

1. (a) If  $\beta = P(\text{Type II error})$ , then we define the power of a test to be

$$\text{power} = 1 - \beta = 1 - P_{H_A}(\text{accept } H_0) = P_{H_A}(\text{reject } H_0).$$

Now, with the alternative given, we reject  $H_0$  if

$$Z = \frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} > 1.65,$$

or, equivalently, if

$$\bar{Y} > \sigma/\sqrt{n} \cdot 1.65 + \mu_0$$

where  $\bar{Y} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2/n)$ . Hence, we conclude that

$$\text{power} = P_{H_A}(\bar{Y} > \sigma/\sqrt{n} \cdot 1.65 + \mu_0).$$

Finally, if  $\mu_0 = 0$ ,  $\sigma^2 = 25$ ,  $n = 4$ , then

- $\mu = 1$ :

$$\text{power} = P_{\mu=1}(\bar{Y} > 4.125) = P\left(\frac{\bar{Y} - 1}{5/2} > \frac{4.125 - 1}{5/2}\right) = 0.1056;$$

- $\mu = 2$ :

$$\text{power} = P_{\mu=2}(\bar{Y} > 4.125) = P\left(\frac{\bar{Y} - 2}{5/2} > \frac{4.125 - 2}{5/2}\right) = 0.1977;$$

- $\mu = 3$ :

$$\text{power} = P_{\mu=3}(\bar{Y} > 4.125) = P\left(\frac{\bar{Y} - 3}{5/2} > \frac{4.125 - 3}{5/2}\right) = 0.3264;$$

where all calculations were made using Table 4. Notice that as  $\mu$  gets farther away from 0, the probability of a *correct* decision increases; it becomes easier to distinguish between the null and alternative.

(b) By mimicking the computations above, if

$$\text{power} = P_{H_A}(\bar{Y} > \sigma/\sqrt{n} \cdot 1.65 + \mu_0),$$

where  $\mu_0 = 0$ ,  $\sigma^2 = 25$ ,  $n = 16$ , then

- $\mu = 1$ :

$$\text{power} = P\left(\frac{\bar{Y} - 1}{5/4} > \frac{2.0625 - 1}{5/4}\right) = 0.1977;$$

- $\mu = 2$ :

$$\text{power} = P\left(\frac{\bar{Y} - 2}{5/4} > \frac{2.0625 - 2}{5/4}\right) = 0.4801;$$

- $\mu = 3$ :

$$\text{power} = P\left(\frac{\bar{Y} - 3}{5/4} > \frac{2.0625 - 3}{5/4}\right) = 0.7734.$$

The reason that the power is significantly higher in **(b)** arises from the fact that as the sample size increases, the variance of  $\bar{Y}$  decreases. (That is, larger  $n$  yields less variance.) Thus, again, as  $\mu$  gets farther away from 0, the probability of a *correct* decision increases; it becomes easier to distinguish between the null and alternative. For a fixed  $H_A$ , by increasing  $n$  (so that there is more data), it becomes easier to detect that  $H_0$  is false.

**2. (a)** If this test is to have significance level 0.1, then

$$P_{H_0}(\text{reject } H_0) = P_{\sigma=1}(S^2 > c) = 0.1.$$

Since  $\sigma = 1$  under  $H_0$  so that  $9S^2$  has a  $\chi^2$  distribution with  $df = 9$ , we must find  $c$  so that

$$P(9S^2 > 9c) = 0.1.$$

Using the table we find that for  $\alpha = 0.10$ , the appropriate critical value is  $\chi_{\alpha}^2 = 14.68$ . Thus, we find  $9c = 14.68$  so that  $c = 14.68/9 \approx 1.63$ .

**(b)** Refer to problem #1 where it is shown in detail that

$$\text{power} = P_{H_A}(\text{reject } H_0).$$

As in part **(a)**, we find

$$\text{power} = P_{H_A}(S^2 > 1.63) = P_{H_A}\left(\frac{9S^2}{\sigma^2} > \frac{14.68}{\sigma^2}\right),$$

where

$$\frac{9S^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_9^2$$

for any  $\sigma^2$ . Thus,

- $\sigma^2 = 2$ :

$$\text{power} = P_{\sigma^2=2}(S^2 > 1.63) = P\left(\frac{9S^2}{2} > \frac{14.68}{2}\right) \approx 0.60;$$

- $\sigma^2 = 3$ :

$$\text{power} = P_{\sigma^2=3}(S^2 > 1.63) = P\left(\frac{9S^2}{3} > \frac{14.68}{3}\right) \approx 0.85;$$

where all calculations were made to the accuracy permitted by the table attached to the assignment.

**3.** As always,  $\alpha = P_{H_0}(\text{reject } H_0)$  and  $\beta = P_{H_A}(\text{accept } H_0)$ . Since  $X$  has an Exponential( $\lambda$ ) distribution so that  $f(x|\lambda) = \lambda^{-1}e^{-x/\lambda}$ , and since our rejection region is  $\{X < c\}$ , we find that

$$\alpha = P_{H_0}(\text{reject } H_0) = P(X < c|\lambda = 1) = \int_0^c e^{-x} dx = 1 - e^{-c}$$

and

$$\beta = P_{H_A}(\text{accept } H_0) = P(X > c|\lambda = 1/2) = \int_c^{\infty} 2e^{-2x} dx = e^{-2c}.$$

Thus,  $\alpha = 1 - e^{-c}$  and  $\beta = e^{-2c}$  which easily implies that

$$1 - \alpha = \sqrt{\beta}.$$

Rewrite this as  $\alpha + \sqrt{\beta} = 1$  to illustrate the direct tradeoff between them: as  $\alpha$  increases,  $\beta$  must decrease, and vice-versa.

4. If  $X$  has an Exponential( $\lambda$ ) distribution so that  $f(x|\lambda) = \lambda^{-1}e^{-x/\lambda}$ , then the Fisher information (as done in class on January 26) is

$$I(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}$$

and the maximum likelihood estimator (as done in class on January 31) is

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}} = \bar{X}.$$

Hence, a significance level 0.1 test of  $H_0 : \lambda = 1/5$  vs.  $H_A : \lambda \neq 1/5$  has rejection region

$$\sqrt{nI(\hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}})} \left| \hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}} - \lambda_0 \right| \geq z_{0.05}$$

or

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\bar{X}} \left| \bar{X} - \frac{1}{5} \right| \geq 1.645.$$

(10.10) Let  $\mu$  denote the average hardness index. In order to test the manufacturer's claim, we want to test  $H_0 : \mu \geq 64$  against  $H_A : \mu < 64$ . It is equivalent to test  $H_0 : \mu = 64$  against  $H_A : \mu < 64$ . The test statistic is given by

$$Z = \frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} = \frac{62 - 64}{8/\sqrt{50}} \approx -1.77.$$

In order to conduct this test at the significance level  $\alpha = 0.01$ , we find that the rejection region is

$$RR = \{\text{reject } H_0 \text{ if } Z < z_{0.01} = -2.326\}.$$

Since  $Z = -1.77$  does not fall in the rejection region ( $-1.77 > -2.326$ ), we do not reject  $H_0$  in favour of  $H_A$  at the 0.01 level. Thus, we conclude that there is insufficient evidence to reject the manufacturer's claim.

(10.38) The rejection region is

$$\frac{\hat{\theta} - \theta_0}{\sigma_{\hat{\theta}}} < -z_{\alpha}$$

which is true if and only if

$$\hat{\theta} + z_{\alpha}\sigma_{\hat{\theta}} < \theta_0.$$

That is,  $H_0$  will be rejected at the significance level  $\alpha$  if and only if the  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  upper confidence bound for  $\theta$  (namely,  $\hat{\theta} + z_{\alpha}\sigma_{\hat{\theta}}$ ) is less than  $\theta_0$ .

(10.50) A  $t$ -test can be used whenever one wants to conduct a hypothesis test of the population mean when the population is known to have a normal distribution with unknown variance. The  $t$ -test also works reasonably well for populations whose distribution is mound-shaped (and resembles the normal).

**(10.73)** Let  $\sigma$  denote the standard deviation of the accuracy of the precision instrument. In order to assess the precision, we want to test  $H_0 : \sigma = 0.7$  against  $H_A : \sigma > 0.7$ . It is equivalent to test  $H_0 : \sigma^2 = 0.49$  against  $H_A : \sigma^2 > 0.49$ . The sample variance is given by

$$s^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2 = \frac{(353 - 352.5)^2 + (351 - 352.5)^2 + (351 - 352.5)^2 + (355 - 352.5)^2}{3} \\ \approx 3.667$$

so that the test statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(n-1)s^2}{\sigma_0^2} \approx \frac{3 \cdot 3.667}{0.49} \approx 22.45.$$

(Recall that this is the distribution of the null hypothesis, i.e., assuming that  $\sigma_0^2 = 0.49$ .) Consulting Table 6 for the  $\chi^2$  density, we find  $\chi_{0.005,3}^2 = 12.8381$ . Since  $22.45 \gg 12.8381$ , we see that the  $p$ -value must be smaller than 0.005.