

Math 216 - Exam 1 Solutions  
 Fall 2001 - Hartlaub.

1. Paired Data  $\Rightarrow$  use Wilcoxon Signed Rank

(a)	Test Stat	$\{-10, -8, -6, -4, -2, 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10\}$
	Prob	$\{\frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}\}$

(b)	Test Stat	$\{-10, -9, -8, -7, -6, -5, -4, -3, -2, -1, 0\}$
	Prob	$\{\frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}\}$

- (c) The results will NOT depend on which of the two statistics is used to conduct the test. The value of the test statistic will change, but the p-values will remain the same.

2. Matched Pairs  $\Rightarrow$  use Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test.

- (a) Let  $Z_i = \cancel{\text{Control}_i} - \text{Test}_i$  and  $\theta = \text{median of the population for the differences}$ . The point and interval estimators for  $\theta$  are based on the Walsh averages of the differences.

$$\hat{\theta} = \text{median} \left\{ \frac{z_i + z_j}{2}, 1 \leq i < j \leq 14 \right\} = 368$$

94.8% CI is  $(91, 142)$  Stat > Nonpar > 1-Sample Wilcoxon.

- (b) Reducing faults  $\Rightarrow H_0: \theta = 0$  vs  $H_1: \theta > 0$

- (c) The CI in part (a) should not be used to test the hypotheses in part (b). CI's can be used to 11 looks like 1. + 0.100 is needed to conduct an Wilcoxon test

Math 216 Exam 1 Solutions  
 Fall 2001 - Hartlaub

3. The A.R.E. is the ratio of sample sizes necessary to get the same power with two different tests. Since  $E(W, t) = 3$ , this means that we would need approximately 3 times as many observations with the *t*-test to achieve the same power as the Wilcoxon rank sum test for exponential populations.

$$\left( \frac{n_t}{n_w} \right)^2 > 1 \Rightarrow n_t > n_w \Rightarrow \begin{matrix} \text{Wilcoxon Rank} \\ \text{sum test is better} \\ \text{for exponential} \\ \text{populations.} \end{matrix}$$

4. Let  $p$  = proportion of artists that are left-handed.

(a)  $H_0: p = .10$  vs  $H_1: p > .10$

(b) Upper tailed test  $\Rightarrow$  Find a lower C.B.

$$(7) \quad \hat{p} = 3\alpha \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}} \\ = \frac{18}{150} - 1.6449 \sqrt{\frac{\frac{18}{150} \left( \frac{132}{150} \right)}{150}} = .12 - .0436 = .0764$$

A 95% LCB for  $p$  is

$$(.0764, 1]$$

(3) since  $p_0 = .10$  is in the 95% LCB for  $p$ , the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. i.e. we do not have statistically significant evidence that artists are more likely to be left-handed.

(1) Test stat:  $B = 18 \quad B^* = \frac{18 - 150(.1)}{\sqrt{150(.1)(.9)}} = \frac{18 - 15}{3.6742} = .8165$

P-value:  $P_0(B \geq 18) = 1 - P_0(B \leq 17)$   $P_0(Z \geq .8165) = \underline{\text{approx}}.2071$

Math 216 Exam 1 - Solutions  
 Fall 2001 - Hartlaub

- ⑤ a) Assume: Distances are mutually indep & come from a population  
 that is continuous and symmetric about  $\theta$ .

$$H_0: \theta = 450 \text{ vs. } H_1: \theta > 450$$

8 Test stat:  $T^+ = 95.5$   
 p-value: .081

Conclusion: At any reasonable significance level ( $\alpha = .05, .03, .02, \text{ or. } .01$ ) we can't reject  $H_0$ . i.e., we do not have statistically significant evidence that the new <sup>dosing</sup> ~~sign~~ improves visibility.

b)  $\hat{\theta} = \text{median} \left\{ \frac{z_i + z_j}{2} \mid 1 \leq i \leq j \leq 16 \right\}$  where  $z_i$ 's are distances  
 $= 490$

- ⑥ a)  $H_0: \mu_{OT} = \mu_{ACID} \text{ vs. } H_1: \mu_{OT} > \mu_{ACID}$

OR:  $OT = ACID + \Delta$   $H_0: \Delta = 0 \text{ vs. } H_1: \Delta > 0$

$$W = 129 \text{ p-value} = .0378$$

At  $\alpha = .05$  level, we reject  $H_0$  and conclude that the OT tends to produce larger odontoblasts.

- b) All  $m \times n = 10 \times 10 = 100$  differences  $\{y_j - x_i\}$  were computed and sorted. Then, the null distribution of the Wilcoxon rank sum statistic was used to find the position constant (how many positions to count up from the bottom & down from the top.)

Math 216 Exam 1 - Solutions  
 Fall 2001 - Hartlaub

5. b)  $1-\alpha = .936 \Rightarrow \alpha = .064 \Rightarrow \alpha/2 = .032$

$$C_{.064} = \frac{10(2(10)+10+1)}{2} + 1 - \sqrt{.032}$$

Table A.6

$$= 155 + 1 - 130 = 26$$

93.6% CI is  $(\bar{U}(26), \bar{U}(100+1-26)) = (\bar{U}(26), \bar{U}(75))$   
 $\equiv (-.1, 9.1)$

c) The null hypothesis in part a) was rejected ~~nowhere~~ because the one sided p-value is below the significance level of  $\alpha = .06$ . A 93.6% C.I. is equivalent to an  $\alpha = 1 - .936 = .064$  level two-sided test. The duality between inferences for one sided tests ~~is~~ and those based on intervals only holds for confidence bounds.

