20th March 2024

Continuing with Sec 6.3:

Two Sample Models.

det's look at figure 6.5 :->

There is clear overlap in medians, Boxes, whishers and even outlies between the box plots. Thus, it seems like the work term salaries have similar distributions ..

A Note: Take your time to practice these Derivations of L.R.S; All are considered ch 2, 3, 4 Materials. If they are not "obvious" to you. See me in office hours for help if needed *

Case 1: Assume $S_1^2 = S_2^2 = 818^2$

Basie Model

$$L(u_1, u_2) = \prod_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathcal{E}_{xp} \left\{ -\frac{1}{28^2} \left(y_{1i} - u_1 \right)^2 \right\} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{n_2} \mathcal{E}_{xp} \left\{ -\frac{1}{28^2} \left(y_{2j} - u_2 \right)^2 \right\}$$

$$J(u_1,\mu_2) = -\frac{1}{28^2} \left[\frac{2}{5} (y_1 - \mu_1)^2 + \frac{2}{5} (y_2 - \mu_2)^2 \right]$$

If we take and In, and solve for (û, û2):

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{1} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_{ii}/n_{i}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_{2j}/n_{2}} = \frac{y_{1}}{y_{2}}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{2} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_{2j}/n_{2}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_{2j}/n_{2}} = \frac{y_{2}}{y_{2}}$$

K=2/

Inpostperifical foodel :
$$\mu_{1} = \mu_{2} = \mu$$
 (unknown)

$$|Q = 1|$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{2j} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{m_{2}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} \right]$$

$$|L(\mu)| = -\frac{1}{282} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m_{1}} (y_{ti} - \mu)^{2} +$$

$$\partial_{obs} = 10.4129$$
 $10-\text{value} = P(D > \partial_{obs}) = P(\chi_{u}^{2} > 10.4129)$
 $= P(171 > \sqrt{10.4129})$
 $= 2P(7 > 3.23)$

Same. $P(7 \le -3.23)$
 $= 2 * 0.0006$
 $= 0.0012$ Via tables.

95%. C.I. (J. - J2) ± Zo.975 * 8/ 1, + 1/2

-205.35

\(\rightarrow (-331.04, -80.86) \)

There is strong evidence against flo, given b-value = 0.0012.

The estimated year monthly increase in work Term 2

Over work Term 1 in \$205.95 (95%. C. I. \$80.86

-\$331.04)

The data suggest the increase in mean monthly balary is

Significantly different from Zero, at 5% level of significance.

(on 1% level)

Here we looked at the other two examples in the lecture notes (unknown & unequal Variances, unknown but equal variances)

C) Connectioned to pages 20-22 of the cf-6 tof.

when Lecture Dates".