Lecture 10: Chapter 10

C C Moxley

UAB Mathematics

15 March 16

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

In Chapter 9, we talked about pairing data in a "natural" way. In this Chapter, we will essentially be discussing whether these "natural" parings are useful or not.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

In Chapter 9, we talked about pairing data in a "natural" way. In this Chapter, we will essentially be discussing whether these "natural" parings are useful or not. Mainly, we'll be using the notion of correlation to do so.

In Chapter 9, we talked about pairing data in a "natural" way. In this Chapter, we will essentially be discussing whether these "natural" parings are useful or not. Mainly, we'll be using the notion of correlation to do so.

We will also look at ways of predicting values based on linear models arising from samples - this is called **linear regression**.

In Chapter 9, we talked about pairing data in a "natural" way. In this Chapter, we will essentially be discussing whether these "natural" parings are useful or not. Mainly, we'll be using the notion of correlation to do so.

We will also look at ways of predicting values based on linear models arising from samples - this is called **linear regression**. We'll also discuss methods for determining how much these predicted values may vary from the actual value.

Two variables are correlated when the values of one variable are somehow associated with the values of the other variable.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Two variables are correlated when the values of one variable are somehow associated with the values of the other variable.

Definition (Linear Correlation)

A linear correlation exists between two variables when the correlation between the two variables can be expressed as a line.

Two variables are correlated when the values of one variable are somehow associated with the values of the other variable.

Definition (Linear Correlation)

A linear correlation exists between two variables when the correlation between the two variables can be expressed as a line. This can also be seen on a scatter plot.

Two variables are correlated when the values of one variable are somehow associated with the values of the other variable.

Definition (Linear Correlation)

A linear correlation exists between two variables when the correlation between the two variables can be expressed as a line. This can also be seen on a scatter plot.

Note: Correlation does not imply causation!

Are the following variables (one on the *x*-axis and the other on the *y*-axis) correlated?



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Are the following variables (one on the *x*-axis and the other on the *y*-axis) correlated?



▲ロト ▲御 ト ▲ 臣 ト ▲ 臣 ト の Q @

Are the following variables (one on the *x*-axis and the other on the *y*-axis) correlated?



▲ロト ▲御 ト ▲ 臣 ト ▲ 臣 ト の Q @

For a linear correlation, we can measure the "strength" of the correlation using the **linear correlation coefficient** r.

Definition (The Linear Correlation Coefficient r)

$$r = \frac{n\sum(xy) - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{n(\sum x^2) - (\sum x)^2} \cdot \sqrt{n(\sum y^2) - (\sum y)^2}}$$
$$r = \frac{\sum(z_x z_y)}{n - 1}$$

For a linear correlation, we can measure the "strength" of the correlation using the **linear correlation coefficient** r.

Definition (The Linear Correlation Coefficient r)

$$r = \frac{n\sum(xy) - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{n(\sum x^2) - (\sum x)^2} \cdot \sqrt{n(\sum y^2) - (\sum y)^2}}$$
$$r = \frac{\sum(z_x z_y)}{n - 1}$$

Note: The paired data must be a simple random sample of quantitative data whose scatter plot demonstrates an approximate straightline pattern with outliers arising from known errors in sampling removed. Determining if r is significant depends on Table A-6 on page 732 in your text. It will give you the critical values for ρ , the population parameter corresponding to r.

Determining if r is significant depends on Table A-6 on page 732 in your text. It will give you the critical values for ρ , the population parameter corresponding to r. The null hypothesis for determining a linear relationship is always given as below.

 $H_0: \rho = 0$ $H_1: \rho \neq 0$

Determining if r is significant depends on Table A-6 on page 732 in your text. It will give you the critical values for ρ , the population parameter corresponding to r. The null hypothesis for determining a linear relationship is always given as below.

 $H_0:\rho=0$

 $H_1: \rho \neq 0$

Always reject the null hypothesis if |r| is greater than your critical value. If the sample size *n* falls between points in the table, you can interpolate the critical value. And if it exceeds the values in the table, you can use technology to perform a *P*-test on this null hypothesis.

§10.2 Example

For a sample of 12 men, the circumference of their waists (measured in inches) was found to have a correlation coefficient r = -0.75 when paired against the distance they could walk in five minutes. Is there evidence to support the claim that the two data points are linearly correlated if we use a significance level of 0.01?

§10.2 Example

For a sample of 12 men, the circumference of their waists (measured in inches) was found to have a correlation coefficient r = -0.75 when paired against the distance they could walk in five minutes. Is there evidence to support the claim that the two data points are linearly correlated if we use a significance level of 0.01?

n	$\alpha = .05$	a = .01
4	.950	.990
5	.878	.959
6	.811	.917
7	.754	.875
8	.707	.834
9	.666	.798
10	.632	.765
11	.602	.735
12	.576	.708
13	.553	.684
14	.532	.661
15	.514	.641
16	.497	.623
17	.482	.606
18	.468	.590
19	.456	.575
20	.444	.561
25	.396	.505
30	.361	.463
35	.335	.430
40	.312	.402
45	.294	.378
50	.279	.361
60	.254	.330

For a sample of 12 men, the circumference of their waists (measured in inches) was found to have a correlation coefficient r = -0.75 when paired against the distance they could walk in five minutes. Is there evidence to support the claim that the two data points are linearly correlated if we use a significance level of 0.01?

So yes, there is evidence to support that there is a linear correlation between the two pieces of data because |r| > 0.708, meaning we reject the null hypothesis that $\rho = 0$.

x	7	8	10	5	11	9	4	4	2
y	6.42	7.48	9.3	5	10.98	8.29	3.82	8.22	1.9

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

X	7	8	10	5	11	9	4	4	2
y	6.42	7.48	9.3	5	10.98	8.29	3.82	8.22	1.9

Simple linear regression results:

Dependent Variabie: y Independent Variabie: x y = 1.4961404 + 0.79907895 x Sample size: 9 R (correlation coefficient) = 0.86611165 R-sq = 0.75014939 Estimate of error standard deviation: 1.5195458

Parameter estimates:

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Err.	Alternative	DF	T-Stat	P-value
Intercept	1.4961404	1.2676204	≠ 0	7	1.1802748	0.2764
Slope	0.79907895	0.17430385	≠ 0	7	4.584402	0.0025

x	7	8	10	5	11		9	4	4	2		
y	6.42	7.48	9.3	5 1	0.98	8.	.29	3.82	8.22	1.9		
	Simple linear regression results: Dependent Variable: y Independent Variable: x y = 1.4061(Adv + 0.79907895 x Sample size: 9 R (correlation coefficient) = 0.86611165 R-sq = 0.75014939 Estimate of error standard deviation: 1.5195458 Parameter estimates:											
		Parame	ter Estimat	Std. Err.	Alternative	DF	T-Stat	P-value				
		Intercep	t 1.49614	1.267620	4 ≠ 0	71	1.1802748	0.2764				
		Slope	0.799078	0.1743038	5 ≠ 0	7	4.584402	0.0025				

This yields r = 0.8661, and since the critical value for n = 9 is 0.798, we have evidence to support that there is a linear correlation between the two variables.

x	7	8	10	5	11	9)	4	4	2		
y	6.42	7.48	9.3	5 10).98	8.2	29	3.82	8.22	1.9		
	Simple linear regression results: Dependent Variable: y Independent Variable: x y = 1.4961.040 + 0.79907895 x Sample size: 9 R (correlation coefficient) = 0.86611165 R-sq = 0.75014939 Estimate of error standard deviation: 1.5195458 Parameter estimates:											
		Parame	ter Estimate	Std. Err.	Alternative	DF T	-Stat	P-value				
		Intercep	t 1.496140	4 1.2676204	≠ 0	7 1.1	802748	0.2764				
		Slope	0.7990789	5 0.17430385	≠ 0	7 4.	.584402	0.0025				

This yields r = 0.8661, and since the critical value for n = 9 is 0.798, we have evidence to support that there is a linear correlation between the two variables. We could also have used the P-test and seen that the *P*-value for the **slope** is 0.0025, which is less that $\alpha = 0.01$, telling us that we should reject our null hypothesis p = 0.



Notice, the scatter plot confirms this linear correlation with a single outlier. It's important to look at the scatter plot to determine if the correlation is actually linear!

Definition (Regression Line)

The regression line (or least-squares line or best fit line) is the straight line that best fits the scatter plot of the data. It's given in equation form often.

$$\hat{y} = b_0 + b_1 x$$

Definition (Regression Line)

The regression line (or least-squares line or best fit line) is the straight line that best fits the scatter plot of the data. It's given in equation form often.

$$\hat{y} = b_0 + b_1 x$$

The sum of the squares of the distances from this line to all the points in the scatter point is minimum, i.e. any other line will have larger distances in the sum-of-squares sense.

Definition (Regression Line)

The regression line (or least-squares line or best fit line) is the straight line that best fits the scatter plot of the data. It's given in equation form often.

$$\hat{y} = b_0 + b_1 x$$

The sum of the squares of the distances from this line to all the points in the scatter point is minimum, i.e. any other line will have larger distances in the sum-of-squares sense.

There are lovely equations for b_0 and b_1 on page 518 on your text, but I will be using technology to compute b_0 and b_1 .

$\S10.3$ Example

For the data, find the equation of the regression line.

х	7	8	10	5	11	9	4	4	2
y	6.42	7.48	9.3	5	10.98	8.29	3.82	8.22	1.9

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

§10.3 Example

For the data, find the equation of the regression line.

x	7	8	10	5	11	9	4	4	2
y	6.42	7.48	9.3	5	10.98	8.29	3.82	8.22	1.9

Simple linear regression results: Dependent Variable: y Independent Variable: x y = 1.4961404 + 0.79907895 xSample size: 9 R (correlation coefficient) = 0.86611165 R-sq = 0.75014939

Estimate of error standard deviation: 1.5195458

Parameter estimates:

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Err.	Alternative	DF	T-Stat	P-value
Intercept	1.4961404	1.2676204	≠ 0	7	1.1802748	0.2764
Slope	0.79907895	0.17430385	≠ 0	7	4.584402	0.0025

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ★ □▶ ★ □▶ = □ ● ● ●

§10.3 Example

For the data, find the equation of the regression line.

x	7	8	10	5	11	9	4	4	2
y	6.42	7.48	9.3	5	10.98	8.29	3.82	8.22	1.9

Simple linear regression results: Dependent Variable: y Independent Variable: x 9 = 1.4961404 + 0.79907895 x Sample size: 9 R (correlation coefficient) = 0.86611165 R-sq = 0.75014939 Estimate of error standard deviation: 1.5195458

Parameter estimates:

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Err.	Alternative	DF	T-Stat	P-value
Intercept	1.4961404	1.2676204	≠ 0	7	1.1802748	0.2764
Slope	0.79907895	0.17430385	≠ 0	7	4.584402	0.0025

From the output table, we get that the equation is

$$\hat{y} = 1.49 + 0.799x.$$

§10.3 Example

For the data, find the equation of the regression line.

x	7	8	10	5	11	9	4	4	2
y	6.42	7.48	9.3	5	10.98	8.29	3.82	8.22	1.9

Simple linear regression results: Dependent Variable: y Independent Variable: X 9 = 1.4961404 + 0.79907895 × Sample size: 9 R (correlation coefficient) = 0.86611165 R-sq = 0.75014939 Estimate of error standard deviation: 1.5195458

Parameter estimates:

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Err.	Alternative	DF	T-Stat	P-value
Intercept	1.4961404	1.2676204	≠ 0	7	1.1802748	0.2764
Slope	0.79907895	0.17430385	≠ 0	7	4.584402	0.0025

From the output table, we get that the equation is

$$\hat{y} = 1.49 + 0.799x.$$

Thus, $b_0 = 1.49$ and $b_1 = 0.799$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

You can use the regression line to extrapolate/interpolate corresponding values - simply plug in.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

You can use the regression line to extrapolate/interpolate corresponding values - simply plug in. There are limitations to extrapolation - you want to make sure that the value you're plugging in isn't too far from the observed values.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

You can use the regression line to extrapolate/interpolate corresponding values - simply plug in. There are limitations to extrapolation - you want to make sure that the value you're plugging in isn't too far from the observed values.

Definition (Marginal Change)

When two variables are related by a regression line, the marginal change in a variable is the amount that the output changes when the input is increased by exactly one unit.

You can use the regression line to extrapolate/interpolate corresponding values - simply plug in. There are limitations to extrapolation - you want to make sure that the value you're plugging in isn't too far from the observed values.

Definition (Marginal Change)

When two variables are related by a regression line, the marginal change in a variable is the amount that the output changes when the input is increased by exactly one unit.

Definition (Outlier/Influential Point)

In a scatter plot, an outlier is a point lying far from the others. An influential point is one which greatly affects the regression line.
§10.3 Example

Use the equation of the regression line to estimate the value of \hat{y} when x is 6 (using our previous example).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Well, we simply plug in!

$$\hat{y} = 1.49 + 0.799(6) = 6.284.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Well, we simply plug in!

$$\hat{y} = 1.49 + 0.799(6) = 6.284.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

What's the marginal change?

Well, we simply plug in!

$$\hat{y} = 1.49 + 0.799(6) = 6.284.$$

What's the marginal change? It's the slope! Were there any influential points?



Well, we simply plug in!

$$\hat{y} = 1.49 + 0.799(6) = 6.284.$$

What's the marginal change? It's the slope! Were there any influential points?



$\S10.4$ Prediction Intervals and Variation

Definition (Prediction Interval)

A range of values used to estimate a dependent variable is called a prediction interval.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Definition (Prediction Interval)

A range of values used to estimate a dependent variable is called a prediction interval.

To construct a prediction interval from a regression line, we simply calculate the following.

$$\hat{y} - E < y < \hat{y} + E,$$

where \hat{y} is the point estimate obtained from the regression line and E is given by

$$E = t_{\alpha/2} s_e \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{n(x - \bar{x})^2}{n(\sum x^2) - (\sum x)^2}}.$$

The standard error of estimate s_e can be calculated in StatCrunch or by using formulas 10-5 or 10-6 on page 532.

$$E = (4.0322)(0.11)\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{7} + \frac{7(1.3 - 1.046)^2}{7(9.6) - (6.05)^2}} = 0.477.$$

$$E = (4.0322)(0.11)\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{7} + \frac{7(1.3 - 1.046)^2}{7(9.6) - (6.05)^2}} = 0.477.$$

Also $\hat{y} = 0.033 + 0.91(1.3) = 1.216$.

$$E = (4.0322)(0.11)\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{7} + \frac{7(1.3 - 1.046)^2}{7(9.6) - (6.05)^2}} = 0.477.$$

Also $\hat{y} = 0.033 + 0.91(1.3) = 1.216$. So our prediction interval is (0.739, 1.693).

Definition (Coefficient of Determination)

The coefficient of determination is given by r^2 . But it can also be calculated by the ratio $r^2 = \frac{\text{explained variation}}{\text{total variation}}$.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Definition (Coefficient of Determination)

The coefficient of determination is given by r^2 . But it can also be calculated by the ratio $r^2 = \frac{\text{explained variation}}{\text{total variation}}$.

The total deviation $(y - \bar{y})$ is the vertical distance between the point (x, y) and the horizontal line passing through the sample mean \bar{y} . The explained deviation $(\hat{y} - \bar{y})$ is the distance between the point \hat{y} and \bar{y} . The unexplained deviation $(y - \hat{y})$ is the distance between the point \hat{y} and the y. See Formula 10-7 on page 535.

x	7	8	10	5	11	9	4	4	2
y	6.42	7.48	9.3	5	10.98	8.29	3.82	8.22	1.9

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

We get the explained variation as 48.53, the total variation as 64.69, and the prediction interval as (-0.1845, 7.9713).

We get the explained variation as 48.53, the total variation as 64.69, and the prediction interval as (-0.1845, 7.9713). Also, $r^2 = 0.750$, so 75% of the variation can be explained by the linear relationship between the two variables.

We get the explained variation as 48.53, the total variation as 64.69, and the prediction interval as (-0.1845, 7.9713). Also, $r^2 = 0.750$, so 75% of the variation can be explained by the linear relationship between the two variables. When going from r^2 to r, make sure to give r the sign of the slope of the regression line!

It's important to remember that the regression line does not **always** give the best predicted value \hat{y} for a value x. This is only the case when the hypothesis test suggests that the paired data is linearly correlated! If they are not linearly correlated, the best predicted value for **any** value x is the mean of the y-values, i.e. $\hat{y} = \bar{y}$.

We conduct a hypothesis test for correlation and find that r = -0.46. What proportion of the total variation can is unexplained? Explained?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

The following tables give the total enrollment (in thousands) of a university and the number of crime on campus. Determine the best predicted value for the number of crimes on a campus with 33000 students enrolled.

Enrollment	32	31	53	28	27	36	42	30	34	46
Crimes	103	103	86	57	32	131	157	20	27	161

A sample of 20 people was taken to determine if the minutes spent on a treadmill was correlated with blood sugar levels. The sample resulted in a correlation coefficient of 0.52. If we use $\alpha = 0.01$, can we say that minutes spent on a treadmill and blood sugar levels are correlated?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

A sample of 20 people was taken to determine if the minutes spent on a treadmill was correlated with blood sugar levels. The sample resulted in a correlation coefficient of 0.52. If we use $\alpha = 0.01$, can we say that minutes spent on a treadmill and blood sugar levels are correlated? What else might be nice to know to verify this correlation?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

A sample of 20 people was taken to determine if the minutes spent on a treadmill was correlated with blood sugar levels. The sample resulted in a correlation coefficient of 0.52. If we use $\alpha = 0.01$, can we say that minutes spent on a treadmill and blood sugar levels are correlated? What else might be nice to know to verify this correlation? You'd like to investigate the scatterplot!



Which of the following is the best example of a null hypothesis?



Which of the following is the best example of a null hypothesis?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- The probability of committing a Type-II Error.
- The population mean is greater than 10.
- The sample mean is 10.
- The population mean is 10.

For the following claim, would supporting the claim be equivalent to rejecting or failing to reject the null hypothesis? Claim: The standard deviation of the weights of cats is no more than 3 ounces.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Say you want to test with 5% significance the claim that the standard deviation of the weights of cats is no more than three ounces. After conducting the test, you find that your *P*-value is 0.045. Does this mean that you support your claim or that you do not support your claim?

Say you want to test with 98% confidence that the standard deviation of the weights of cats is no more than three ounces. If you want to test this claim with a confidence interval, how much area would be under the curve between the lower and the upper bounds of the confidence interval?

Say you want to test with 98% confidence that the standard deviation of the weights of cats is no more than three ounces. If you want to test this claim with a confidence interval, how much area would be under the curve between the lower and the upper bounds of the confidence interval? After constructing this appropriate confidence interval, you get (2.90, 3.01). Do you fail to reject or reject your null hypothesis? Do you support your claim?

We want to test the claim that watching TV negatively impacts cognitive function. We ask 25 test subjects to perform a cognitive task before and after watching 30 minutes of TV and subtract the time spent of the first task from the time spent on the second task. We get a test statistic of -2.04. Do we reject or fail to reject our null hypothesis? Do we support our claim or not? Use significance of $\alpha = 0.02$.



Describe in words what a 90% Cl for a population proportion is.





When do critical value tests include one critical value? Two? What gets compared to the critical values?





Make sure to spend time learning the requirements for each type of hypothesis test.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Make sure to spend time learning the requirements for each type of hypothesis test. Be able to articulate the difference between confidence interval tests, *P*-value tests, and critical value(s) tests. You may also want to go through the mastery questions in the lecture slides from the chapters covered.

If your *P*-value is 0.005, you're probably going to reject the null hypothesis. What's the probability of making a Type-I error in this case?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 三臣 - のへで



What's the most general form for the formula for the margin of error?




What's needed to calculate a critical value?





How can you reduce the size of the margin of error?



Why would we use a t distribution rather than a z distribution when we produce a confidence interval for a population mean? Why is this necessary?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ



What is the assumption we use when doing a test of significance?

