

Assignment - 2

(1) a) Let regression line y on x be

$$\hat{y} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x$$

$$\hat{\beta} = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} = \frac{\sum xy - n\bar{x}\bar{y}}{\sum x^2 - n\bar{x}^2}$$

$$\sum xy = 182560$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{n} = 850$$

$$\bar{y} = \frac{\sum y}{n} = 173.7$$

$$\sum x^2 = 92500$$

$$\therefore \hat{\beta} = \frac{182560 - (10 \times 85 \times 173.7)}{92500 - (10 \times 85^2)}$$

$$\hat{\beta} = 1.7242$$

$$\therefore \hat{\alpha} = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}\bar{x} = 27.143$$

$$\text{So, } \hat{y} = 27.143 + 1.7242x$$

b) Since the slope (β) is positive, y and x have a +ve relation.

(2) (i) Here, the least square fit regression line is : $\hat{y} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x$

$$\hat{\beta} = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} = \frac{38191.41 - (12 \times 32.1 \times 96.875)}{12666.58 - (12 \times 32.1^2)}$$

$$= \frac{875.16}{301.66} = 2.9011$$

$$= \hat{\alpha} = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta} \bar{x}$$

$$= 96.875 - (2.9011 \times 32.1)$$

$$= \underline{\underline{3.7497}}$$

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{\hat{y} = 3.7497 + 2.9011x}$$

cii) Test statistic : $\frac{\hat{\beta} - \beta}{\sqrt{\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{S_{xx}}} \sim t_{n-2}$

$$= \hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{S_{yy} - \frac{S_{xy}^2}{S_{xx}}}{n-2}$$

= On putting values, we get

$$\boxed{\hat{\sigma}^2 = 387.075}$$

$$= 95\% \text{ CI} = \hat{\beta} \pm t_{0.025, 10} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{S_{xx}}}$$

$$= 2.9011 \pm 2.228 \times \sqrt{\frac{387.075}{301.66}}$$

$$= (0.3773, 5.4249)$$

$$(iii) \mu_0 \sim N \left[\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0, \sigma^2 \left[\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}} \right] \right]$$

Test Statistic $\rightarrow$ TS $\rightarrow$

$$\frac{\mu_0 - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0)}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}}} \sim t_{n-2}$$

$$95\% \text{ CI for } \mu_0 = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0 \pm t_{0.025, 10} \sqrt{se(\mu_0)^2}$$

$$= se(\mu_0) = \sqrt{387.075 \left\{ \frac{1}{12} + \frac{(40 - 32.1)^2}{301.66} \right\}}$$

$$= \left\{ se(\mu_0) = 10.3989 \right\}$$

$$\therefore 95\% \text{ CI} = 3.7497 + (2.9011 \times 40) \pm (2.228 \times 10.5989)$$

$$= (96.178, 143.408)$$

③ (i) The plot suggests that:-
the time differences in commutation in peak hours and non peak hours is minimum in city D and max in city A, whereas the variation for city C is the least as compared to D with max. variance.

(ii) Assumptions for ANOVA :-

$\rightarrow$ The data should conform to a Normal distribution

$\rightarrow$ The sample items must be independent of each other

→ The population should have a common variance

(iii) H_0 : Mean of difference is same for each city.
 H_1 : Mean is different

$$= SS_{TOT} = SS_y = \sum y^2 - n\bar{y}^2$$

$$= 1495 - \left(28 \times \frac{103^2}{28} \right)$$

$$= 1116.11 \quad \text{--- (1)}$$

$$= SS_{reg} = \frac{1}{n} \left[64^2 + 44^2 + 8^2 + (-13)^2 \right] - \left(\frac{28 \times 103^2}{28} \right) = 516.11 \quad \text{--- (2)}$$

∴ From (1) & (2).

$$= SS_{res} = SS_{TOT} - SS_{reg}$$

$$= SS_{res} = 1116.11 - 516.11$$

$$\boxed{SS_{res} = 600}$$

ANOVA Table

Source of Variation	Dof	Sum of Sq	MSS
Regression	3	516.11	172.0
Residual	24	600	25
Total	27	1116.11	

TS:

$$\frac{MSS_{\text{peg}}}{MSS_{\text{res}}} \sim F_{3,24}$$

$$= F_{\text{cal}} = \frac{MSS_{\text{peg}}}{MSS_{\text{res}}} = \frac{172.04}{25} = 6.88$$

$$F_{\text{tab}} = F_{3,25} = 3.009$$

$\therefore F_{\text{cal}} > F_{\text{tab}}$, so we reject H_0 at 5% significance level. Thus we can conclude that the mean of difference in here is not same

④ a) Mathematical Model of one-way ANOVA given by:-

$$y_{ij} = \mu + T_i + \epsilon_{ij}; \text{ where}$$

y_{ij} = j^{th} observation on the i^{th} treatment

μ = common effect for the whole experiment

T_i = i^{th} treatment effect

ϵ_{ij} = random error in the j^{th} observation on the i^{th} treatment

Assumptions $\rightarrow$

1. Errors are assumed to be Normally and independently distribution with mean 0 and constant variance σ^2
2. μ is a fixed parameter

(b) H_0 : Mean claims are equal
 H_1 : Mean claims are unequal

$$\sim \begin{matrix} M_1 = 7 & M_3 = 6 & M_5 = 5 \\ M_2 = 8 & M_4 = 7 & M_{TOT} = 53 \end{matrix}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^5 \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} y_{ij} = 354 + 386 + 87 + 645 + 384 = 1856$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^5 \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} y_{ij}^2 = 27184 + 29430 + 2123 + 84669 + 30910 = 174316$$

$$SS_{TOT} = 174316 - \left\{ \frac{33 \times 1856}{33 \times 33} \right\}$$

$$= 69930.06$$

$$= SS_{reg} = \left[\frac{354^2}{7} + \frac{386^2}{8} + \frac{87^2}{1} + \frac{645^2}{7} + \frac{384^2}{3} \right] - \left[\frac{33 \times 1856^2}{33^2} \right]$$

$$= 22325.69$$

$$= SS_{res} = SS_{TOT} - SS_{reg} = 47604.37$$

Source of Variation	Dof	Sum of Sq	MSS
Regression	4	22325.69	5581.42
Residual	28	47604.37	1700.156
Total	32	69930.06	

TS: $\frac{MSS_{reg}}{MSS_{res}} \sim F_{4,28}$

$F_{cal} = \frac{5581.4225}{1700.156} = 3.2829$

$F_{tab} = F_{4,28} = 2.714$

Since $F_{cal} > F_{tab}$, we reject H_0
 → mean claims are not equal for the 5 companies

(c) H_0 : No association between salaries & no. of papers cleared

H_1 : There is an interdependence between salary and papers cleared.

O_i

Salary	3-5	5-8	8-10	10-12	Total
Papers					
0-3	45	20	6	5	76
4-6	7	20	9	6	42
7-9	5	8	15	12	40
Total	57	48	30	23	158

E_i

	3-5	5-8	8-10	10-12
0-3	27.4177	23.0536	14.4303	11.0629
4-6	15.1518	12.7594	7.9746	6.1139
7-9	14.4305	12.1518	7.5949	5.8228

$$T_{31} \quad \frac{\sum (C_{0i} - \bar{C}_i)^2}{C_i} \sim \chi^2_{(3-1)(2-1)}$$

$$\chi^2_{\text{cal}} = 49.91146$$

$$\chi^2_{\text{tab}} = \chi^2_{1.5\%} = 12.59$$

Since $\chi^2_{\text{cal}} > \chi^2_{\text{tab}}$, we reject H_0

$\therefore$ Salaries and no. of papers cleaned are associated.

⑤ Assumptions:-

Data should be normally distributed
sample items must be independent
populations should have common
variance.

ii) Missing values are

$$\text{Mean} \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{29} + \sqrt{13} + \sqrt{21}}{3}$$

$$= 4.5444$$

$$\text{Var}_x = \frac{\sum (X_i - \bar{x})^2}{n-1}$$

$$= 0.1213$$

(iii) loge transformation is the best suited as the common variance assumption holds true in this case

(iv) a) $y_{ij} = \mu + T_i + \epsilon_{ij}$, $i = j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

$H_0: T_i = 0$

$H_1: T_i \neq 0$

b) $\bar{y}_i^2 = \sum y_{ij}^2 = (3 \times \text{Mean } i)^2 = 973.375$

$SS_{\text{reg}} = \sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{\bar{y}_i^2}{3} - \frac{\bar{y}^2}{12} = 21.153$

$SS_{\text{res}} = \sum_{i=1}^4 \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 (y_{ij} - \bar{y}_i)^2 \right)$

$= \sum_{i=1}^4 \{ 2 \times \text{Variance} \}$

$= 2 \times 0.618$

$= 1.236$

Source of Variation	Dof	Sum of Sq	MSS
Regression	3	21.153	7.051
Residuals	8	1.236	0.155
Total	11	22.386	

TS: $\frac{MSS_{\text{reg}}}{MSS_{\text{res}}} \sim F_{3,8}$

$F_{\text{cal}} = 45.638$

$F_{\text{tab}} = F_{3,8, 5\%} = 4.066$

Since $F_{\text{cal}} > F_{\text{tab}}$, we reject H_0

$$\begin{aligned}
 \textcircled{a} \text{ i) Correlation coeff (r)} &= \frac{S_{xy}}{\sqrt{S_{xx} \cdot S_{yy}}} \\
 &= \frac{\sum xy - n\bar{x}\bar{y}}{\sqrt{(\sum x^2 - n\bar{x}^2)(\sum y^2 - n\bar{y}^2)}} \\
 &= \frac{661.2}{\sqrt{34.9 \times 8923.6}} \\
 &= \underline{\underline{0.9447}}
 \end{aligned}$$

ii) Fitted linear regression eqn is given by

by

$$\hat{y} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x$$

$$\hat{\beta} = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} = \frac{661.2}{54.9} = 12.0437$$

$$= \hat{\alpha} = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}\bar{x}$$

$$= 9.22957$$

$$\text{Ans} = \hat{y} = 9.22957 + 12.0437x$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{iii) } SS_{\text{tot}} &= S_{yy} = \sum y^2 - n\bar{y}^2 \\
 &= 40508 - (10 \times 56.2^2) \\
 &= \underline{\underline{8923.6}}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$SS_{\text{reg}} = \frac{S^2_{xy}}{S_{xx}} = \frac{661.2^2}{54.9} = 7963.3$$

$$SS_{res} = SS_{Tot} - SS_{reg} = 960.3$$

$$(iv) R^2 = \frac{SS_{reg}}{SS_{Tot}} = \frac{7963.3}{8923.6} = 0.8924$$

→ Using part (i), we have
 $r^2 = R^2$

→ The correlation coeff is the square root of the coeff of determination

(v) i) Linear Regression equation :-

$$\hat{y} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x$$

$$\hat{\beta} = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} = \frac{2176.84}{7545.9 - (11 \times 250.5889)} = 0.4545$$

$$\hat{\alpha} = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}\bar{x} = 10.7907$$

$$\hat{y} = 10.7907 + 0.4545x$$

$$ii) H_0 : \beta = 0 ; H_1 : \beta \neq 0$$

$$TS : \frac{\hat{\beta} - \beta}{\text{se}(\hat{\beta})} \sim t_{n-2}$$

$$\text{se}(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2}}{\sqrt{S_{xx}}} = \frac{\sqrt{SS_{res}}}{\sqrt{(n-2)S_{xx}}} = \frac{\sqrt{1189.203 - \frac{2176.84^2}{4739.422}}}{\sqrt{9 \times 4739.422}} = 0.0681$$

$$t_{cal} = \frac{0.4545}{0.0681} = 6.674$$

$$t_{tab} = t_{9, 1.5\%} = 2.162$$

Since $t_{cal} > t_{tab}$, we reject H_0 . There is a linear relationship b/w X & Y .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(ii) corr. coeff (r)} &= \frac{S_{xy}}{\sqrt{S_{xx} \cdot S_{yy}}} \\ &= \frac{2176.84}{\sqrt{4739.4221 \times 1189.1208}} \\ &= 0.9121 \end{aligned}$$

(iv) Individual response:-

$$y_0 \sim N \left[\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0, \sigma^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}} \right) \right]$$

$$\rightarrow T.S. = \frac{y_0 - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0)}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}}} \sim t_{n-2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= 22.1532 \pm 2.262 \sqrt{22.2014 \left(1 + \frac{1}{11} + \frac{0.01756}{11} \right)} \\ &= (10.9319, 33.3745) \end{aligned}$$

Mean Response $\rightarrow$

$$\begin{aligned} T.S. &= \frac{y_0 - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} x_0)}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{S_{xx}}}} \sim t_{n-2} \end{aligned}$$

$$95\% \text{ CI} = \hat{x} + \hat{\beta}x_0 \pm t_{9, 0.025} \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_0 - \bar{x})^2}{\sum x_i^2} \right)}$$

$$= (18.643, 25.663)$$

(v) The residual plot appears to follow a pattern which is first increasing and then decreasing, which implies that the model isn't a good fit for the ~~data~~ data.

③ (i) → Factor Analysis provides a method for reducing the dimensionality of the data set i.e. it seeks to identify the key components necessary to model and understand data.

④ → the original data is rewritten in terms of new variables that are uncorrelated; only some are needed to explain most of the variability observed in the data. These new variables are called principle components.

(ii) Variance-cov matrix of PC1, PC2, PC3, PC4, PC5 is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.436 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.137 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.08 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0165 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.012 \end{bmatrix}$$

• % of total variance explained by each PC:

$$PC1 = \frac{0.456}{0.7015} \times 100 = 65\%$$

$$PC2 = \frac{0.137}{0.7015} \times 100 = 19.53\%$$

$$PC3 = \frac{0.08 \times 100}{0.7015} = 11.46\%$$

$$PC4 = \frac{0.01 \times 100}{0.7015} = 2.35\%$$

$$PC5 = \frac{0.012 \times 100}{0.7015} = 1.71\%$$

(iii) We can conclude that the dimensionality could be reduced 3, using the first 3 PCs as 96% of variability has been explained by these 3 alone

9 (i) Based on the plot, there is a negative linear correlation b/w marks and hours spent daily on social Media

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(ii) correlation coeff}(r) &= \frac{S_{xy}}{\sqrt{S_{xx} \cdot S_{yy}}} \\ &= \frac{-290}{\sqrt{75 \times 2428.4}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(iii) } H_0: P &= 0 \\ H_1: P &< 0 \end{aligned} \quad = -0.686$$

Using Fisher's transformation

$$W = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{1+r}{1-r} \right) \sim N \left(\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho} \right), \frac{1}{n-3} \right)$$

$$= z_{cal} = -0.84036 \sqrt{n} = -2.2234$$

$$= z_{tab} = -1.96$$

→ Since $z_{cal} < z_{tab}$; we reject H_0 . there is negative correlation b/w the variables

(iv) Let the linear regression model:

$$\hat{y} = \hat{a} + \hat{\beta}x$$

$$\hat{\beta} = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} = \frac{-296}{75} = -3.9467$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{a} &= \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}\bar{x} \\ &= 64.4 - (-3.9467)(4.5) \\ &= 82.16\end{aligned}$$

$$\hat{y} = 82.16 - 3.9467x$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(v) Coefficient of } CR^2 &= \frac{S^2_{xy}}{S_{xx} \cdot S_{yy}} = \frac{(-296)^2}{75 \times 2482.4} \\ \text{determination} &= 0.4706\end{aligned}$$

$$\rightarrow r^2 = R^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(vi) Expected change in} &= \Delta \hat{y} \\ \text{marks} &= -3.9467\end{aligned}$$

(10) H_0 : Inclination has no impact on resignation rate
 H_1 : There is an impact

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{27 + 36 + 30}{3} = 31$$

$$SS_{\text{Reg}} = 20 \left[(27-31)^2 + (36-31)^2 + (30-31)^2 \right] = 840$$

$$SS_{\text{res}} = 19 (5^2 + 10^2 + 8^2) = 3591$$

ANOVA TABLE

Source of Variation	Dof	Sum of Sq	MSS
Residual	57	3591	63
Regression	2	840	420

$$TS: \frac{MSS_{\text{Reg}}}{MSS_{\text{res}}} \sim F_{2,57}$$

$$F_{\text{cal}} = \frac{420}{63} = 6.67$$

$$F_{\text{tab}} = F_{2,60, 0.5\%} = 3.130$$

→ As $F_{\text{cal}} > F_{\text{tab}}$ we reject H_0 , there is an impact of industry on the resignation ratio.