

## **Ch 9. Hypothesis Tests — Modules**

36. Introduction / Terminology

37. Normal Mean Tests (variance known)

38. Normal Mean Tests (variance unknown)

39. Tests for Other Parameters

## **36. Introduction to Hypothesis Testing**

General Approach

Easy Example

How Can You Go Wrong?

## General Approach

1. State a hypothesis.
2. Select a test statistic (to test whether or not the hypothesis is true).
3. Evaluate (calculate) the test statistic.
4. Interpret results — does the test statistic allow you to reject your hypothesis?

Details.

1. **Hypotheses** are simply statements or claims about parameter values.

You perform a **hypothesis test** to prove or disprove the claim.

Set up a **null hypothesis** ( $H_0$ ) and an **alternative hypothesis** ( $H_1$ ) to cover the entire parameter space.

The null hyp sort of represents the “status quo”.

Example: We claim that the mean weight of a filled package of chicken is  $\mu_0$  ounces. (We specify  $\mu_0$ .)

$$H_0 : \mu = \mu_0$$

$$H_1 : \mu \neq \mu_0$$

This is a **two-sided test**. We'll reject the claim if  $\hat{\mu}$  (an estimator of  $\mu$ ) is “too high” or “too small”.

Example: We claim that a certain brand of tires lasts for at least a mean of  $\mu_0$  miles. (We specify  $\mu_0$ .)

$$H_0 : \mu \geq \mu_0$$

$$H_1 : \mu < \mu_0$$

This is a **one-sided test**. We'll reject the claim if  $\hat{\mu}$  is “too small”.

Example: We claim that emissions from a certain type of car do not exceed a mean of  $\mu_0$  ppm. (We specify  $\mu_0$ .)

$$H_0 : \mu \leq \mu_0$$

$$H_1 : \mu > \mu_0$$

This is a **one-sided test**. We'll reject the claim if  $\hat{\mu}$  is “too large”.

Idea:  $H_0$  is the old, conservative “status quo”.  $H_1$  is the new, radical hypothesis. Although you may not be toooo sure about the truth of  $H_0$ , you won’t reject it in favor of  $H_1$  unless you see substantial evidence in support of  $H_1$ .

If you get substantial evidence supporting  $H_1$ , you’ll decide to reject  $H_0$ . Otherwise, you “fail to reject”  $H_0$ . (This roughly means that you grudgingly accept  $H_0$ .)

2. Select a test statistic (to test if  $H_0$  is true).

For instance, we could compare an estimator  $\hat{\mu}$  with  $\mu_0$ . The comparison is accomplished using a known sampling distribution (aka “test statistic”), e.g.,

$$z_{\text{obs}} = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \quad (\text{if } \sigma^2 \text{ is known) or}$$

$$t_{\text{obs}} = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_0}{S/\sqrt{n}} \quad (\text{if } \sigma^2 \text{ is unknown)}$$

More details later.

3. Evaluate the test statistic. Here's the logic of hypothesis testing:

(a) Collect sample data

(b) Assume  $H_0$  (the "status quo") is true.

(c) Determine the probability of the sample result, assuming  $H_0$  is true.

(d) Decide from (c) if  $H_0$  is plausible.

\* If the prob from (c) is low, reject  $H_0$  and select  $H_1$ .

\* If the prob from (c) is high, fail to reject  $H_0$ .

Example: Time to metabolize a drug. Current drug takes  $\mu_0 = 15$  min. Is new drug better?

Claim: Expected time for new drug is  $< 15$  min.

$$H_0 : \mu \geq 15$$

$$H_1 : \mu < 15$$

Data:  $n = 20$ ,  $\bar{X} = 14.88$ ,  $S = 0.333$ . The test statistic is

$$t_{\text{obs}} = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_0}{S/\sqrt{n}} = -1.61.$$

Now, if  $H_0$  is actually the true state of things, then  $\mu = \mu_0$ , and from our discussion on CI's, we have

$$t_{\text{obs}} = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_0}{S/\sqrt{n}} \sim t(n-1) \sim t(19).$$

What would cause us to reject  $H_0$ ?

If  $\bar{X} \ll \mu_0 (= 15)$ , this would indicate that  $H_0$  is probably wrong.

Equivalently, I'd reject  $H_0$  if  $t_{\text{obs}}$  is "significantly"  $\ll 0$ .

4. Interpret the Test Statistic.

So if  $H_0$  is true, is it reasonable (or, at least, not outrageous) to have gotten  $t_{\text{obs}} = -1.61$ ?

If yes, then we we'll *fail to reject*  $H_0$ .

If no, then we'll *reject*  $H_0$  in favor of  $H_1$ .

Let's see. . . . From the  $t$  table, we have

$$t_{.05,19} = -1.729 \quad \text{and} \quad t_{.10,19} = -1.328.$$

I.e.,

$$\Pr(t(19) < -1.729) = .05 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\Pr(t(19) < -1.328) = .10.$$

This means that

$$0.05 < p \equiv \Pr(t(19) < \underbrace{-1.61}_{t_{\text{obs}}}) < 0.10.$$

In English: If  $H_0$  were true, there's a  $100p\%$  chance that we'd see a value of  $t_{\text{obs}}$  that's  $\leq -1.61$ . That's not a real high probability, but it's not toooo small.

Formally, we'd **reject**  $H_0$  at "level" 0.10, since  $t_{\text{obs}} = -1.61 < t_{.10,19} = -1.328$ .

But, we'd **fail to reject**  $H_0$  at level 0.05, since  $t_{\text{obs}} = -1.61 > t_{.05,19} = -1.729$ .

More on this in the next modules!

## Where Can We Go Wrong?

Four things can happen:

1. If  $H_0$  is actually true and we conclude that it's true — good.
2. If  $H_0$  is actually false and we conclude that it's false — good

3. If  $H_0$  is actually true and we conclude that it's false — bad. This is called **Type I error**.

Example: We conclude that a new, inferior drug is better than the drug currently on the market.

4. If  $H_0$  is actually false and we conclude that it's true — bad. This is called **Type II error**.

Example: We conclude that a new, superior drug is worse than the drug currently on the market.

Want to keep

$$\Pr(\text{Type I error}) = \Pr(\text{Reject } H_0 \mid H_0 \text{ true}) \leq \alpha$$

$$\Pr(\text{Type II error}) = \Pr(\text{Fail to Rej } H_0 \mid H_0 \text{ false}) \leq \beta$$

We choose  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Of course, we need to have  $\alpha + \beta < 1$ .

Usually, Type I error is considered as “worse” than Type II.

Definition: The **power** of a hypothesis test is

$$1 - \beta = \Pr(\text{Reject } H_0 \mid H_0 \text{ false}).$$

It's good to have high power.

Definition: The probability of Type I error,  $\alpha$ , is called the **size** or **level of significance** of the test.