

# Math 308 Assignment 7

## Exercises 3.9

Nakul Joshi

February 16, 2014

4

The null hypothesis is that the difference in proportions is zero. However, performing the permutation test gave a  $p$ -value of 0.002, allowing us to reject the null at 1% confidence. Thus, the difference in proportions is statistically significant.

8

The  $p$ -value is 1, which does not let us reject the null hypothesis that the presence of competition has no value on the height change of the seedlings.

11

**Null Hypothesis** Voting preference is independent of age.

**Alternative hypothesis** Voting preference depends on age.

| Age   | Response |         |      |
|-------|----------|---------|------|
|       | For      | Against | All  |
| 18-29 | 172      | 52      | 224  |
| 30-49 | 313      | 103     | 416  |
| 50+   | 258      | 119     | 377  |
| All   | 743      | 274     | 1017 |

Table 1: Observed values

Multiplying column marginal fractions by row marginal totals, we can get the expected values:

| Age   | Response |         |
|-------|----------|---------|
|       | For      | Against |
| 18-29 | 164      | 60      |
| 30-49 | 304      | 112     |
| 50+   | 275      | 102     |

Table 2: Expected values

Then, we calculate the  $\chi^2$  test statistic:  

$$c = \sum_{i,j}^{\text{all cells}} \frac{(\text{observed}_{i,j} - \text{expected}_{i,j})^2}{\text{expected}_{i,j}} = 6.33$$

Under the null,  $C$  follows a  $\chi^2$  distribution with  $(3-1) \times (2-1) = 2$  degrees of freedom; i.e.  $C \sim \chi^2_2$ . So, the  $p$ -value is  $P(C > c) = \int_c^\infty \frac{e^{-t/2}}{2} dt \approx 0.042$ .

Thus, we can reject the null at 5% significance, but not at 1% significance.

13

a)

We are testing for homogeneity since we want to know whether the distribution of fin ray counts differs from lake to lake.

b)

**Null hypothesis** Fin ray distributions are the same from lake to lake.

**Alternative hypothesis** Fin ray distributions are different from lake to lake.

| Habitat      | Ray Count |     |     |     |     |    | All |
|--------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|
|              | 36        | 35  | 34  | 33  | 32  | 31 |     |
| Guadalupe    | 14        | 30  | 42  | 78  | 33  | 14 | 211 |
| Cedro        | 11        | 28  | 53  | 66  | 27  | 9  | 194 |
| San Clemente | 10        | 17  | 61  | 53  | 22  | 10 | 173 |
| All          | 71        | 110 | 190 | 230 | 114 | 64 | 779 |

| Habitat      | Ray Count |    |    |    |    |           |
|--------------|-----------|----|----|----|----|-----------|
|              | $\geq 36$ | 35 | 34 | 33 | 32 | $\leq 31$ |
| Guadalupe    | 19        | 30 | 51 | 62 | 31 | 17        |
| Cedro        | 18        | 27 | 47 | 57 | 28 | 16        |
| San Clemente | 16        | 24 | 42 | 51 | 25 | 14        |

Table 3: Expected Values

$c = \sum_{i,j}^{\text{all cells}} \frac{(\text{observed}_{i,j} - \text{expected}_{i,j})^2}{\text{expected}_{i,j}} = 41.77$ ,  
 where  $C \sim \chi_{10}^2$ . So,  $p = P(C > c) = \int_c^\infty \frac{t^{10/2-1} e^{-t/2}}{2^{10/2} \Gamma(10/2)} dt = \int_c^\infty \frac{t^4 e^{-t/2}}{768} dt = 8 \times 10^{-6}$ . So, we can reject the null.

17

a)

| Happiness     | Gender |      |
|---------------|--------|------|
|               | Female | Male |
| Not too happy | 109    | 61   |
| Pretty happy  | 406    | 378  |
| Very happy    | 205    | 210  |

Table 4: Observed happiness against gender data

b)

We get a  $p$  value of 0.004, allowing us to reject the null hypothesis of independence at a 1% significance level.

19

a)

Let the elements of the contingency table be  $o_{i,j}$ , and let their corresponding row and column totals be  $r_i$  and  $c_j$  respectively. Further, let the total number of observations  $\sum_{i,j} o_{i,j} = n$ . The corresponding expected values are then  $e_{i,j} = \frac{r_i c_j}{n}$ , which gives the test statistic  $c = \sum_{i,j} \frac{(o_{i,j} - e_{i,j})^2}{e_{i,j}}$ .

However, if each element is multiplied by  $k$ , then  $o_{i,j}, r_i, c_j$  and  $n$  are each multiplied by  $k$ . So, the corresponding expected values become  $e_{i,j}^* = \frac{k^2}{k} \times \frac{r_i c_j}{n} = k \times e_{i,j}$ . The new test statistic  $c^* = \sum_{i,j} \frac{(o_{i,j}^* - e_{i,j}^*)^2}{e_{i,j}^*} = \sum_{i,j} \frac{k^2}{k} \times \frac{(o_{i,j} - e_{i,j})^2}{e_{i,j}} = k \times c$ . Thus, the test statistic is also multiplied by  $k$ .

However, the marginal probabilities are unchanged since the  $k$ 's cancel on the row and overall totals. Further, the degrees of freedom are unaffected since they only depend upon  $r$  and  $c$ .

b)

Originally, the  $p$ -value was  $\int_c^\infty f(t; k) dt$ , but the new  $p$ -value becomes  $\int_{kc}^\infty f(t; k) dt$ . Thus, the  $p$  value reduces, since  $k > 1 \implies kc > c$ .

22

a)

| p   | q    |
|-----|------|
| 0.2 | 16.1 |
| 0.4 | 20.2 |
| 0.6 | 23.8 |
| 0.8 | 27.9 |

b)

| Interval    | Counts |      |
|-------------|--------|------|
|             | Obs.   | Exp. |
| <16.11      | 16     | 10   |
| 16.11–20.23 | 13     | 10   |
| 20.23–23.77 | 9      | 10   |
| 23.77–27.89 | 9      | 10   |
| >27.89      | 3      | 10   |

c)

We get a  $p$ -value of 0.048, which does not let us reject the hypothesis that the data was drawn from a  $N(22, 7^2)$  distribution.

**25**

**29**