STAT SIO			
FINAL	EXAM	SOLUTIONS	
SPRING	2019		
	0		
2,	15		
3.a)	12		
3.6)	6		
3.c)	0		
3.d)	9		
3. e)	6		
4.a)	8		
4.6)	8		
4.C)	8		
4.)	В		

1. THE PEARSON CHI-SQUARE STATISTIC IS $\sum_{i=1}^{100} \left(\frac{y_i - \hat{E}(y_i)}{\sqrt{\sqrt{x}}} \right)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{100} \left(\frac{y_i - \overline{y}}{\sqrt{\overline{y}}} \right)^2$ $= \frac{1}{\overline{V}_{i}} \sum_{\overline{i}=1}^{100} (\gamma_{i} - \overline{Y}_{i})^{2}$ $= \frac{1}{\overline{Y}_{.}} qq \sum_{\overline{z}=1}^{100} (\overline{Y_{z}} - \overline{Y}_{.})^{2} / (100-1)$ $= \frac{1}{62} \cdot \frac{99 \cdot 93}{99 \cdot 1.5} = 148.5$ UNDER THE NULL, THE STAT IS APPROXIMATELY χ^{2}_{qq} . $E(\chi^{2}_{qq}) = 99$, $VAR(\chi^{2}_{qq}) = 198$ 5D (Xga) ~ 14. THUS, THE STAT IS MORE THAN 3 STANDARD DEVIATIONS ABOVE THE NUL EXPECTATION. THERE IS EVIDENCE AGAINST THE ASSUMPTION OF ind Bisson OBSERVATIONS.

2. Yür Mür ind Poisson (Nür) $\ln(\lambda_{ijk}) = \mu_{jk} + f_{i} + S_{ij} + \mathcal{E}_{ijk}$ (FIELD RANDOM EFFECTS) $f: \sim N(0, \sigma_f^2)$ (STRIP RANDOM EFFECTS) $S_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_s^2)$ (TRAP RANDOM EFFECTS) Cijk~ N(O, Je) ALL fi, Sij, AND EUjk EFFECTS ARE INDEPENDENT OF EACH OTHER. THE MIR TERMS ALLOW THE MEAN RESPONSE TO DEPEND ON BOTH TYPE AND DISTANCE ALONG EACH STRIP. THIS CEL-MEANS STRUCTURE ALLOWS FOR TYPE MAIN EFFECTS (WHICH ARE OF PRIMARY INTEREST), DISTANCE MAIN EFFECTS, AND TYPE-BY-DISTANCE INTERACTIONS.

3. THIS IS A SPLIT-SPLIT-PLOT EXPERIMENT. THE WHOLE-PLOT TREATMENT FACTOR CONSISTS OF THE COMBINATIONS OF TEMPERATURE, HUMIDITY, AND CO2 LEVEL. THIS HAS 8-1=7 DF THAT CAN BE BROKEN DOWN INTO 7 SINALE-DF PIELES: T, H, C, TH, TXC, HXC, TXHXC. TO REDUCE LINES, THIS FACTOR WILL BE WRITTEN AS THE IN ANOVA TABLE BELOW. WE WILL AS ABBREVIATE MONTH AS M G = GENOTYPE, A = AME, P=PLANT.

	DF
Source	3
M	7
THC	21
MXTHC = WPERROR	1
$G = 3 + 21 + (5 - 1) \times 4 \times 8 \times 2 = 280$	7
$C_{X}THC$ $M_{H}THC_{X}G_{+} P(M, THC, G) = SP_{ERROR}$	280
MXGFMXMCACCITC	
A	1
AxG	7
AXTHC	7
AXCXTHC MXA+ AXWPERNER + AXSPERNER = SSPERNER .	304
C. TOTAL	639

3, (CONTINUED)

IF YOU DON'T SEE HOW TO FIND THE WHOLE-PLOT ERROR, SPLIT-PLOT ERROR, AND SPLIT-SPLIT-PLOT ERROR DF IN THE PREVIOUS ANOVA TABLE, YOU CAN USE THE FOLOWING ALTERNATIVE REASONING.

WHOLE-PLOT: THIS IS A RCBD WITH MONTH'S AS BLOCKS AND GROWTH CHAMBERS AS EXPERIMENTAL UNITS, THERE ARE 4 × 8 = 32 WHOLE-PLOT EXERIMENTAL UNITS, So THE WHOLE-PLOT ANOVA IS

MONTH
$$8-1$$

THC $8-1$
W.P. ERROR $21 = (32-1) - (4-1) - (8-1)$
C. TOTAL $32-1$

SPLIT-PLOT: THE SPLIT-PLOT TREATMENT FACTOR IS GENOTYPE, AND THE SPLIT- PLOT EXPERIMENTAL UNITS ARE PLANTS. WE HAVE 4X8X5X2 = 320 PLANTS TOTAL. THUS, THE THE SPLIT- SPLIT-PLOT ERROR ANOVA IS DF CAN BE OBTAINED 3 BY SUBTRACTION ALSO MONTH BY FOLLOWING THE SAME 7 THC 21 MONTH X THC STRATEGY. 1 6 $\frac{319 - (3 + 7 + 21 + 1 + 7)}{280} = 280$ GX THC S.P. ERROR 319 C.TOTAL

3. (CONTINUED) THE MODEL SPECIFIED IN THE PROBLEM Assumes The CHAMBER EFFECTS ARE COMPLETELY NEW EACH MONTH AND INDEPENDENT OF THE CHAMBER EFFECTS IN ANY OTHER MONTH. AN ALTERNATIVE MODEL WOULD ASSUME A TOTAL OF & RATHER THAN 32 GROWTH CHAMBER EFFECTS. YET ANOTHER APPROACH WONLD CONSIDER A REPEATED - MEDSURES CORPERATION STRUCTURE (LIKE AR(I)) WITHIN EACH GROWTH CHAMBEN ACROSS MONTHS. BECAUSE NEW PLANTS ARE USED IN EACH GROWTH CHAMBER EACH MONTH, NEITHER OF THESE MODELS MAY BE BETTER THAN THE MODEL SPECIFIES IN THE PROBLEM STATEMENT. THERE ARE REPEATED -MEASURES ON PLANTS (TWO AGES). THE MOSEL ASSUMES COMPONNO SYMMETRY STRUCTURE, WHICH ES THE SAME AS AR(1) For Two OBSERVATIONS.

3. a) No THREE-WAY INTERACTION MEANS THAT
THE TWO-WAY INTERACTIONS ARE THE SAME
FOR ALL LEVELS OF THE THIRD FACTOR.
(WE HAD A HOMEWORK PROBLEM ABOUT
THREE-WAY INTERACTION.) THUS,

$$M_0: \overline{\mu}_{111..} - \overline{\mu}_{121..} - \overline{\mu}_{211..} + \overline{\mu}_{221..} = \overline{\mu}_{112..} - \overline{\mu}_{122..} - \overline{\mu}_{212..} + \overline{\mu}_{22..}$$

 $M_0: \overline{\mu}_{111..} - \overline{\mu}_{121..} - \overline{\mu}_{211..} + \overline{\mu}_{221..} = \overline{\mu}_{112..} - \overline{\mu}_{122..} - \overline{\mu}_{212..} - \overline{\mu}_{212..}$
 $M_0: \overline{\mu}_{111..} - \overline{\mu}_{121..} - \overline{\mu}_{211..} + \overline{\mu}_{221..} = \overline{\mu}_{112..} - \overline{\mu}_{122..} - \overline{\mu}_{212..} - \overline{\mu}_{212..}$
 $M_0: \overline{\mu}_{111..} - \overline{\mu}_{121..} - \overline{\mu}_{211..} + \overline{\mu}_{221..} = \overline{\mu}_{112..} - \overline{\mu}_{122..} - \overline{\mu}_{212..} - \overline{\mu}_{21$

3 a) (CONTINUED)

THUS,

$$t = \frac{8.6-7.5 - 10.8 + 13.3 - 9.6 + 8.6 + 11.6 - 14.0}{\sqrt{10} \left[20 \times 0.1 + 2 \times 0.4 + 0.2 \right]} = \frac{.2}{\sqrt{3/10}}$$

$$3b) 21 \quad (See Anova Table)$$

$$3c) 280 \quad (See Anova Table)$$

$$3c) 280 \quad (See Anova Table)$$

$$3d) \overline{\gamma}_{.1111} - \overline{\gamma}_{.1112} = M_{1111} - M_{1112} + \overline{e}_{.1111} - \overline{e}_{.1112},$$

$$VAre(\overline{\gamma}_{.1111}, -\overline{\gamma}_{.1112}) = 2\frac{G_e^2}{20} = \frac{\sigma_e^2}{10}$$

$$se = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_e^2}{10}} = \sqrt{0.02}$$

$$3e) 304 \quad (See Anova Table)$$



PART (E) WAS TO FIND A CONFIDENCE INTERVAL FOR THE TEMPERATURE AT WHICH EXPECTED TOTAL LEAF AREA IS MAXIMIZED, BUT THIS PART WAS REMOVED TO KEEP EXAM LENGTH DOWN.