Problem 1141:

The following code was used to analyze data1141 using one tail t-test.

```
#problem 1141
#importing the data1141
data1<-read.csv("/Users/Downloads/data1141.csv",header=T)
#Welch two sample t test
t.test(data1$X2008_mins,data1$X2003_mins,"greater",mu=0)</pre>
```

The generated output was:

Welch Two Sample t-test

The p value was calculated to be 0.04348 which was less than the 0.05 significance level. This implies at 5% significance level, mean hold times for customers was significantly greater in 2008 as compared to that in 2003.

Problem 1150:

The following code was used to test the difference between reaction times in data_1150 using a paired t-test.

```
# importing data 1150
data2<-read.csv("/Users/Downloads/data1150.csv",header=T)
#paired t test
t.test(data2$After,data2$Before,"greater",paired=TRUE,mu=0,conf.level=
0.995)</pre>
```

The output was the following:

Paired t-test

Thus, the p value was equal to 2.087e-14. This is less than the significance level of 0.005. This implies there was a significant increase in reaction time due to alcohol. The program host did make his point.

Problem 1057:

The following code was used to analyze data1057 by one sample t test.

```
#importing data1057
data3<-read.csv("/Users/Downloads/data1057.csv",header=T)
#one sample t test
t.test(data3$Expense,mu=817)
```

The following was the output from the code. data: data3\$Expense t = 2.2073, df = 79, p-value = 0.0302 alternative hypothesis: true mean is not equal to 817 95 percent confidence interval: 820.2983 880.8517 sample estimates: mean of x 850.575

The p value was 0.0302. At 0.05 significance level, the insurance expenditure was significantly different from \$817.

The 95% confidence interval was calculated as (820.2983, 880.8517). If 95% confidence intervals like this were calculated a large number of times, they would contain the true mean 95% times.

No, the hypothesized mean \$817 was not in the confidence interval.