

HYPOTHESIS TESTING DPP

Answer 1:

To test whether the new customer feedback process has improved satisfaction, we can perform a **one-sample t-test** because sample size is 30.

Step 1:

Null Hypothesis (H_0): 72

Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): Mean score > 72 **(This is a one-tailed test.)**

Given Data

- **Population means (mu):** = 72
- **Sample mean after{x} = 78**
- **Sample standard deviation: (std)= 10**
- **Sample size: (n) = 30**
- **Significance level: (alpha) = 0.05**

Step 2:

STANDAR ERROR:

$$SE = \Sigma/\sqrt{n}$$

Sigma (std) = 10

Sample size(n) = 30

$\sqrt{n} = (5.477)$

$SE = 10/5.477 = 1.82$

Step 3:

$$T\text{-Calc} = \bar{X} - \mu / SE$$

$\mu = 72$

$SE = 1.82$

$$T\text{-Calc} = (78-72)/1.82 = 3.29$$

Step 4:

Critical Value

Sample size (n)

Degrees of freedom: $df = 30 - 1 = 29$

From the t-distribution table, the critical value for a one-tailed test at alpha = 0.05 and df = 29 is approximately **1.699**.

Step 5:

Decision

- Calculated t-value: **3.29**
- Critical t-value: **1.699**

Since **$3.29 > 1.699$** , we **reject the null hypothesis**.

Conclusion

There is **statistically significant evidence** at the 5% level to conclude that the new customer feedback process has **improved customer satisfaction**.

Answer 2:

To verify the school's claim, we'll perform a one-sample t-test to see if the sample mean is significantly greater than the national average.

Step 1:

Null Hypothesis (H_0): 75

Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): $MU > 75$ (This is a one-tailed test.)

Given Data

- National average: (MU) = **75**
- Sample means: $\{x\bar{ }\} = 77$
- Sample standard deviation: (std) = **8**
- Sample size: (n) = **50**
- Significance level: ($alpha$) = **0.01**

Step 2:

STANDARD ERROR:

$$SE = \Sigma/\sqrt{n}$$

Sigma (std) = 8

Sample size(n) = 50

Sqrt(n) = (7.071)

SE = 8/7.071 = 1.13

Step 3:

$$T\text{-Calc} = \bar{X} - \mu / SE$$

MU = 75

SE = 1.13

T-Calc = (77-75)/1.13 = 1.77

Step 4:

Critical Value

Sample size (n)

Degrees of freedom: df = 50-1 = 49

From the t-distribution table, the critical value for a **one-tailed test** at alpha = 0.01 and df = 49 is approximately **2.405**.

Decision

- Calculated t-value: **1.77**
- Critical t-value: **2.405**

Since $1.77 < 2.405$, we **fail to reject the null hypothesis**.

Conclusion

At the 0.01 significance level, there is **not enough statistical evidence** to support the school's claim that their students' average math score is higher than the national average.

Answer 3:

To determine whether the new sales strategy significantly increased average daily sales, we'll perform a **one-sample t-test**.

Step 1

Null Hypothesis (H_0): 10,000

Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): $MU > 10,000$ (This is a one-tailed test.)

Given Data

- **Population mean: (mu) = 10,000**
- **Sample mean: {xbar} = 11,200**
- **Sample standard deviation: (std) = 1,500**
- **Sample size: (n) = 15**
- **Significance level: (alpha) = 0.05**

Step 2:

STANDAR ERROR:

$$SE = \text{Sigma}/\text{Sqrt}(n)$$

Sigma (std) = 1,500

Sample size(n) = 15

Sqrt(n) = (3.873)

SE = $1500/3.873 = \underline{\underline{387.29}}$

Step 3:

$$\text{T-Calc} = \text{XBAR} - \text{MU} / SE$$

MU = 10,000

SE = 387.29

T-Calc = $(11,200 - 10,000)/387.29 = \underline{\underline{3.10}}$

Step 4:

Critical Value

Sample size (n)

Degrees of freedom: $df = 15 - 1 = 14$

From the t-distribution table, the critical value for a **one-tailed test** at alpha = 0.05 and df = 14 is approximately **1.761**.

Decision

- Calculated t-value: **3.10**
- Critical t-value: **1.761**

Since $3.10 > 1.761$, we **reject the null hypothesis**.

Conclusion

At the 5% significance level, there is **strong statistical evidence** that the new sales strategy has **increased average daily sales**.

Answer 4:

To test if the advertised lifespan of 1200 hours is accurate, we'll perform a **one-sample t-test** since the population standard deviation is unknown and the sample size is relatively small ($n = 40$).

Step 1:

Null Hypothesis (H_0): 1200 hour

Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): $\neq 1200$ hour **(This is a two-tailed test.)**

Given Data

- **Population mean: (μ) = 1200 hour**
- **Sample mean { \bar{x} } = 1180 hours**
- **Sample standard deviation (std) = 50 hours**
- **Sample size (n) = 40**
- **Significance level (alpha) = 0.05**

Step 2:

STANDAR ERROR:

$$SE = \Sigma/\sqrt{n}$$

Sigma (std) = 50

Sample size(n) = 40

Sqrt(n) = (6.32)

SE = 50/6.32 = 7.91

Step 3:

$$T\text{-Calc} = \bar{X} - \mu / SE$$

MU = 1200

SE = 7.91

$$T\text{-Calc} = (1800 - 1200)/7.91 = -2.53$$

Step 4:

Critical Value

Degrees of freedom (df) = 40 - 1 = 39

From the t-distribution table, **the critical t-value for a two-tailed test at $\alpha = 0.05$ and df = 39 is approximately 2.022**

Decision

- Calculated t-value: **-2.53**
- Critical t-value: **2.022**

Since $2.53 > 2.022$, we **reject the null hypothesis.**

Conclusion

At the 0.05 significance level, there is **sufficient evidence to conclude** that the actual mean lifespan of the bulbs **differs from the advertised 1200 hours.**

Answer 5:

To test whether the average height of adult males in the city differs from the national average of 5.8 feet, we'll perform a **two-tailed one-sample t-test**.

Step 1:

Null Hypothesis (H_0): 5

Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): $\neq 5.8$ (This is a two-tailed test.)

Given Data

- **Population mean: (μ) = 5.8feet**
- **Sample mean { \bar{x} } = 5.7feet**
- **Sample standard deviation (std) = 0.3feet**
- **Sample size (n) = 25**
- **Significance level (alpha) = 0.01**

Step 2:

STANDARD ERROR:

$$SE = \sigma / \sqrt{n}$$

Sigma (std) = 0.3

Sample size(n) = 25

$\sqrt{n} = (5)$

$$SE = 0.3/5 = \underline{\underline{0.06}}$$

Step 3:

$$T\text{-Calc} = \bar{X} - \mu / SE$$

$\mu = 5.8$

$SE = 0.06$

$$T\text{-Calc} = (5.7 - 5.8) / 0.06 = \underline{\underline{1.67}}$$

Step 4:

Critical Value

Degrees of freedom (df) = 25 - 1 = 24

From the t-distribution table, the critical t-value for a two-tailed test at $\alpha = 0.01$ and df = 24 is approximately 2.797

Decision

- Calculated t-value: 1.67
- Critical t-value: 2.797

Since $1.67 < 2.797$, we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Conclusion

At the 1% significance level, there is not enough evidence to conclude that the average height of adult males in the city differs from the national average of 5.8 feet.