

STA 431s23 Assignment Four¹

For the Quiz on Friday Feb. 10th, please bring printouts of your full R input for Questions 3 and 4. The other problems are not to be handed in. They are practice for the Quiz.

1. Independently for $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \epsilon_i$, where $E(x_{i1}) = \mu_{x1}$, $E(x_{i2}) = \mu_{x2}$, $Var(x_{i1}) = \phi_{11}$, $Var(x_{i2}) = \phi_{22}$, $Cov(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) = \phi_{12}$, $Var(\epsilon_i) = \psi$, and ϵ_i is independent of x_{i1} and x_{i2} .
 - (a) What is the parameter θ for this model?
 - (b) What is the parameter space Θ ?
 - (c) What is the restricted parameter space Θ_0 under $H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2$ and $\phi_{11} = \phi_{22} = \psi = 1$?
 - (d) The null hypothesis can be written $H_0 : \mathbf{L}\theta = \mathbf{h}$. Give the \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{h} matrices
2. On the formula sheet, the statement $\hat{\theta}_n \overset{\sim}{\sim} N(\theta, \mathbf{V}_n)$ is saying that the vector of maximum likelihood estimates is asymptotically normal. That is, for large sample sizes, $\hat{\theta}_n$ has a probability distribution that is approximately multivariate normal, centered on the vector of true parameter values and with variance-covariance matrix \mathbf{V}_n . Generally speaking, the rules (theorems) for exact multivariate normality also apply to asymptotic multivariate normality. It's not rigorous, but you usually arrive at the correct conclusion. Accordingly,
 - (a) Let θ be $m \times 1$, and let \mathbf{L} be an $r \times m$ matrix of constants with linearly independent rows. This part of the question develops the Wald statistic for testing $H_0 : \mathbf{L}\theta = \mathbf{h}$.
 - i. What is the asymptotic distribution of $\mathbf{L}\hat{\theta}_n$? Just write it down.
 - ii. What is the asymptotic distribution of $(\mathbf{L}\hat{\theta}_n - \mathbf{L}\theta)^\top (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{V}_n\mathbf{L}^\top)^{-1} (\mathbf{L}\hat{\theta}_n - \mathbf{L}\theta)$?
 - iii. What are the dimensions (number of rows and columns) in the matrix $(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{V}_n\mathbf{L}^\top)^{-1}$?
 - iv. Why is it critical that the rows of \mathbf{L} be linearly independent, so that the rank of \mathbf{L} equals r ?
 - v. Compare the expression in Question 2(a)ii to the Wald statistic W_n on the formula sheet. There are two differences. Briefly explain them.
 - (b) Let \mathbf{a} be an $m \times 1$ non-zero vector of constants. What is the asymptotic distribution of $\mathbf{a}^\top \hat{\theta}_n$?
 - (c) Based on the last result, give a $(1 - \alpha)100\%$ confidence interval for $\mathbf{a}^\top \theta$. Use $z_{\alpha/2}$ to denote the value that cuts off the top $\alpha/2$ of the standard normal distribution (For example for $\alpha = 0.05$, $z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$). Show some work. Why are you using $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_n$ instead of \mathbf{V}_n ?
 - (d) Using the same standard error, write down a z statistic for testing $H_0 : \mathbf{a}^\top \theta = h$.
 - (e) Show that for $H_0 : \mathbf{a}^\top \theta = h$, $W_n = z^2$.

¹This assignment was prepared by Jerry Brunner, Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto. It is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution - ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/). Use any part of it as you like and share the result freely. The L^AT_EX source code is available from the course website: <http://www.utstat.toronto.edu/brunner/oldclass/431s23>

3. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be a random sample from a beta distribution. The density is

$$f(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} x^{\alpha-1} (1-x)^{\beta-1}$$

for $0 < x < 1$, where α and β are both greater than zero. Numerical data are available [HERE](#). You can get a copy of the data with

```
x = scan("https://www.utstat.toronto.edu/brunner/openSEM/data/beta24.data.txt")
```

- Find the maximum likelihood estimates of α and β .
- Test $H_0 : \beta = 2\alpha$ with a large-sample likelihood ratio test. Your output should include the G^2 statistic, the degrees of freedom, and the p -value. Is the null hypothesis rejected at the 0.05 significance level? What, if anything, do you conclude?
- Test the same null hypothesis, this time with a Wald test. Your output should include the W_n statistic, the degrees of freedom, and the p -value. Is the null hypothesis rejected at the 0.05 significance level? What, if anything, do you conclude?
- Give a 95% confidence interval for the quantity $2\alpha - \beta$. Your answer is a set of two numbers, the lower confidence limit and the upper confidence limit. Hint: Does this remind you of Problem [2c](#)?

Please bring a printout of your full R input and output to the quiz.

4. Independently for $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $y_i = \beta x_i + \epsilon_i$, where $x_i \sim N(\mu_x, \sigma_x^2)$, $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$, and x_i and ϵ_i are independent. This is the model of Question 14 in Assignment 3.

- Use R to simulate a data set from this model. The true parameter values and the sample size are up to you, but the sample size should be large.
- In Question 14 of Assignment 3, you found two method of moments estimators for β . They were

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{\bar{y}_n}{\bar{x}_n} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\beta}_2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x}_n)(y_i - \bar{y}_n)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x}_n)^2}$$

Calculate $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $\hat{\beta}_2$ for your simulated data. Which estimate comes closer to the truth? Of course you would have to carry out this experiment a large number of times to determine whether one of them is better in general.

Please bring a printout of your full R input and output to the quiz.

5. The usual univariate multiple regression model with independent normal errors is

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon},$$

where \mathbf{X} is an $n \times p$ matrix of known constants, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a $p \times 1$ vector of unknown constants, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is multivariate normal with mean zero and covariance matrix $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n$, with $\sigma^2 > 0$ an unknown constant. But of course in practice, the explanatory variables are random, not fixed. Clearly, if the model holds *conditionally* upon the values of the explanatory variables, then all the usual results hold, again conditionally upon the particular values of the explanatory variables. The probabilities (for example, p -values) are conditional probabilities, and the F statistic does not have an F distribution, but a conditional F distribution, given $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{X}$.

- Show that the least-squares estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{y}$ is conditionally unbiased.
 - Show that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is also unbiased unconditionally.
 - A similar calculation applies to the significance level of a hypothesis test. Let F be the test statistic (say for an extra-sum-of-squares F -test), and f_c be the critical value. If the null hypothesis is true, then the test is size α , conditionally upon the explanatory variable values. That is, $P(F > f_c | \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{X}) = \alpha$. Find the *unconditional* probability of a Type I error. Assume that the explanatory variables are discrete, so you can write a multiple sum.
6. The point of this question is that under conditions that are fairly common and natural, MLEs and likelihood ratio tests based on a fixed- x regression model are also valid for a random- x model. For notational convenience, suppose that the model parameter $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$, and that the joint density/probability mass function of the data can be written

$$f_\theta(x, y) = g_{\theta_1}(y|x) h_{\theta_2}(x), \text{ where}$$

- $f_\theta(x, y)$ is the joint density of x and y . It depends on the entire parameter vector θ .
- $g_{\theta_1}(y|x)$ is the conditional density of y given x . It depends on θ_1 .
- $h_{\theta_2}(x)$ is the marginal density of x . It depends on θ_2 .

The quantities x , y , θ_1 and θ_2 could all be vectors. There must be no functional connection between θ_1 and θ_2 . For example in a regression, we might have $\theta_1 = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$, and if $h_{\theta_2}(x)$ is a multivariate normal density, θ_2 would be the unique elements of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_x$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$. The lack of functional connection between θ_1 and θ_2 just means there are no β_j parameters and no σ^2 in $\boldsymbol{\mu}_x$ or $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$. Usually, we only care about the parameters in θ_1 .

- Writing the full likelihood as $L(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_\theta(x_i, y_i)$, show that $\widehat{\theta}_1$ for the random- x model is the same as for the model of y conditional on x . It's easiest to see if you take the log of the likelihood and start differentiating.
- Now consider a likelihood ratio test that *only* restricts θ_1 . In regression, it would be about the β_j parameters. Show that the likelihood ratio test statistic

$$G^2 = -2 \ln \left(\frac{L(\widehat{\theta}_0)}{L(\widehat{\theta})} \right)$$

for the random- x model is the same as for the model of y conditional on x .

Please bring printouts of your full R input and output for Questions 3 and 4 to the quiz.