

1.

The study described in the lecture about “Obesity & Heart Disease” also included men. The data for men are shown in the accompanying table.

(a) Compute (i) the sample proportions of CVD deaths for the obese and nonobese groups; (ii) the standard error for the difference in sample proportions; (iii) a 95% confidence interval for the difference in populations.

$$(i) \hat{\pi}_1 = \frac{22}{1201} = 0.01832$$

$$\hat{\pi}_2 = \frac{22}{1431} = 0.01537$$

$$\hat{\pi}_1 - \hat{\pi}_2 = 0.00295$$

(ii)

$$SE = \sqrt{\frac{0.01832 \times (1 - 0.01832)}{1201} - \frac{0.01537 \times (1 - 0.01537)}{1431}} = 0.00505$$

$$(iii) 95\% CI = (\hat{\pi}_1 - \hat{\pi}_2 \pm 1.96 SE) = 0.00295 \pm 1.96 * 0.00505 = (-0.00695, 0.012857)$$

(b) Find a one-sided p-value for the test of equal population proportions (using the standard error for testing equality).

$$Z = \frac{\hat{\pi}_1 - \hat{\pi}_2}{SE} = \frac{0.00295}{0.00505} = 0.58415$$

$$p\text{-value} \rightarrow p(z \geq 0.58415) = 0.2796$$

(c) Compute (i) the sample odds of CVD death for the obese and nonobese groups; (ii) the estimated odds ratio; (iii) the standard error of the estimated log odds ratio; (iv) a 95% confidence interval for the odds ratio.

(i)

$$odds_1 = \frac{22}{1179} = 0.01866, odds_2 = \frac{22}{1409} = 0.01561$$

(ii)

$$OR = \frac{0.01866}{0.01561} = 1.1952$$

(iii)

$$ASE\{\ln(OR)\} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{22} + \frac{1}{22} + \frac{1}{1179} + \frac{1}{1409}} = 0.30408$$

$$\ln(OR) = 0.1783$$

(iv)

95% CI for the log odds ratio is $\rightarrow 1.1952 \pm 1.96 * 0.30408$

95%CI for the odds ratio $\rightarrow e^{\log(OR) \pm 1.96SE} = (0.659, 2.169)$

(d) Write a concluding sentence that incorporates the confidence interval from part (c)

There is no evidence that the odds ration differs from 1 and no sufficient evidence that odds ratio is higher in obese because 1 is contained inside the 95% CI.

2. For the data in “Smoking & Lung Cancer” case, test whether the odds of lung cancer for smokers are equal to the odds of lung cancer for nonsmokers, using Fisher’s Exact Test.

Set null hypothesis:

$$H_0: \varphi = 1$$

$$H_A: \varphi \neq 1$$

Note the p-value is significant and the confidence interval doesn't contain 1. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis of the odds ratio being 1.

<Code input>

```
> fisher.test(case1803)
```

Fisher's Exact Test for Count Data

data: case1803

p-value = 0.008823

alternative hypothesis: true odds ratio is not equal to 1

95 percent confidence interval:

1.409691 30.094245

sample estimates:

odds ratio

5.333256

3. A management behavior analyst has been studying the relationship between male/female supervisory structures in the workplace and the level of employee’s job satisfaction. The results of a recent survey are shown in the table below. Is there sufficient evidence to infer that the level of hob satisfaction depends on the boss/employee gender relationship?

To test the hypothesis is that the level of job satisfaction depends on the boss/employee gender relationship at 5% significance level.

The null and alternative hypothesis is:

H_0 : *The level of job satisfaction independent on the boss – employee gender relationship.*

H_A : *The level of job satisfaction depends on the boss – employee gender relationship.*

The chi-squared test:

<code input>

```
> job<-matrix(c(21,25,54,71,39,49,50,38,31,48,10,11),nrow=3,byrow=TRUE)
> colnames(job)<-c("female/male","female/female","male/female","female/female")
> rownames(job)<-c("satisfied","neutral","dissatisfied")
> job=as.table(job)
> chisq.test(job,correct=F)
```

Pearson's Chi-squared test

data: job

X-squared = 74.478, df = 6, p-value = 4.915e-14

Conclusion:

Based on the chi-squared test, $X^2 = 74.478$, and p-value=0.0000. Since the p-value is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance. There is sufficient evidence to infer that the level of job satisfaction depends on the boss/employee gender relationship. The result is statistically significant.