

Introduction to hypothesis testing

Introduction:

For each of the following problems,

- (a) Write null and alternative hypotheses appropriate to this study.
- (b) Compute the z-score of the sample mean.
- (c) Compute the p-value of the sample mean.
- (d) Are the results statistically significant at level $\alpha = 0.05$?
- (e) What conclusions, if any, can be drawn from this study? Answer in ordinary human language.

Problem 1

A medical school advertises that the mean starting salary of its graduates is \$89,000. Concerned that it may actually be less, a group of first-years surveys 38 recent graduates, finding a sample mean of \$85,500. Assume $\sigma = \$8000$.

Answer:

```
populationMean <- 89000
sampleMean <- 85500
stndDev <- 8000
count <- 38

#PART A
cat("Null-hypotheses:",
    , "N =", populationMean, "\n")
```

Null-hypotheses: N = 89000

```
cat("Alternative-hypotheses:",
    "N <", populationMean, "\n\n")
```

Alternative-hypotheses: $N < 89000$

```
# PART B
z_score <- (sampleMean - populationMean) / (stdDev / sqrt(count))
cat("z-score:", z_score, "\n\n")
```

z-score: -2.696931

```
# PART C
p_score <- pnorm(z_score)
cat("p-score:", p_score, "\n\n")
```

p-score: 0.003499087

```
# PART D
if (p_score < 0.05){
  cat("The results are not statistically significant.")
} else if (p_score > 0.05){
  cat("The results are statistically significant.")
} else {
  cat("p-score is equal to 5%.")
}
```

The results are not statistically significant.

PART E:

That means there is **NOT** enough evidence to support us confidently saying the mean salary of graduates is 89000 dollars.

Problem 2

A laptop manufacturer claims that the mean life of the battery for a certain model of laptop is 6 hours. In a simple random sample of 80 laptops, the mean battery life is 5.9 hours. Assume $\sigma = 1.3$ hours. Is the company's claim reasonable?

Answer:

```

populationMean <- 6
sampleMean <- 5.9
stndDev <- 1.3
count <- 80

#PART A
cat("Null-hypotheses:",
    , "N =", populationMean, "\n")

```

Null-hypotheses: N = 6

```

cat("Alternative-hypotheses:",
    "N <", populationMean, "\n\n")

```

Alternative-hypotheses: N < 6

```

# PART B
z_score <- (sampleMean - populationMean) / (stndDev / sqrt(count))
cat("z-score:", z_score, "\n\n")

```

z-score: -0.6880209

```

# PART C
p_score <- pnorm(z_score)
cat("p-score:", p_score, "\n\n")

```

p-score: 0.2457198

```

# PART D
if (p_score < 0.05){
  cat("The results are not statistically significant.")
} else if (p_score > 0.05){
  cat("The results are statistically significant.")
} else {
  cat("p-score is equal to 5%.")
}

```

The results are statistically significant.

PART E:

That means there is enough evidence to support us confidently saying the mean battery life of a phone is 6 hours.

Problem 3

A soft drink manufacturer claims that the mean calorie content of one of its sports drinks is 150 calories per bottle. In a simple random sample of 95 bottles, the mean is 158 calories. Is there sufficient evidence to conclude that the mean is actually more than 150 calories/bottle? Assume $\sigma = 20$ calories.

Answer:

```
populationMean <- 150
sampleMean <- 158
stndDev <- 20
count <- 95

#PART A
cat("Null-hypotheses:",
    "N =", populationMean, "\n")
```

Null-hypotheses: N = 150

```
cat("Alternative-hypotheses:",
    "N >", populationMean, "\n\n")
```

Alternative-hypotheses: N > 150

```
# PART B
z_score <- (sampleMean - populationMean) / (stndDev / sqrt(count))
cat("z-score:", z_score, "\n\n")
```

z-score: 3.898718

```
# PART C
p_score <- 1 - pnorm(z_score)
cat("p-score:", p_score, "\n\n")
```

p-score: 4.835171e-05

```
# PART D
if (p_score < 0.05){
  cat("The results are not statistically significant.")
} else if (p_score > 0.05){
  cat("The results are statistically significant.")
} else {
  cat("p-score is equal to 5%.")
}
```

The results are not statistically significant.

PART E:

That means there is **NOT** enough evidence to support us confidently saying the mean of calories in a drink is 150 calories.