

# **Tutorial letter 201/2/2018**

## **Statistical Inference II** **STA2602**

**Semester 2**

**Department of Statistics**

**Solutions to Assignment 1**

**QUESTION 1****[25]**

(a)

**(6)**

$$\begin{aligned}
MSE(\hat{\theta}) &= E[(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2] \\
&= E[(\hat{\theta} - E(\hat{\theta})) + (E(\hat{\theta}) - \theta)]^2 \\
&= E[(\hat{\theta} - E(\hat{\theta}))^2 + 2(\hat{\theta} - E(\hat{\theta}))(E(\hat{\theta}) - \theta) + (E(\hat{\theta}) - \theta)^2] \\
&= E[(\hat{\theta} - E(\hat{\theta}))^2] + 2(E(\hat{\theta}) - E(\hat{\theta}))(E(\hat{\theta}) - \theta) + (E(\hat{\theta}) - \theta)^2 \\
&= E[(\hat{\theta} - E(\hat{\theta}))^2] + 0 + (E(\hat{\theta}) - \theta)^2 \\
&= V(\hat{\theta}) + [B(\hat{\theta})]^2
\end{aligned}$$

(b)

**(19)**

$$(i) E(\hat{\theta}_3) = \alpha E(\hat{\theta}_1) + (1 - \alpha)E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \alpha\theta + (1 - \alpha)\theta = \theta. \quad (3)$$

$$(ii) V(\hat{\theta}_3) = \alpha^2 V(\hat{\theta}_1) + (1 - \alpha)^2 V(\hat{\theta}_2) = [\alpha^2 + (1 - \alpha)^2]\sigma^2 = (2\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + 1)\sigma^2. \quad (4)$$

(iii) We find the value of  $\alpha$  which solves the equation

$$0 = \frac{\partial V(\hat{\theta}_3)}{\partial \alpha} = (4\alpha - 2)\sigma^2.$$

The solution is  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$  minimizes  $V(\hat{\theta}_3)$ . (5)

$$(iv) V(\hat{\theta}_3) = \alpha^2 V(\hat{\theta}_1) + (1 - \alpha)^2 V(\hat{\theta}_2) = \alpha^2 \sigma^2 + 3(1 - \alpha)^2 \sigma^2 = [4\alpha^2 - 6\alpha + 3]\sigma^2. \quad (3)$$

Hence the efficiency of  $\hat{\theta}_1$  relative to  $\hat{\theta}_3$  is

$$eff(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_3) = \frac{V(\hat{\theta}_1)}{V(\hat{\theta}_3)} = \frac{1}{4\alpha^2 - 6\alpha + 3}.$$

(2)

$$(v) \left. eff(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_3) \right|_{\alpha=1/2} = \left. \frac{1}{4\alpha^2 - 6\alpha + 3} \right|_{\alpha=1/2} = 1. \quad (2)$$

**QUESTION 2****[8]**

$$E\left(\frac{n\hat{\theta}_n}{\theta}\right) = n \implies \frac{n}{\theta} E(\hat{\theta}_n) = n \implies E(\hat{\theta}_n) = \theta. \text{ Hence } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\hat{\theta}_n) = \theta. \quad (3)$$

$$V\left(\frac{n\hat{\theta}_n}{\theta}\right) = 2n \implies \frac{n^2}{\theta^2} V(\hat{\theta}_n) = 2n \implies V(\hat{\theta}_n) = \frac{2}{n}\theta^2. \text{ Hence } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V(\hat{\theta}_n) = 0. \quad (5)$$

That  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\hat{\theta}_n) = \theta$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V(\hat{\theta}_n) = 0$  implies that  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is a consistent estimator of  $\theta$ .

**QUESTION 3**

**[7]**

(a)

**(3)**

$$\begin{aligned} L(\beta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i, \beta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \beta(1 - \beta)^{x_i - 1} \\ &= \beta(1 - \beta)^{x_1 - 1} \times \beta(1 - \beta)^{x_2 - 1} \times \dots \times \beta(1 - \beta)^{x_n - 1} \\ &= \beta^n (1 - \beta)^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - n} \end{aligned}$$

(b)

**(4)**

From part (a) we have  $L(\beta) = \beta^n (1 - \beta)^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - n} = g\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i, \beta\right) \times h(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  where  $g\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i, \beta\right) = \beta^n (1 - \beta)^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - n}$  (**depends on the sample only through**  $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ ) and  $h(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = 1$  (**independent of**  $\beta$ ). This means, by the factorization criterion,  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\beta$ .

**QUESTION 4**

**[10]**

(a)

**(3)**

$E(X_i) = \frac{1}{\beta}$  means  $\beta = \frac{1}{E(X_i)}$ . The method-of-moments estimator is  $\tilde{\beta}$  which is obtained by replacing  $E(X_i)$  in  $\beta = \frac{1}{E(X_i)}$  with a corresponding sample moment which in this case is  $\bar{X}$ . Hence  $\tilde{\beta} = \frac{1}{\bar{X}}$  is the method-of-moments estimator of  $\beta$ .

(b)

**(7)**

From **QUESTION 3** the log-likelihood function is

$$l(\beta) = \ln L(\beta) = n \ln \beta = \ln(1 - \beta) \left( \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - n \right).$$

**(1)**

The maximum likelihood estimate of  $\beta$  is  $\hat{\beta}$  which solves the equation

$$0 = l'(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{\partial l(\beta)}{\partial \beta} \Big|_{\beta=\hat{\beta}} = \frac{n}{\hat{\beta}} - \frac{1}{1 - \hat{\beta}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - n \right) = \frac{n}{\hat{\beta}} - \frac{n}{1 - \hat{\beta}} (\bar{x} - 1).$$

**(2)**

The solution is  $\hat{\beta} = \frac{1}{\bar{x}}$ . Hence the maximum likelihood estimator of  $\beta$  is  $\hat{\beta} = \frac{1}{\bar{X}}$ .

**(4)**

**QUESTION 5**

**[20]**

(a)

**(6)**

$$\begin{aligned} E(\bar{Y}) &= E(\beta\bar{x} + \bar{\epsilon}) \\ &= E(\beta\bar{x}) + E(\bar{\epsilon}) \\ &= \beta\bar{x} + 0 \implies E\left(\frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{x}}\right) = \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{x}}$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\beta$ . (4)

$$V\left(\frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{x}}\right) = \frac{1}{\bar{x}^2} V(\bar{Y}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n\bar{x}^2}. \quad (1)$$

(b)

**(7)**

The likelihood of the sample is

$$\begin{aligned} L(\beta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n f(y_i, \beta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(y_i - \beta x_i)^2} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma}\right)^n e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \beta x_i)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

and the log-likelihood is

$$l(\beta) = \ln L(\beta) = -n/2 \ln(2\pi\sigma^2) - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \beta x_i)^2. \quad (1)$$

The maximum likelihood estimate of  $\beta$  is  $\hat{\beta}$  which solves the equation

$$0 = l'(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{\partial l(\beta)}{\partial \beta} \Big|_{\beta=\hat{\beta}} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i (y_i - \hat{\beta}). \quad (2)$$

The solution is  $\hat{\beta} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}$ . Hence the maximum likelihood estimator is  $\hat{\beta} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i Y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2} \neq$

$$\frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{x}}. \quad (2)$$

(c) (7)

The least squares estimator of  $\beta$  is  $\hat{\beta}$  which solves the equation

$$0 = \left. \frac{\partial SSE}{\partial \beta} \right|_{\beta=\hat{\beta}} = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i (y_i - \hat{\beta}). \quad (4)$$

The solution is  $\hat{\beta} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}$ . Hence the least squares estimator of  $\beta$  is the same as

the maximum likelihood estimator of  $\beta$ . (3)

**QUESTION 6****[30]**

(a) (6)

$$S_{xx} = \sum_{i=1}^{10} x_i^2 - \frac{1}{10} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{10} x_i \right)^2 = 7688 - \frac{(268)^2}{10} = 485.6, \quad (2)$$

$$S_{yy} = \sum_{i=1}^{10} y_i^2 - \frac{1}{10} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{10} y_i \right)^2 = 83.8733 - \frac{(27.73)^2}{10} = 6.97801, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{and } S_{xy} = \sum_{i=1}^{10} x_i y_i - \frac{1}{10} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{10} x_i \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{10} y_i \right) = 800.62 - \frac{(268)(27.73)}{10} = 57.456. \quad (2)$$

(b) (5)

$$r = \frac{S_{xy}}{\sqrt{S_{xx} S_{yy}}} = \frac{57.456}{\sqrt{(485.6)(6.97801)}} = 0.99. \quad (3)$$

The correlation coefficient is positive and large (**close to 1**). This means there is a strong positive linear relationship between the yearly number of sales people ( $x$ ) and the yearly sales revenue ( $y \times 1000$ ). (2)

(c) (6)

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}} = \frac{57.456}{485.6} = 0.1183, \quad (3)$$

$$\text{and } \hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} = \frac{27.73}{10} - (0.118319605) \frac{268}{10} = -0.3984. \quad (3)$$

(The fitted model is  $\hat{y} = -0.398 + 0.1183x$ .)

(d) (3)

$$SSE = S_{yy} - \hat{\beta}_1 S_{xy} = 6.97801 - (0.118319605)(57.456) = 0.1798. \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Hence the estimate of } \sigma^2 \text{ is } s^2 = \frac{SSE}{5-2} = \frac{0.179838775}{8} = 0.02248. \quad (1)$$

(e) (2)

$$\text{The estimate of } V(\hat{\beta}_1) \text{ is } s_{\hat{\beta}_1}^2 = \frac{s^2}{S_{xx}} = \frac{0.022479847}{485.6} = 0.000046.$$

(f) (8)

The test statistic is  $t = \frac{\hat{\beta}_1}{s_{\hat{\beta}_1}} = \frac{0.1183}{0.0068} = 17.3871$ . (3)

The decision rule is "Reject  $H_0$  if  $|t| > t_{0.025} = 2.306$  (**obtained from the  $t$ -tables using 8 degrees of freedom**)" or "Reject  $H_0$  if either  $t < -t_{0.025} = -2.306$  or  $t > t_{0.025} = 2.306$ ." (3)

Since  $t = 17.3871 > t_{0.025} = 2.306$  we reject  $H_0$  and conclude, at the 0.05 level of significance, that there is a strong linear between the yearly number of sales people ( $x$ ) and the yearly sales revenue ( $y \times 1000$ ). (2)

**TOTAL: [100]**