# Mathematical statistics 

May 8th, 2019
Lecture 30: The two-sample $t$-test

## Att.

- Final exam:

> Wednesday, $5 / 29 / 2019$, Wednesday, $10: 30 \mathrm{am}-12: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ Ewing Hall Room 101

- Course evaluation
- Last homework due this Friday
- Department colloquium


## Overview



## Inferences based on two samples

10.1 Difference between two population means

- z-test
- confidence intervals
10.2 The two-sample $t$ test and confidence interval
10.3 Analysis of paired data


## Two－sample inference



## Difference between two population means

- Testing:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{0}: \mu_{1}=\mu_{2} \\
& H_{a}: \mu_{1}>\mu_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Works well, even if
$\left|\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right| \ll \sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}$


## Settings

## Assumption

(1) $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{m}$ is a random sample from a population with mean $\mu_{1}$ and variance $\sigma_{1}^{2}$.
(2) $Y_{1}, Y_{2}, \ldots, Y_{n}$ is a random sample from a population with mean $\mu_{2}$ and variance $\sigma_{2}^{2}$.
(3) The $X$ and $Y$ samples are independent of each other.

## Review Chapter 6 and Chapter 7

## Problem

## Assume that

- $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{m}$ is a random sample from a population with mean $\mu_{1}$ and variance $\sigma_{1}^{2}$.
- $Y_{1}, Y_{2}, \ldots, Y_{n}$ is a random sample from a population with mean $\mu_{2}$ and variance $\sigma_{2}^{2}$.
- The $X$ and $Y$ samples are independent of each other.

Compute (in terms of $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}, m, n$ )
(a) $E[\bar{X}-\bar{Y}]$
(b) $\operatorname{Var}[\bar{X}-\bar{Y}]$ and $\sigma_{\bar{X}-\bar{Y}}$

## Properties of $\bar{X}-\bar{Y}$

## Proposition

The expected value of $X-Y$ is $\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}$, so $X-Y$ is an unbiased estimator of $\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}$. The standard deviation of $\bar{X}-\bar{Y}$ is

$$
\sigma_{\bar{X}-\bar{Y}}=\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}
$$

## Chapter 8: Confidence intervals

Assume further that the distributions of $X$ and $Y$ are normal and $\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}$ are known:

## Problem

(a) What is the distribution of

$$
\frac{(\bar{X}-\bar{Y})-\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}}
$$

(b) Compute

$$
P\left[-1.96 \leq \frac{(\bar{X}-\bar{Y})-\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}} \leq 1.96\right]
$$

(c) Construct a $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ for $\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}$ (in terms of $\bar{x}, \bar{y}, m, n, \sigma_{1}$, $\sigma_{2}$ ).

## Confidence intervals

When both population distributions are normal, standardizing $\bar{X}-\bar{Y}$ gives a random variable $Z$ with a standard normal distribution. Since the area under the $z$ curve between $-z_{\alpha / 2}$ and $z_{\alpha / 2}$ is $1-\alpha$, it follows that

$$
P\left(-z_{\alpha / 2}<\frac{\bar{X}-\bar{Y}-\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}}<z_{\alpha / 2}\right)=1-\alpha
$$

Manipulation of the inequalities inside the parentheses to isolate $\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}$ yields the equivalent probability statement

$$
P\left(\bar{X}-\bar{Y}-z_{\alpha / 2} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}<\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}<\bar{X}-\bar{Y}+z_{\alpha / 2} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}\right)=1-\alpha
$$

- Setting: independent normal random samples $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{m}$ and $Y_{1}, Y_{2}, \ldots, Y_{n}$ with known values of $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$. Constant $\Delta_{0}$.
- Null hypothesis:

$$
H_{0}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}=\Delta_{0}
$$

- Alternative hypothesis:
(a) $H_{a}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}>\Delta_{0}$
(b) $H_{a}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}<\Delta_{0}$
(c) $H_{a}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2} \neq \Delta_{0}$
- When $\Delta=0$, the test (c) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{0}: \mu_{1}=\mu_{2} \\
& H_{a}: \mu_{1} \neq \mu_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Testing the difference between two population means

## Proposition

Null hypothesis: $H_{0}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}=\Delta_{0}$
Test statistic value: $z=\frac{\bar{x}-\bar{y}-\Delta_{0}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}}$

## Alternative Hypothesis

$H_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}>\Delta_{0}$
$H_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}<\Delta_{0}$
$H_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2} \neq \Delta_{0}$
$z \geq z_{\alpha}$ (upper-tailed test)
Rejection Region for Level $\alpha$ Test
$z \leq-z_{\alpha}$ (lower-tailed test)
either $z \geq z_{\alpha / 2}$ or $z \leq-z_{\alpha / 2}$ (two-tailed test)

## Sample solution

1. The parameter of interest is $\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}$, the difference between true mean GPA for the $<10$ (conceptual) population and true mean GPA for the $\geq 10$ population.
2. The null hypothesis is $H_{0}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}=0$.
3. The alternative hypothesis is $H_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2} \neq 0$; if $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ is true then $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$ are different. Although it would seem unlikely that $\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}>0$ (those with low study hours have higher mean GPA) we will allow it as a possibility and do a two-tailed test.
4. With $\Delta_{0}=0$, the test statistic value is

$$
z=\frac{\bar{x}-\bar{y}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}}
$$

5. The inequality in $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ implies that the test is two-tailed. For $\alpha=.05, \alpha / 2=.025$ and $z_{\alpha / 2}=z_{.025}=1.96$. $H_{0}$ will be rejected if $z \geq 1.96$ or $z \leq-1.96$.

## Solution

6. Substituting $m=10, \bar{x}=2.97, \sigma_{1}^{2}=.36, n=11, \bar{y}=3.06$, and $\sigma_{2}^{2}=.36$ into the formula for $z$ yields

$$
z=\frac{2.97-3.06}{\sqrt{\frac{.36}{10}+\frac{.36}{11}}}=\frac{-.09}{.262}=-.34
$$

That is, the value of $\bar{x}-\bar{y}$ is only one-third of a standard deviation below what would be expected when $H_{0}$ is true.
7. Because the value of $z$ is not even close to the rejection region, there is no reason to reject the null hypothesis. This test shows no evidence of any relationship between study hours and GPA.

- Central Limit Theorem: $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{Y}$ are approximately normal when $n>30 \rightarrow$ so is $\bar{X}-\bar{Y}$. Thus

$$
\frac{(\bar{X}-\bar{Y})-\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}}
$$

is approximately standard normal

- When $n$ is sufficiently large $S_{1} \approx \sigma_{1}$ and $S_{2} \approx \sigma_{2}$
- Conclusion:

$$
\frac{(\bar{X}-\bar{Y})-\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{S_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{S_{2}^{2}}{n}}}
$$

is approximately standard normal when $n$ is sufficiently large
If $m, n>40$, we can ignore the normal assumption and replace $\sigma$ by $S$

## Large-sample tests

## Proposition

Use of the test statistic value

$$
z=\frac{\bar{x}-\bar{y}-\Delta_{0}}{\sqrt{\frac{s_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{s_{2}^{2}}{n}}}
$$

along with the previously stated upper-, lower-, and two-tailed rejection regions based on $z$ critical values gives large-sample tests whose significance levels are approximately $\alpha$. These tests are usually appropriate if both $m>40$ and $n>40$. A $P$-value is computed exactly as it was for our earlier $z$ tests.

## Large-sample Cls

## Proposition

Provided that $m$ and $n$ are both large, a CI for $\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}$ with a confidence level of approximately $100(1-\alpha) \%$ is

$$
\bar{x}-\bar{y} \pm z_{\alpha / 2} \sqrt{\frac{s_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{s_{2}^{2}}{n}}
$$

where - gives the lower limit and + the upper limit of the interval. An upper or lower confidence bound can also be calculated by retaining the appropriate sign and replacing $z_{\alpha / 2}$ by $z_{\alpha}$.

## Example

## Example

Let $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$ denote true average tread lives for two competing brands of size P205/65R15 radial tires.
(a) Test

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{0}: \mu_{1}=\mu_{2} \\
& H_{a}: \mu_{1} \neq \mu_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

at level 0.05 using the following data: $m=45, \bar{x}=42,500$, $s_{1}=2200, n=45, \bar{y}=40,400$, and $s_{2}=1900$.
(b) Construct a $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ for $\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}$.

The two-sample $t$ test and confidence interval

## Remember Chapter 8?

- Section 8.1
- Normal distribution
- $\sigma$ is known
- Section 8.2
- Normal distribution
$\rightarrow$ Using Central Limit Theorem $\rightarrow$ needs $n>30$
- $\sigma$ is known
$\rightarrow$ needs $n>40$
- Section 8.3
- Normal distribution
- $\sigma$ is known
- $n$ is small
$\rightarrow$ Introducing $t$-distribution


## Principles

- For one-sample inferences:

$$
\frac{\bar{X}-\mu}{S / \sqrt{n}} \sim t_{n-1}
$$

- For two-sample inferences:

$$
\frac{(\bar{X}-\bar{Y})-\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{S_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{S_{2}^{2}}{n}}} \sim t_{\nu}
$$

where $\nu$ is some appropriate degree of freedom (which depends on $m$ and $n$ ).

## 2-sample $t$ test: degree of freedom

THEOREM When the population distributions are both normal, the standardized variable

$$
\begin{equation*}
T=\frac{X-Y-\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{S_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{S_{2}^{2}}{n}}} \tag{10.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

has approximately a $t$ distribution with df $v$ estimated from the data by

$$
v=\frac{\left(\frac{s_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{s_{2}^{2}}{n}\right)^{2}}{\frac{\left(s_{1}^{2} / m\right)^{2}}{m-1}+\frac{\left(s_{2}^{2} / n\right)^{2}}{n-1}}=\frac{\left[\left(s e_{1}\right)^{2}+\left(s e_{2}\right)^{2}\right]^{2}}{\frac{\left(s e_{1}\right)^{4}}{m-1}+\frac{\left(s e_{2}\right)^{4}}{n-1}}
$$

where

$$
s e_{1}=\frac{s_{1}}{\sqrt{m}} \quad s e_{2}=\frac{s_{2}}{\sqrt{n}}
$$

(round $v$ down to the nearest integer).

## Cls for difference of the two population means

The two-sample $\boldsymbol{t}$ confidence interval for $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{1}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_{2}$ with confidence level $100(1-\alpha) \%$ is then

$$
\bar{x}-\bar{y} \pm t_{\alpha / 2, v} \sqrt{\frac{s_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{s_{2}^{2}}{n}}
$$

A one-sided confidence bound can be calculated as described earlier.

## 2-sample t procedures

The two-sample $\boldsymbol{t}$ test for testing $H_{0}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}=\Delta_{0}$ is as follows:

$$
\text { Test statistic value: } t=\frac{\bar{x}-\bar{y}-\Delta_{0}}{\sqrt{\frac{s_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{s_{2}^{2}}{n}}}
$$

## Alternative Hypothesis Rejection Region for Approximate Level $\alpha$ Test

$H_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}>\Delta_{0} \quad t \geq t_{\alpha, v}$ (upper-tailed test)
$H_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}<\Delta_{0} \quad t \leq-t_{\alpha, v}$ (lower-tailed test)
$H_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2} \neq \Delta_{0} \quad$ either $t \geq t_{\alpha / 2, v}$ or $t \leq-t_{\alpha / 2, v}$ (two-tailed test)
A $P$-value can be computed as described in Section 9.4 for the one-sample $t$ test.

## Example

## Example

A paper reported the following data on tensile strength (psi) of liner specimens both when a certain fusion process was used and when this process was not used:

| No fusion | 2748 | 2700 | 2655 | 2822 | 2511 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 3149 | 3257 | 3213 | 3220 | 2753 |  |  |  |
|  | $m=10$ | $\bar{x}=2902.8$ | $s_{1}=277.3$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fused | 3027 | 3356 | 3359 | 3297 | 3125 | 2910 | 2889 | 2902 |
|  | $n=8$ | $\bar{y}=3108.1$ | $s_{2}=205.9$ |  |  |  |  |  |

The authors of the article stated that the fusion process increased the average tensile strength. With confidence level $\alpha=0.05$, carry out a test of hypotheses to see whether the data supports this conclusion (and provide the P -value of the test)

Table A. 5 Critical Values for $t$ Distributions

$\alpha$

| $\nu$ | .10 | . 05 | . 025 | . 01 | . 005 | . 001 | . 0005 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3.078 | 6.314 | 12.706 | 31.821 | 63.657 | 318.31 | 636.62 |
| 2 | 1.886 | 2.920 | 4.303 | 6.965 | 9.925 | 22.326 | 31.598 |
| 3 | 1.638 | 2.353 | 3.182 | 4.541 | 5.841 | 10.213 | 12.924 |
| 4 | 1.533 | 2.132 | 2.776 | 3.747 | 4.604 | 7.173 | 8.610 |
| 5 | 1.476 | 2.015 | 2.571 | 3.365 | 4.032 | 5.893 | 6.869 |
| 6 | 1.440 | 1.943 | 2.447 | 3.143 | 3.707 | 5.208 | 5.959 |
| 7 | 1.415 | 1.895 | 2.365 | 2.998 | 3.499 | 4.785 | 5.408 |
| 8 | 1.397 | 1.860 | 2.306 | 2.896 | 3.355 | 4.501 | 5.041 |
| 9 | 1.383 | 1.833 | 2.262 | 2.821 | 3.250 | 4.297 | 4.781 |
| 10 | 1.372 | 1.812 | 2.228 | 2.764 | 3.169 | 4.144 | 4.587 |
| 11 | 1.363 | 1.796 | 2.201 | 2.718 | 3.106 | 4.025 | 4.437 |
| 12 | 1.356 | 1.782 | 2.179 | 2.681 | 3.055 | 3.930 | 4.318 |
| 13 | 1.350 | 1.771 | 2.160 | 2.650 | 3.012 | 3.852 | 4.221 |
| 14 | 1.345 | 1.761 | 2.145 | 2.624 | 2.977 | 3.787 | 4.140 |
| 15 | 1.341 | 1.753 | 2.131 | 2.602 | 2.947 | 3.733 | 4.073 |
| 16 | 1.337 | 1.746 | 2.120 | 2.583 | 2.921 | 3.686 | 4.015 |
| 17 | 1.333 | 1.740 | 2.110 | 2.567 | 2.898 | 3.646 | 3.965 |
| 18 | 1.330 | 1.734 | 2.101 | 2.552 | 2.878 | 3.610 | 3.922 |
| 19 | 1.328 | 1.729 | 2.093 | 2.539 | 2.861 | 3.579 | 3.883 |
| 20 | 1.325 | 1.725 | 2.086 | 2.528 | 2.845 | 3.552 | 3.850 |
| 21 | 1.323 | 1.721 | 2.080 | 2.518 | 2.831 | 3.527 | 3.819 |
| 22 | 1.321 | 1.717 | 2.074 | 2.508 | 2.819 | 3.505 | 3.792 |
| 23 | 1.319 | 1.714 | 2.069 | 2.500 | 2.807 | 3.485 | 3.767 |
| 24 | 1.318 | 1.711 | 2.064 | 2.492 | 2.797 | 3.467 | 3.745 |

Mathematical statistics

## Solution

1. Let $\mu_{1}$ be the true average tensile strength of specimens when the no-fusion treatment is used and $\mu_{2}$ denote the true average tensile strength when the fusion treatment is used.
2. $H_{0}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}=0$ (no difference in the true average tensile strengths for the two treatments)
3. $H_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1}-\mu_{2}<0$ (true average tensile strength for the no-fusion treatment is less than that for the fusion treatment, so that the investigators' conclusion is correct)
4. The null value is $\Delta_{0}=0$, so the test statistic is

$$
t=\frac{\bar{x}-\bar{y}}{\sqrt{\frac{s_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{s_{2}^{2}}{n}}}
$$

5. We now compute both the test statistic value and the df for the test:

$$
t=\frac{2902.8-3108.1}{\sqrt{\frac{277.3^{2}}{10}+\frac{205.9^{2}}{8}}}=\frac{-205.3}{113.97}=-1.8
$$

Using $s_{1}^{2} / m=7689.529$ and $s_{2}^{2} / n=5299.351$,

$$
v=\frac{(7689.529+5299.351)^{2}}{\frac{(7689.529)^{2}}{9}+\frac{(5299.351)^{2}}{7}}=\frac{168,711,004}{10,581,747}=15.94
$$

so the test will be based on 15 df .

## Example

The following data summarizes the proportional stress limits for specimens constructed using two different types of wood:

| Type of wood | Sample size | Sample mean | Sample sd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red oak | 14 | 8.48 | 0.79 |
| Douglas fir | 10 | 6.65 | 1.28 |

Assuming that both samples were selected from normal distributions, carry out a test of hypotheses with significance level $\alpha=0.05$ to decide whether the true average proportional stress limit for red oak joints exceeds that for Douglas fir joints by more than 1 MPa . Provide the P -value of the test.

## Chi-squared distribution

## Proposition

- If $Z$ has standard normal distribution $\mathcal{Z}(0,1)$ and $X=Z^{2}$, then $X$ has Chi-squared distribution with 1 degree of freedom, i.e. $X \sim \chi_{1}^{2}$ distribution.
- If $Z_{1}, Z_{2}, \ldots, Z_{n}$ are independent and each has the standard normal distribution, then

$$
Z_{1}^{2}+Z_{2}^{2}+\ldots+Z_{n}^{2} \sim \chi_{n}^{2}
$$

## Definition

Let $Z$ be a standard normal $r v$ and let $W$ be a $\chi_{\nu}^{2} r v$ independent of $Z$. Then the $t$ distribution with degrees of freedom $\nu$ is defined to be the distribution of the ratio

$$
T=\frac{Z}{\sqrt{W / \nu}}
$$

Definition of $t$ distributions:

$$
\frac{Z}{\sqrt{W / \nu}} \sim t_{\nu}
$$

Our statistic:

$$
\frac{(\bar{X}-\bar{Y})-\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{S_{1}^{2}}{m}}+\frac{S_{2}^{2}}{n}}=\frac{\left[(\bar{X}-\bar{Y})-\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{2}\right)\right] / \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{S_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{S_{2}^{2}}{n}\right) /\left(\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}\right)}}
$$

What we need:

$$
\left(\frac{S_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{S_{2}^{2}}{n}\right) /\left(\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}\right)=\frac{W}{\nu}
$$

## Quick maths

- What we need:

$$
\left(\frac{S_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{S_{2}^{2}}{n}\right)=\left(\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}\right) \frac{W}{\nu}
$$

- What we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - } E[W]=\nu, \operatorname{Var}[W]=2 \nu \\
& \text { - } E\left[S_{1}^{2}\right]=\sigma_{1}^{2}, \operatorname{Var}\left[S_{1}^{2}\right]=2 \sigma_{1}^{4} /(m-1) \\
& \text { - } E\left[S_{2}^{2}\right]=\sigma_{2}^{2}, \operatorname{Var}\left[S_{2}^{2}\right]=2 \sigma_{2}^{4} /(n-1)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Variance of the LHS

$$
\operatorname{Var}\left[\frac{S_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{S_{2}^{2}}{n}\right]=\frac{2 \sigma_{1}^{4}}{(m-1) m^{2}}+\frac{2 \sigma_{2}^{4}}{(n-1) n^{2}}
$$

- Variance of the RHS

$$
\operatorname{Var}\left[\left(\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}\right) \frac{W}{\nu}\right]=\left(\frac{\sigma_{1}^{2}}{m}+\frac{\sigma_{2}^{2}}{n}\right)^{2} \frac{2 \nu}{\nu^{2}}
$$

