

### Exercise 1

a)

$H_0: p = 10\%$ ,  $H_a: p > 10\%$ , one-sided

b)

```
> flint <- read.csv("~/Desktop/stats10/lab5/flint_2015.csv", header = TRUE)
> n <- nrow(flint)
> dangerous_lead_indicator <- (flint$Pb >= 15)
> p_hat <- mean(dangerous_lead_indicator)
> sd_sample <- sqrt(p_hat*(1-p_hat)/n)
> p_hat
[1] 0.1238447
> sd_sample
[1] 0.0141622
```

c)

```
> p_null <- 0.10
> se_null <- sqrt(p_null*(1-p_null)/n)
> z_stat <- (p_hat-p_null)/se_null
> se_null
[1] 0.01289801
> z_stat
[1] 1.848714
```

d)

```
> p_value <- 1-pnorm(z_stat, sd=1, mean=0)
> p_value
[1] 0.03224953
```

e)

$p\_value < 0.05$ , Reject  $H_0$

f)

Reject  $H_0$ ,  $p > 10\%$ , we should take actions.

g)

```
> prop.test(x=sum(dangerous_lead_indicator), n=n, p=0.1, alternative = "greater")
```

1-sample proportions test with continuity correction

data: sum(dangerous\_lead\_indicator) out of n, null probability 0.1

X-squared = 3.1579, df = 1, p-value = 0.03778

alternative hypothesis: true p is greater than 0.1

95 percent confidence interval:

0.101559 1.000000

sample estimates:

p

0.1238447

h)

```
> prop.test(x=sum(dangerous_lead_indicator), n=n, p=0.1, alternative = "greater", conf.level = 0.99)
```

1-sample proportions test with continuity correction

```

data: sum(dangerous_lead_indicator) out of n, null probability 0.1
X-squared = 3.1579, df = 1, p-value = 0.03778
alternative hypothesis: true p is greater than 0.1
99 percent confidence interval:
 0.09376523 1.00000000
sample estimates:
      p
0.1238447

```

## Exercise 2

a)

$H_0: p_1 = p_2$ ,  $H_a: p_1 \neq p_2$ , two-sided

b)

```

> flint_north <- flint[flint$Region=="North",]
> n_north <- nrow(flint_north)
> flint_south <- flint[flint$Region == "South",]
> n_south <- nrow(flint_south)
> p_hat_north <- mean(flint_north$Pb>=15)
> p_hat_south <- mean(flint_south$Pb>=15)
> p_hat_pooled <- mean(flint$Pb >=15)
> SE <- sqrt(p_hat_pooled*(1-p_hat_pooled)*(1/n_north + 1/n_south))
> z_stat <- (p_hat_north-p_hat_south-0)/SE
> z_stat
[1] 3.572283

```

c)

```

> p_value <- 2*(1-pnorm(z_stat, sd=1, mean=0))
> p_value
[1] 0.0003538831

```

d)

$p\_value < 0.05$ , reject the null hypothesis. The proportion of the lead level greater than 15 in the north is different from that in the south.

e)

```

> x_north <- sum(flint_north$Pb >= 15)
> x_south <- sum(flint_south$Pb >= 15)
> prop.test(x=c(x_north, x_south), n = c(n_north, n_south), alternative = "two.sided")

```

2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction

```

data: c(x_north, x_south) out of c(n_north, n_south)
X-squared = 11.845, df = 1, p-value = 0.0005781
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
95 percent confidence interval:
 0.04196839 0.16052203
sample estimates:
 prop 1    prop 2
0.1762452 0.0750000

```

The  $p\_value$  changes a little, but it is still smaller than 0.05. The result does not change and we still reject the null hypothesis.

## Exercise 3

a)

Ho:  $M=40$   
Ha:  $M \neq 40$   
Two-sided

b)

```
> xbar <- mean(flint$Cu)
> s <- sd(flint$Cu)
> xbar
[1] 54.58102
> s
[1] 133.3042
```

c)

```
> n <- nrow(flint)
> SE <- s/sqrt(n)
> SE
[1] 5.731197
```

d)

```
> t_stat <- (xbar-40)/SE
> t_stat
[1] 2.54415
> p_value <- (1-pt(t_stat, df=n-1))*2
> p_value
[1] 0.01123183
```

e)

$0.011 > 0.01$ , Fail to reject the Ho. We don't have strong evidence that the mean copper is different from 40 ppm.

f)

```
> t.test(flint$Cu, mu=40, alternative = "two.sided")
```

One Sample t-test

```
data: flint$Cu
t = 2.5441, df = 540, p-value = 0.01123
alternative hypothesis: true mean is not equal to 40
95 percent confidence interval:
 43.32285 65.83920
sample estimates:
mean of x
 54.58102
```

$0.011 < 0.05$ , reject Ho  $\Rightarrow$  the mean is different from 40 ppm.

Extra Credit

a)

b)

b)

Ho:  $b = 0$

Ha:  $b \neq 0$

c)

```
> soil<-read.table("http://www.stat.ucla.edu/~nchristo/statistics_c173_c273/soil_complete.txt",
header=TRUE)
> linear_model <- lm(soil$lead ~ soil$zinc)
> summary(linear_model)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = soil$lead ~ soil$zinc)
```

Residuals:

	Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
	-79.853	-12.945	-1.646	15.339	104.200

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	17.367688	4.344268	3.998	9.92e-05 ***
soil\$zinc	0.289523	0.007296	39.681	< 2e-16 ***

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 33.24 on 153 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.9114, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9109

F-statistic: 1575 on 1 and 153 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

p\_value is 2.2e-16

d)

$2.2e-16 < 0.05$ . Reject  $H_0 \Rightarrow b \neq 0$  and there is a relationship between lead and zinc values.