Lecture 19 (Ch. 7)

From that, we can get probs like in The last example:

Suppose a sample of size 25 yields $\bar{x}_1 = 3$, S = 1. E.S. If The population is $N(\mu = 2, \sigma = 1)$, what's The prob. of getting an even larger sample mean? $prob(\bar{x} > \bar{x}_0 bs) = \frac{\bar{x} - m_0}{\sigma_2 N h}$

 $prob(\overline{x} > \overline{x}obs) = \frac{\overline{x} - m_x}{\sigma_x \sqrt{n}}$ $prob(\overline{x} > 3) = prob(\frac{\pi}{2}) = prob(\frac{\pi}{2} > 5) \approx 0$

In English, if we know pop. mean and std dov., Then we can compute the prob. of a sample mean being in some range. That's useful because that prob can tell us whether The single sample mean we have observed is typical or not.

So, how can we use all This to infer Mx (or ox)?

1) Build Confidence Intervals for μ_{x} (Ch. 7) pop. pavam. 2) Test hypotheses about μ_{x} (Ch. 3)

Notation & terminology: × (sample mean) is a point estimate of μ_{x} (pop. mean) S (" std. Lev.) , , , " , " ox (" std. dev.)

b (n brob.) " " " (~ lorob.)

n (" size) is NOT related to pop, size. _ for us = 00

Later, I may drop the x subscript. Let's do The C.I. for pog. mean Mx, first. In words, we know that to tells us how far a typical Sample mean is from ux. CLT: X→ == X-MF € N (0,1) . So, we can compute prob(a < 2 < b) = blak The trick is to look at special values of a, b, blok. (self-evident fait) p(-1.96 < 2 < 1.96) = 0.95 P (-1.96 / X-M= < 1.96) = 0.95 P(-1.96 5 < x-/x < +1.96 5/m) = 0.95 level " 1 x -196 5 < Mx < x +1.96 € pop. mean. Stowly, I may drop The x1 i. 95% C.I. for m. : X ± 1.96 ox approximate with sample std. dev. This is a random C. I, because X is vandom (how else would it have a sampling dist?!) The (observed) 95% C.I. for ux is xobs ± 1.96 0x Later, I may drop saying "observed".

E.g. Suppose a sample of size 25 yields $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ What can we say about The pop. mean? Suppose pop is wormal ($\mu=2$, $\sigma_{x}=1$). What's the prob ($\frac{1}{8}$) prob($\frac{1}{8}$) $\frac{1}{8}$ is unlikely.

(prob($\frac{1}{8}$) $\frac{1}{8}$ prob($\frac{1}$ (doserved) 95% C.I. for μ_{x} : $\overline{X} + 1.96 \frac{\sigma_{x}}{\sqrt{n}}$ $3 \pm 1.96 \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_5}} = 3 \pm .392 = (2.6, 3.4)$ -> We can be 95% Confident That The True menn is in here. Note that we have actually made it to our goal of being able to say something about a psp. mean, from a sample. Review how we needed everything we've done since Ca.1. Go and celebrate But, There are other ways of interpreting CIs, and That's where things get difficult again, and unfortunately, the interpretations are very important.

So, if I decide on the 0.95 confidence level, then I can say something about the interval wherein ye resides.

Note: Not prob of ye !!

Only confidence that ye is in some Conf. Int.

There is a way of squeezing probability into The conclusions, but it has to pertain to The vandom C.I

We are 95% confident that the pop. mean is in the interval $\frac{x_1 + 1.96}{\sqrt{x_2}}$.

Equivalent interpretations of C.I.

There is a 95% prob that a random sample will yield a C.I. (x ± 1.96 $\frac{\sigma_{\times}}{m}$) that covers μ_{\times} .

Sample 2

Fig. 190 of these intervals cover Mx.

O I.e. The prob. that a random

C.I. (x ± 1.96 ox) will include

Mx is 0.95.

Sample 2

O It you want to say something directly about pex, use "confidence"

Not pop. mean

CIS are all about coverage;

[a 95% C.I. for μ_x is designed to cover μ_x in 95% of samples.]

For The above example: (Observed) 95% CI: (2.6, 3.4) -> We can be 95% Confident that The True mean is in here. -> There is a 95% prob. That a vandom 95% CI will cover 1/2. Note that if we think of n=25 as "large," Then we don't even have to assume that the pop. (whose mean we have inferred) is normal Q1: Suppose we have computed a 95% C.I. for My: (-2,1).
Which of the following statements is correct. A) There is a 95 % prob. That Mx is between -2 and +1. B) There is a 95% prob that a random C.I. is (-2,+1). C) There is a 95% prob That The obs. x is in (-2,+1). D) There is a 95% prob That a vandom x is in (-2,+1). E) None of The above. A) Mx has no prob. Continuous

B) The prob of a vandom Thing being any specific Thing is zero!

C) We know Shs! It has no prob. D) The correct statement would be is in Mx ±1.96 x See ha below.

hurled 19-1) Rephrasing 7-16

- a) The problem tells us That the sample std. dev., s, has a worned distr. with parameters of and or Non, where of is the pop. std. dev. How, follow the procedure we have developed, starting from a self-evident fact "to develop a C.I. formula for ox.

 Note: in this way of witing the problem, we avoid the notational complexity of Ms and of in 7.16.
- b) Then compute The observed 95% C.I for The true/population standard deviation for The data in problem 7.15.
- c) Interpret in 2 ways.

In The clicker question above is correct, ie. That The prob of a random sample mean to be within Mx ± 1.96 tx is 95. This document was created with Win2PDF available at http://www.win2pdf.com. The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only. This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.