4. Producer of 'gutkha' claims that the nicotine constent in his 'gutkha' on the average is 0.83 neg can this claim be accepted if a random cample of 8 'gutkhas' of this type have the nicotine constants of 2.0, 1.7, 2.1, 1.9, 2.2, 2.1, 2.0, 1.6 mg.

Sde- Given n=8, 11=1.83

in Null hypothesis (Ho) 5- 11=1.83

(1), Alternative hypotheris (H1)8- 11 \$ 1.83

in, Level of Significance: - #22 toyat N=n-1 d.o.f to:025 at N=8-1 d.o.f = 2.365

iv. Test statistic: - t = x-4

R= 2.0+1.7+2.1+1.9+2.2+2-1+2.0+1.6=1.95

 $(2-\overline{x})^{6} = (2.0-1.95)^{6} + (1.7-1.95)^{6} + --- (1.6-1.95)^{6}$ =0.3

$$S^{n} = \frac{S(x; -\overline{x})^{2}}{h-1} = \frac{0.3}{7} \implies S = 0.21$$

$$\frac{1.95 - 1.83}{5\sqrt{n-1}} = \frac{1.95 - 1.83}{\frac{0.21}{\sqrt{8-1}}} = 1.62 \quad \text{2 lt} = 1.62$$

i we allest null hypothess.

2. A Cample of 26 bulbs gives a mean life of 990 his with C.D of 20 hrs. The manufactures claims that the mean life of bulbs 1000 hrs. Is the Cample not upto the chandard?

Sde Here n=26, == 990, 1=1000, S=20

3, Null hypothesis (Ho) 8- 11=1000

Alternative hypothesis (Hi) = 11 + 1000

(11), Level of significance (d) = to.025 at 25 d.o.f= 2.060

 $\frac{1}{1}$ = $\frac{1}$

conclusions- læbelden |t/>tap, we reject mil hypothets

3. A random sample of 10 boys had the following Itos 40, 120, 110, 101, 88, 83, 95, 98, 107, 100. Do the data support the assumption of population means I. Of of 100. Test at 5th level of significance?

Soler Given n=10, $x = \frac{27}{n} = \frac{70+120+110+101+88+83+95}{+98+107+100}$ = 97.9

 $2(x-\overline{x})^{2} = (70-97.2)^{2} + (120-97.2)^{2} + ---+ (100-97.2)^{2}$ = 1833.60 $S^{2} = \frac{1}{2} + 2(x^{2}-\overline{x})^{2} = \frac{1833.60}{2} \implies S = 14.27$

31 Null hypotheris (Ho):- 11=100

ii, Atternative Hypothesis (Hi) :- 11 7 100

iii, Level of significance (d):- t 0.025 at 9 d.0 f = 2.262

ivi Test statistics: $t = \frac{7-4}{5} = \frac{97.2-100}{14.27} = -0.62$ $\frac{S}{\sqrt{n-1}} = \frac{14.27}{\sqrt{10-1}}$

N' conclusions- 16/2 tol2

: we allest null hypothesis

4. The means of two sandern samples of 852e8 9,7 are 196.42 and 198.82. The sum of squares of denations from their respective means are 26.94, 18.73. Can be samples be considered to have been the same population?

Solver $n_1=4$, $n_2=7$; $\overline{\chi}_1=196.42$, $\overline{\chi}_2=198.82$ $\Sigma(\chi^2-\overline{\chi_1})^2=26.96$, $\Sigma(\chi^2-\overline{\chi_2})^2=18.73$

$$S^2 = \frac{2(x^2 - \overline{x_1})^2 + 2(x^2 - \overline{x_2})^2}{y_1 + y_2 - 2} = \frac{26.96 + 18.73}{9 + 7 - 2} = 3.26$$

→ S=1.81

in Null hypotheris (Ho) = = x = x2

Alternative hypotheris (41)6- \$\frac{7}{2} \dispost \frac{7}{2}

in Level of liquificance:

to.025 at 14 d.o.f = 2145

av. That elatistics $t = \frac{\overline{\chi}_1 - \overline{\chi}_2}{9\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}} = \frac{196.42 - 198.82}{1.81\sqrt{\frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{7}}}$ t = -2.63 & H)= 2.63

W conclusions Hotaly .: we regent will hypothoses 5. In one cample of & olosewedium the seven of equally of destalling of the cample values from the cample mean was 84.4 and another cample of 10 observation Ft cons 102.6. Test colother there is any exquificent difference between two cample variances at 5% level of significance. Solf aren n=8, ne=10 S(x1-x1)=84.4, 2(x1-x2)=102.6 $S_1^2 = \frac{1}{n_1-1} 2 (x_1^2 - x_1)^2 = \frac{1}{8-1} (84.4) = 12.087$ So = 1 (202.6) = 11.4 il Null hypothesis (40) 6- SI= So iii, Alternative hypotheric (44) = ST + So iii Level of eignificance & 2=0.05 Fx at (n,-1, ng-1) doof Fo.05 at (8-1,10-1) d.o.f = 3.39 iv. Test statistic: F = 312 = 12.057 = 1.057 evi conclusion: - IFIZFX, we allest null hypothesis 6. Two random Samples gave thre following results. Sample size sample mean sum of squares of denations 90 108

1281 colubbase - Heave the array

Ist Test whither the samples came from the same 6 population of not? Given n=10, n==12 カニ151 を二十 E(x=-x1)=90, E(x=-x2)=108 $S_1^2 = \frac{1}{n_1 - 1} S(x_1^2 - \overline{x_1})^2 = \frac{1}{10 - 1} (90) = 10$ $\Omega_2^2 = \frac{1}{n_2 - 1} 2 (x_1^2 - \overline{x_2})^2 = \frac{1}{12 - 1} (108) = 9.82$ in Null hypother's (Ho):- Si= So iii. Alternative hypothesis (Hi); - Si + Se cilli Level of Eignifiance & d=0.05 Fa at (n,-1, n2-1) d.o.f Fo.05 at (10-1, 12-1) d.o.f = 2.90 (N) Test statistic: F= Si = 10 = 1.018 Vi Conclusion: - IFI < Fox, we allept null hypothesis 7. Two independent samples of Hems are given expectively had the following Values. 15 9 12, 14 11 Cample I 13 11 11 LO 13 9 8 10 Sample II 9 11 Test whether there is any significant difference blus there means?

Given n=8, n2=7

 $\overline{\chi_1} = \frac{11+11+\cdots+14}{8} = 12$, $\overline{\chi_2} = \frac{9+11+\cdots+10}{7} = 10$

S(20-21)= (11-12)+ (11-12)2+---- + (14-12)2=26 S(xi- xe)= (9-10)7 (11-10)7 ---- + (10-10)=16 S= 1 [2(xi-xi)2+ 2(xi-x2)2] $=\frac{1}{8+7-2}\left[26+16\right]=3.23$ =) S=1.8 31 Null hypothesis (40):- 74 = 70 iii. Atternative hypother's (Hi) = \$\frac{1}{24} \frac{1}{22} in Level of significance 8- 2=0.05 ta at (n,+n2-2) d.o.f to.025 at (8+7-2) d.o.f = 2.160 iv, Test statistic: += == == 12-10 Si hi+h2 (1.8) / ++ t = 2.15 & |t| = 2.15 M conclusion: - It / Ltd/2, we allest null hypothesis 8. Time taken by worker in preforming a job by method & and method # 2 95 given below. Method 1 20 16 27 23 22 26 Method 2 27 33 42 35 32 34 38 Dees the data show that variances of time distabilion for population which these samples are deawn do not differ significantly; Solt Given n=6, n2=7

$$\bar{x_1} = 20 + 16 + --- + 26 = 22.3$$

$$\overline{x}_2 = \frac{27 + 33 + - - + 38}{7} = 81/34/34.4$$

$$\Sigma(x^{2}-\overline{x_{1}})^{2}=(20-22\cdot3)^{2}+(16-22\cdot3)^{2}+\cdots+(26-22\cdot3)^{2}$$

$$=81.34$$

$$2(x^{2}-x^{2})^{2}=(24-84.4)^{2}+(33-34.4)^{2}+---+(38-34.4)^{2}$$

$$= |33.72$$

$$S_1^2 = \frac{1}{2} S(\alpha^2 - \overline{\alpha}_1)^2 = \frac{1}{5} (81.34) = 16.26$$

$$S_2^2 = \frac{1}{n_2 - 1} \mathcal{L} (x_1^2 - x_2)^2 = \frac{1}{6} \mathcal{L}(133.72) = 22.9$$

$$ci'$$
, rest statistics $F = \frac{S_2^2}{g_1^2} = \frac{22.9}{16.26} = 1.372|F| = 1.87$

Sdr Given n=10

observed	tuguencies (Ei)	0- E;	(01-E)2-
Frequencies (Oi)	friguenties (101)	2	0.4
12	10	-2	0.4
20	10	10 -8	10
2-	10	4	6.4
14	10	05	1.6
10	10		2.5
6	10	-4 -1	1.6
9	10	-6	0.1
4	10		3.6
		200	\$(0:-E1)2-266

in Null hypother's (Ho):- 01= 50

Si. Atternative hypothesis (H) = 01 = 57

$$\%0.05$$
 at $10-1$ d.o. $f = 16.9$
 $\%1$ Test statisfici- $\% = 5$ $\frac{(0i-5i)^2}{5i} = 26.6$

Vi Conclusion i- 1x1 > xx, we reject will hypothesis

10. A die is theoun 264 times with the following results. Show that the die se can brased

No. appeared on de	1	2	3	4	5	6
Frequency 4	40	32	28	58	54	52

EP = 44

0° E° 0° - E°
$$\frac{(0°-E°)^{4}}{E°}$$

40 44 -4 0.3636

32 44 -12 3.2727

28 44 -16 5.8181

58 44 14 4.4545

54 44 10 2.2727

52 44 8 1.4545

 $\frac{2^{2}}{E°}$
 $\frac{2(0°-E°)^{4}}{E°}$
 $\frac{1}{2}$
 $\frac{2(0°-E°)^{4}}{E°}$
 $\frac{1}{2}$
 $\frac{1}{2}$

31 Null hypothesis (Ho) :- Oi = Ei

II, Alternative Hypothesis (Hi):- 0; + 51

illi, Level of significante:-

x=0.05, xx at (n-1) d.o.f x0.05 at 6-1 d.o.f = 11.07

N, Test statistic:- x = 5 (0:-5:) = 17.6862

Vi cordusion :- | x > xx, we assept right will hypotheris

11. 200 digits were choosen at random from et of tables the frequency of the digits are

digit 0123456789

Regnery 18 19 28 21 16 25 22 20 21 15.

use chi-equare test to asset the concerness of the hypothesis that the digits are destributed in equal number in the Table.

Gren n=10 $Ei = \frac{18+19+23+21+16+25+22+20+21+15}{10}$

		. 9-	(OP-EP)12			
OP	EP	(01-E1)2	53			1
18	20	4	0.2			
19	20	1	0.05			
23	20	9	0.45			
21	20	16	0.05			
16	20	16	0.8	-11		
25	20	25	1.25			
22,	20	4	0.2	•	N - 1	
20	20	U	0.05			
21	20	25	1.25			
. 3	20	2	(01-Fi)2			
		25	= S (01-E1)2 = 4	y	1 1)	
JI N	Jull hy	pothers (Ho) ;-		,		
		1.7		1 1		
R, A	lteenati	le hypothesis	(HI) = 01 + 51			
ૃક્ષિ?,	Level	of Signafic	ale:- d=0.	05		
		par at (n	1) dof			
		20.05 at	(10-1) dio-	f = 16.919		
رام	Test	statetice-	x= 2 Co:-	一句) = 4.0		
V1 6	conclus	non :- 12	Texa, we	allept 4	0.	
				•		
14 J.A. F	100		. 0 . 7.			
12.	19t a	Poisson de	stabition to	the follow	ong di	eta &
54	-test	the goodness	of 1st at	0.05 leve	el.	
	9/	1 1 2	Q 4	5 6	7	
	· Proces	cu 305 366 21	10 20 28	9 '2	J	2
	- Juguer	02	Felia d			
car	, 'X	1 fr	5 - 1 - 6p		1 1 11	
	Ī	366 366		2 fg = 12 8 f = 10	02 =1.2	- 1
	3	210 420	Mean =	21 10) 100	,
	4	80 240 28 112	41			
	5	9 45	de application	1=1.2		
	6	2 12				
	7	-S_P=1001 7				
- 0	N	=5=== (00)		Scanna	d by Cam	l Scanne

Scanned by CamScanner

Expected frequencies
$$ED = N \cdot P(X=e) = N \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{e^{\lambda}} = |col \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{e^{\lambda}} \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} = |col \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{e^{\lambda}} \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} = |col \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{e^{\lambda}} \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} = |col \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} = |col \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} = |col \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}{ol} = |col \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda}}$$

iv, Test statistic: - x= 2 (0i-Fi) = 5.551 N condusion: - 1272 xx, we allest will hypothesis Given below 9s the number of male bretty is 1000 trompties having 5 children Male chaldren o 180 Number of families 40 300 250 200 Test cohetter the given data is consistent with the hypother's that the bonormal destabution holds of the chance of a male bosetts 90 equal to femalo bosetts. Sdr fx $mean = \frac{2420}{24} = \frac{2420}{1000} = 242$ 40 0 300 300 250 500 np=2.42 200 600 6P=24=0.4 120 30 9=1-P=1-0.4=0.6 180 @ 900 Stx=2420 N=2f=1000 Esqueted frequency to = NP(X=0) = N. napqn-2 =1000.6co (0.4)°(0.6) 6-0 =46.656 EI = NP(X=1) = NAMCX PAQN-1 = 1000. GC1 (0.4) (0.6) = 186.62 E2=NP(X=2) = N. ncx pq qn-x = 1000. Gc (0.4) (0.6) = 311.04 E3 = NP(X=3) = N. ma pq qn-7 = 1000. 6g (0.4)3 (0.6) 6-3 = 276.48 E4 = NP(x=4) = N. nexpqqn-2 = 1000. 64 (0.4) 4(0.6) 64 188.24 E5 = NP(X=5) = N. ncx p7 gn-1 = 1000. 64 (0.4) (0.6) 6-5 = 36.864

Etaupexac) = Nacarago = 100 (cot) (o. 6) (c.

```
(OP-EP)2
                               (01-Fr)2
  Oi
        Fig
        46.856
  40
                   44.30
                                0.94
  300
        186.62
                                68.88
                   12855.02
 250
        311.04
                                11.97
                   3725.88
  200
        276.48
                                21.15
                   5849.19
  30
        138.24
                                84.74
                    11715.8
  180
        36.864
                    20489.05
                                555.80
                         20 = 5 (01-51)2=743.48
  is Null hypother's (Ho) & 00 = 50
  il. Alterative hypothesis (41):- 0; # E)
  ili, Level of liquiticane = 0.05
             xx at (n-1) d.o.f
            ×0.05 at (6-1) d.o.f= 11.070
  iv, Test statistic: - x= 2 (0:-E1)2 = 743.48
   Vi Conclusion: 1x1 > Xx, we reject null hypothesis
14. 5 dice were to thrown 96 times the number of times
     Showing 4,5006 Obtain is given below.
             0 1 2 3
       Frequery 1 10 24 35 18 8
   Fit a bishormal distribution and test for goodness of for
        at one desab.
        a f fr
                           Mean = 2fx = 275 = 2.86
                   0
                                     1=2.86
                  10
            10
                              n=6, np=1
            24
                  48
        2
                                     np = 2.86
            35
                  105
                                     =) P=2.86/6=0.4
            18
                  72
                                     9=1-P=0.6
            8
                  40
```

N=2f=96 2fx=275

```
Expeded pregnercy (E0) = NP(X=0) = N nr p P q = 96.66 (0.4) (0.6) 60
 E1 = NP(x=1) = Nnapagn-2 = 96 6c, (0.4)'(0.6) 6-1 17.91
 EZ= NP(X=2) = N ncapq gn-1 = 96 Gc (0.4) (0.6) 6-2 = 29.85
  E3 = NP(X=8) = Nncxpxqn-x= 96 6c3 (0.4)3(0.6)6-3= 26.54
  E4 = NP(x=4) = N nexp7qn-4 = 96 64 (0.4) + (0.6) 6-4 = 13.22
  BJ = NP(x=5) = N n(x pagn-x = 96 Bcg- (0.4) 5 (0.6) 6-5 = 3-53
                              (01-Ei)
                 (01-KT)2
    00
         EP
         4.47
                    12.04
                               2.69
   10
         17.91
                    62.56
                               3.4-8
   24
         29-8-
                    34.22
                               1.14
   35
        26.54
                    7-1.5
                               2.69
   18
        13.27
                    22.37
                               1.68
         3.53
                    19-98
                               5.66
                      8 = 2 (OT- 51) = 17.34
     whill hypothesis (Ho) = Or= Ex
      Alternative hypothesis (44) 8- 01 + For
     Level of significance & d=0.05
            xà at (n-1) doct
           90,05 at 5 d.of = 11.070
 , N Test stabilic :- 90= 5 (01-51) = 17.34
  N. Conclusion 5- 12/ > 20, we reject will hypothes ?
```

Expected fugurery (ED) =
$$NP(x=0) = N \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot \lambda^{0}}{0!} = 498 \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot 2^{0}}{0!} = 67.39$$

ET = $N \cdot e^{\lambda} \lambda^{0} P(x=1) = N \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot \lambda^{1}}{1!} = 498 \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot 2^{0}}{1!} = 134.7$

E2 = $N \cdot P(x=2) = N \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot \lambda^{2}}{2!} = 448 \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot 2^{0}}{2!} = 134.7$

E3 = $NP(x=3) = N \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot \lambda^{3}}{3!} = 498 \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot 2^{0}}{3!} = 89.86$

E4 = $N \cdot P(x=4) = N \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot \lambda^{4}}{4!} = 498 \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot 2^{0}}{4!} = 444.93$

E5 = $N \cdot P(x=5) = N \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot \lambda^{5}}{5!} = 498 \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot 2^{5}}{5!} = 17.97$

E6 = $N \cdot P(x=6) = N \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot \lambda^{6}}{6!} = 498 \cdot \frac{e^{\lambda} \cdot 2^{5}}{5!} = 5.99$

$$E_{7} = N \cdot P(X=X) = N \cdot \frac{e^{2} \cdot \lambda^{7}}{7!} = 498 \cdot \frac{e^{2} \cdot 2^{7}}{7!} = 1.711$$

$$E_{8} = N \cdot P(X=X) = N \cdot \frac{e^{2} \cdot \lambda^{8}}{8!} = 498 \cdot \frac{e^{2} \cdot 2^{8}}{8!} = 0.427$$

$$0^{6} \quad E_{7} \quad (0^{7} - E_{7})^{2} \quad (0^{7} - E_{7})^{2}$$

$$52 \quad 67.39 \quad 236.8 \quad 3.61$$

$$151 \quad 134.7 \quad 265.69 \quad 1.97$$

$$130 \quad 134.7 \quad 22.09 \quad 0.16$$

$$10^{2} \quad 89.86 \quad 147.37 \quad 1.63$$

$$45 \quad 44.93 \quad 0.0049 \quad 0.0001$$

$$12 \quad 17.97 \quad 35.64 \quad 1.98$$

$$3 \quad 5.99 \quad 8.94 \quad 1.49$$

$$1 \quad 1.711 \quad 0.50 \quad 0.292$$

$$2 \quad 0.42.7 \quad 2.49 \quad 5.83$$

$$x^{2} = \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{2}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$31, \text{ Alle hypether's } (H_{7}) = 0.7 = E_{7}$$

$$311 \quad \text{Level of } Sign_{2}^{2} \cdot conce : - \times = 0.05$$

$$x^{2} \quad \text{at } (n-1) \text{ d.o.t.}$$

$$x^{2} \quad \text{o.o.s.} \quad \text{d.o.o.l.} = 15.507$$

$$x^{3} \quad \text{Test } \text{ shotistic } : - x^{2} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \text{ shotistic } : - x^{2} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \text{ shotistic } : - x^{2} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \text{ shotistic } : - x^{2} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \text{ shotistic } : - x^{2} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \text{ shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \text{ shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \text{ shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \text{ shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \quad \text{shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \quad \text{shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \quad \text{shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \quad \text{shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \quad \text{shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x^{7} \quad \text{Test } \quad \text{shotistic } : - x^{7} = 2 \cdot \frac{(0^{7} - E_{7})^{7}}{E_{7}} = 16.86$$

$$x$$

16. The areenege breaking strength of the steel ends is specified to be 18.5 thousand pounds. To test this sample of 14 rods are tested, the mean and S.D. Obtained were 17.85 and 1.955 respectively. He the result of experiment? Significant?

Sdr Given n=14, 7=17.85, M=18.5, S=1.955

3, Null hypothesis (Ho) :- 4=18.5

Si. Alberrative hypothesis (H) & 11 \$ 18.5

to at n-1 d.o.t

to:005 at (14-1) doof = 2.160

 $\sqrt[8]{1}$ Test statistic $e^{-t} = \frac{17.85 - 18.5}{1.955 / 13} = -1.199$

& H1= 1.199

VI Conclusion + It I stay we allest will hypothesis.

17. A group of 5 potients treated with medicine.

A weight 42,39,48,60 & 41 kegs. Seemed group of a patients from the same hospital treated with medicine B weight 38,42,56,64,68,69 and 62 kgs.

Do you agree with the claim that medicine B increases the weight significantly.

Given $\overline{x}_1 = \frac{38 + 4 + 2 + 39 + 48 + 60 + 41}{4} = 230$ $\overline{x}_2 = \frac{38 + 42 + 56 + 64 + 68 + 69 + 82}{4} = 5 = 5 = 5$

E(24-71)2= (42-46)2+ (39-46)2+ (48-46)2-+(60-46) -+ (41-46) = 290 2(20-72)= (38-57)-+ (42-57)-+ (56-57)-+(64-57)+(68-57)+(69-57)+(62-57)-82= 1 (2 (xp-x1)2+ 2 (xx - x2)2) $=\frac{1}{5+7-2}$ [290+926] Sh= 121.6 → S=11.03 3, Null hypothesis (Ho) 8- \$1=\$2 Ir, Alternative hypothesis (4) 1- \$1 7 2 Level of Significance & =0.05 tay at (mitne-2) doct to.095 at (5+7-2) docf = 200 2228 34 Test statestace $t = \frac{\overline{x_1} - \overline{x_2}}{S\sqrt{\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2}}} = \frac{46 - 57}{(11.03)\sqrt{\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{7}}}$ & It1 =1.7 VI or conclusion &- It/ctap we alless will hypothesis 18. In one sample of 10 observations, the sum of the denations of the sample values from sample mean was 120 and in the other sample of 12 dosewations Pt was 314. Test whether the difference & Eignifelant at 5% level. Given n1=10, n2=12 Elas- \$1 /= 120, Elas-\$2/2=314

Scanned by CamScanner

$$\Omega_{1}^{2} = \frac{1}{n_{1}-1} 2 (\alpha_{1}^{2} - \overline{\alpha_{1}})^{2} = \frac{1}{10-1} \times 120 = 13.3$$

$$S_{2}^{2} = \frac{1}{n_{2}-1} 2 (x^{2}-x_{2})^{2} = \frac{1}{12-1} \times 314 = 28.5$$

3. Null hypotheris (Ho):- Si=52

Il Alternative hypothesis (H1) 5- 517 52

iss. Level of significance & x=0.05

Fx at (n1-1, n2-1) doof

Foros at (9,11) doof 95 2.90

(1V, Test statistic 1- F = 50 = 28.5 = 2.14, 1F/=2.14

NI Conclusion !- IFI L Fx, we allest nell hypothesis

19. The following table gives the classification of 1000 waters arreading to guide and nature of work. Test whether the nature of work 25 kndependent of the gender of the worker. Stable unstable total Male 40 20 60

temale 10 30 40 total 50 50 100

solv Expected frequences

Male $\frac{50\times60}{100} = 30$ $\frac{50\times60}{100} = 30$

Female $\frac{50x40}{100} = 20$ $\frac{50x40}{100} = 20$

2. A mechanish making ongine parts with able deameter of 0.700 meh. A random Cample of 10 parts shows a mean diameter of 0.742 meh with a S.D of 0.040 meh. Compute the statistic you would use to test whether the work of melting the specifications.

Soft Gren n=10, = 0.742, Q=0.040, M=0.700

Si, Alternative hypothesis (41) :- 11 = 0.700

[17], Level of significante 6- $\alpha = 0.05$ to at (n-1) d.o.f to.025 at (10-1) d.0. f = 2.262

of test statistic: $t = \frac{\overline{x} - 4}{5\sqrt{n-1}} = \frac{0.742 - 0.700}{0.040} = 3.15$

Vi conclusion :- It > toy, we reject null hypothesis

2. To examine the hypotheris that the hurbands are more intelligent than the cover, an investigator, took a sample of to coupler and administered them a test which measures I.O. The results are folly thurbands 47 105 97 105 128 109 86 78 103 107 wifes 106 98 87 104 H6 95 90 69 105 85 Test the hypotheris with a reasonable test at the level of ergusticance of 0.05

Scanned by CamScanner

Get
$$n_{1}=10$$
, $n_{2}=10$
 $\overline{x}_{1}=\frac{117+105+97+----+107}{10}=103$
 $\overline{x}_{2}=\frac{106+98+87+----+85}{10}=95.8$
 $(x_{1}-\overline{x}_{1})^{2}=(117-103)^{2}+(105-103)^{2}+(97-103)^{2}+---+(107-102)^{2}$
 $=160.6$
 $(x_{1}-\overline{x}_{2})^{2}=(106-95.8)^{2}+(98-95.8)^{2}+(87-95.8)^{2}+------+(107-102)^{2}$
 $+(85-95.8)^{2}$
 $=1679.6$
 $S^{2}=\frac{1}{10+10-2}$
 $S=\frac{1}{10+10-2}$
 $S=\frac{1}{10+10-2}$

evi conclusion or It/ < tal. , we allest null hypothesis

3. Too Independent samples of 827 Herne respective had the following values 13 11 15 9 12 14 Samp II 11 11 10 18 9 8 10 Sample I 9 11 Is the difference blis the means of comples Signoff cont? Sdf Given n=8, n=7 $\overline{x_1} = \frac{11 + 11 + \dots + 14}{2} = 12$ $\sqrt{2} = 9 + 11 + - - - + 10 = 10$ (xi-xi)=(11-12) + (11-12) + ---+(14-12) = 26 (xi-72)= (9-10) = (11-10)2+ ---- + (10-10)= 16 S= 1 [2 (xi- \frac{1}{21})^2 + 2 (xi-\frac{1}{22})^2] $=\frac{1}{8+7-2}\left(26+16\right)$ = 3.23J S = 1.79 in Null hypothesis (Ho) - X1 = X2 in Alterative hypothesis (44) 8- XI + Xe in Level of significance :top at (ni+n2-2) dioif to.025 at 13 d.o.f = 2.160 (1v. test statistic :- t = \frac{\overline{\chi_1 - \overline{\chi_2}}}{c}

$$= \frac{12-10}{1.79.\sqrt{\frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{7}}} = 2.15$$

(V) Conclusions It | < tal) we allest null hypothesis

4. Pumpline were grown under two experimental conditions. Two earstern Saroples of 119 9 pumpting. The sample standard devation of their weights as 0.8 and 015 respectively. Assuming that the weight distributions are normal, test hypotheris that the true busances are equal.

Str Given n=11, n2=9 SI= 0.8 , S2 =0.5

31 Null hypothers; - SI = S2 (i), Alternative hypothesis 5- Sit & Se2

Ellis Level of agrificance: - x=0.05

Fx at (m,-1, m2-1) d.o.f

Fo.05 at (11-1, 9-1) d.o.f = 3.35

iv, Test statistic: $F = \frac{S_1^2}{S_2} = \frac{(0.8)^2}{0.5} = 2.56$

& IFI = 2.56

allept will hypothesis we V, conclusion: - IFI < Fx,

5. From the following data, find whether there to
any significant linking in the habit of taking
got desides among the categories of employees.
Eft dinles clades Teachers officers
Pegss 10 25 65
Thempup 15. 30 65
Forta 50 60 30
Sit Expected Feaquercies (Ei)
Soft dinks clearles Teachers Officers
Pepsi $\frac{75\times100}{350} = 21.4 \frac{115\times100}{350} = 32.9 \frac{160\times100}{350} = 45.71$
Thursup $\frac{75\times110}{350} = 23.6$ $\frac{115\times110}{350} = 36.1$ $\frac{160\times110}{350} = 50.3$
Fanta $\frac{75 \times 140}{350} = 30$ $\frac{115 \times 140}{350} = 46$ $\frac{160 \times 140}{350} = 64$
0; Ei (0:-5:)2 (0!-5i)2
10 21.4 129.96 6.073
25 32.9 62.41 1.897
65 45.7 372.49 8.157
15 23.6 73.96 3.134
30 36.1 37.21 1.031
65 50.3 216.09 4.3
50 30 400 13.333
60 46 196 4.26
30 64 1156 18.062
$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(0i-Ei)^2}{Ei} = 60.2425$

```
Mull hypothesis :- 01=Er
ii. Atternative hypothers: - 01+51
Ti, Level of significance: - = 0.05
         x2 at N= (8-1) (C-1) d.o.f
         20.05 at 9= (8-1) (3-1) d.o.f = 9.488
iv, Test statistic: - 8 = 5 (01-Ei) = 60.2425
Vi Conclusion: - 1x2/ > xx , we reject will hypothesis
   In an investigation on the machine performance,
   the following results are obtained.
              No. of units inspected No. of defective
                    375
                                         22
   Machene-I
                    450
    madine -I
                                 No. of defective total
Self Expedied Given
            No. of with inspected
                                     17
                  375
     MachineI
                   450
                                     39 864
                   825
      total
   Expected frequencies
                                      No. of defective
              No. of with inspected
                   \frac{825 \times 392}{864} = 374.8
    machine I
                                            39×472 = 21.3
    machine II
                   825 x 472 = 450.69
```

(01-61)2 (01-61)2-EP Oi 0.49 0.00131 374.3 375 0.476) 0.0269 17.69 17 450.69 0.4761 0.0011 450 0.49 0.023 21.3 22 2 = 5 (OF-ET) = 0.05281 is, Null hypothesis :- 01=51 cii, Attendive hypothesis or + 51 in, Level of Significance; xx at v= (8-1) (c-1) d.o.f 20.05 at v= (2-1) (2-1) d.o.f = 3.84 N. Test statistic: x = 5 (01-E1) = 0.052 120.052 N conclusion is 12/2 2/2, we alleft well hypothesis 7. A surey of 240 families with 4 children each revealed the following distabution. male bietty 4 3 No. of families 10 55 105 58 12 Tost whether the male & tremale breths are equally popular. Given P=9=1/2, N=240, n=4 Expected frequencies E = N. nex px gn-7 E0 = 240 x 4(0 (1/2) (1/2) 4-0 = 15 E1= 240 x 4(1 (1/2) (1/2)4-1 = 60

E2= 240 × 4(2 (1/2)2 (1/2)4-2 = 90				
$E_3 = 240 \times 4_{(3)} (4_2)^3 (4_2)^{4-3} = 60$				
$E_4 = 240 \times 4c_4 (42)^4 (42)^{4-4} = 15$				
or	E	(01-51)2	(01-51)2 Fil	
10	15	25	1.67	
55	60	25	0.42	
105	90	225	2.5	
58	60	4	0.07	
12	15	9	0.6	
			x= 2 (01-E1)2= 5.26	
		0.5.	. C	

3, Null hypotheris = 09=50 ii, Alternative hypothesis :- 0; \$ 50 ill, Level of Egypticales 2=0.05 25 at v=n-1 d.o.f 20.05 at N=5-1 d.of= 9. 488 Test statistic: x= 5 (0:-51) = 5.26 . |x=5.26 V, Conclusion 6- 127 < xx, we allest null hypothesise 8. Samples of students were dearn from two ineverties and from their weight in kelograms mean and S.D are calculated and down below make a large sample test to the significance of difference blu means. Mean ID Sample Gize 10 55 university A 15 University B

Sit Given
$$\overline{x}_1 = 55$$
, $\overline{x}_2 = 57$
 $x_1 = 10$, $x_2 = 15$
 $x_2 = 15$
 $x_1 = 10$, $x_2 = 15$
 $x_2 = 15$
 $x_3 = 10$, $x_4 = 10$
 $x_4 = 10$, $x_5 = 10$, $x_6 = 10$
 $x_6 $x_6 = 10$

Unit-A 14.1 10.1 14.7 13.7 14.0

Unit-13 14.0 14.5 13.7 12.7

$$S' = \frac{1}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \left[\frac{2(n_1 - x_1)^2 + S(n_1 - x_2)^2}{2(n_1 - x_1)^2 + S(n_1 - x_2)^2} \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{5 + 6 - 2} \left[\frac{10 + 74}{10 + 74} \right]$$

$$S' = 9.33$$

$$= S = 3.049$$

Nell hypothesse: - 74 = 72

Alternative hypotheries - = + x2

Level of Eignificances x=0.05 ta/2 at V=n1+n2-2 d.0+ to.025 at 0= 5+6-2=9 d.o.f = 2.262

(iv, rest statistic for
$$t = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$$

Vi conclusion 6- 11/7 tay we eiget will hypothesis with the state with the state of the state of of the difference by minera and the level.

Maria Maria