

U

	L1	L2	L3	L4
# of predictors	6	4	3	2
# with $0.01 \leq p\text{-value} \leq 0.05$	0	0	0	0
# with $p\text{-value} > 0.05$	4	2	1	1
$R_I^2$	0.941	0.941	0.939	0.932
$\text{corr}(\hat{Y}, \hat{Y}_I)$	1.0	0.9998	0.9992	0.9953
$C_p(I)$	6.0	2.61	2.83	13.84
$\sqrt{MSE}$	16.700	16.592	16.687	17.584
p-value for partial $F$ test	1.0	0.742	0.424	0.005

- 1) The above table gives summary statistics for 4 MLR models considered as final submodels after performing variable selection. The data set had 111 cases and the response plot and residual plot for the full model L1 was good. Model L2 was the minimum  $C_p$  model found.

- a) For the partial  $F$  test, if  $0.07 \leq p\text{-value} < 0.10$ , there is a small amount of evidence that  $H_0$  should be rejected. If  $0.01 \leq p\text{-value} < 0.07$  then there is moderate evidence that  $H_0$  should be rejected. If  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$  then there is strong evidence that  $H_0$  should be rejected. For which models, if any, is there strong evidence that "Ho: reduced model is good" should be rejected.

L4

- b) Which model should be used as the final submodel? Explain briefly why each of the other 3 submodels should not be used.

L3 = II

L1 and L2 have too many predictors

L4 has  $C_p > 2k$  and  $p\text{-val} = .005$  is too small

- 7) Find shorth(5) for the following data set. Show work.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 6 \quad 76 \quad 90 \quad 98 \quad \underline{\overbrace{90}^{=94-6} \quad 94} \quad 94 \quad 95 \quad 97 \quad 97 \quad 1008 \\
 & \text{shorth}(5) = \underline{\overbrace{94-76}^{18}} \quad \underline{\overbrace{95-90}^{5}} \quad \underline{\overbrace{97-90}^{7}} \quad \underline{\overbrace{97-94}^{3}} \quad \leftarrow \text{shortest} \quad \underline{\overbrace{94-97}^{914}} = \underline{\overbrace{1008-94}^{914}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Base terms: (log[TeachSal] log[TeachTax])

	df	RSS		k	C_I	$\leftarrow$ model to look at
Add: log[Service]	41	3.34509		4	6.966	
Add: log[Bread]	41	3.37904		4	7.413	
Add: log[EngSal]	41	3.44498		4	8.279	
Add: log[EngTax]	41	3.57509		4	9.989	
Add: log[BusFare]	41	3.5824		4	10.085	
Add: log[VacDays]	41	3.62314		4	10.621	
Add: log[WorkHrs]	41	3.63334		4	10.755	

Base terms: (log[TeachSal] log[TeachTax] log[Service])

	df	RSS		k	C_I	$\leftarrow$ model to look at
Add: log[EngSal]	40	3.1498		5	6.400	
Add: log[Bread]	40	3.18237		5	6.828	
Add: log[BusFare]	40	3.21972		5	7.319	
Add: log[EngTax]	40	3.32914		5	8.757	
Add: log[WorkHrs]	40	3.33908		5	8.887	
Add: log[VacDays]	40	3.34442		5	8.958	

Base terms: (log[TeachSal] log[TeachTax] log[Service] log[EngSal])

	df	RSS		k	C_I	$\leftarrow I_I = I_{min}$
Add: log[BusFare]	39	2.88385		6	4.904	
Add: log[Bread]	39	3.07875		6	7.466	
Add: log[EngTax]	39	3.11603		6	7.956	model with
Add: log[VacDays]	39	3.14563		6	8.345	$C_P(I) \leq C_P(I_{min}) + 1 = 8.9$
Add: log[WorkHrs]	39	3.14787		6	8.374	and # predictors $\leq$

- 3) The above output is for the Big Mac data. Do not forget the constant. # predictors  $\leq I_{min}$

a) List the k=4 model.

$\log(\text{TeachSal})$ ,  $\log(\text{TeachTax})$ ,  $\log(\text{Service})$ , constant

model to look at

b) List the k=5 model.

$\log(\text{TeachSal})$ ,  $\log(\text{TeachTax})$ ,  $\log(\text{Service})$ ,  $\log(\text{EngSal})$ , constant

model to look at

c) List the k=6 model.

$\log(\text{TeachSal})$ ,  $\log(\text{TeachTax})$ ,  $\log(\text{Service})$ ,  $\log(\text{EngSal})$ ,  $\log(\text{BusFare})$ , constant

$I_I$

d) What is the value of k for model  $I_I$ ?

$k = 6$

Other models to look at have  $C_P(I) \leq C_P(I_{min}) + 1 = 8.904$   
and fewer predictors than  $I_I$