#### **Significance Tests**

- Example 1: Are college freshmen getting more stressed?
- A 2010 UCLA Higher Education Research Institute poll took a random sample of 201,818 college freshmen.
- 29.1% of the sampled freshmen reported being frequently "overwhelmed."
- In a similar poll from 2009, the percentage overwhelmed was 27.1%.
- Has the true proportion of freshmen who are overwhelmed increased from 2009 to 2010?
- Or is the increase in overwhelmed percentage in 2010 simply attributable to random chance?

In the UCLA stress example, the sample size was very large (201,818 freshmen in 2010, and a similar number in 2009). Because of this, what can we conclude?

- A. The true proportions of stressed freshmen should be similar to the respective sample proportions of stressed freshmen.
- B. The sample proportions are untrustworthy since the sample sizes are so large.
- C. The poll is actually a census of all college freshmen in America.
- D. None of the above are true.

#### **Another Significance Test Example**

- Example 2: A sample of coffee drinkers undergoes a taste test to determine whether fresh-brewed coffee or instant coffee is preferred.
- The experimenter suspects that more of the population prefers freshbrewed coffee.
- In math notation, we could represent this belief as: p > 0.5.
- Here, *p* is the proportion of the *whole population* that prefers freshbrewed.
- In our sample, suppose 36 out of 50 prefer fresh-brewed. That is, our  $\hat{p}$  is 36/50 = 0.72.
- Is this sample proportion large enough that we would conclude that the population  ${m p}>0.5$ ?

#### **Reasoning of Tests of Significance**

- Recall that the sample result in Example 2 was that 36 out of 50 sampled drinkers preferred fresh-brewed.
- The significance test in Example 2 asks the question: "If the true proportion preferring fresh-brewed is no more than 0.5 (say, if it equals 0.5), then is it *unlikely* that we'd see a sample result like we did?"
- We can answer this question based on our knowledge of the sampling distribution of  $\hat{p}$ .
- When we have a fairly large sample size, the sampling distribution of  $\hat{p}$  is roughly Normal with a mean equal to the true p and a standard deviation of

$$\sqrt{rac{oldsymbol{p}(1-oldsymbol{p})}{oldsymbol{n}}}.$$

# Sampling Distribution of $\hat{p}$

- Let's pretend that in fact  $\boldsymbol{p}=0.5$ .
- The sampling distribution gives us the probability of seeing as extreme or more extreme of a value of  $\hat{p}$  than the one we actually did see.
- The term "extreme" here means "favorable toward what the experimenter is trying to show."
- In this example, he's trying to show that  $\boldsymbol{p} > 0.5$ .

# Sampling Distribution of $\hat{p}$

- If p = 0.5, then the probability of seeing a  $\hat{p} \ge 0.72$  is 0.001 (really small!)
- Conclusion: "If the true proportion preferring fresh-brewed equals 0.5, then it is VERY unlikely that we'd see a sample result as extreme as we did!"
- Are you convinced that p, the true proportion preferring fresh-brewed, is actually bigger than 0.5?
- What if our sample proportion had been 28/50 = 0.56? Then if p = 0.56, the probability of seeing a  $\hat{p} \ge 0.56$  would be 0.20. Is that unlikely enough to convince you that p is really bigger than 0.5?

#### **Two Types of Hypothesis**

- The *null hypothesis*, denoted  $H_0$ , is the claim we are testing.
- This is usually some statement of "no effect," "no difference," or "previous belief."
- In our examples, the null hypothesis always has an equals sign!
- The *alternative hypothesis*, denoted  $H_a$ , is what we are seeking evidence for.
- This is usually some statement of "some new effect,"
  "some difference," or "suspected belief."
- The alternative hypothesis contains one of these signs:  $< > \neq$ .
- These hypotheses are ALWAYS statements about a parameter, not about a statistic!

#### In the coffee example, what is the null hypothesis?

- **A.** p = 0.5
- **B.** p > 0.5
- C.  $\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}=0.5$
- **D.**  $\hat{p} > 0.5$

#### In the coffee example, what is the alternative hypothesis?

- **A.** p < 0.5
- **B.** p > 0.5
- C.  $p \neq 0.5$
- D.  $\hat{p} > 0.5$

#### **P-value**

- Recall that our decision about whether  $H_0$  was true was based on the probability of observing a sample outcome *as extreme or more extreme* as the one we did observe, if  $H_0$  were in fact true.
- "Extreme" here means "favorable toward the alternative hypothesis".
- This probability is called the *P-value* of the significance test.
- The smaller the P-value is, the stronger the evidence against  $H_0$ .
- Coffee example: If  $\hat{p} = 0.72$ , then the P-value is 0.001 (really small!). If  $\hat{p} = 0.56$ , then the P-value is 0.20 (not so small).

#### **Statistical Significance**

- We will let software or calculators calculate the P-value for us, so we won't worry about how to calculate it.
- We do need to interpret the P-value and decide whether it is small enough to make us reject the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative.
- Our *significance level* (denoted  $\alpha$ ) is the cutoff value for deciding whether the P-value is "small enough."
- If our P-value is less than or equal to  $\alpha$ , we will *reject*  $H_0$  and say the data are "statistically significant."
- If our P-value is greater than  $\alpha$ , we will not reject  $H_0$  and we say the data are "not statistically significant."

We test  $H_0$  : p = 0.5 against  $H_a$  : p < 0.5, using a significance level of  $\alpha$  = 0.05. Our p-value turns out to be 0.036. What is our conclusion?

- A. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude p = 0.5.
- B. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude p < 0.5.
- C. The data are NOT statistically significant; do not reject  $H_0$  and we conclude p = 0.5.
- D. The data are NOT statistically significant; do not reject  $H_0$  and we conclude p < 0.5.

We test  $H_0$  : p = 0.5 against  $H_a$  : p < 0.5, using a significance level of  $\alpha$  = 0.05. Our p-value turns out to be 0.087. What is our conclusion?

- A. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude  ${m p}=0.5$  is possible.
- B. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude p < 0.5.
- C. The data are NOT statistically significant; do not reject  $H_0$  and we conclude p = 0.5 is possible.
- D. The data are NOT statistically significant; do not reject  $H_0$  and we conclude p < 0.5.

## **Meaning of Statistical Significance**

- Recall that "statistically significant" means that such a result is "unlikely to have occurred by chance" (if  $H_0$  were true).
- "Statistically significant" does not mean "practically important." (more about this in the next chapter)

## Meaning of Statistical Significance (Continued)

- Usually scientists choose a significance level such as 0.05 or 0.01.
- In a report, it's best to report the actual P-value; then any reader can decide whether it is "small enough" for her purposes.
- Sometimes as a rule of thumb, people say a P-value < 0.10 indicates "some evidence against  $H_0$ ."
- A P-value < 0.05 indicates "moderate evidence against  $H_0$ ."
- A P-value < 0.01 indicates "strong evidence against  $H_0$ ."
- These are just loose guidelines, however.

## **Different Types of Alternative Hypothesis**

- In the coffee example, our alternative hypothesis was  $H_a: {m p} > 0.5.$
- This is a *one-sided* alternative because we only seek evidence that *p* is on one side of 0.5.
- An alternative hypothesis like  $H_a$  : p < 0.5 is also a *one-sided* alternative.

## **Different Types of Alternative Hypothesis (Continued)**

- *Example 2*: We toss a coin numerous times to determine whether it is balanced. If p is the probability of "heads", we test  $H_0: p = 0.5$  against  $H_a: p \neq 0.5$ .
- This is a *two-sided* alternative because we seek evidence that p is *either* side of 0.5.
- We still make our conclusion by comparing the P-value to  $\alpha$  in the usual way.

#### Which is a two-sided alternative hypothesis?

- **A.** p = 0.5
- B. p < 0.5
- **C.** p > 0.5
- D.  $p \neq 0.5$

In the coin-tossing experiment, we test  $H_0$ : p = 0.5 against  $H_a$ :  $p \neq 0.5$ , using  $\alpha$  = 0.05. We toss a coin 50 times and get 21 heads. Our p-value turns out to be 0.52. What is our conclusion?

- A. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude the coin may be balanced.
- B. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude the coin is unbalanced.
- C. The data are NOT statistically significant; do not reject  $H_0$  and we conclude the coin may be balanced.
- D. The data are NOT statistically significant; do not reject  $H_0$  and we conclude the coin is unbalanced.

## **Significance Tests about a Population Mean**

- We can similarly perform a significance test about a population mean  $\mu$ .
- Our null hypothesis is  $H_0$  :  $\mu$  = [some number].
- The alternative hypothesis could be one-sided like  $H_a: \mu < [some number], or H_a: \mu > [some number].$
- Or it could be two-sided like  $H_a$  :  $\mu \neq$  [some number].
- We take a random sample and calculate the sample mean  $\bar{x}$  (recall  $\bar{x}$  has a normal sampling distribution).
- If the value of  $\bar{x}$  is so "extreme" that it is unlikely to have occurred when  $H_0$  is true, then we reject  $H_0$  in favor of  $H_a$ .
- Again, we reject  $H_0$  when the P-value is less than or equal to  $\alpha$ .

We test whether the mean SAT math score for lowa students is greater than 500, so we test  $H_0$ :  $\mu = 500$  against  $H_a$ :  $\mu > 500$ , using  $\alpha$ = 0.05. Based on a sample of 75 students yielding  $\bar{x} = 523.4$ , our p-value is 0.048. What is our conclusion?

- A. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude lowa's mean math SAT score exceeds 500.
- B. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude lowa's mean math SAT score may not exceed 500.
- C. The data are NOT statistically significant; do not reject  $H_0$  and we conclude lowa's mean math SAT score exceeds 500.
- D. The data are NOT statistically significant; do not reject  $H_0$  and we conclude lowa's mean math SAT score may not exceed 500.

The mean systolic blood pressure of males aged 35-44 is 128. Is this mean SBP different for executives? We test  $H_0$  :  $\mu$  = 128 against  $H_a$  :  $\mu \neq$  128, using  $\alpha$  = 0.05. Based on a sample of 72 executives yielding  $\bar{x}$  = 126.1, our p-value is 0.29. Conclusion?

- A. The data are NOT statistically significant; do not reject  $H_0$  and we conclude the mean SBP for executives may be 128.
- B. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude the mean SBP for executives is not 128.
- C. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude the mean SBP for executives is less than 128.
- D. The data are statistically significant; reject  $H_0$  and conclude the mean SBP for executives is greater than 128.