EDP308: STATISTICAL LITERACY

The University of Texas at Austin, Fall 2020 RAZ: Rebecca A. Zárate, MA

Overview

- Recap on Formulating Hypotheses
 - And draw the picture!
- Level of Significance
- Choosing a Statistical Test
- □ Find the Critical Values ("Cut Offs")
- Calculate the Test Statistic
- □ State a Conclusion
- Hypothesis Testing in R

Recap Hypothesis Formulation

- Hypotheses always comes in pairs
 - The Null and the Alternative
- \square Hypotheses are statements about the population, so you only use μ in the notation
- Hypotheses may be formulated to test either:
 - Two Tailed Test
 - No direction, only a difference of some sort
 - One Tailed Test
 - There is an assertion of direction, like greater or less than

Recap Hypothesis Formulation

Two Tailed Different Than

- *H*₀: There is no difference in □ this school's performance on the STAR test compared to national average (10).
- *H*₁: There IS a difference in this school's performance on the STAR test compared to national average (10).

One Tailed (Left) Less Than

- H_0 : This school's performance \Box on the STAR test is greater than or equal to the national average (10).
- □ H_1 : This school's performance □ on the STAR test is less the national average (10).

One Tailed (Right) Greater Than

- H_0 : This school's performance on the STAR test is less than or equal to the national average (10).
- H_1 : This school's performance on the STAR test is greater the national average (10).



Significance Test: Step by Step

A significance test about a hypothesis has six steps.

- 1. State the null and alternative hypotheses
 - And draw the picture!
- 2. Select a level of significance (α)
- 3. Choose a statistical test
- 4. Find the critical values
- 5. Compute the test statistic and the p-value
- 6. Formulate a decision (reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis)

Selecting a Level of Significance α

- Remember our 95% (or 90%, 99%) confidence level for our confidence intervals? What did that mean, again?
 - 95% or .95 = the proportion of the time that we capture the "truth" (the population parameter)
 - 95 out of 100 times we will capture it
 - 19 out of 20 times we will capture it

5% or .05 = the proportion of the time that we are willing to FAIL to capture the "truth"

- 5 out of 100 times we will FAIL to capture the truth
- 1 out of 20 times we will FAIL to capture the truth

The compliment to "confidence level" is the "level of significance."

- "How much of a risk are you willing to take about being wrong if you reject the null hypothesis?"
 - With a level of significant at .05, you risk being wrong 1 in 20 times or 5% of the time.
- □ Common Levels of Significance:
 - **5%** (.05) and 1% (.01)
 - More strict levels of significance (.01) for high stakes outcomes
 - Ex. Medical testing, infrastructure safety
 - Sometimes you see 10% (.10), but it's usually not accepted
 - \square Significance Levels are denoted at α (alpha)
 - Ex. *α* = .05
 - Same as 95% confidence level (1- α = Confidence Level)
 - Same as .05 significance level

- □ In hypothesis testing, we always assume the NULL hypothesis is true, then we test how likely it is we would see this sample mean \bar{x} if the null is true.
- Alpha level (α): Under the sampling distribution of H₀, we decide what proportion (ex. 5%) of sample means are too extreme, "unlikely enough."



- When you select a level of significance, and by extension your confidence level, you are defining the boundaries for what will be considered "unlikely enough" or "extreme enough" for us to reject the assumption we live in the NULL world.
 - Imagine one school had an average STAR test score that was way down here... Do you think everything is fine and it's just a fluke, they just happened to have such a low average, or would you reject the idea that everything is ok (the null) and maybe want to investigate further?



How Unlikely is "Unlikely Enough"?

You want to know whether getting tutoring in statistics will have an effect on your class grade (in GPA grading). The average grade in a statistics course is 3.0.

*H*₀: $\mu = 3.0$ *H*₁: $\mu \neq 3.0$

H₀: The average GPA for tutored students is 3.0.
H₁: The average GPA for tutored students is not 3.0. (Two-Tailed because no assertion of direction was made.)
Remember, even if the tutoring has no effect, the mean for the tutored group might not be exactly 3.0... What is 3.0 enough for us to conclude tutors has no effect?

What if your sample had an average GPA of 3.4? Do we reject H_0 ? What if your sample had an average GPA of 2.9? Do we reject H_0 ?

- □ Let's say the mean for the sample you collected was $\bar{x} = 3.4$ How likely is it that this observed sample value is....
 - An extreme value of the NULL distribution?
 - We would expect to happen by random chance ~5% of the time

OR

- A value from a truly different ALTERNATIVE distribution?
 - A reasonable mean value for a different alternative distribution of people
 - Ex. A different group of people
 - Tutored vs Non-Tutored



If the null were true, we would expect our sample means to be within a certain range → (ex. 2.8-3.2*)

If this were the case, how likely is it that I get a sample that is less than 2.8 or greater than 3.2?

What are the chances we get one of these?

*bounds are made up

 \Box Let's assume the NULL is true.

H₀: The average GPA for tutored students is 3.0.



What are the chances we get one of these?

If the Null were TRUE and we set our level of significance to .05, the chances of getting a sample mean that is lower than 2.8 or higher than 3.2 is **5%**. This would be a fluke under the null hypothesis.

Wisdom from Kevin Malone

"Here is a piece of trivia: A fluke is one of the most common fish in the sea. So if you go fishing for a fluke, chances are, you just might catch one."

Trivia, The Office: Season 8, Episode 11

Unfortunately, in the real world, we only take one sample...

How do we know if our sample is one of the 95% that is "correct" or one of those 5% of extremes that are "incorrect"?



We only see this...



And have no idea if it is really one of these...



Sadly, for the most part, we can never know for sure...

This is why we have to acknowledge our p-value (the probability of randomly getting one of those extreme cases if the NULL were true)

Maybe It's Extreme Null Value

- Maybe I just took a sample of people who would have done well without tutoring anyway, maybe I sampled some overachievers
- □ It could just be one of those extreme cases we expect to get 1 in 20 times (if $\alpha = .05$)

5% chance



Or Maybe It's From Somewhere Else...

- Maybe there is a different population... The population of those that got tutoring, and their average is higher than non-tutored.
- What is more likely, that you got one of those rare 5% extremely high means from the NULL (tutoring has no effect) world or that you got a reasonable mean for an ALTERNATIVE world?



The Essence of Hypothesis Testing

There a many different types of hypothesis testing, but this example highlights the essence of trying to determine if a certain result is a fluke or some sort of "real" difference all based on how likely something is.





Step 3: Choose a Statistical Test

- There are many different types of statistical tests out there. Which one you choose depends on:
 - 1) Your research question
 - 2) The data you have
 - Nominal data?
 - Quantitative data?
- Ideally, if you were a funded researcher formulating a study, you'd ask your question then determine how to collect the data you need
 - But sometimes you are stuck with a data set (maybe you didn't collect it) and will have to work with it

Step 3: Choose a Statistical Test

"What kind of test should you run given the data?"

Here are just a few... We will be covering these statistical tests for the rest of the class.

<u>Statistic</u>	Outcome ¹	Variable 2	<u>Language</u>	<u>Notes</u>	
	Variable				
One-sample	Interval/ratio	-	Comparison of	Only 1 group,	
<i>t</i> -test			one group's mean	compare mean	
			with one value	with a known	
				reference mean	
Independent	Interval/ratio	Nominal	Group	Two groups must	
Samples <i>t</i> -test		(2 groups)	comparison	be independent	
Related	Interval/ratio	Nominal	Group	Two groups are	
samples <i>t</i> -test		(2 groups)	comparison	related – either	
				pre & post or	
				matched pairs	
ANOVA	Interval/ratio	Nominal	Group	Independent	
		$(\geq 2 \text{ groups})$	comparison	groups	
Pearson's	Interval/Ratio	Interval/Ratio	Relationship		
Correlation			100x		
Regression	Interval/Ratio	Any	Prediction	Simple regression	
Chi-Squared	Nominal	Nominal	Group		
χ^2			comparison or		
			relationship		

Step 3: Choose a Statistical Test

- From the statistical test you choose, you will calculate a "test statistic." This is the thing you are going to compare to a certain cut off to then make a decision about whether to reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis.
- □ A test statistic is a standardized number that you compute from a sample (i.e. it will be in a standardized language like z or t) $Z_{stat} = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{r}$

$$z_{stat} = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma}$$

$$t_{stat} = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}}$$

Finding the Critical Value(s)

Step 4: Find the Critical Value(s)

- The critical value is your "cut off" value that you will use to determine if a test statistic is "extreme enough" or "unlikely enough" to reject the null.
- Critical values come from standardized table (depending on what data you have, z for known σ, t for unknown σ)



Step 4: Find the Critical Value(s)

The critical value tells you the value associated with a certain level of significance (ex. .05)



Critical t-values depend on the degrees of freedom, ex. (n-1)

Standardized Cut-Offs Example

Job Promotion Example from Previous PPT

A random sample of 25 college graduates revealed that they worked an average of 6 years at a job before being promoted, with a standard deviation of 1.3 years. Compute and interpret a 99% confidence interval for the mean number of years worked at a job before being promoted.

$$\bar{x} = 6, \quad s = 1.3$$

 $n = 25 \rightarrow df = 24$
Level of Significance = 99% or .01

How high/low would your t-statistic (or observed mean) have to be to reject the null hypothesis?

Standardized Cut-Offs Example

Job Promotion Example from Previous PPT

How high or low would your t-statistic have to be to reject the null hypothesis?



t-table



We need to determine critical values based on a few things...

Degrees of Freedom

Level of Significance

One or Two Tail Test

	Proportion in One Tail								
	0.25	0.10	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005			
	Proportion in Two Tails Combined								
df	0.50	0.20	0.10	0.05	0.02	0.01			
1	1.000	3.078	6.314	12.706	31.821	63.657			
2	0.816	1.886	2.920	4.303	6.965	9.925			
3	0.765	1.638	2.353	3.182	4.541	5.841			
4	0.741	1.533	2.132	2.776	3.747	4.604			
5	0.727	1.476	2.015	2.571	3.365	4.032			
6	0.718	1.440	1.943	2.447	3.143	3.707			
7	0.711	1.415	1.895	2.365	2.998	3.499			
8	0.706	1.397	1.860	2.306	2.896	3.355			
9	0.703	1.383	1.833	2.262	2.821	3.250			
10	0.700	1.372	1.812	2.228	2.764	3.169			
11	0.697	1.363	1.796	2.201	2.718	3.106			
12	0.695	1.356	1.782	2.179	2.681	3.055			
13	0.694	1.350	1.771	2.160	2.650	3.012			
14	0.692	1.345	1.761	2.145	2.624	2.977			
15	0.691	1.341	1.753	2.131	2.602	2.947			
16	0.690	1.337	1.746	2.120	2.583	2.921			
17	0.689	1.333	1.740	2.110	2.567	2.898			
18	0.688	1.330	1.734	2.101	2.552	2.878			
19	0.688	1.328	1.729	2.093	2.539	2.861			
20	0.687	1.325	1.725	2.086	2.528	2.845			
21	0.686	1.323	1.721	2.080	2.518	2.831			
22	0.686	1.321	1.717	2.074	2.508	2.819			
23	0.685	1.319	1.714	2.069	2.500	2.807			
24	0.685	1.318	1.711	2.064	2.492	2.797			
25	0.684	1.316	1.708	2.060	2.485	2.787			
26	0.684	1.315	1.706	2.056	2.479	2.779			
27	0.684	1.314	1.703	2.052	2.473	2.771			
28	0.683	1.313	1.701	2.048	2.467	2.763			
29	0.683	1.311	1.699	2.045	2.462	2.756			
30	0.683	1.310	1.697	2.042	2.457	2.750			
40	0.681	1.303	1.684	2.021	2.423	2.704			
60	0.679	1.296	1.671	2.000	2.390	2.660			
120	0.677	1.289	1.658	1.980	2.358	2.617			
œ	0.674	1.282	1.645	1.960	2.326	2.576			

The t-table, Again

- □ We've looked at the t-table before when we were working on creating confidence intervals. Then we only looked at the "Proportion in Two Tail Combined" row, which distributes the alpha level you want on two sides, ex. if $\alpha = .05$, then the proportion on either side is .025 (.05/2 = .025) or 2.5%
- If we were running a two tailed test, we use the same row as before, but if we were running a one tailed test, then we look at the row above where the .05 is lumped together on one side.



One tail (either right or left)

Two tails combined

Proportion in One Tail								
	0.25	0.10	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005		
Proportion in Two Tails Combined								
df	0.50	0.20	0.10	0.05	0.02	0.01		
1	1.000	3.078	6.314	12.706	31.821	63.657		
2	0.816	1 886	2 920	4 303	6 965	9 9 2 5		

Step 4: Find the Critical Value(s)

Same procedure but if we are running a one sided test, we only need one critical value because we are only looking in one direction (greater than or less than).



Try it.

Find the critical values for each scenario (assume that σ is **unknown**, so we will use a t-table).

- □ 1) An emergency room advertises a wait time of 10 minutes, but you believe that it is longer. (n = 20, α = .05, \bar{x} = 13, s = 1.3)
- □ 2) A psychologist believes that watching 9 or more hours of football a week reduces men's self esteem. The population of men score an average of 40 points on a self-esteem questionnaire. (n = 25, α = .05, \bar{x} = 39, s = 6.9)
- □ 3) It is suspected behavior modification will have an effect on the average number of sodas a person drinks (8) in a week. Test if there is an effect using the sample mean of 4 and sample size of 12 to test this. (n = $12, \alpha = .05, \overline{x} = 4, s = 2.5$)

Try it: Emergency Room Wait Time

□ 1) An emergency room advertises a wait time of 10 minutes, but you believe that it is longer. (n = 20, α = .05) $H_0: \mu \le 10$ $H_1: \mu > 10$

$$\alpha = .05$$

df = 19
One Tailed Test (Right)
$$t_{critical} = 1.729$$

t = 0





One Tailed Test		Proportion in One Tail						
		0.25	0.10	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005	
(D:		Proportion in Two Tails Combined 0.50 0.20 0.10 0.05 0.02						
(Right)	1	1.000	3.078	6.314	12.706	31.821	63.657	
	2	0.816	1.886	2.920	4.303	6.965	9.925	
	3	0.765	1.638	2.353	3.182	4.541	5.841	
$\neg \alpha - 05$	4	0.741	1.533	2.132	2.776	3.747	4.604	
$\Box u - J U J$	5	0.727	1.476	2.015	2.571	3.365	4.032	
	6	0.718	1.440	1.943	2.447	3.143	3.707	
	7	0.711	1.415	1.895	2.365	2.998	3.499	
_ Jf _ 10	8	0.706	1.397	1.860	2.306	2.896	3.355	
$\Box \Box \Box = 19$	9	0.703	1.383	1.833	2.262	2.821	3.250	
	10	0.700	1.372	1.812	2.228	2.764	3.169	
	11	0.697	1.363	1.796	2.201	2.718	3.106	
	12	0.695	1.356	1.782	2.179	2.681	3.055	
	13	0.694	1.350	1.771	2.160	2.650	3.012	
	14	0.692	1.345	1.761	2.145	2.624	2.977	
	15	0.691	1.341	1.753	2.131	2.602	2.947	
	16	0.690	1.337	1.746	2.120	2.583	2.921	
	17	0.689	1.333	1.740	2.110	2.567	2.898	
	18	0.688	1.330	1.734	2.101	2.552	2.878	
<u> </u>	19	0.688	1.328	1.729	2.093	2.539	2.861	
$L_{aut} = 1 = 1 / 29$	20	0.687	1.325	1./25	2.086	2.528	2.845	
	21	0.686	1.323	1.721	2.080	2.518	2.831	
	22	0.686	1.321	1.717	2.074	2.508	2.819	
	23	0.685	1.319	1.714	2.069	2.500	2.807	
	24	0.685	1.318	1.711	2.064	2.492	2.797	
	25	0.684	1.316	1.708	2.060	2.485	2.787	
	26	0.684	1.315	1.706	2.056	2.479	2.779	
	27	0.684	1.314	1.703	2.052	2.473	2.771	
	28	0.683	1.313	1.701	2.048	2.467	2.763	
	29	0.683	1.311	1.699	2.045	2.462	2.756	
	30	0.683	1.310	1.697	2.042	2.457	2.750	
	40	0.681	1.303	1.684	2.021	2.423	2.704	
	60	0.679	1.296	1.671	2.000	2.390	2.660	
	120	0.677	1.289	1.658	1.980	2.358	2.617	
	œ	0.674	1.282	1.645	1.960	2.326	2.576	

Try it: Football and Self-Esteem

 2) A psychologist believes that watching 9 or more hours of football a week reduces men's self esteem. The population of men score an average of 40 points on a self-esteem questionnaire. (n = 25, α = .05)



t-table



One Tailed Test		Proportion in One Tail							
		0.25	0.10	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005		
		Proportion in Two Tails Combined							
	df	0.50	0.20	0.10	0.05	0.02	0.01		
	1	1.000	3.078	6.314	12.706	31.821	63.657		
	2	0.816	1.886	2.920	4.303	6.965	9.925		
	3	0.765	1.638	2.353	3.182	4.541	5.841		
$\neg \alpha - 0$	4	0.741	1.533	2.132	2.776	3.747	4.604		
$\Box u - J U J$	5	0.727	1.476	2.015	2.571	3.365	4.032		
	6	0.718	1.440	1.943	2.447	3.143	3.707		
	7	0.711	1.415	1.895	2.365	2.998	3.499		
JC JL	8	0.706	1.397	1.860	2.306	2.896	3.355		
$\Box \Omega I = 74$	9	0.703	1.383	1.833	2.262	2.821	3.250		
	10	0.700	1.372	1.812	2.228	2.764	3.169		
	11	0.697	1.363	1.796	2.201	2.718	3.106		
	12	0.695	1.356	1.782	2.179	2.681	3.055		
	13	0.694	1.350	1.771	2.160	2.650	3.012		
	14	0.692	1.345	1.761	2.145	2.624	2.977		
	15	0.691	1.341	1.753	2.131	2.602	2.947		
	16	0.690	1.337	1.746	2.120	2.583	2.921		
	17	0.689	1.333	1.740	2.110	2.567	2.898		
	18	0.688	1.330	1.734	2.101	2.552	2.878		
1 711	19	0.688	1.328	1.729	2.093	2.539	2.861		
$T \dots t \downarrow t \downarrow \dots t \equiv -1 / 1 \downarrow$	20	0.687	1.325	1.725	2.086	2.528	2.845		
	- 21	0.686	1.323	1.721	2.080	2.518	2.831		
	22	0.686	1.321	1.717	2.074	2.508	2.819		
	23	0.685	1.319	1.714	2.069	2.500	2.807		
	24	0.685	1.318	1.711	2.064	2.492	2.797		
	25	0.684	1.316	1.708	2.060	2.485	2.787		
	26	0.684	1.315	1.706	2.056	2.479	2.779		
	27	0.684	1.314	1.703	2.052	2.473	2.771		
	28	0.683	1.313	1.701	2.048	2.467	2.763		
	29	0.683	1.311	1.699	2.045	2.462	2.756		
	30	0.683	1.310	1.697	2.042	2.457	2.750		
	40	0.681	1.303	1.684	2.021	2.423	2.704		
	60	0.679	1.296	1.671	2.000	2.390	2.660		
	120	0.677	1.289	1.658	1.980	2.358	2.617		
	∞	0.674	1.282	1.645	1.960	2.326	2.576		

Try it: Behavior Modification and Sodas

 3) It is suspected behavior modification will have an effect on the average number of sodas a person drinks (8) in a week.

(
$$n = 12, \alpha = .05$$
) $t_{crit} = \pm 2.20$



Compute the Test Statistic

Step 5: Compute the Test Statistic (or Determine P-Value)

- □ If our test statistic falls past our critical value (falls in the **critical region**), then we reject H_0 .
 - It we reject the null, we can then say the p value was less than our set alpha value
 - It states that though we could incorrectly be rejecting the null, the chances of that are p < .05

$$z_{stat} = rac{ar{x}-\mu}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}$$
 $t_{stat} = rac{ar{x}-\mu}{s/\sqrt{n}}$

APA Notation: t(df) = t-statistic value, $p < or > \alpha$ level. Example: t(21) = 2.46, p < .05

Try it.

Find the test statistic for each scenario. Does it fall in the critical region?

- □ 1) An emergency room advertises a wait time of 10 minutes, but you believe that it is longer. (n = 20, α = .05, \bar{x} = 13, s = 1.3)
- □ 2) A psychologist believes that watching 9 or more hours of football a week reduces men's self esteem. The population of men score an average of 40 points on a self-esteem questionnaire. (n = 25, α = .05, \bar{x} = 39, s = 6.9)
- □ 3) It is suspected behavior modification will have an effect on the average number of sodas a person drinks (8) in a week. Test if there is an effect using the sample mean of 4 and sample size of 12 to test this. (n = $12, \alpha = .05, \overline{x} = 4, s = 2.5$)

Try it: Emergency Room Wait Time

1) An emergency room advertises a wait time of 10 minutes, but you believe that it is longer.

□ n = 20, α = .05, \bar{x} = 13, s = 1.3, t_{crit} = 1.729

Our t_{stat} is further than t_{crit} (10.32 > 1.729), so we reject H_0 .



Try it: Football and Self-Esteem

2) A psychologist believes that watching 9 or more hours of football a week reduces men's self esteem. The population of men score an average of 40 points on a self-esteem questionnaire.

□ n = 25,
$$\alpha$$
 = .05, \bar{x} = 39, s = 6.9, t_{crit} = −1.71

Our t_{stat} is not extreme enough (t_{stat} is not further than t_{crit}), so we fail to reject H_0 .



Try it: Behavior Modification and Sodas

3) It is suspected behavior modification will have an effect on the average number of sodas a person drinks (8) in a week. Test if there is an effect using the sample mean of 4 and sample size of 12 to test this.

$$\Box$$
 (n = 12, α = .05, \bar{x} = 4, s = 2.5) t_{crit} = 2.20

Our is t_{stat} past the t_{crit} , so we reject H_0 .



P Values

- A p-value is the probability of getting the calculated test statistic or a more extreme number <u>if the null hypothesis was</u> <u>true</u>.
 - Remember, we are always working under the assumption that the null is true.
 - The smaller the p-values, the greater the likelihood that the null hypothesis is false
- In practice, statistical software like R tells us the exact p-value, but the decision using critical values to determine if the probability of a fluke is less than ex. .05 will result in the same conclusion (i.e. reject or fail to reject).
 - \blacksquare This is because t_{stat} corresponds to p, and t_{crit} corresponds to α
 - You can find the probability by looking up the t-statistic value in the table and find the probability on top, though usually we just say:

 $p < \alpha \rightarrow \text{Reject } H_0$ $p \ge \alpha \rightarrow \text{Fail to reject } H_0$



Step 6: Draw Your Conclusions

When we "Reject the Null Hypothesis," we is saying that the probability of seeing this results (this certain sample mean x
), if the Null were true, is low enough (ex. less than 5% chance) that we can reject the idea that we live in the null world. We can conclude there is a statistically significant difference.



Statistical Significance

- Something is statistically significant if we are able to reject the null hypothesis.
 - "The results were statistically significant at the .05 level."
- When we "Fail to Reject the Null Hypothesis," the results are not statistically significant. The x̄ we observe is close enough to the Null that there is no statistically significant difference. If the p-value is greater than ex.
 .05, we are saying that the probability of seeing this x̄ if the Null is true are higher than 5%.
 - "The results were not statically significant at the .05 level."

Step 6: Draw Your Conclusions

- After all the steps, you will come to a conclusion whether to "reject" or "fail to reject the null."
- The APA notation (and the notation you need to write to get full credit) is as follows:



Step 6: Draw Your Conclusions

Technically, the "real" APA notation gives the actual p-value rather than the > or < symbol because statistical software like R will give you a p-value

t(19) = 10.32, p = 0.00

Degrees of Freedom

> t-statistic (The one you calculate.)

Actual p-value (There are some numbers after a lot of zeros, but we don't need to write it all out, 1.580561e-09.)

Up Next...

- We know now that p tells up the probability of making a mistake...
- □ There are two main types of mistakes:
 - Type | Error
 - Type II Error



Critical Values in R

- Instead of using a table, you can use the "qt()" function to find the critical t-value in R.
 - You need to specify the level of confidence you want (ex. 95%) and the degrees of freedom

```
###### One & Two Tailed ########
two_tail_crit_t_95 <- at(p = c(.025, .975), df = )
two_tail_crit_t_99 <- qt(p = c(.005, .995), df = )</pre>
right_tail_crit_t_95 <- qt(p = .95, df = )
right_tail_crit_t_99 <- qt(p = .99, df = )
left_tail_crit_t_95 <- qt(p = .05, df = )
```

 $left_tail_crit_t_99 <- qt(p = .01, df =)$

Emergency Room Wait Time (Right Tail)

First fill in the information that is know: Emergency Room Wait Time

sample_mean <- 13 pop_mean <- 10 sd <- 1.3 n <- 20 df <- n-1

Find the critical values: 95% Critical t-values for 95% Confidence, significance = 0.05
right_tail_crit_t_95 <- qt(p = .95, df = df) # critical t = 1.729</pre>

Calculate the t-statistic
t_stat_one_sample <- (sample_mean - pop_mean)/(sd/sqrt(n)) # t-statistic = 10.32</pre>

Our t-statistic (10.32) is greater than the critcal t value (1.729) # We can reject the null hypothesis.

Football and Self-Esteem (Left Tail)

First fill in the information that is know: Football and Self-Esteem

sample_mean <- 39 pop_mean <- 40 sd <- 6.9 n <- 25 df <- n-1

Find the critical values: 95% Critical t-values for 95% Confidence, significance = 0.05
left_tail_crit_t_95 <- qt(p = .05, df = df) # critical t = -1.71</pre>

Calculate the t-statistic
t_stat_one_sample <- (sample_mean - pop_mean)/(sd/sqrt(n)) # t-statistic = -0.72</pre>

Our t-statistic (-0.72) is not LESS than the critcal t value (-1.71)
We FAIL reject the null hypothesis.

Behavior Modification and Sodas (Two Tails)

First fill in the information that is know: Behavior Modification and Sodas

```
sample_mean <- 4
pop_mean <- 8
sd <- 2.5
n <- 12
df <- n-1
```

Find the critical values: 95% Critical t-values for 95% Confidence, significance = 0.05two_tail_crit_t_95 <- qt(p = c(.025, .975), df = df) # critical ts = -2.20, 2.20

```
# Calculate the t-statistic
t_stat_one_sample <- (sample_mean - pop_mean)/(sd/sqrt(n)) # t-statistic = -5.54</pre>
```

Our t-statistic (-5.54) is further out than the critcal t values (-2.20, 2.20)
We reject the null hypothesis.

Looking Up Exact p-values in R

```
# With R, we can also look up the exact p-value using "pt()"
# The "p" in "pt()" is asking for the p value from a t distribution
# the "q" in "pt()" is asking you to put in the t-statistic you calculated above
# We also need to use the "abs()" function to take the absolute value of the t-statistic,
# then add a "-" sign in front... I know it's strange, but it works!
```

```
# Example of a RIGHT Tail t-test
# Emergency Room Wait Time: t-statistic (10.32), df = 19
# p = 0.00000
```

```
pt(q = -abs(10.32), df = 19)
```

```
# Example of a LEFT Tail t-test
# Football and Self-Esteem: t-statistic (-0.72), df = 24
# p = 0.24
pt(q = -abs(-0.72), df = 24)
# Example of a TWO Tail t tost
```

```
Behavior Modification and Sodas: t-statistic (-5.54), df = 11
```

p = 0.0001

```
pt(q = -abs(-5.54), df = 11, lower.tail = T)*2
```

Instead of just checking if the t-static is greater than the critical value, you could look up the exact p-value in R