

Make Assumptions about values when it is necessary in consistent manner. Refer necessary table from following link when necessary.

[https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly\\_fs/1.43999!/file/tutorial-10-reading-tables.pdf](https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.43999!/file/tutorial-10-reading-tables.pdf)

Testing a Proportion of small samples

1.  $H_0: p = p_0$
2. One of the alternatives  $H_1: p < p_0, p > p_0, \text{ or } p \neq p_0$
3. Choose a level of significance equal to  $\alpha$ .
4. Test statistic: Binomial variable  $X$  with  $p = p_0$ .
5. Computations: Find  $x$ , the number of successes, and compute the appropriate P-value.
6. Decision: Draw appropriate conclusions based on the P-value

Ex. 1

A builder claims that air-conditions are installed in 70% of all homes being constructed today in the city of Mumbai. Would you agree with this claim if a random survey of new homes in this city shows that 8 out of 15 had air-conditions installed? Use a 0.10 level of significance

ex 11.

Claim: 70%

Random survey: 8 out of 15 have pumps.

0.1 level of significance

$$H_0 : p = 0.7$$

$$H_1 : p \neq 0.7$$

$$\alpha = 0.1$$

Test statistic:

We have a Binomial variable  $X$  with  $p = 0.7$  and  $n = 15$ .

$$\text{Here, } x = 8, n = 15$$

$$np_0 = (15)(0.7) \\ = 10.5$$

Since  $np_0 < 10$ ,

$$P = 2P(X \leq x, \text{ when } p = p_0), \text{ if } x < np_0$$

$$\text{Here, } x = 8 \text{ \& } np_0 = 10.5$$

$$P = 2P(X \leq 8, \text{ when } p = 0.7) \\ = 2 \sum_{x=0}^8 (0.7)^x (0.3)^{15-x}$$

$$= 2 \times 0.1311 = 0.2622$$

$$\therefore 0.2622 > 0.1$$

We don't reject  $H_0$ .

We don't have sufficient reason to doubt the claim.

### Ex.2

A commonly prescribed drug for relieving nervous tension is believed to be only 60% effective. Experimental results with a new drug administered to a random sample of 100 adults who were suffering from nervous tension show that 70 received relief. Is this sufficient evidence to conclude that the new drug is superior to the one commonly prescribed? Use a 0.05 level of significance.

Ex 2:

Claim: 0.6 ← commonly prescribed.

New drug:

Sample  $\rightarrow$  100, 70 received relief.

- Q. Is it sufficient evidence to conclude that the new drug is superior to commonly prescribed.

Level of significance:  $\alpha = 0.05$

$$\therefore H_0: P = 0.6$$

$$H_1: P > 0.6$$

$$\alpha = 0.05.$$

Critical value of  $z = 1.645$

$$x = 70 \quad n = 100 \quad p = 0.7$$

$$z = \frac{0.7 - 0.6}{\sqrt{(0.6)(0.4)/100}} = 2.04$$

$$P = P(Z > 2.04)$$

$$< 0.0207$$

$$< 0.05 = \alpha.$$

We reject  $H_0$  & we conclude that the new is superior.

### Ex.3

A vote is to be taken among the residents of a Mumbai and the surrounding area to determine whether a proposed Nuclear plant should be constructed. The construction site is within the Mumbai limits, and for this reason many voters in the surrounding area feel that the proposal will pass because of the large

proportion of Mumbai voters who favor the construction. To determine if there is a significant difference in the proportion of Mumbai voters and surrounding area voters favoring the proposal, a poll is taken. If 120 of 200 Mumbai voters favor the proposal and 240 of 500 surrounding area residents favor it, would you agree that the proportion of Mumbai voters favoring the proposal is higher than the proportion of surrounding area voters? Use an  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance.

Ex 3:

$P_1$  = Proportion of Mumbai voters favoring the proposal  
 $P_2$  = Proportion of surrounding voters favoring the proposal  
 $\hat{P}_1$  = Sample proportion of Mumbai voters favoring the proposal  
 $\hat{P}_2$  = Sample proportion of surrounding voters favoring the proposal

Mumbai,  
 $n_1 = 200$      $X_1 = 120$   
 $\hat{P}_1 = \frac{X_1}{n_1} = 0.6$      $\hat{Q}_1 = 1 - 0.6 = 0.4$

Surrounding  
 $n_2 = 500$      $X_2 = 240$   
 $\hat{P}_2 = \frac{X_2}{n_2} = 0.48$      $\hat{Q}_2 = 1 - 0.48 = 0.52$

Pooled estimate:  
 $\hat{P} = \frac{X_1 + X_2}{n_1 + n_2} = \frac{360}{700} = 0.514$   
 $\hat{Q} = 1 - 0.514 = 0.486$

Hypothesis:  
 $H_0: P_1 \leq P_2$      $H_1: P_1 > P_2$

$$Z = \frac{(\hat{P}_1 - \hat{P}_2)}{\sqrt{\hat{P}\hat{Q}\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{(0.60 - 0.48)}{\sqrt{0.514 \cdot 0.486 \left(\frac{1}{200} + \frac{1}{500}\right)}}$$

$$= 2.869$$

$$P = P(Z > 2.869) = 0.0044$$

Because,  
 $P < \alpha(0.05)$   
 we reject  $H_0$ .  
 $P_1 > P_2$  i.e. proportion of Mumbai voters favoring the proposal is more than proportion of surrounding.

#### Ex.4

State the null and alternative hypotheses to be used in testing the following claims, and determine generally where the critical region is located:

- (a) At most, 20% of next year's wheat, crop will be exported to the Russia..
- (b) On the average, Indian homemakers drink 3 cups of tea per day.
- (c) The proportion of graduates in engineering this year majoring in the computer sciences is at least 0.15.
- (d) The average donation to the Indian Autism Association is no more than 500 INR.
- (e) Residents in suburban Mumbai commute, on the average, 15 kilometers to their place of employment.

- a) Almost 20%
- Null Hypothesis:  $H_0 : p = 0.2$   
 Alternative Hypothesis:  $H_1 : p > 0.2$   
 Critical region is the right tail.
- b) On an average 3 cups of tea per day
- Null Hypothesis:  $H_0 : \mu = 3$   
 Alternative Hypothesis:  $H_1 : \mu \neq 3$   
 Since  $\neq$  is there for it is two tailed.
- c) At least 15%
- Null Hypothesis:  $H_0 : p = 0.15$   
 Alternative Hypothesis:  $H_1 : p < 0.15$   
 Critical region is in left tail
- d) Average no more than 500 INR
- Null Hypothesis:  $H_0 : \mu = 500$   
 Alternative Hypothesis:  $H_1 : \mu > 500$   
 Critical region is in right tail
- e) Average: 15 km
- Null Hypothesis:  $H_0 : \mu = 15$   
 Alternative Hypothesis:  $H_1 : \mu \neq 15$   
 Critical Region is in both tails

In a study conducted by the Department of computer Engineering and analyzed by the Statistics Consulting Center at SPIT the laptops supplied by two different companies were compared. Ten sample laptops were made out of the Intel chips supplied by each company and the "robustness" was studied. The data are as follows:

Company A: 9.3 8.8 6.8, 8.7 8.5 6.7 8.0 6.5 9.2 7.0

Company B: 11.0 9.8 9.9 10.2,10.1 9.7 11.0 11.1 10.2 9.6

Can you conclude that there is virtually no difference in means between the laptops supplied by the two companies? Use a P-value to reach your conclusion. Should variances be pooled here?

Ex 5: Null hypothesis  $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$   
 Alternative hypothesis  $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

assuming  $\alpha = 0.05$

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{\sum x_1}{n_1} = \frac{79.5}{10} = 7.95$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = \frac{102.6}{10} = 10.26$$

Standard dev.

$$s_1^2 = \frac{1}{n_1-1} [\sum x_1^2 - n_1 \bar{x}_1^2]$$

$$= \frac{10.605}{10-1} = 1.2072$$

$$s_2^2 = \frac{1}{n_2-1} [\sum x_2^2 - n_2 \bar{x}_2^2]$$

$$= \frac{2.924}{10-1} = 0.3248$$

Now, we need to calculate degree of freedom

$$V = \left( \frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2} \right)^2$$

$$\left( \frac{1}{10-1} \right) \left( \frac{s_1^2}{n_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{1}{10-1} \right) \left( \frac{s_2^2}{n_2} \right)^2$$

$$= \left( \frac{1.2072}{10} + \frac{0.3248}{10} \right)^2$$

$$\frac{1}{9} \left( \frac{1.2072}{10} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{9} \left( \frac{0.3248}{10} \right)^2$$

$$= 10.30$$

$\therefore df = 10$

Test Statistic:

$$T = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

Considering null hypothesis  $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$

$$= \frac{7.95 - 10.26}{\sqrt{\frac{1.2072}{10} + \frac{0.3248}{10}}} = -5.902$$

Considering two sided test

$$|T| = |-5.902| = 5.902$$

$$P\text{-value} = 2P(T \geq |T|) = 2P(T \geq 5.9)$$

$$\therefore P\text{-value} = 2P(T \geq 5.9) = 4.587$$

to 0.005 (10) = 4.587

$|T| = 5.9$  is even.

$$P(T \geq 5.9) < 0.0005$$

$\therefore P\text{-value} < 0.001$

$P < \alpha$ ,  $\therefore$  Null hypothesis is rejected.