```
M358 K: November 4th, 2020.
  Hypothesis testing for the population proportion p.
 Test statistic = ?
   Sample proportion of "successes"; we look @ its
     sampling distribution under the null hypothesis
    for a large enough sample, we know that the
       X "~" Normal (mean = n.p., var = n.p. (1-p.))
   = D \hat{P} = \frac{x}{n} \text{ "N" Normal (mean = Po, var = } \frac{Po(1-Po)}{n})
The Observed sample proportion is denoted by p. Then, the corresponding zistatistic is (under the null hypothesis)
     7 = 2-20
     p-value: the probability of observing what we
     observed or something more extreme under the null
   IF Ha: p<po, then p-value = P[Z<z]
   IF Ha: p = po, then p. value = P[Z <-121] + P[Z>121]

IF Ha: p>po, then p. value = P[Z>2]
```

Let's say that a significance level & is given.

IF p. value < &, then we REJECT THE NULL Ho.

IF p. value > &, then we FAIL TO REJECT THE NULL Ho.

## University of Texas at Austin

## Problem Set # 13

Hypothesis testing: One-sample proportion.

Problem 13.1. Source: Problem 8.99 from the Moore/McCabe/Craig.

<u>Castaneda v. Partida</u> is an important court case in which statistical methods were used as part of a legal argument. When reviewing this case, the Supreme Court used the phrase "two or three standard deviations" as a criterion for statistical significance. This Supreme Court review has served as the basis for many subsequent applications of statistical methods in legal settings. (The two or three standard deviations referred to by the Court are values of the z statistic and correspond to p-values of approximately 0.05 and 0.0026.)

In Castaneda the plaintiffs alleged that the method for selecting juries in a county in Texas was biased against Mexican Americans. For the period of time at issue, there were 181,535 persons eligible for jury duty, of whom 143,611 were Mexican Americans. Of the 870 people selected for jury duty 339 were Mexican Americans.

(i) (1 point) What proportion of eligible jurors were Mexican Americans?

(ii) (2 points) Let p denote the probability that a randomly selected juror is a Mexican American. Formulate the null and alternative hypotheses to be tested.

(iii) (1 point) What is the sample proportion of jurors who were Mexican American?

$$\hat{p} = \frac{339}{870} = 0.3897$$

(iv) (4 points) Compute the z-statistic, and find the p-value.

$$7 = \frac{\hat{p} - p_0}{\sqrt{\frac{p_0(1-p_0)}{n}}} = \frac{0.3897 - 0.7941}{\sqrt{\frac{0.7941}{870}}} = -29...$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{0.7941(0.2089)}{870}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{p_0(1-p_0)}{870}} = \sqrt{\frac{0.7941(0.2089)}{870}}$$

(v) (2 points) How would you summarize your conclusions? (A finding of statistical significance in this circumstance does not constitute proof of discrimination. It can be used, however, to establish a prima facie case. The burden of proof then shifts to the defense.)

There is evidence in favor of the prima facie case!

```
Statistical Inference for Two Roportions.
 Our parameters of interest:
    p:, i=1,2 ... the population proportion for the
               subpopulation i=1,2.
       e.g., p1... corresponds to the subpopulation who get
              the sugar pill;
            p2... corresponds to the subpopulation who get
             the actual treatment.
 Sample of size ni, i=1,2 from the subpopulation
    i=1,2 is planned for.
  Assume that the two samples are INDEPENDENT.
 tor large ni, i=1,2, we know that for the count r.v.s.
     X; "~" Normal (mean = n; p; , var = n; p; (1-p;)) i=1,2
=D for the sample proportion r.v.s
     \hat{P}_i = \frac{x_i}{n_i} "Normal (mean = p_i, var = \frac{p_i(1-p_i)}{n_i}) i=1,2.
 We want to do statistical inference on P1-12
 It's sensible to focus on:
   P<sub>1</sub> - P<sub>2</sub> "~" Normal (mean = p<sub>1</sub> - p<sub>2</sub>)
                          Var = P1 (1-P1) + P2 (1-P2)
```