Tests of Hypotheses
for a Single Sample
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9-1 Hypothesis Testing

9-1.1 Statistical Hypotheses

Statistical hypothesis testing and confidence interval estimation of parameters are the fundamental methods used at the data analysis stage of a comparative experiment, in which the engineer is interested, for example, in comparing the mean of a population to a specified value.

Definition

A statistical hypothesis is a statement about the parameters of one or more populations.
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

9-1.1 Statistical Hypotheses

For example, suppose that we are interested in the burning rate of a solid propellant used to power aircrew escape systems.

- Now burning rate is a random variable that can be described by a probability distribution.

- Suppose that our interest focuses on the mean burning rate (a parameter of this distribution).

- Specifically, we are interested in deciding whether or not the mean burning rate is 50 centimeters per second.
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

9-1.1 Statistical Hypotheses

Two-sided Alternative Hypothesis

\[ H_0: \mu = 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \quad \text{null hypothesis} \]
\[ H_1: \mu \neq 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \quad \text{alternative hypothesis} \]

One-sided Alternative Hypotheses

\[ H_0: \mu = 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \quad H_0: \mu = 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \]
or
\[ H_1: \mu < 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \quad H_1: \mu > 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \]
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

9-1.1 Statistical Hypotheses

Test of a Hypothesis
• A procedure leading to a decision about a particular hypothesis

• Hypothesis-testing procedures rely on using the information in a random sample from the population of interest.

• If this information is consistent with the hypothesis, then we will conclude that the hypothesis is true; if this information is inconsistent with the hypothesis, we will conclude that the hypothesis is false.
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

9-1.2 Tests of Statistical Hypotheses

\[ H_0: \mu = 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \]
\[ H_1: \mu \neq 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \]

**Figure 9-1** Decision criteria for testing \( H_0: \mu = 50 \) centimeters per second versus \( H_1: \mu \neq 50 \) centimeters per second.
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

9-1.2 Tests of Statistical Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>$H_0$ Is True</th>
<th>$H_0$ Is False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fail to reject $H_0$</td>
<td>no error</td>
<td>type II error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject $H_0$</td>
<td>type I error</td>
<td>no error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejecting the null hypothesis $H_0$ when it is true is defined as a type I error.

Failing to reject the null hypothesis when it is false is defined as a type II error.

$$\alpha = P(\text{type I error}) = P(\text{reject } H_0 \text{ when } H_0 \text{ is true})$$

Sometimes the type I error probability is called the significance level, or the $\alpha$-error, or the size of the test.
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

9-1.2 Tests of Statistical Hypotheses

• In the propellant burning rate example, a type I error will occur when

\[ \bar{x} < 48.5 \text{ or } \bar{x} > 51.5 \]

when the true mean burning rate is \( \mu = 50 \) centimeters per second.

• \( n=10. \)

• Suppose that the standard deviation of burning rate is \( \sigma = 2.5 \) centimeters per second and that the burning rate has a normal distribution, so the distribution of the sample mean is normal with mean \( \mu = 50 \) and standard deviation

\[ \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{2.5}{\sqrt{10}} = 0.79 \]

• The probability of making a type I error (or the significance level of our test) is equal to the sum of the areas that have been shaded in the tails of the normal distribution in Fig. 9-2.
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9-1.2 Tests of Statistical Hypotheses

\[ \alpha = P(\bar{X} < 48.5 \text{ when } \mu = 50) + P(\bar{X} > 51.5 \text{ when } \mu = 50) \]

The z-values that correspond to the critical values 48.5 and 51.5 are

\[ z_1 = \frac{48.5 - 50}{0.79} = -1.90 \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \frac{51.5 - 50}{0.79} = 1.90 \]

Therefore

\[ \alpha = P(Z < -1.90) + P(Z > 1.90) = 0.028717 + 0.028717 = 0.057434 \]
Figure 9-2  The critical region for $H_0: \mu = 50$
versus $H_1: \mu \neq 50$ and $n = 10$.

$\alpha = P(\text{type I error}) = P(\text{reject } H_0 \text{ when } H_0 \text{ is true})$  \hspace{1cm} (9-3)
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

\[ \beta = P(\text{type II error}) = P(\text{fail to reject } H_0 \text{ when } H_0 \text{ is false}) \] (9-4)

**Figure 9-3** The probability of type II error when \( \mu = 52 \) and \( n = 10 \).
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

\[ \beta = P(48.5 \leq \bar{X} \leq 51.5 \text{ when } \mu = 52) \]

The \( z \)-values corresponding to 48.5 and 51.5 when \( \mu = 52 \) are

\[ z_1 = \frac{48.5 - 52}{0.79} = -4.43 \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \frac{51.5 - 52}{0.79} = -0.63 \]

Therefore

\[ \beta = P(-4.43 \leq Z \leq -0.63) = P(Z \leq -0.63) - P(Z \leq -4.43) \]
\[ = 0.2643 - 0.0000 = 0.2643 \]
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

\[ \beta = P(48.5 \leq \bar{X} \leq 51.5 \text{ when } \mu = 50.5) \]

**Figure 9-4** The probability of type II error when \( \mu = 50.5 \) and \( n = 10 \).
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

\[ \beta = P(48.5 \leq \bar{X} \leq 51.5 \text{ when } \mu = 50.5) \]

As shown in Fig. 9-4, the z-values corresponding to 48.5 and 51.5 when \( \mu = 50.5 \) are

\[ z_1 = \frac{48.5 - 50.5}{0.79} = -2.53 \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \frac{51.5 - 50.5}{0.79} = 1.27 \]

Therefore

\[ \beta = P(-2.53 \leq Z \leq 1.27) = P(Z \leq 1.27) - P(Z \leq -2.53) = 0.8980 - 0.0057 = 0.8923 \]
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

\[ \beta = P(48.5 \leq \bar{X} \leq 51.5 \text{ when } \mu = 52) \]

Figure 9-5 The probability of type II error when \( \mu = 52 \) and \( n = 16 \).
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

\[ \beta = P(48.5 \leq \bar{X} \leq 51.5 \text{ when } \mu = 52) \]

When \( n = 16 \), the standard deviation of \( \bar{X} \) is \( \sigma / \sqrt{n} = 2.5 / \sqrt{16} = 0.625 \), and the z-values corresponding to 48.5 and 51.5 when \( \mu = 52 \) are

\[ z_1 = \frac{48.5 - 52}{0.625} = -5.60 \quad \text{and} \quad z_2 = \frac{51.5 - 52}{0.625} = -0.80 \]

Therefore

\[ \beta = P(-5.60 \leq Z \leq -0.80) = P(Z \leq -0.80) - P(Z \leq -5.60) \]
\[ = 0.2119 - 0.0000 = 0.2119 \]
## 9-1 Hypothesis Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance Region</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\beta$ at $\mu = 52$</th>
<th>$\beta$ at $\mu = 50.5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$48.5 &lt; \bar{x} &lt; 51.5$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0576</td>
<td>0.2643</td>
<td>0.8923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$48 &lt; \bar{x} &lt; 52$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.9705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$48.5 &lt; \bar{x} &lt; 51.5$</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0164</td>
<td>0.2119</td>
<td>0.9445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$48 &lt; \bar{x} &lt; 52$</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.9918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance Region</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\beta$ at $\mu = 52$</th>
<th>$\beta$ at $\mu = 50.5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$48.5 &lt; \bar{x} &lt; 51.5$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0576</td>
<td>0.2643</td>
<td>0.8923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$48 &lt; \bar{x} &lt; 52$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.9705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$48.81 &lt; \bar{x} &lt; 51.19$</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0576</td>
<td>0.0966</td>
<td>0.8606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$48.42 &lt; \bar{x} &lt; 51.58$</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.2515</td>
<td>0.9578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The size of the critical region, and consequently the probability of a type I error $\alpha$, can always be reduced by appropriate selection of the critical values.

2. Type I and type II errors are related. A decrease in the probability of one type of error always results in an increase in the probability of the other, provided that the sample size $n$ does not change.

3. An increase in sample size reduces $\beta$, provided that $\alpha$ is held constant.

4. When the null hypothesis is false, $\beta$ increases as the true value of the parameter approaches the value hypothesized in the null hypothesis. The value of $\beta$ decreases as the difference between the true mean and the hypothesized value increases.
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

Definition

The power of a statistical test is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis $H_0$ when the alternative hypothesis is true.

- The power is computed as $1 - \beta$, and power can be interpreted as the probability of correctly rejecting a false null hypothesis. We often compare statistical tests by comparing their power properties.

- For example, consider the propellant burning rate problem when we are testing $H_0 : \mu = 50$ centimeters per second against $H_1 : \mu$ not equal 50 centimeters per second. Suppose that the true value of the mean is $\mu = 52$. When $n = 10$, we found that $\beta = 0.2643$, so the power of this test is $1 - \beta = 1 - 0.2643 = 0.7357$ when $\mu = 52$. 
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

9-1.3 One-Sided and Two-Sided Hypotheses

**Two-Sided Test:**

\[ H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \]
\[ H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0 \]

**One-Sided Tests:**

\[ H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \quad \text{or} \quad H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \]
\[ H_1: \mu > \mu_0 \quad \text{or} \quad H_1: \mu < \mu_0 \]

Rejecting \( H_0 \) is a strong conclusion.
Example 9-1

Consider the propellant burning rate problem. Suppose that if the burning rate is less than 50 centimeters per second, we wish to show this with a strong conclusion. The hypotheses should be stated as

\[ H_0: \mu = 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \]
\[ H_1: \mu < 50 \text{ centimeters per second} \]

Here the critical region lies in the lower tail of the distribution of $\bar{X}$. Since the rejection of $H_0$ is always a strong conclusion, this statement of the hypotheses will produce the desired outcome if $H_0$ is rejected. Notice that, although the null hypothesis is stated with an equal sign, it is understood to include any value of $\mu$ not specified by the alternative hypothesis. Therefore, failing to reject $H_0$ does not mean that $\mu = 50$ centimeters per second exactly, but only that we do not have strong evidence in support of $H_1$. 
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9-1.4 P-Values in Hypothesis Tests

P-value = P (test statistic will take on a value that is at least as extreme as the observed value when the null hypothesis $H_0$ is true)

Decision rule:

• If P-value > $\alpha$, fail to reject $H_0$ at significance level $\alpha$;

• If P-value < $\alpha$, reject $H_0$ at significance level $\alpha$.

The $P$-value is the smallest level of significance that would lead to rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0$ with the given data.
9-1 Hypothesis Testing

9-1.4 P-Values in Hypothesis Tests

Consider the two-sided hypothesis test for burning rate

\[ H_0 : \mu = 50 \quad H_1 : \mu \neq 50 \]

with \( n = 16 \) and \( \sigma = 2.5 \). Suppose that the observed sample mean is \( \bar{x} = 51.3 \) centimeters per second. Figure 9-6 shows a critical region for this test with critical values at 51.3 and the symmetric value 48.7. The \( P \)-value of the test is the \( \alpha \) associated with this critical region. Any smaller value for \( \alpha \) expands the critical region and the test fails to reject the null hypothesis when \( \bar{x} = 51.3 \). The \( P \)-value is easy to compute after the test statistic is observed. In this example

\[
P\text{-value} = 1 - P(48.7 < \bar{X} < 51.3)
= 1 - P\left(\frac{48.7 - 50}{2.5/\sqrt{16}} < Z < \frac{51.3 - 50}{2.5/\sqrt{16}}\right)
= 1 - P(-2.08 < Z < 2.08)
= 1 - 0.962 = 0.038
\]
Figure 9-6  \( P \)-value is area of shaded region when \( \bar{x} = 51.3 \).
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9-1.5 Connection between Hypothesis Tests and Confidence Intervals

There is a close relationship between the test of a hypothesis about any parameter, say $\theta$, and the confidence interval for $\theta$. If $[l, u]$ is a $100(1 - \alpha)$% confidence interval for the parameter $\theta$, the test of size $\alpha$ of the hypothesis

$$H_0: \theta = \theta_0,$$
$$H_1: \theta \neq \theta_0$$

will lead to rejection of $H_0$ if and only if $\theta_0$ is not in the $100(1 - \alpha)$% CI $[l, u]$. As an illustration, consider the escape system propellant problem with $\overline{x} = 51.3$, $\sigma = 2.5$, and $n = 16$. The null hypothesis $H_0: \mu = 50$ was rejected, using $\alpha = 0.05$. The 95% two-sided CI on $\mu$ can be calculated using Equation 8-7. This CI is $51.3 \pm 1.96(2.5/\sqrt{16})$ and this is $50.075 \leq \mu \leq 52.525$. Because the value $\mu_0 = 50$ is not included in this interval, the null hypothesis $H_0: \mu = 50$ is rejected.
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9-1.6 General Procedure for Hypothesis Tests

1. From the problem context, identify the parameter of interest.

2. State the null hypothesis, $H_0$.

3. Specify an appropriate alternative hypothesis, $H_1$.

4. Choose a significance level, $\alpha$.

5. Determine an appropriate test statistic.

6. State the rejection region for the statistic.

7. Compute any necessary sample quantities, substitute these into the equation for the test statistic, and compute that value.

8. Decide whether or not $H_0$ should be rejected and report that in the problem context.
9-2 Tests on the Mean of a Normal Distribution, Variance Known

9-2.1 Hypothesis Tests on the Mean

We wish to test:

\[ H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \]
\[ H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0 \]

The test statistic is:

\[ Z_0 = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \]  

(9-8)
9-2 Tests on the Mean of a Normal Distribution, Variance Known

9-2.1 Hypothesis Tests on the Mean

Reject $H_0$ if the observed value of the test statistic $z_0$ is either:

$$z_0 > z_{\alpha/2} \text{ or } z_0 < -z_{\alpha/2}$$

Fail to reject $H_0$ if

$$-z_{\alpha/2} < z_0 < z_{\alpha/2}$$
9-2 Tests on the Mean of a Normal Distribution, Variance Known

Figure 9-7  The distribution of $Z_0$ when $H_0: \mu = \mu_0$ is true, with critical region for (a) the two-sided alternative $H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0$, (b) the one-sided alternative $H_1: \mu > \mu_0$, and (c) the one-sided alternative $H_1: \mu < \mu_0$. 
9-2 Tests on the Mean of a Normal Distribution, Variance Known

Example 9-2

Aircrew escape systems are powered by a solid propellant. The burning rate of this propellant is an important product characteristic. Specifications require that the mean burning rate must be 50 centimeters per second. We know that the standard deviation of burning rate is $\sigma = 2$ centimeters per second. The experimenter decides to specify a type I error probability or significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ and selects a random sample of $n = 25$ and obtains a sample average burning rate of $\bar{x} = 51.3$ centimeters per second. What conclusions should be drawn?
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We may solve this problem by following the eight-step procedure outlined in Section 9-1.4. This results in

1. The parameter of interest is $\mu$, the mean burning rate.
2. $H_0$: $\mu = 50$ centimeters per second
3. $H_1$: $\mu \neq 50$ centimeters per second
4. $\alpha = 0.05$
5. The test statistic is

$$z_0 = \frac{\overline{x} - \mu_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}$$
Example 9-2

6. Reject $H_0$ if $z_0 > 1.96$ or if $z_0 < -1.96$. Note that this results from step 4, where we specified $\alpha = 0.05$, and so the boundaries of the critical region are at $z_{0.025} = 1.96$ and $-z_{0.025} = -1.96$.

7. Computations: Since $\bar{x} = 51.3$ and $\sigma = 2$,

$$z_0 = \frac{51.3 - 50}{2/\sqrt{25}} = 3.25$$

8. Conclusion: Since $z_0 = 3.25 > 1.96$, we reject $H_0$: $\mu = 50$ at the 0.05 level of significance. Stated more completely, we conclude that the mean burning rate differs from 50 centimeters per second, based on a sample of 25 measurements. In fact, there is strong evidence that the mean burning rate exceeds 50 centimeters per second.
We may also develop procedures for testing hypotheses on the mean \( \mu \), where the alternative hypothesis is one-sided. Suppose that we specify the hypotheses as

\[
H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \\
H_1: \mu > \mu_0
\]  

In defining the critical region for this test, we observe that a negative value of the test statistic \( Z_0 \) would never lead us to conclude that \( H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \) is false. Therefore, we would place the critical region in the upper tail of the standard normal distribution and reject \( H_0 \) if the computed value of \( z_0 \) is too large. That is, we would reject \( H_0 \) if

\[
z_0 > z_\alpha
\]
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9-2.1 Hypothesis Tests on the Mean (Continued)

as shown in Figure 9-7(b). Similarly, to test

\[ H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \]
\[ H_1: \mu < \mu_0 \]  \hspace{2cm} (9-13)

we would calculate the test statistic \( Z_0 \) and reject \( H_0 \) if the value of \( z_0 \) is too small. That is, the critical region is in the lower tail of the standard normal distribution as shown in Figure 9-7(c), and we reject \( H_0 \) if

\[ z_0 < -z_\alpha \]  \hspace{2cm} (9-14)
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9-2.1 Hypothesis Tests on the Mean (Continued)

The notation on p. 307 includes n-1, which is wrong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Hypothesis</th>
<th>Rejection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0$</td>
<td>$Z_0 &gt; z_{\alpha/2}$ or $z_0 &lt; -z_{\alpha/2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_1: \mu &gt; \mu_0$</td>
<td>$z_0 &gt; z_{\alpha}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_1: \mu &lt; \mu_0$</td>
<td>$z_0 &lt; -z_{\alpha}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**P-Values in Hypothesis Tests**

The **P-value** is the smallest level of significance that would lead to rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0$ with the given data.

\[
P = \begin{cases} 
2[1 - \Phi(|z_0|)] & \text{for a two-tailed test: } H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \quad H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0 \\
1 - \Phi(z_0) & \text{for an upper-tailed test: } H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \quad H_1: \mu > \mu_0 \\
\Phi(z_0) & \text{for a lower-tailed test: } H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \quad H_1: \mu < \mu_0 
\end{cases}
\] (9-15)
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9-2.2 Type II Error and Choice of Sample Size

Finding the Probability of Type II Error $\beta$

Consider the two-sided hypothesis

\[ H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \]
\[ H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0 \]

Suppose that the null hypothesis is false and that the true value of the mean is $\mu = \mu_0 + \delta$, say, where $\delta > 0$. The test statistic $Z_0$ is

\[ Z_0 = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} = \frac{\bar{X} - (\mu_0 + \delta)}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\delta \sqrt{n}}{\sigma} \]

Therefore, the distribution of $Z_0$ when $H_1$ is true is

\[ Z_0 \sim N\left(\frac{\delta \sqrt{n}}{\sigma}, 1\right) \]

(9-16)
9-2.2 Type II Error and Choice of Sample Size

Finding the Probability of Type II Error $\beta$

$\beta = P(\text{type II error}) = P(\text{failing to reject } H_0 \text{ when it is false})$

$$\beta = \Phi\left(z_{\alpha/2} - \frac{\delta \sqrt{n}}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(-z_{\alpha/2} - \frac{\delta \sqrt{n}}{\sigma}\right) \quad (9-17)$$
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9-2.2 Type II Error and Choice of Sample Size

Finding the Probability of Type II Error $\beta$

Figure 9-7 The distribution of $Z_0$ under $H_0$ and $H_1$
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9-2.2 Type II Error and Choice of Sample Size

Sample Size Formulas

For a two-sided alternative hypothesis:

\[ n \approx \left( \frac{z_{\alpha/2} + z_\beta}{\delta} \right)^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\delta^2} \quad \text{where} \quad \delta = \mu - \mu_0 \quad (9-19) \]

For a one-sided alternative hypothesis:

\[ n = \left( \frac{z_\alpha + z_\beta}{\delta} \right)^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\delta^2} \quad \text{where} \quad \delta = \mu - \mu_0 \quad (9-20) \]
9-2 Tests on the Mean of a Normal Distribution, Variance Known

Example 9-3

Consider the rocket propellant problem of Example 9-2. Suppose that the analyst wishes to design the test so that if the true mean burning rate differs from 50 centimeters per second by as much as 1 centimeter per second, the test will detect this (i.e., reject $H_0: \mu = 50$) with a high probability, say 0.90. Now, we note that $\sigma = 2$, $\delta = 51 - 50 = 1$, $\alpha = 0.05$, and $\beta = 0.10$. Since $z_{\alpha/2} = z_{0.025} = 1.96$ and $z_{\beta} = z_{0.10} = 1.28$, the sample size required to detect this departure from $H_0: \mu = 50$ is found by Equation 9-19 as

$$n = \frac{(z_{\alpha/2} + z_{\beta})^2 \sigma^2}{\delta^2} = \frac{(1.96 + 1.28)^2 \cdot 2^2}{(1)^2} \approx 42$$

The approximation is good here, since $\Phi(-z_{\alpha/2} - \delta \sqrt{n}/\sigma) = \Phi(-1.96 - (1)\sqrt{42}/2) = \Phi(-5.20) = 0$, which is small relative to $\beta$. 
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9-2.2 Type II Error and Choice of Sample Size

Using Operating Characteristic Curves

When performing sample size or type II error calculations, it is sometimes more convenient to use the operating characteristic (OC) curves in Appendix Charts VIa and VIb. These curves plot $\beta$ as calculated from Equation 9-17 against a parameter $d$ for various sample sizes $n$. Curves are provided for both $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\alpha = 0.01$. The parameter $d$ is defined as

$$d = \frac{|\mu - \mu_0|}{\sigma} = \frac{|\delta|}{\sigma}$$  (9-21)
so one set of operating characteristic curves can be used for all problems regardless of the values of $\mu_0$ and $\sigma$. From examining the operating characteristic curves or Equation 9-17 and Fig. 9-7, we note that

1. The further the true value of the mean $\mu$ is from $\mu_0$, the smaller the probability of type II error $\beta$ for a given $n$ and $\alpha$. That is, we see that for a specified sample size and $\alpha$, large differences in the mean are easier to detect than small ones.

2. For a given $\delta$ and $\alpha$, the probability of type II error $\beta$ decreases as $n$ increases. That is, to detect a specified difference $\delta$ in the mean, we may make the test more powerful by increasing the sample size.
Example 9-4

Consider the propellant problem in Example 9-2. Suppose that the analyst is concerned about the probability of type II error if the true mean burning rate is \( \mu = 51 \) centimeters per second. We may use the operating characteristic curves to find \( \beta \). Note that \( \delta = 51 - 50 = 1 \), \( n = 25 \), \( \sigma = 2 \), and \( \alpha = 0.05 \). Then using Equation 9-21 gives

\[
d = \frac{|\mu - \mu_0|}{\sigma} = \frac{\delta}{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}
\]

and from Appendix Chart VIIa, with \( n = 25 \), we find that \( \beta = 0.30 \). That is, if the true mean burning rate is \( \mu = 51 \) centimeters per second, there is approximately a 30% chance that this will not be detected by the test with \( n = 25 \).
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9-2.3 Large Sample Test

We have developed the test procedure for the null hypothesis \( H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \) assuming that the population is normally distributed and that \( \sigma^2 \) is known. In many if not most practical situations \( \sigma^2 \) will be unknown. Furthermore, we may not be certain that the population is well modeled by a normal distribution. In these situations if \( n \) is large (say \( n > 40 \)) the sample standard deviation \( s \) can be substituted for \( \sigma \) in the test procedures with little effect. Thus, while we have given a test for the mean of a normal distribution with known \( \sigma^2 \), it can be easily converted into a large-sample test procedure for unknown \( \sigma^2 \) that is valid regardless of the form of the distribution of the population. This large-sample test relies on the central limit theorem just as the large-sample confidence interval on \( \mu \) that was presented in the previous chapter did. Exact treatment of the case where the population is normal, \( \sigma^2 \) is unknown, and \( n \) is small involves use of the \( t \) distribution and will be deferred until Section 9-3.
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9-3.1 Hypothesis Tests on the Mean

One-Sample \( t \)-Test

Null hypothesis: \( H_0: \mu = \mu_0 \)

Test statistic: \( T_0 = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu_0}{S/\sqrt{n}} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative hypothesis</th>
<th>Rejection criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0 )</td>
<td>( t_0 &gt; t_{\alpha/2,n-1} ) or ( t_0 &lt; -t_{\alpha/2,n-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H_1: \mu &gt; \mu_0 )</td>
<td>( t_0 &gt; t_{\alpha,n-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H_1: \mu &lt; \mu_0 )</td>
<td>( t_0 &lt; -t_{\alpha,n-1} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9-3.1 Hypothesis Tests on the Mean

**Figure 9-9** The reference distribution for $H_0: \mu = \mu_0$ with critical region for (a) $H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0$, (b) $H_1: \mu > \mu_0$, and (c) $H_1: \mu < \mu_0$. 
Example 9-6

The increased availability of light materials with high strength has revolutionized the design and manufacture of golf clubs, particularly drivers. Clubs with hollow heads and very thin faces can result in much longer tee shots, especially for players of modest skills. This is due partly to the "spring-like effect" that the thin face imparts to the ball. Firing a golf ball at the head of the club and measuring the ratio of the outgoing velocity of the ball to the incoming velocity can quantify this spring-like effect. The ratio of velocities is called the coefficient of restitution of the club. An experiment was performed in which 15 drivers produced by a particular club maker were selected at random and their coefficients of restitution measured. In the experiment the golf balls were fired from an air cannon so that the incoming velocity and spin rate of the ball could be precisely controlled. It is of interest to determine if there is evidence (with $\alpha = 0.05$) to support a claim that the mean coefficient of restitution exceeds 0.82. The observations follow:

\[
\begin{align*}
0.8411 & \quad 0.8191 & \quad 0.8182 & \quad 0.8125 & \quad 0.8750 \\
0.8580 & \quad 0.8532 & \quad 0.8483 & \quad 0.8276 & \quad 0.7983 \\
0.8042 & \quad 0.8730 & \quad 0.8282 & \quad 0.8359 & \quad 0.8660
\end{align*}
\]
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The sample mean and sample standard deviation are $\bar{x} = 0.83725$ and $s = 0.02456$. The normal probability plot of the data in Fig. 9-9 supports the assumption that the coefficient of restitution is normally distributed. Since the objective of the experimenter is to demonstrate that the mean coefficient of restitution exceeds 0.82, a one-sided alternative hypothesis is appropriate.

The solution using the eight-step procedure for hypothesis testing is as follows:

1. The parameter of interest is the mean coefficient of restitution, $\mu$.
2. $H_0: \mu = 0.82$
3. $H_1: \mu > 0.82$. We want to reject $H_0$ if the mean coefficient of restitution exceeds 0.82.
4. $\alpha = 0.05$
5. The test statistic is

$$t_0 = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu_0}{s/\sqrt{n}}$$

6. Reject $H_0$ if $t_0 > t_{0.05,14} = 1.761$
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Example 9-6

Figure 9-10
Normal probability plot of the coefficient of restitution data from Example 9-6.
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Example 9-6

7. Computations: Since $\bar{x} = 0.83725$, $s = 0.02456$, $\mu_0 = 0.82$, and $n = 15$, we have

$$t_0 = \frac{0.83725 - 0.82}{0.02456/\sqrt{15}} = 2.72$$

8. Conclusions: Since $t_0 = 2.72 > 1.761$, we reject $H_0$ and conclude at the 0.05 level of significance that the mean coefficient of restitution exceeds 0.82.
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9-3.2 \( P \)-value for a \( t \)-Test

The \( P \)-value for a \( t \)-test is just the smallest level of significance at which the null hypothesis would be rejected.

To illustrate, consider the \( t \)-test based on 14 degrees of freedom in Example 9-6. The relevant critical values from Appendix Table IV are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Value:</th>
<th>0.258</th>
<th>0.692</th>
<th>1.345</th>
<th>1.761</th>
<th>2.145</th>
<th>2.624</th>
<th>2.977</th>
<th>3.326</th>
<th>3.787</th>
<th>4.140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tail Area:</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that \( t_0 = 2.72 \) in Example 9-6, and that this is between two tabulated values, 2.624 and 2.977. Therefore, the \( P \)-value must be between 0.01 and 0.005. These are effectively the upper and lower bounds on the \( P \)-value.
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9-3.3 Type II Error and Choice of Sample Size

The type II error of the two-sided alternative (for example) would be

\[ \beta = P\left\{ -t_{\alpha/2,n-1} \leq T_0 \leq t_{\alpha/2,n-1} \mid \delta \neq 0 \right\} \]

\[ = P\left\{ -t_{\alpha/2,n-1} \leq T'_0 \leq t_{\alpha/2,n-1} \right\} \]

where \( T'_0 \) denotes a noncentral \( t \) random variable.
Example 9-7

Consider the golf club testing problem from Example 9-6. If the mean coefficient of restitution exceeds 0.82 by as much as 0.02, is the sample size \( n = 15 \) adequate to ensure that \( H_0: \mu = 0.82 \) will be rejected with probability at least 0.8? 

To solve this problem, we will use the sample standard deviation \( s = 0.02456 \) to estimate \( \sigma \). Then \( d = |\delta|/\sigma = 0.02/0.02456 = 0.81 \). By referring to the operating characteristic curves in Appendix Chart VIIg (for \( \alpha = 0.05 \)) with \( d = 0.81 \) and \( n = 15 \), we find that \( \beta = 0.10 \), approximately. Thus, the probability of rejecting \( H_0: \mu = 0.82 \) if the true mean exceeds this by 0.02 is approximately \( 1 - \beta = 1 - 0.10 = 0.90 \), and we conclude that a sample size of \( n = 15 \) is adequate to provide the desired sensitivity.
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Hypothesis testing is one of the most important techniques of statistical inference. Throughout this book we present many applications of hypothesis testing. While we have emphasized a heuristic development, many of these hypothesis-testing procedures can be developed using a general principle called the likelihood ratio principle. Tests developed by this method often turn out to be “best” test procedures in the sense that they minimize the type II error probability $\beta$ among all tests that have the same type I error probability $\alpha$.

The likelihood ratio principle is easy to illustrate. Suppose that the random variable $X$ has a probability distribution that is described by an unknown parameter $\theta$, say, $f(x, \theta)$. We wish to test the hypothesis $H_0$: $\theta$ is in $\Omega_0$ versus $H_1$: $\theta$ is in $\Omega_1$, where $\Omega_0$ and $\Omega_1$ are disjoint sets of values (such as $H_0$: $\mu \geq 0$ versus $H_1$: $\mu < 0$). Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ be the observations in a random sample. The joint distribution of these sample observations is

$$f(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n, \theta) = f(x_1, \theta) \cdot f(x_2, \theta) \cdot \cdots \cdot f(x_n, \theta)$$

Recall from our discussion of maximum likelihood estimation in Chapter 7 that the likelihood function, say $L(\theta)$, is just this joint distribution considered as a function of the parameter $\theta$. The likelihood ratio principle for test construction consists of the following steps:
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1. Find the largest value of the likelihood for any $\theta$ in $\Omega_0$. This is done by finding the maximum likelihood estimator of $\theta$ restricted to values within $\Omega_0$ and by substituting this value of $\theta$ back into the likelihood function. This results in a value of the likelihood function that we will call $L(\Omega_0)$.

2. Find the largest value of the likelihood for any $\theta$ in $\Omega_1$. Call this the value of the likelihood function $L(\Omega_1)$.

3. Form the ratio

$$\lambda = \frac{L(\Omega_0)}{L(\Omega_1)}$$

This ratio $\lambda$ is called the **likelihood ratio test statistic**.

The test procedure calls for rejecting the null hypothesis $H_0$ when the value of this ratio $\lambda$ is small, say, whenever $\lambda < k$, where $k$ is a constant. Thus, the likelihood ratio principle requires rejecting $H_0$ when $L(\Omega_1)$ is much larger than $L(\Omega_0)$, which would indicate that the sample data are more compatible with the alternative hypothesis $H_1$ than with the null hypothesis $H_0$. Usually, the constant $k$ would be selected to give a specified value for $\alpha$, the type I error probability.
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- **Neyman-Pearson Lemma:**
  
  Likelihood-ratio test is the **most powerful test** of a specified value \( \alpha \) when testing two simple hypotheses.

- **simple hypotheses**
  
  \[ H_0: \theta = \theta_0 \text{ and } H_1: \theta = \theta_1 \]

The likelihood ratio principle is a very general procedure. Most of the tests presented in this book that utilize the \( t \), chi-square, and \( F \)-distributions for testing means and variances of normal distributions are likelihood ratio tests. The principle can also be used in cases where the observations are dependent, or even in cases where their distributions are different.
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Suppose that we have a sample of $n$ observations from a normal population with unknown mean $\mu$ and unknown variance $\sigma^2$, say, $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$. We wish to test the hypothesis $H_0: \mu = \mu_0$ versus $H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0$. The likelihood function of the sample is

$$L = \left( \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^n e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \mu)^2}{(2\sigma^2)}}$$

and the values of $\Omega_0$ and $\Omega_1$ are $\Omega_0 = \mu_0$ and $\Omega_1 = \{\mu: -\infty < \mu < \infty\}$, respectively. The values of $\mu$ and $\sigma^2$ that maximize $L$ in $\Omega_1$ are the usual maximum likelihood estimates for $\mu$ and $\sigma^2$:

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = \bar{x}$$

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})^2$$

Substituting these values in $L$, we have

$$L(\Omega_1) = \left[ \frac{1}{(2\pi/n) \sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2} \right]^{n/2} e^{-(n/2)}$$
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To maximize $L$ in $\Omega_0$ we simply set $\mu = \mu_0$ and then find the value of $\sigma^2$ that maximizes $L$. This value is found to be

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \mu_0)^2$$

which gives

$$L(\Omega_0) = \left[ \frac{1}{(2\pi/n) \sum(x_i - \mu_0)^2} \right]^{n/2} e^{-\frac{n}{2}}$$

The likelihood ratio is

$$\lambda = \frac{L(\Omega_0)}{L(\Omega_1)} = \left[ \frac{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{\sum(x_i - \mu_0)^2} \right]^{n/2}$$
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we may write the value of the likelihood ratio $\lambda$ as

$$
\lambda = \left\{ \frac{1}{1 + \left( \frac{1}{n-1} \right) \left[ \frac{(\bar{x} - \mu_0)^2}{s^2/n} \right]} \right\}^n = \left\{ \frac{1}{1 + \left[ t^2/(n - 1) \right]} \right\}^{n/2}
$$

It is easy to find the value for the constant $k$ that would lead to rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0$. Since we reject $H_0$ if $\lambda < k$, this implies that small values of $\lambda$ support the alternative hypothesis. Clearly, $\lambda$ will be small when $t^2$ is large. So instead of specifying $k$ we can specify a constant $c$ and reject $H_0$: $\mu = \mu_0$ if $t^2 > c$. The critical values of $t$ would be the extreme values, either positive or negative, and if we wish to control the type I error probability at $\alpha$, the critical region in terms of $t$ would be

$$
t < -t_{\alpha/2,n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad t > t_{\alpha/2,n-1}
$$

or, equivalently, we would reject $H_0$: $\mu = \mu_0$ if $t^2 > c = t_{\alpha/2,n-1}^2$. Therefore, the likelihood ratio test for $H_0: \mu = \mu_0$ versus $H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0$ is the familiar single-sample $t$-test.
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9-4.1 Hypothesis Test on the Variance

Suppose that we wish to test the hypothesis that the variance of a normal population $\sigma^2$ equals a specified value, say $\sigma_0^2$, or equivalently, that the standard deviation $\sigma$ is equal to $\sigma_0$. Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ be a random sample of $n$ observations from this population. To test

$$H_0: \sigma^2 = \sigma_0^2$$
$$H_1: \sigma^2 \neq \sigma_0^2$$

we will use the test statistic:

$$X_0^2 = \frac{(n - 1)S^2}{\sigma_0^2}$$
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9-4.1 Hypothesis Test on the Variance

If the null hypothesis \( H_0: \sigma^2 = \sigma_0^2 \) is true, the test statistic \( X_0^2 \) defined in Equation 9-27 follows the chi-square distribution with \( n - 1 \) degrees of freedom. This is the reference distribution for this test procedure. Therefore, we calculate \( \chi_0^2 \), the value of the test statistic \( X_0^2 \), and the null hypothesis \( H_0: \sigma^2 = \sigma_0^2 \) would be rejected if

\[
\chi_0^2 > \chi_{\alpha/2, n-1}^2 \quad \text{or if} \quad \chi_0^2 < \chi_{1-\alpha/2, n-1}^2
\]

where \( \chi_{\alpha/2, n-1}^2 \) and \( \chi_{1-\alpha/2, n-1}^2 \) are the upper and lower 100\( \alpha/2 \) percentage points of the chi-square distribution with \( n - 1 \) degrees of freedom, respectively. Figure 9-10(a) shows the critical region.
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9-4.1 Hypothesis Test on the Variance

Figure 9-11 Reference distribution for the test of $H_0: \sigma^2 = \sigma_0^2$ with critical region values for (a) $H_1: \sigma^2 \neq \sigma_0^2$, (b) $H_1: \sigma^2 > \sigma_0^2$, and (c) $H_1: \sigma^2 < \sigma_0^2$. 
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9-4.1 Hypothesis Test on the Variance

The same test statistic is used for one-sided alternative hypotheses. For the one-sided hypothesis

\[ H_0: \sigma^2 = \sigma_0^2 \]
\[ H_1: \sigma^2 > \sigma_0^2 \]  

we would reject \( H_0 \) if \( \chi_0^2 > \chi_{\alpha, n-1}^2 \), whereas for the other one-sided hypothesis

\[ H_0: \sigma^2 = \sigma_0^2 \]
\[ H_1: \sigma^2 < \sigma_0^2 \]  

we would reject \( H_0 \) if \( \chi_0^2 < \chi_{1-\alpha, n-1}^2 \). The one-sided critical regions are shown in Figure 9-10(b) and (c).
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Example 9-8

An automatic filling machine is used to fill bottles with liquid detergent. A random sample of 20 bottles results in a sample variance of fill volume of $s^2 = 0.0153$ (fluid ounces)$^2$. If the variance of fill volume exceeds 0.01 (fluid ounces)$^2$, an unacceptable proportion of bottles will be underfilled or overfilled. Is there evidence in the sample data to suggest that the manufacturer has a problem with underfilled or overfilled bottles? Use $\alpha = 0.05$, and assume that fill volume has a normal distribution.

Using the eight-step procedure results in the following:

1. The parameter of interest is the population variance $\sigma^2$.
2. $H_0$: $\sigma^2 = 0.01$
3. $H_1$: $\sigma^2 > 0.01$
4. $\alpha = 0.05$
5. The test statistic is

$$\chi^2_0 = \frac{(n - 1)s^2}{\sigma_0^2}$$
6. Reject $H_0$ if $\chi^2_0 > \chi^2_{0.05,19} = 30.14$.

7. Computations:

$$\chi^2_0 = \frac{19(0.0153)}{0.01} = 29.07$$

8. Conclusions: Since $\chi^2_0 = 29.07 < \chi^2_{0.05,19} = 30.14$, we conclude that there is no strong evidence that the variance of fill volume exceeds 0.01 (fluid ounces)$^2$. 
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9-4.2 Type II Error and Choice of Sample Size

\[ \lambda = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_0} \]

Operating characteristic curves are provided in

- Charts VII(i) and VII(j) for the \textit{two-sided} alternative
- Charts VII(k) and VII(l) for the \textit{upper tail} alternative
- Charts VII(m) and VII(n) for the \textit{lower tail} alternative
Example 9-9

Consider the bottle-filling problem from Example 9-8. If the variance of the filling process exceeds 0.01 (fluid ounces)$^2$, too many bottles will be underfilled. Thus, the hypothesized value of the standard deviation is $\sigma_0 = 0.10$. Suppose that if the true standard deviation of the filling process exceeds this value by 25%, we would like to detect this with probability at least 0.8. Is the sample size of $n = 20$ adequate?

To solve this problem, note that we require

$$\lambda = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_0} = \frac{0.125}{0.10} = 1.25$$

This is the abscissa parameter for Chart VII$k$. From this chart, with $n = 20$ and $\lambda = 1.25$, we find that $\beta \approx 0.6$. Therefore, there is only about a 40% chance that the null hypothesis will be rejected if the true standard deviation is really as large as $\sigma = 0.125$ fluid ounce.

To reduce the $\beta$-error, a larger sample size must be used. From the operating characteristic curve with $\beta = 0.20$ and $\lambda = 1.25$, we find that $n = 75$, approximately. Thus, if we want the test to perform as required above, the sample size must be at least 75 bottles.
Many engineering decision problems include hypothesis testing about $p$.

$$H_0: p = p_0$$

$$H_1: p \neq p_0$$

An appropriate test statistic is

$$Z_0 = \frac{X - np_0}{\sqrt{np_0(1 - p_0)}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9-32)

and reject $H_0: p = p_0$ if

$$z_0 > z_{\alpha/2} \quad \text{or} \quad z_0 < -z_{\alpha/2}$$
9-5 Tests on a Population Proportion

Example 9-10

A semiconductor manufacturer produces controllers used in automobile engine applications. The customer requires that the process fallout or fraction defective at a critical manufacturing step not exceed 0.05 and that the manufacturer demonstrate process capability at this level of quality using \( \alpha = 0.05 \). The semiconductor manufacturer takes a random sample of 200 devices and finds that four of them are defective. Can the manufacturer demonstrate process capability for the customer?

We may solve this problem using the eight-step hypothesis-testing procedure as follows:

1. The parameter of interest is the process fraction defective \( p \).
2. \( H_0: p = 0.05 \)
3. \( H_1: p < 0.05 \)
   This formulation of the problem will allow the manufacturer to make a strong claim about process capability if the null hypothesis \( H_0: p = 0.05 \) is rejected.
4. \( \alpha = 0.05 \)
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5. The test statistic is (from Equation 9-32)

\[ z_0 = \frac{x - np_0}{\sqrt{np_0(1 - p_0)}} \]

where \( x = 4, n = 200, \) and \( p_0 = 0.05. \)

6. Reject \( H_0: p = 0.05 \) if \( z_0 < -z_{0.05} = -1.645 \)

7. Computations: The test statistic is

\[ z_0 = \frac{4 - 200(0.05)}{\sqrt{200(0.05)(0.95)}} = -1.95 \]

8. Conclusions: Since \( z_0 = -1.95 < -z_{0.05} = -1.645, \) we reject \( H_0 \) and conclude that the process fraction defective \( p \) is less than 0.05. The \( P \)-value for this value of the test statistic \( z_0 \) is \( P = 0.0256, \) which is less than \( \alpha = 0.05. \) We conclude that the process is capable.
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Another form of the test statistic $Z_0$ is

$$Z_0 = \frac{X/n - p_0}{\sqrt{p_0(1 - p_0)/n}} \quad \text{or} \quad Z_0 = \frac{\hat{P} - p_0}{\sqrt{p_0(1 - p_0)/n}}$$

Think about: What are the distribution of $Z_0$ under $H_0$ and $H_1$?
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9-5.2 Type II Error and Choice of Sample Size

For a two-sided alternative

\[ \beta = \Phi \left( \frac{p_0 - p + z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{p_0(1 - p_0)/n}}{\sqrt{p(1 - p)/n}} \right) - \Phi \left( \frac{p_0 - p - z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{p_0(1 - p_0)/n}}{\sqrt{p(1 - p)/n}} \right) \]  

(9-34)

If the alternative is \( p < p_0 \)

\[ \beta = 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{p_0 - p - z_{\alpha} \sqrt{p_0(1 - p_0)/n}}{\sqrt{p(1 - p)/n}} \right) \]  

(9-35)

If the alternative is \( p > p_0 \)

\[ \beta = \Phi \left( \frac{p_0 - p + z_{\alpha} \sqrt{p_0(1 - p_0)/n}}{\sqrt{p(1 - p)/n}} \right) \]  

(9-36)
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9-5.3 Type II Error and Choice of Sample Size

For a two-sided alternative

\[ n = \left[ \frac{z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{p_0(1 - p_0)} + z_\beta \sqrt{p(1 - p)}}{p - p_0} \right]^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (9-37)

For a one-sided alternative

\[ n = \left[ \frac{z_{\alpha} \sqrt{p_0(1 - p_0)} + z_\beta \sqrt{p(1 - p)}}{p - p_0} \right]^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (9-38)
Consider the semiconductor manufacturer from Example 9-10. Suppose that its process fall-out is really \( p = 0.03 \). What is the \( \beta \)-error for a test of process capability that uses \( n = 200 \) and \( \alpha = 0.05 \)?

The \( \beta \)-error can be computed using Equation 9-35 as follows:

\[
\beta = 1 - \Phi \left[ \frac{0.05 - 0.03 - (1.645) \sqrt{0.05(0.95)/200}}{\sqrt{0.03(1 - 0.03)/200}} \right] = 1 - \Phi(-0.44) = 0.67
\]

Thus, the probability is about 0.7 that the semiconductor manufacturer will fail to conclude that the process is capable if the true process fraction defective is \( p = 0.03 \) (3%). That is, the power of the test against this particular alternative is only about 0.3. This appears to be a large \( \beta \)-error (or small power), but the difference between \( p = 0.05 \) and \( p = 0.03 \) is fairly small, and the sample size \( n = 200 \) is not particularly large.
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Suppose that the semiconductor manufacturer was willing to accept a \( \beta \)-error as large as 0.10 if the true value of the process fraction defective was \( p = 0.03 \). If the manufacturer continues to use \( \alpha = 0.05 \), what sample size would be required?

The required sample size can be computed from Equation 9-38 as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
    n &= \left[ \frac{1.645 \sqrt{0.05(0.95)} + 1.28 \sqrt{0.03(0.97)}}{0.03 - 0.05} \right]^2 \\
    &\approx 832
\end{align*}
\]

where we have used \( p = 0.03 \) in Equation 9-38. Note that \( n = 832 \) is a very large sample size. However, we are trying to detect a fairly small deviation from the null value \( p_0 = 0.05 \).
9-7 Testing for Goodness of Fit

• The test is based on the chi-square distribution.

• Assume there is a sample of size \( n \) from a population whose probability distribution is unknown.

• Arrange \( n \) observations in a frequency histogram.

• Let \( O_i \) be the observed frequency in the \( i \)th class interval.

• Let \( E_i \) be the expected frequency in the \( i \)th class interval.

The test statistic is

\[
X_0^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}
\]  

(9-39)

which has approximately chi-square distribution with \( df = k-p-1 \).
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A Poisson Distribution
The number of defects in printed circuit boards is hypothesized to follow a Poisson distribution. A random sample of \( n = 60 \) printed boards has been collected, and the following number of defects observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Defects</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The mean of the assumed Poisson distribution in this example is unknown and must be estimated from the sample data. The estimate of the mean number of defects per board is the sample average, that is, \((32.0 + 15.1 + 9.2 + 4.3)/60 = 0.75\). From the Poisson distribution with parameter 0.75, we may compute \(p_i\), the theoretical, hypothesized probability associated with the \(i\)th class interval. Since each class interval corresponds to a particular number of defects, we may find the \(p_i\) as follows:

\[
p_1 = P(X = 0) = \frac{e^{-0.75}(0.75)^0}{0!} = 0.472
\]

\[
p_2 = P(X = 1) = \frac{e^{-0.75}(0.75)^1}{1!} = 0.354
\]

\[
p_3 = P(X = 2) = \frac{e^{-0.75}(0.75)^2}{2!} = 0.133
\]

\[
p_4 = P(X \geq 3) = 1 - (p_1 + p_2 + p_3) = 0.041
\]
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The expected frequencies are computed by multiplying the sample size $n = 60$ times the probabilities $p_i$. That is, $E_i = np_i$. The expected frequencies follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Defects</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Expected Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>28.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>21.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (or more)</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Since the expected frequency in the last cell is less than 3, we combine the last two cells:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Defects</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Expected Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (or more)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi-square test statistic in Equation 9-39 will have $k - p - 1 = 3 - 1 - 1 = 1$ degree of freedom, because the mean of the Poisson distribution was estimated from the data.
Example 9-12

The eight-step hypothesis-testing procedure may now be applied, using $\alpha = 0.05$, as follows:

1. The variable of interest is the form of the distribution of defects in printed circuit boards.
2. $H_0$: The form of the distribution of defects is Poisson.
3. $H_1$: The form of the distribution of defects is not Poisson.
4. $\alpha = 0.05$
5. The test statistic is

$$
\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(o_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}
$$
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6. Reject $H_0$ if $\chi_0^2 > \chi_{0.05,1}^2 = 3.84$.

7. Computations:

$$\chi_0^2 = \frac{(32 - 28.32)^2}{28.32} + \frac{(15 - 21.24)^2}{21.24} + \frac{(13 - 10.44)^2}{10.44} = 2.94$$

8. Conclusions: Since $\chi_0^2 = 2.94 < \chi_{0.05,1}^2 = 3.84$, we are unable to reject the null hypothesis that the distribution of defects in printed circuit boards is Poisson. The $P$-value for the test is $P = 0.0864$. (This value was computed using an HP-48 calculator.)
Many times, the $n$ elements of a sample from a population may be classified according to two different criteria. It is then of interest to know whether the two methods of classification are statistically independent;

Table 9-2  An $r \times c$ Contingency Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rows</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$O_{11}$</td>
<td>$O_{12}$</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$O_{1c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$O_{21}$</td>
<td>$O_{22}$</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$O_{2c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$O_{r1}$</td>
<td>$O_{r2}$</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$O_{rc}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We are interested in testing the hypothesis that the row-and-column methods of classification are independent. If we reject this hypothesis, we conclude there is some interaction between the two criteria of classification. The exact test procedures are difficult to obtain, but an approximate test statistic is valid for large $n$. Let $p_{ij}$ be the probability that a randomly selected element falls in the $ij$th cell, given that the two classifications are independent. Then $p_{ij} = u_i v_j$, where $u_i$ is the probability that a randomly selected element falls in row class $i$ and $v_j$ is the probability that a randomly selected element falls in column class $j$. Now, assuming independence, the estimators of $u_i$ and $v_j$ are

$$\hat{u}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{c} O_{ij}$$

$$\hat{v}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{r} O_{ij}$$

(9-40)
Therefore, the expected frequency of each cell is

$$E_{ij} = n \hat{u}_i \hat{v}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{c} O_{ij} \sum_{i=1}^{r} O_{ij}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9-41)

Then, for large $n$, the statistic

$$\chi_0^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{c} \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9-42)

has an approximate chi-square distribution with $(r - 1)(c - 1)$ degrees of freedom if the null hypothesis is true. Therefore, we would reject the hypothesis of independence if the observed value of the test statistic $\chi_0^2$ exceeded $\chi_{\alpha,(r-1)(c-1)}^2$.  

Example 9-14

A company has to choose among three pension plans. Management wishes to know whether the preference for plans is independent of job classification and wants to use $\alpha = 0.05$. The opinions of a random sample of 500 employees are shown in Table 9-3.

To find the expected frequencies, we must first compute $\hat{u}_1 = (340/500) = 0.68$, $\hat{u}_2 = (160/500) = 0.32$, $\hat{v}_1 = (200/500) = 0.40$, $\hat{v}_2 = (200/500) = 0.40$, and $\hat{v}_3 = (100/500) = 0.20$. The expected frequencies may now be computed from Equation 9-41. For example, the expected number of salaried workers favoring pension plan 1 is

$$E_{11} = n\hat{u}_1\hat{v}_1 = 500(0.68)(0.40) = 136$$

The expected frequencies are shown in Table 9-4.
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**Table 9-3**  
Observed Data for Example 9-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Classification</th>
<th>Pension Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried workers</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly workers</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9-4**  
Expected Frequencies for Example 9-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Classification</th>
<th>Pension Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried workers</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly workers</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The eight-step hypothesis-testing procedure may now be applied to this problem.

1. The variable of interest is employee preference among pension plans.
2. \( H_0 \): Preference is independent of salaried versus hourly job classification.
3. \( H_1 \): Preference is not independent of salaried versus hourly job classification.
4. \( \alpha = 0.05 \)
5. The test statistic is

\[
\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{c} \frac{(o_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}
\]

6. Since \( r = 2 \) and \( c = 3 \), the degrees of freedom for chi-square are \( (r - 1)(c - 1) = (1)(2) = 2 \), and we would reject \( H_0 \) if \( \chi^2 > \chi^2_{0.05,2} = 5.99 \).
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7. Computations:

\[ \chi^2_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{3} \frac{(o_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}} \]

\[ = \frac{(160 - 136)^2}{136} + \frac{(140 - 136)^2}{136} + \frac{(40 - 68)^2}{68} + \frac{(40 - 64)^2}{64} \]

\[ + \frac{(60 - 64)^2}{64} + \frac{(60 - 32)^2}{32} = 49.63 \]

8. Conclusions: Since \( \chi^2_0 = 49.63 > \chi^2_{0.05,2} = 5.99 \), we reject the hypothesis of independence and conclude that the preference for pension plans is not independent of job classification. The \( P \)-value for \( \chi^2_0 = 49.63 \) is \( P = 1.671 \times 10^{-11} \). (This value was computed using a hand-held calculator.) Further analysis would be necessary to explore the nature of the association between these factors. It might be helpful to examine the table of observed minus expected frequencies.