## **11. Introduction to Hypothesis Testing.** Large-Sample Test about a Mean

## **Hypothesis testing**

The purpose of hypothesis testing is to determine whether there is enough statistical evidence in favor of a certain belief about a parameter.

#### **Examples:**

- Is there any statistical evidence in a random sample of potential customers that supports the hypothesis that more than 50% of the potential customers will purchase new products?
- Is a new drug effective in curing a certain disease? A sample of patients is randomly selected. Half of them are given the drug where half are given a placebo (sugar pill). The improvement in the patients' conditions is then measured and compared.

## **Concept of hypothesis testing: two hypotheses**

There are two hypotheses about a population parameter(s).

- The null hypothesis, denoted by H<sub>0</sub>, is a claim about a population parameter that is *initially* assumed to be true.
- The alternative (research) hypothesis, H<sub>a</sub>, is a competitive claim about the same parameter.

The null hypothesis will be rejected in favor of the alternative if a sample provides a strong evidence that  $H_0$  is false. If the sample do not suggest such evidence,  $H_0$  will not be rejected.

## **Concept of hypothesis testing: two possible conclusions**

Thus we can have two possible conclusions:

- Reject  $H_0$ , accept  $H_a$
- Fail to reject  $H_0$ , reject  $H_a$

## **Concept of hypothesis testing: setup**

The form of the null hypothesis is

H<sub>0</sub>: population parameter = test value

Here the *test value* is a specific number determined by the problem context.

For the alternative hypothesis we can have *one* of the following three possibilities:

*H<sub>a</sub>*: *population parameter > test value* 

 $H_a$ : population parameter < test value

 $H_a$ : population parameter  $\neq$  test value

Which one will be used depends on the problem.

## **Concept of hypothesis testing: type I and II errors**

Two types of errors are possible when the decision whether to reject the null hypothesis is made.

The actual state

		<i>H</i> <sub>0</sub> is true	<i>H<sub>a</sub></i> is true
Our conclusion	Reject <i>H</i> <sub>a</sub>	OK	Type II error
	Accept <i>H</i> <sub>a</sub>	Type I error	OK

- Probability of Type I error is denoted by  $\alpha$  and called the *significance level.*
- Probability of Type II error is denoted by  $\beta$ .

### **Concept of hypothesis testing: type I and II errors**

Two errors are *inversely* related: if we try to reduce one error the other one will increase. Therefore, we have to balance the consequences of Type I and Type II errors.

The accepted practice is to employ the largest  $\alpha$  that is tolerable for the problem, and then we try to do our best in minimizing  $\beta$ . The significance level  $\alpha$  is always under our control.

## **Concept of hypothesis testing: test statistic**

Once a sample is collected, the typical testing goes like this.

- **1.** Assume the null hypothesis is true.
- 2. Build a *test statistic* (based on the sample) related to the parameter of interest.
- 3. Pose the following question. How probable is it to obtain a test statistic value at least as extreme as the observed test statistic if we assume the null hypothesis is true?
- 4. Make a conclusion based on your answer to that question.

## **Concept of hypothesis testing: making conclusion**

There are two ways how we can answer the question in step 3.

- The rejection region approach. Depending on (1) the type of the alternative, (2) distribution of the test statistic under  $H_0$ , and (3) chosen significance level  $\alpha$  we can construct a region that corresponds to extreme values of test statistics. If our test statistic is in that region we reject  $H_0$ , and accept  $H_a$ .
- The *p*-value approach. Again depending on (1) the type of the alternative, (2) distribution of the test statistic under  $H_0$ , and (3) chosen significance level  $\alpha$  we calculate the probability (called *p*-value) of obtaining a test statistic value at least as extreme as our test statistic, assuming that  $H_0$ is true. If this probability, or *p*-value, is less than  $\alpha$ , then we reject  $H_0$ , and accept  $H_a$ .

#### Testing population mean: *z*-test about $\mu$

The *z*-test about  $\mu$  is employed when one wants to check a claim about the population mean, and the sample size *n* is large, typically,  $n \ge 30$ .



The null hypothesis:

$$H_0$$
:  $\mu = \mu_0$ 

**Possible alternatives:** 

 $H_a: \mu > \mu_0$  $H_a: \mu < \mu_0$  $H_a: \mu \neq \mu_0$ 

Which type of alternative and what test value  $\mu_0$  will be used is determined by the problem context.

#### *z*-test about $\mu$ : test statistic

To test the research hypothesis we use the following test statistic

$$z = \frac{\overline{X} - \mu_0}{s/\sqrt{n}}$$

If  $H_0$  is true then by the central limit theorem and the law of large numbers random variable z has approximately standard normal distribution. We use this fact to make our judgment whether the sample is consistent with the null or the alternative.

### *z*-test about $\mu$ : rejection region

Three possible expressions for the rejection region:

- If we test  $H_a$ :  $\mu > \mu_0$ , then  $RR = [z_{\alpha}, +\infty]$
- If we test  $H_a$ :  $\mu < \mu_0$ , then  $RR = [-\infty, -z_\alpha]$
- If we test  $H_a$ :  $\mu \neq \mu_0$ , then  $RR = \left[-\infty, -z_{\alpha/2}\right] \cup \left[z_{\alpha/2}, +\infty\right]$

The rejection region tells us which values of the test statistic z are not consistent with the null hypothesis  $H_0$  when it is tested versus a given alternative  $H_a$ .

# *z*-test about $\mu$ : conclusion based on rejection region

The decision depends on the relationship between the rejection region and the test statistic. The universal rule is

- If the test statistic falls *inside* the rejection region we accept H<sub>a</sub>, the research claim.
- If the test statistic falls *outside* the rejection region we reject H<sub>a</sub>.

#### *z*-test about $\mu$ : *p*-value method

Instead of the rejection region approach we can calculate p-value. There are three formulas depending on a type of the alternative.

- If we test  $H_a: \mu > \mu_0$ , then p-value = P(Z > z)
- If we test  $H_a$ :  $\mu < \mu_0$ , then p-value = P(Z < z)
- If we test  $H_a$ :  $\mu \neq \mu_0$ , then *p*-value =  $2 \times P(Z > |z|)$
- *p*-value is the probability of obtaining a test statistic value at least as extreme as our observed test statistic, assuming that  $H_0$  is true. If this probability is small it means that our observed test statistic is too extreme to be consistent with  $H_0$ .

#### *z*-test about $\mu$ : conclusion based on *p*-value

The universal rule is

- If *p*-value  $< \alpha$ , then we accept  $H_a$ .
- If *p*-value >  $\alpha$ , then we reject  $H_a$ .

#### Example

*Example 1.* In a nationwide opinion poll based on a random sample of 240 people, one question is: "How do you rate the ethics of business executives of large companies?" A rating of 3 means "no better or worse than most people", a rating of 1 is "much better than most people", and 5 is "much worse than most people". The sample mean rating is 3.1 and the standard deviation is 0.9. Can we infer at significance level 5% that respondents rated the ethics of executives at different level in comparison to most people?

#### 1. Setup

Let  $\mu$  be the true (nationwide) mean rating of business executives of large companies.

 $H_0: \mu = 3$  $H_a: \mu \neq 3$ 

2. Test statistic

Test statistic is given by

$$z = \frac{\overline{X} - \mu_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} = \frac{3.1 - 3}{.9/\sqrt{240}} \approx 1.72$$



The rejection region is given by

$$RR = \begin{bmatrix} -\infty, -z_{\alpha/2} \end{bmatrix} \cup \begin{bmatrix} z_{\alpha/2}, +\infty \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} -\infty, -z_{.025} \end{bmatrix} \cup \begin{bmatrix} z_{.025}, +\infty \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} -\infty, -1.96 \end{bmatrix} \cup \begin{bmatrix} 1.96, +\infty \end{bmatrix}$$

## 4. Conclusion

Since the test statistic falls outside the rejection region we reject  $H_a$ , that is, there is no difference in ratings between executives and most people.



The p-value of the test is

p-value = 2 ×  $P(Z > 1.72) = 2 \times .0427 = .0854$ 

## 4<sup>°</sup>. Conclusion based on *p*-value

Since *p*-value =  $.0854 > \alpha = .05$ , we reject  $H_a$ , that is, there no difference in ratings between executives and most people.

An important remark: rejection region approach and p-value approach are mathematically equivalent.

### *z*-test about $\mu$ : exercise

*Exercise 1.* According to the U. S. Department of Commerce, the average price for a new home topped \$200,000 for the first time in 1999. In November 1999, the average new-home price was \$209,700 (Wall Street Journal Interactive Edition, Jan. 7, 2000). The prices of a random sample of 32 new homes sold in November 2000 yielded  $\overline{X} = 216981$  and s = 19805.

- a. What are the appropriate null and alternative hypotheses to test whether the mean price of a new home in November 2000 exceeds \$209,700?
- b. Compute and interpret the p-value of the test. Do the data provide sufficient evidence to conclude that the mean new-home price in November 2000 exceeded the reported mean price of November 1999?