# Matematisk Statistik och Disktret Matematik, MVE051/MSG810, VT20

Föreläsning 11

Nancy Abdallah

Chalmers - Göteborgs Universitet

#### Comparing two means

In a similar way as for the proportions, we can compare the means of two different populations.

- Suppose we have two populations 1 and 2 with mean μ<sub>1</sub> and μ<sub>2</sub> and variances σ<sup>2</sup><sub>1</sub> and σ<sup>2</sup><sub>2</sub> respectively.
- From each population we take a random sample such that the samples are independent from each other.
- For each sample we compute the point estimator for the mean:  $\hat{\mu}_1 = \overline{X}_1$  and  $\hat{\mu}_2 = \overline{X}_2$ .
- A point estimator for  $\mu_1 \mu_2$  is  $\hat{\mu}_1 \hat{\mu}_2 = \overline{X}_1 \overline{X}_2$ .
- When sampling from a normal distribution, or if the sample sizes are large enough,  $\overline{X}_1 \overline{X}_2$  is normally distributed with mean  $\mu_1 \mu_2$  and variance  $\sigma_1^2/n_1 + \sigma_2^2/n_2$ .

## C.I. on the difference between two means

Populations normally distributed (or *n* large) with known variances

■ A 100(1 – 
$$\alpha$$
)% C.I. on  $\mu_1 - \mu_2$  is given by

$$\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2 \pm z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sigma_1^2 / n_1 + \sigma_2^2 / n_2}$$

If the population variances are equal to each other  $(\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2)$  then the C.I. is

$$\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2 \pm z_{\alpha/2}\sigma\sqrt{1/n_1 + 1/n_2}$$

# C.I. on the difference between two means

Populations normally distributed with same unknown variance

Suppose  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma$ , both unknown.

Pooled variance

$$S_{p}^{2} = \frac{(n_{1} - 1)S_{1}^{2} + (n_{2} - 1)S_{2}^{2}}{n_{1} + n_{2} - 2}$$

The pooled variance is an unbiased estimator for σ<sup>2</sup><sub>2</sub>.

The random variable

$$\frac{(\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2) - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{\sqrt{S_p^2(1/n_1 + 1/n_2)}}$$

follows the *T*-distribution with  $n_1 + n_2 - 2$  degrees of freedom.

# C.I. and hypothesis test on $\mu_1 - \mu_2$

Populations normally distributed (or n large), unknown variances, equal variances

A 100(1 –  $\alpha$ )% C.I. on  $\mu_1 - \mu_2$  when the populations are normally distributed with  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma$  unknown is

$$(\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2) \pm t_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{S_p^2(1/n_1 + 1/n_2)}$$

To compare two means we can also do a hypothesis test. The alternative hypothesis can be one of the following

$$\mu_1 > \mu_2, \ \mu_1 < \mu_2 \text{ or } \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

and we use the same procedure as for hypothesis testing on one parameter.

#### Example (Exercise 10.14)

To decide whether or not to purchase a new hand-held laser scanner for use in inventorying stock, tests are conducted on the scanner currently in use and on the new scanner. There data are obtained on the number of 7-inch bar codes that can be scanned per second:

New	Old
<i>n</i> <sub>1</sub> = 61	<i>n</i> <sub>2</sub> = 61
$\overline{x}_1 = 40$	$\overline{x}_2 = 29$
$s_1^2 = 24.9$	$s_2^2 = 22.7$

- 1. Find the pooled variance.
- 2. Find a 90% confidence interval on  $\mu_1 \mu_2$ .
- 3. Does the new laser appear to read more bar codes per second on the average?

### Solution of Exercise 10.14

1. 
$$s_2^p = \frac{60(24.9) + 60(22.7)}{120} = 23.8$$

2. *T*-distribution with 120 degrees of freedom.

 $t_{(\alpha/2} = t_{0.05} = 1.658$  (note that the table does not give the values for degrees of freedom greater than 100, use then an approximation). A 90% C.I. is therefore

 $(40 - 29 \pm 1.658\sqrt{23.8(1/61 + 1/61)}) = (9.54, 12.45)$ 

3. Yes, since the interval does not contain 0 and is positive-valued.

Can we find the same result using hypothesis testing?  $H_0: \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$  and  $H_1: \mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0$  The test statistic is

$$T = \frac{\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2}{\sqrt{S_p^2(1/n_1 + 1/n_2)}}$$

which follows a *T*-distribution with  $n_1 + n_2 - 2$  degrees of freedom. It is a right-tailed test with critical value  $t_{\alpha} = t_{0.1} = 1.289$ .  $T = \frac{40-29}{\sqrt{23.8(1/61+1/61)}} = 12.45 > t_{0.1}$ . Hence, we reject the hypothesis and we are 90% confident that  $H_1$  is true.