```
1. If Z is norm (mean = 0, sd = 1)
find P(Z > 2.64)
    1. - pnorm(2.64, mean = 0, sd = 1, lower.tail = TRUE, log.p = FALSE) =
       1 - 0.9958 = 0.0042
find P(|Z| > 1.39)
P(|Z| > 1.39) = P(Z > 1.39) + P(Z < -1.39) = [1 - P(Z < 1.39)] + [1 - P(Z < 1.39)]
P(z < 1.39)
   = 2*[1 - P(z < 1.39)] = 2*[1 - pnorm(1.39, mean = 0, sd = 1,
lower.tail = TRUE, log.p = FALSE)]
    = 2(1 - 0.9177) = 2(0.0823) = 0.1646
   Suppose p = the proportion of students who are admitted to the
    graduate school
of the University of California at Berkeley, and suppose that a public
relation
officer boasts that UCB has historically had a 40% acceptance rate for its
school. Consider the data stored in the table UCBAdmissions from 1973.
Assuming
these observations constituted a simple random sample, are they consistent
with the
officerâ..s claim, or do they provide evidence that the acceptance
rate was significantly less than 40%?
Use an \tilde{A}\tilde{Z}\hat{A}\pm = 0.01 significance level.
 Ho: p = 0.4
 Ha: p < 0.4
 alpha = 0.01
 qnormval <- qnorm(0.99)</pre>
  #qnormval - 2.326348
 newucb data <- as.data.frame(UCBAdmissions)</pre>
 View(newucb data)
 dim(newucb data)
 summary(newucb data$Admit)
 phat <-12/(24)
 t <- (phat-0.4)/sqrt(0.4*0.6/(24))
 t > qnormval , so we accept null hypothesis, the observed data are
consistent with the officer's claim
```