{s_x}$$
 ,  $\hat{\sigma}=s=\sqrt{rac{\sum_{i=1}^n e_i^2}{n-2}}$ 

Estimator as a Random Variable  $B_0$  $B_1$  $S^2$  $(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$ 

With Thing 1, we have:

$$B_0 \sim N[\beta_0, \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)]$$

With **Thing 2**, we have:

$$\frac{B_0 - \beta_0}{\sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)} \sim N[0, 1]$$

But we do not know the variance, so with **Thing 3**, we have:

$$\frac{B_0 - \beta_0}{SE(B_0)} \sim t_{n-2}$$

#### And therefore:

$$Pr\Big(b_0 - t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \cdot s\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)} < \beta_0 < b_0 + t_{n-2,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \cdot s\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)}\Big) = 1 - \alpha$$

with  $\alpha$ =0.05:

$$Pr\left(b_0 - t_{n-2,0.975} \cdot s_{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)}} < \beta_0 < b_0 + t_{n-2,0.975} \cdot s_{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)}}\right) = 0.95$$

## **Estimator** as a Random Variable $B_0$ $B_1$ **S**<sup>2</sup> $(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$

#### **2.6.4 Explanation of Student t quantiles**

With **Thing 1**, we have:

$$B_0 \sim N[\beta_0, \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)]$$

With **Thing 2**, we have:

$$\frac{B_0 - \beta_0}{\sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)} \sim N[0, 1]$$

But we do not know the variance, so with **Thing 3**, we have:

$$\frac{B_0 - \beta_0}{SE(B_0)} \sim t_{n-2}$$

95% C.I. for  $\beta_0 =$ 

And therefore:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{y} - b_1 \bar{x} - t_{n-2,0.975} \cdot s \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)} \\ \bar{y} - b_1 \bar{x} + t_{n-2,0.975} \cdot s \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right)} \end{bmatrix}$$

,

Estimator as a Random Variable B<sub>0</sub> B<sub>1</sub>

**S**<sup>2</sup>

 $(\hat{\mu}_Y(x))$ 

With **Thing 1**, we have:

 $\mu_Y(x) \sim Normal\left(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x, \sigma^2(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x-\bar{x})^2}{[(n-1)s_x^2]})\right)$ 

With Thing 2, we have...

But we do not know the variance, so with **Thing 3**, we have...

#### And therefore:

The 95% confidence interval for subpopulation mean  $\mu_Y(x) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$  is

$$\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x) \pm t_{n-2,0.975} \times se(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)),$$

where:

$$se(\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x)) = \hat{\sigma} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x - \overline{x})^{2}}{(n - 1)s_{x}^{2}}}$$
$$\hat{\mu}_{Y}(x) = \hat{\beta}_{0} + \hat{\beta}_{1}x.$$
$$\hat{\sigma} = s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} e_{i}^{2}}{n - 2}}$$

For the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ . (2.76) implies that the null distribution of  $\hat{B}_1/SE(\hat{B}_1)$  is  $t_{n-2}$ . For the data version,  $\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)$  is the standardized version of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ; it is invariant to scale changes of the x and y variables (because a scale change affect the SE in the same way as  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ).  $|\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)|$  is the absolute t-ratio statistic and large values indicate that the slope is significantly different from 0.

For the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ . (2.76) implies that the null distribution of  $\hat{B}_1/SE(\hat{B}_1)$  is  $t_{n-2}$ . For the data version,  $\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)$  is the standardized version of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ; it is invariant to scale changes of the x and yvariables (because a scale change affect the SE in the same way as  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ).  $|\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)|$  is the absolute t-ratio statistic and large values indicate that the slope is significantly different from 0.

Hypothesis Test "Null" hypothesis  

$$H_0: \beta_1 = 0 \checkmark$$
  
 $H_1: \beta_1 \neq 0 \checkmark$   
"Alternative" hypothesis  
We have:

 $\frac{B_1 - \beta_1}{SE(B_1)} \sim t_{n-2}$ 

For the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ . (2.76) implies that the null distribution of  $\hat{B}_1/SE(\hat{B}_1)$  is  $t_{n-2}$ . For the data version,  $\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)$  is the standardized version of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ; it is invariant to scale changes of the x and yvariables (because a scale change affect the SE in the same way as  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ).  $|\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)|$  is the absolute t-ratio statistic and large values indicate that the slope is significantly different from 0.

Hypothesis Test  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$   $H_1: \beta_1 \neq 0$ We have:  $\frac{B_1 - \beta_1}{SE(B_1)} \sim t_{n-2}$ 

For the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ . (2.76) implies that the null distribution of  $\hat{B}_1/SE(\hat{B}_1)$  is  $t_{n-2}$ . For the data version,  $\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)$  is the standardized version of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ; it is invariant to scale changes of the x and yvariables (because a scale change affect the SE in the same way as  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ).  $|\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)|$  is the absolute t-ratio statistic and large values indicate that the slope is significantly different from 0.

Hypothesis Test  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$   $H_1: \beta_1 \neq 0$ We have:  $\frac{B_1 - \beta_1}{SE(B_1)} \sim t_{n-2}$ "Null" hypothesis

Therefore, "under the null", we have:

$$\frac{B_1}{SE(B_1)} \sim t_{n-2}$$

For the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ . (2.76) implies that the null distribution of  $\hat{B}_1/SE(\hat{B}_1)$  is  $t_{n-2}$ . For the data version,  $\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)$  is the standardized version of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ; it is invariant to scale changes of the x and y variables (because a scale change affect the SE in the same way as  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ).  $|\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)|$  is the absolute t-ratio statistic and large values indicate that the slope is significantly different from 0.

Even if we decide to record "Age" (x) in months and "Money" (Y) in pennies, "under the null", we still have:

$$\frac{B_1}{SE(B_1)} \sim t_{n-2}$$

For the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ . (2.76) implies that the null distribution of  $\hat{B}_1/SE(\hat{B}_1)$  is  $t_{n-2}$ . For the data version,  $\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)$  is the standardized version of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ; it is invariant to scale changes of the x and y variables (because a scale change affect the SE in the same way as  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ).  $|\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)|$  is the absolute t-ratio statistic and large values indicate that the slope is significantly different from 0.

Even if we decide to record "Age" (x) in months and "Money" (Y) in pennies, "under the null", we still have:

$$\frac{B_1}{SE(B_1)} \sim t_{n-2}$$

and:

$$t$$
-statistic =  $\frac{\hat{\beta}_1}{SE(\hat{\beta}_1)}$ 

#### Therefore...

If  $\beta_1$  (the slope) was actually equal to 0, it would be very unlikely that the absolute t-stat would be very large. > x <- c(82, 45, 71, 22, 29, 9, 12, 18, 24) > y <- c(71, 54, 43, 45, 21, 11, 30, 45, 10) > n <- 9 > xbar <- (1/n)\*sum(x) > sx <- sqrt( sum((x-xbar)^2)/(n-1) )</pre> > ybar <- (1/n)\*sum(y) > sy <- sqrt( sum((y-ybar)^2)/(n-1) )</pre> > sxy <- (1/(n-1))\*sum((x-xbar)\*(y-ybar))</pre> > rxy <- sxy/(sx\*sy)</pre> > b0\_hat<-ybar-b1\_hat\*xbar</pre> > b1\_hat <- rxy\*sy/sx</pre> > residuals <- y - b0\_hat - b1\_hat\*x</pre> > s <- sqrt( (1/(n-2))\*sum(residuals^2) )</pre> > S [1] 15.5308 > SE\_b1 <- s/(sqrt(n-1)\*sx)</pre> > SE\_b1 [1] 0.2108794 > tstat\_b1 <- b1\_hat/SE\_b1</pre> > tstat\_b1 [1] 2.599209

For the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ . (2.76) implies that the null distribution of  $\hat{B}_1/SE(\hat{B}_1)$  is  $t_{n-2}$ . For the data version,  $\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)$  is the standardized version of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ; it is invariant to scale changes of the x and y variables (because a scale change affect the SE in the same way as  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ).  $|\hat{\beta}_1/se(\hat{\beta}_1)|$  is the absolute t-ratio statistic and large values indicate that the slope is significantly different from 0.

Even if we decide to record "Age" (x) in months and "Money" (Y) in pennies, "under the null", we still have:

$$\frac{B_1}{SE(B_1)} \sim t_{n-2}$$

and:

$$t$$
-statistic =  $\frac{\hat{\beta}_1}{SE(\hat{\beta}_1)}$ 

#### Therefore...

If  $\beta_1$  (the slope) was actually equal to 0, it would be very unlikely that the absolute t-stat would be very large.

```
> b1_hat <- rxy*sy/sx</pre>
> b1_hat
[1] 0.5481195
> residuals <- y - b0_hat - b1_hat*x</pre>
> s <- sqrt( (1/(n-2))*sum(residuals^2) )
> S
[1] 15.5308
> SE_b1 <- s/(sqrt(n-1)*sx)</pre>
> SE_b1
[1] 0.2108794
> tstat_b1 <- b1_hat/SE_b1</pre>
> tstat_b1
[1] 2.599209
> # How unlikely would it be to obtain
> # a value this large (or larger) if the
> # null was true (i.e. beta_1 = 0)?
> 2*pt(abs(tstat_b1), n-2, lower=FALSE)
[1] 0.03546599
```

```
> b1_hat <- rxy*sy/sx</pre>
                                                > b1_hat
                                                [1] 0.5481195
                                                > residuals <- y - b0_hat - b1_hat*x</pre>
                                                > s <- sqrt( (1/(n-2))*sum(residuals^2) )</pre>
                                                > S
                                                [1] 15.5308
                                                > SE_b1 <- s/(sqrt(n-1)*sx)</pre>
                                                > SE_b1
                                                [1] 0.2108794
                                                > tstat_b1 <- b1_hat/SE_b1</pre>
                                                > tstat_b1
                                                [1] 2.599209
> summary(lm(y~x))
                                                >
                                                > # How unlikely would it be to obtain
Call:
                                                > # a value this large (or larger) if the
lm(formula = y \sim x)
                                                > # null was true (i.e. beta_1 = 0)?
Residuals:
                                                >
            1Q Median
   Min
                           30
                                 Max
                                                > 2*pt(abs(tstat_b1), n-2, lower=FALSE)
-20.820 -12.561 5.757 11.669 17.469
                                                [1] 0.03546599
Coefficients:
           Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) 17.6652 8.9579 1.972
                                     0.0892 .
                       0.2109 2.599 0.0355 *
            0.5481
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Residual standard error: 15.53 on 7 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared: 0.4911, Adjusted R-squared: 0.4184
F-statistic: 6.756 on 1 and 7 DF, p-value: 0.03547
```

Х

```
> b0_hat<-ybar-b1_hat*xbar</pre>
                                        > b0_hat
                                        [1] 17.66519
                                        > residuals <- y - b0_hat - b1_hat*x</pre>
                                        > s <- sqrt( (1/(n-2))*sum(residuals^2) )
                                        > S
                                        [1] 15.5308
                                        > SE_b0 <- s*sqrt( 1/n + ( (xbar^2)/( sum((x-xbar)^2)) ) )</pre>
                                        > SE_b0
                                        [1] 8.957892
                                        > tstat_b0 <- b0_hat/SE_b0</pre>
                                        > tstat_b0
                                        [1] 1.972026
> summary(lm(y~x))
                                        >
                                        > # How unlikely would it be to obtain
Call:
                                        > # a value this large (or larger) if the
lm(formula = y \sim x)
                                        > # null was true (i.e. beta_0 = 0)?
                                        >
Residuals:
                                        > 2*pt(abs(tstat_b0), n-2, lower=FALSE)
            10 Median
                           30
                                  Max
   Min
                                        [1] 0.08922444
-20.820 -12.561 5.757 11.669 17.469
Coefficients:
           Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) 17.6652 8.9579 1.972
                                      0.0892 .
             0.5481
                       0.2109 2.599 0.0355 *
Х
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Residual standard error: 15.53 on 7 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared: 0.4911, Adjusted R-squared: 0.4184
F-statistic: 6.756 on 1 and 7 DF, p-value: 0.03547
```

Interpretation for a confidence interval: be careful in what is correct and incorrect usage. A confidence interval consists of an interval estimate of a population parameter (Greek letter). So we can say 95% confidence interval for  $\beta_1$  but not 95% confidence interval for  $\hat{\beta}_1$ .

Interpretation for a confidence interval: be careful in what is correct and incorrect usage. A confidence interval consists of an interval estimate of a population parameter (Greek letter). So we can say 95% confidence interval for  $\beta_1$  but not 95% confidence interval for  $\hat{\beta}_1$ . The interval (2.79) has 95% probability content if  $\hat{B}_1$  and  $\hat{S} = \hat{\sigma}$  are considered as random variables. When  $\hat{\beta}_1$  and  $\hat{\sigma}$  are computed from data values, the interval (2.79) is called a 95% confidence interval.

Interpretation for a confidence interval: be careful in what is correct and incorrect usage. A confidence interval consists of an interval estimate of a population parameter (Greek letter). So we can say 95% confidence interval for  $\beta_1$  but not 95% confidence interval for  $\hat{\beta}_1$ . The interval (2.79) has 95% probability content if  $\hat{B}_1$  and  $\hat{S} = \hat{\sigma}$  are considered as random variables. When  $\hat{\beta}_1$  and  $\hat{\sigma}$  are computed from data values, the interval (2.79) is called a 95% confidence interval. For example, the 95% confidence interval for the Merck beta is  $0.871 \pm 0.497 = (0.374, 1.368)$ . With numbers (not random variables) in the interval, the interval either contains the true  $\beta_1$  or it doesn't (and probability is 1 or 0). This is the reason why a numerical interval of most plausible values for a population parameter is called a confidence interval. Probability content of an interval containing a quantity can only be considered if the endpoints of the interval are considered as random variables and not a specific numbers computed from data.

#### Explanation of Thing 3:

#### Definition of a $t_{\nu}$ random variable.

Let  $Z \sim N(0,1)$  and let  $W \sim \chi^2_{\nu}$  (chi-square distribution with  $\nu$  degrees of freedom, this has a rightskewed density on the positive real line). The random variables Z and W are mutually independent. Then the definition of a  $t_{\nu}$  random variables from a standard normal random variable and a chi-square random variable is as follows:

$$T = \frac{Z}{\sqrt{W/\nu}} \sim t_{\nu}$$

or T has a Student  $t_{\nu}$  distribution. For this to apply above to  $\frac{\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1}{SE(\hat{B}_1)}$  in (2.76), write

$$\frac{\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1}{SE(\hat{B}_1)} = \frac{(\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1)/\sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}}{\sqrt{SE^2(\hat{B}_1)/\sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}^2}}.$$

Since  $Z = (\hat{B}_1 - \beta_1)/\sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1} \sim N(0, 1)$ , to get a  $t_{n-2}$  distribution, it is necessary to show that  $SE^2(\hat{B}_1)$  (as a random variable) is independent of  $\hat{B}_1$ , and that  $W = (n-2)SE^2(\hat{B}_1)/\sigma_{\hat{\beta}_1}^2 \sim \chi_{n-2}^2$ .

# **linear**<br/>regressionAge vs. MoneyPREDICTOR variable $\checkmark$ $\chi \rightarrow Age in$ <br/>Years $\chi \rightarrow dollars ($)$ <br/>In bank account

# 

Population parameters  $\beta_0$  ,  $\beta_1$  ,  $\sigma^2$ 

Hypothesis Test  $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$  $H_1: \beta_1 \neq 0$  Sample statistics  $b_0 = 17.7$   $b_1 = 0.55$  s = 15.5 $R^2 = 0.49$ 

For parameter  $\beta_1$ : 95% C.I. = [0.05, 1.05] *p*-value = 0.036

#### Sample, n=9

