

IEDR 165 MT2 Spring 2012

1. chickens  $n=525$

$$\hat{p} = 0.83$$

$$p \leftarrow \hat{p}$$

Assumptions for CLT

1. SRS
2. Samples are iid
3.  $n$  is small relative to size of population
4.  $np \geq 10$   $n(1-p) \geq 10$

(a) 95% CI for  $\hat{p}$

$$\hat{p} \pm z_{0.025} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}} \Rightarrow [0.7978, 0.8621]$$

We are 95% confident that the ~~the proportion~~ <sup>true proportion</sup> of checked infected is captured by  $[0.7978, 0.8621]$

(b) The statement of the spokesperson is invalid because

- (1) #3 assumption for CLT  $\Rightarrow$  against it
- (2) Data in sample should be representative

2

	M	W
$n$ :	50	50
$\bar{X}_m$ :	19.39	17.91
$s_m$	2.52	3.39

(a)  $n > 30$ , 95% CI for male

$$\bar{X} \pm z_{0.025} \sqrt{\frac{s^2}{n}}$$

$$z: [18.69149, 20.088]$$

$$t_{99}: [18.67382, 20.1048]$$

either is okay!

95% CI for female

$$z: [16.9703, 18.8496]$$

(b)  $H_0: \mu_M - \mu_W = 0$

$$H_1: \mu_M - \mu_W \neq 0$$

$$s_d = \sqrt{\frac{s_m^2}{n_m} + \frac{s_w^2}{n_w}} = 0.5973$$

$$z = \frac{(\bar{X}_m - \bar{X}_w) - 0}{s_d} = 2.47$$

$$P\text{-value} = 2 \times Pr\{Z > 2.47\} = 0.0132$$

Reject  $H_0$ : There is a significant difference in the performances of males & females.

(c) 95%  $MSE = 1.96 \times s_d = 1.1708$

$$[0.309, 2.651]$$



3. 1996 20%

2000  $p \leftarrow n=1100 \hat{p} = 0.25$

$$H_0: p = 0.2$$

$$H_1: p > 0.2$$

Assumptions:

1. SRS

2. iid

3. small enough

4. large  $np \geq 10$  &  $n(1-p)$

$$s_d = \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}} = 0.01305$$

$$95\% \text{ CI: } [0.224, 0.275]$$

$$P\text{-Value} = P\left\{Z > \frac{0.25 - 0.2}{0.01305}\right\} = P\{Z > 3.829\} \approx 0$$

Reject  $H_0 \Rightarrow$  Yes, there is evidence for grade inflation.

4. June 54 49 68 66 62 62  $\leftarrow$  group 2

Aug. 50 65 74 64 68 72  $\leftarrow$  group 1

Paired t-test

$d =$  score in Aug. - score in June

$$H_0: d = 0$$

$$H_1: d > 0$$

$$\bar{d} = 5.35 \quad sd(d) = 3.04$$

$$T_s = \frac{\bar{d} - 0}{sd(d)} = 1.7541$$

$$P\text{-Value} = P\{t_s > 1.7541\} = 0.069$$

$$95\% \text{ CI for } d: (-7.56, 8.06)$$

fail to reject  $H_0$ : There is no sufficient evidence to say the program is worthwhile.



5.  $n$ -size = 6 < 30

$$\bar{X} = 28.8 \quad S_n = 0.4$$

$$SE = \frac{S_x}{\sqrt{6}} = 0.1632$$

$$95\% \text{ CI: } \bar{X} \pm t_{5, 0.025} SE$$

$$= [28.38, 29.219]$$

Assumptions: ① 6 bags from SRS

② 6 bags iid from normal distribution

$$H_0: \mu = 28.3$$

$$H_1: \mu \neq 28.3$$

$$t = \frac{\bar{X} - 28.3}{SE} = 3.0618$$

$$P\text{-value} = 2 \cdot P\{t_5 > 3.0618\} = 0.028$$

Reject  $H_0$ : There is significant evidence to show that the true weight of this kind of bags is different from 28.8 grams.

Assumptions: ① SRS

② 6 bags are iid from  $N(28.8, \sigma^2)$

6.

	A	B
$n$	112	108
$S_x$	84	66
$p_i = \frac{S_i}{n_i}$		

(b) 95% CI

$$\Rightarrow (0.01688, 0.26089)$$

$$SE(\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2) = \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{p}_2(1-\hat{p}_2)}{n_2}} = 0.062$$

$$H_0: p_1 = p_2$$

$$H_1: p_1 \neq p_2$$

$$\text{pooled: } \hat{p}_{\text{pooled}} = \frac{S_1 + S_2}{n_1 + n_2} = 0.0818$$

$$SE = \sqrt{\hat{p}_{\text{pooled}}(1-\hat{p}_{\text{pooled}}) \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}$$

$$Z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2 - 0}{SE} = 2.211$$

$$P\text{-Value} = 2 \cdot P\{Z > 2.211\} = 0.027$$

Assumptions:

1. SRS

2.  $n_1, n_2$  are small enough relative to populations

3.  $n_1 p_1 \geq 10$     $n_1(1-p_1) \geq 10$

$n_2 p_2 \geq 10$     $n_2(1-p_2) \geq 10$

4. the groups are iid of each other

5. samples in both groups are iid