

# Statistics 5401

## 14. Univariate Linear Models

Gary W. Oehlert  
School of Statistics  
313B Ford Hall  
612-625-1557  
gary@stat.umn.edu

Linear models relate a *target* or *response* or *dependent* variable  $y$  to known *predictor* or *independent* variables  $x_j$ , unknown *parameters*  $\beta_j$ , and *random variation*.

$$y = \text{predictable part} + \text{random variation}$$

The predictable part is a function of the predictor variables and the parameters. Because this is a linear model, the parameters enter the predictable part linearly:

$$\text{predictable part} = f(x)' \beta$$

where  $\beta$  is the vector of unknown parameters and  $f(x)$  is some (vector) function of the predictor variables. Many well known examples.

*Multiple regression.*

$$y_i = (x_{i0}\beta_0 + x_{i1}\beta_1 + \dots + x_{ik}\beta_k) + \{\epsilon_i\}$$

Usually,  $x_{i0} \equiv 1$ .

Here the part in parentheses is the predictable part, and the part in braces is the unpredictable part.

*One-way ANOVA, g-group means.*

$$y_{ij} = (\mu_i) + \{\epsilon_{ij}\}$$

or

$$y_{ij} = (\mu + \alpha_i) + \{\epsilon_{ij}\}$$

with  $\sum_{i=1}^g \alpha_i = 0$  or a similar restriction.

This can be rewritten as a multiple regression in several ways.

*Nested random effects.*

$$y_{ijk} = (\mu) + \{A_i + B_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijk}\}$$

Here the only predictable part is the overall mean. The other terms are random, and because all  $y_{ijk}$ s with the same  $i$  share the same  $A_i$ , and all  $y_{ijk}$ s with the same  $i, j$  share the same  $B_{ij}$ , there is correlation among the responses.

*Randomized complete block.*

$$y_{ij} = (\mu + \alpha_i) + \{B_j + \epsilon_{ij}\}$$

with  $\sum_{i=1}^g \alpha_i = 0$  or a similar restriction. This assumes that the block effects  $B_j$  are random.

This is a special case of a profile analysis, where we know ahead of time that the correlations are  $\sigma_B^2 / (\sigma_B^2 + \sigma^2)$ .

In particular, the distribution of  $\mathbf{C}y$  does not depend on  $\sigma_B^2$ .

*Analysis of Covariance.* This combines regression and ANOVA-type predictor terms.

$$y_{ij} = (\mu + \alpha_i + x_{ij}\beta) + \{\epsilon_{ij}\}$$

with  $\sum_{i=1}^g \alpha_i = 0$  or a similar restriction. This is a model with parallel lines, with the slope  $\beta$  and different intercepts from the different  $\alpha_i$ s.

There are many more fancier ANOVA-type structures, including factorials, split plots, and so on. All can be written as linear models.

In all cases, if we write all the responses in one vector  $y$ , all the parameters in one vector  $\beta$  and all the predicting variables in one matrix  $\mathbf{X}$ , then

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

where  $\mathbf{X}\beta$  is predictable, and  $\epsilon$  is not predictable. The elements of  $\epsilon$  may be correlated.

We can write the predictable part in many ways. That is,

$$\mathbf{X}\beta = \mathbf{X}^*\beta^*$$

for lots of different  $\mathbf{X}^*$  and  $\beta^*$  pairs.

In one-way ANOVA, we could write  $\mu_i$  or  $\mu + \alpha_i$ .

In regression, we could replace  $x_{i1}$  and  $x_{i2}$  with  $(x_{i1} + x_{i2})$  and  $(x_{i1} - x_{i2})$  (and modified coefficients).

In general, the value of the predictable part is well defined, but the expression as independent variables and parameters is pretty arbitrary.

We have a linear model. The parameters enter linearly, and the unpredictable term is added to the predictable term.

We also want to test *linear hypotheses* about the parameters. Let  $\beta$  be  $r \times 1$ , and let  $\mathbf{L}$  be  $f_h \times r$  of full rank. We want to test

$$H_0 : \mathbf{L}\beta = 0$$

versus

$$H_0 : \mathbf{L}\beta \neq 0$$

Important note: if  $\mathbf{X}$  is not full rank, then some linear combinations  $\ell'\beta$  are not well defined without further restrictions.

For example, consider the one-way model  $\mu + \alpha_i$ . It doesn't make sense to look at  $\alpha_1$ , because we can add 10 to  $\mu$  and subtract 10 from  $\alpha_i$  and not change the predictable part.

We are OK if  $\ell = \mathbf{X}'\gamma$ , that is, if  $\ell$  is a linear combination of the rows of  $\mathbf{X}$ . In this case, the linear combination is *estimable*.

In the one-way model, if the coefficient for  $\mu$  equals the sum of the coefficients for the  $\alpha_i$ s, then  $\ell'\beta$  is estimable in the one-way model.

Examples. Multiple regression with a constant plus four predictors.

$H_0 : \beta_2 = 0$  has  $f_h = 1$  and corresponds to

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$H_0 : \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$  has  $f_h = 2$  and corresponds to

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$H_0 : \beta_2 - \beta_3 = 0$  has  $f_h = 1$  and corresponds to

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

One-way ANOVA.

$H_0 : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_g = 0$  has  $f_h = g - 1$  and corresponds to ( $g = 4$  groups)

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

or

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

because the sum of the  $\alpha_i$ s is fixed at zero.

*Least Squares.* Estimation by least squares finds the estimate  $\mathbf{b}$  of  $\beta$  that minimizes the sum of squared differences between the observed data and the fitted values using  $\mathbf{b}$ . Least squares estimation is also maximum likelihood estimation for independent, normally distributed errors.

The sum of squared differences is often referred to as the *residual sum of squares* RSS, or the *sum of squares for error*  $SS_E$ .

Let  $\mathbf{b}^0$  be the estimate of  $\beta$  when the null is assumed to be true. That is, the vector that minimizes RSS subject to  $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{b} = 0$ . Call the RSS under the null  $RSS(H_0)$ .

Let  $\mathbf{b}^1$  be the estimate of  $\beta$  when the alternative is assumed to be true. That is, the vector that minimizes RSS without restrictions. Call the RSS under the alternative  $RSS(H_1)$ , or  $SS_E$ .

$RSS(H_0)$  and  $RSS(H_1)$  do not depend on the parameterization we choose (the  $\mathbf{b}$ 's depend on the parameterization, but not the sums of squares). Thus we can always use the most convenient parameterization.

Define

$$SS_H = RSS(H_0) - RSS(H_1)$$

This is the increase in RSS when going from the null fit to the alternative fit.

Large values of  $SS_H$  imply that the alternative fits much better than the null, thus implying that the null should be rejected. Specifically, we look at the ratio  $SS_H/SS_E$  and reject for large values. Under the null (with normality)

$$\frac{SS_H}{SS_E} \sim \frac{f_h}{f_e} F_{f_h, f_e}$$

Of course, this is just the usual F test with the degrees of freedom multiplying the F distribution instead of scaling sums of squares into mean squares.

The likelihood ratio test is

$$\Lambda = \left( \frac{RSS(H_0)}{RSS(H_1)} \right)^{-n/2} = \left( 1 + \frac{SS_H}{SS_E} \right)^{-n/2}$$

For large samples under the null,  $SS_E$  should be much bigger than  $SS_H$ , so

$$\chi_{f_e}^2 \sim -2 \ln \Lambda = n \ln \left( 1 + \frac{SS_H}{SS_E} \right) \approx n \frac{SS_H}{SS_E}$$

which agrees asymptotically with the F test.

Here is a shortcut(?). Suppose that the (estimated) variance matrix for  $\mathbf{b}$  is  $s^2\mathbf{C}$ . Then the sum of squares for the hypothesis

$$H_0 : \mathbf{L}\beta = 0$$

is

$$SS_H = (\mathbf{Lb})'(\mathbf{LCL}')^{-1}(\mathbf{Lb})$$

This is very like a Mahalanobis distance.

A regression example. The actual data follow a quadratic, and we'll try to fit a cubic.

```
Cmd> x <- run(20)
```

```
Cmd> x2 <- x*x
```

```
Cmd> x3 <- x*x*x
```

```
Cmd> setseeds(12224,546778)
```

```
Cmd> y <- 3 + 2*x - x2/100 + rnorm(20)
```

```
Cmd> regress("y=x+x2+x3")
```

```
Model used is y=x+x2+x3
```

	Coef	StdErr	t
CONSTANT	2.7427	1.1934	2.2981
x	1.8668	0.48019	3.8875
x2	0.02275	0.05246	0.43367
x3	-0.0014094	0.0016447	-0.85696

```
N: 20, MSE: 1.1937, DF: 16, R^2: 0.99120
```

```
Regression F(3,16): 600.39, Durbin-Watson: 1.5525
```

```
To see the ANOVA table type 'anova()'
```

```
Cmd> anova()
```

```
Model used is y=x+x2+x3
```

```
WARNING: summaries are sequential
```

	DF	SS	MS
CONSTANT	1	10126	10126
x	1	2140.9	2140.9
x2	1	8.2267	8.2267
x3	1	0.87661	0.87661
ERROR1	16	19.099	1.1937

```
Cmd> .87661/1.1937
```

```
(1) 0.73436
```

```
Cmd> .85696*.85696
```

```
(1) 0.73438
```

```
Cmd> (8.2267+.87661)
```

```
(1) 9.1033
```

```
Cmd> 9.1033/2
```

(1) 4.5517

Cmd> 4.5517/1.1937

(1) 3.8131

Cmd> 1-cumF(3.813,2,16)

(1) 0.044242

Cmd> COEF

CONSTANT	x	x2	x3
2.7427	1.8668	0.02275	-0.00141

Cmd> SS

CONSTANT	x	x2	x3	ERROR1
10126	2140.9	8.2267	0.87661	19.099

Cmd> DF

CONSTANT	x	x2	x3	ERROR1
1	1	1	1	16

Cmd> XTXINV

	CONSTANT	x	x2	x3
CONSTANT	1.1932	-0.4343	0.042312	-0.001204
x	-0.4343	0.19317	-0.020548	0.00061435
x2	0.042312	-0.020548	0.0023055	-7.1383e-05
x3	-0.001204	0.00061435	-7.1383e-05	2.2661e-06

Cmd> c <- XTXINV[run(3,4),run(3,4)]

Cmd> lb <- COEF[run(3,4)];lb

x2	x3
0.02275	-0.0014094

Cmd> c

	x2	x3
x2	0.0023055	-7.1383e-05
x3	-7.1383e-05	2.2661e-06

Cmd> lb'%\*%solve(c)%\*%lb

(1)  
(1) 9.1034

Cmd> anova("y=x+x2+x3")

Model used is y=x+x2+x3

WARNING: summaries are sequential

DF	SS	MS
----	----	----

CONSTANT	1	10126	10126
x	1	2140.9	2140.9
x2	1	8.2267	8.2267
x3	1	0.87661	0.87661
ERROR1	16	19.099	1.1937

```
Cmd> anova("y=x+x2+x3",fstats:T)
```

```
Model used is y=x+x2+x3
```

```
WARNING: summaries are sequential
```

	DF	SS	MS	F	P-value
CONSTANT	1	10126	10126	8482.63112	0
x	1	2140.9	2140.9	1793.55009	0
x2	1	8.2267	8.2267	6.89193	0.018373
x3	1	0.87661	0.87661	0.73438	0.40412
ERROR1	16	19.099	1.1937		

One-way ANOVA with five groups.

```
Cmd> a <- factor(rep(run(5),4))
```

```
Cmd> y <- vector(3,1,6,4,5)[a]+rnorm(20)
```

```
Cmd> anova("y=a")
```

```
Model used is y=a
```

	DF	SS	MS
CONSTANT	1	277.99	277.99
a	4	78.37	19.592
ERROR1	15	10.529	0.70191

```
Cmd> coefs()
```

```
component: CONSTANT
```

```
(1) 3.7282
```

```
component: a
```

```
(1) 0.059304 -3.2705 2.7802 -0.51608 0.94706
```

```
Cmd> coefs("a",se:T)
```

```
component: coefs
```

```
(1) 0.059304 -3.2705 2.7802 -0.51608 0.94706
```

```
component: se
```

```
(1) 0.37468 0.37468 0.37468 0.37468 0.37468
```

```
Cmd> contrast("a",vector(1,1,1,-1.5,-1.5))
```

```
component: estimate
```

```
(1) -1.0775
```

```
component: ss
```

```
(1) 0.61915
```

```
component: se
```

```
(1) 1.1472
```

## Analysis of covariance.

```
Cmd> y <- vector(3,1,6,4,5)[a]+x/2+rnorm(20)
```

```
Cmd> anova("y=x+a",pvals:T)
```

Model used is y=x+a

WARNING: summaries are sequential

	DF	SS	MS	P-value
CONSTANT	1	1685.4	1685.4	0
x	1	157.68	157.68	4.6626e-08
a	4	63.095	15.774	0.00027676
ERROR1	14	19.746	1.4104	

```
Cmd> anova("y=a+x")
```

Model used is y=a+x

WARNING: summaries are sequential

	DF	SS	MS
CONSTANT	1	1685.4	1685.4
a	4	101.6	25.4
x	1	119.17	119.17
ERROR1	14	19.746	1.4104

```
Cmd> anova("y=x+a",marginal:T)
```

Model used is y=x+a

WARNING: SS are Type III sums of squares

	DF	SS	MS
CONSTANT	1	93.258	93.258
x	1	119.17	119.17
a	4	63.095	15.774
ERROR1	14	19.746	1.4104

anova() creates several variables as side effects.

```
Cmd> SS
```

CONSTANT	x	a	ERROR1
93.258	119.17	63.095	19.746

```
Cmd> DF
```

CONSTANT	x	a	ERROR1
1	1	4	14

```
Cmd> RESIDUALS
```

(1)	0.72573	0.19843	0.73128	0.72575	1.4661
(6)	-1.0188	-0.48538	-2.1221	-1.6932	-1.7946
(11)	-0.053961	-0.22043	1.3752	1.2618	0.32385
(16)	0.34705	0.50739	0.015678	-0.29436	0.00465

```
Cmd> HII
(1)      0.34      0.34      0.34      0.34      0.34
(6)      0.26      0.26      0.26      0.26      0.26
(11)     0.26      0.26      0.26      0.26      0.26
(16)     0.34      0.34      0.34      0.34      0.34
```

```
Cmd> COEF
UNDEFINED
```

regress ( ) creates COEF, but anova ( ) does not.  
What else can you extract?

```
Cmd> out <- modelinfo(all:T)
```

```
Cmd> compnames(out)
(1) "xvars"
(2) "y"
(3) "parameters"
(4) "xtxinv"
(5) "coefs"
(6) "aliased"
(7) "scale"
(8) "colcounts"
(9) "weights"
(10) "strmodel"
(11) "bitmodel"
(12) "link"
(13) "distrib"
(14) "termnames"
(15) "sigmahat"
```

The **X** matrix.

```
Cmd> print(out$xvars,format:"f5.0")
MATRIX:
(1,1)    1    1    1    0    0    0
(2,1)    1    2    0    1    0    0
(3,1)    1    3    0    0    1    0
(4,1)    1    4    0    0    0    1
(5,1)    1    5   -1   -1   -1   -1
...
(16,1)   1   16    1    0    0    0
(17,1)   1   17    0    1    0    0
(18,1)   1   18    0    0    1    0
(19,1)   1   19    0    0    0    1
(20,1)   1   20   -1   -1   -1   -1
```



```
Cmd> out$termnames
```

```
(1) "CONSTANT"
```

```
(2) "x"
```

```
(3) "a"
```

```
(4) "ERROR1"
```

```
Cmd> out$strmodel
```

```
(1) "y=1+x+a"
```

```
Cmd> out$colcounts
```

```
(1)          1          1          4
```

```
Cmd> print(out$xtxinv,format:"f8.3",labels:F)
```

```
MATRIX:
```

0.226	-0.017	-0.034	-0.017	0.000	0.017
-0.017	0.002	0.003	0.002	-0.000	-0.002
-0.034	0.003	0.206	-0.047	-0.050	-0.053
-0.017	0.002	-0.047	0.202	-0.050	-0.052
0.000	-0.000	-0.050	-0.050	0.200	-0.050
0.017	-0.002	-0.053	-0.052	-0.050	0.202