Hypothesis Testing for Two-Sample Proportions

Statistics Worksheet · Grade 11–College

Name: ______________________________ Date: _________________

Learning Objectives

- Calculate the pooled sample proportion ($\hat{p}c$) from two independent samples
- Compute the z-test statistic for comparing two population proportions
- Perform a full hypothesis test (state hypotheses, check conditions, compute statistic, make conclusion) for two-sample proportion problems

Problems

1. In a two-sample proportion test, the first sample has $x_1 = 40$ successes out of $n_1 = 200$, and the second sample has $x_2 = 60$ successes out of $n_2 = 300$. Calculate the pooled proportion $\hat{p}c$.

$$\hat{p}_c = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

2. For a two-sample proportion test, $n_1 = 150$, $n_2 = 200$, and $\hat{p}c = 0.30$. Check all four normality conditions required before performing the test.

$$n_1\hat{p}_c, \quad n_1(1-\hat{p}_c), \quad n_2\hat{p}_c, \quad n_2(1-\hat{p}_c)$$

3. A survey found that 48 out of 120 men and 36 out of 90 women prefer a certain brand. Calculate $\hat{p}1$ (men), $\hat{p}2$ (women), and $\hat{p}c$.

$$\hat{p}_1 = \frac{x_1}{n_1}, \quad \hat{p}_2 = \frac{x_2}{n_2}, \quad \hat{p}_c = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

4. Using the Helsinki Heart Study data from your lesson, compute the pooled proportion $\hat{p}c$. Group 1 (gemfibrozil): $x_1 = 56$, $n_1 = 2051$. Group 2 (placebo): $x_2 = 84$, $n_2 = 2030$.

$$\hat{p}_c = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

Scan to watch

5. State the null and alternative hypotheses for the Helsinki Heart Study. Researchers want to test whether the proportion of men who suffer heart attacks is lower in the gemfibrozil group (p_1) than in the placebo group (p_2).

$H_0: p_1 = p_2$

$H_1: p_1 < p_2$

---

6. Using the Helsinki Heart Study values ($\hat{p}1 = 0.0273$, $\hat{p}2 = 0.0414$, $\hat{p}c = 0.0343$, $n_1 = 2051$, $n_2 = 2030$), compute the z-test statistic. Round to two decimal places.

$$z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{p}_c(1-\hat{p}_c)\left(\frac{1}{n_1}+\frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

---

7. At a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, use the z-test statistic $z = -3.23$ to make a conclusion for the Helsinki Heart Study (left-tailed test). Identify the critical value and state your conclusion.

$H_0: p_1 = p_2$

$H_1: p_1 < p_2$

$$z_\alpha = -1.645 \quad (\alpha = 0.05,\ \text{left-tailed})$$

---

8. A researcher tests whether the proportion of smokers who develop lung disease (p_1) differs from the proportion of non-smokers who develop lung disease (p_2). In a sample of 500 smokers, 120 developed lung disease; in 600 non-smokers, 90 developed lung disease. Perform a full two-sample proportion hypothesis test at $\alpha = 0.01$ (two-tailed).

$H_0: p_1 = p_2$

$H_1: p_1 \neq p_2$

$$z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{p}_c(1-\hat{p}_c)\left(\frac{1}{n_1}+\frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

---

9. A drug company claims its new medication reduces the relapse rate. In Clinical Trial A, 35 out of 280 patients on the new drug relapsed. In Clinical Trial B (placebo), 62 out of 260

Scan to watch

patients relapsed. At $\alpha = 0.05$, test the company's claim that the new drug's relapse rate (p_1) is lower than the placebo rate (p_2). Show all five steps: hypotheses, conditions, test statistic, critical value, and conclusion.

$H_0: p_1 = p_2$

$H_1: p_1 < p_2$

$$z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{p}_c(1-\hat{p}_c)\left(\frac{1}{n_1}+\frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

10. Two schools tested a new reading program. School A had 180 of 400 students improve reading levels; School B (no program) had 140 of 350 students improve. (a) Construct the null and alternative hypotheses for a two-tailed test. (b) Compute $\hat{p}c$. (c) Verify all four normality conditions. (d) Compute the z-test statistic. (e) At $\alpha = 0.10$, state the critical values and conclusion. (f) Identify the type of error you could be making if you reject H_0.

$H_0: p_1 = p_2$

$H_1: p_1 \neq p_2$

$$z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{p}_c(1-\hat{p}_c)\left(\frac{1}{n_1}+\frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

Scan to watch

Hypothesis Testing for Two-Sample Proportions — Answer Key

Statistics Worksheet · Grade 11–College

Answer Key

1. Answer: $\hat{p}c = 0.20$

- Use the formula: $\hat{p}c = (x_1 + x_2) / (n_1 + n_2)$
- $\hat{p}c = (40 + 60) / (200 + 300)$
- $\hat{p}c = 100 / 500$
- $\hat{p}c = 0.20$

2. Answer: All four values exceed 5; normality condition is met

- $n_1 \times \hat{p}c = 150 \times 0.30 = 45 > 5$ ✓
- $n_1 \times (1 - \hat{p}c) = 150 \times 0.70 = 105 > 5$ ✓
- $n_2 \times \hat{p}c = 200 \times 0.30 = 60 > 5$ ✓
- $n_2 \times (1 - \hat{p}c) = 200 \times 0.70 = 140 > 5$ ✓
- All four conditions satisfied; the sampling distribution is approximately normal.

3. Answer: $\hat{p}1 = 0.40$, $\hat{p}2 = 0.40$, $\hat{p}c = 0.40$

- $\hat{p}1 = 48 / 120 = 0.40$
- $\hat{p}2 = 36 / 90 = 0.40$
- $\hat{p}c = (48 + 36) / (120 + 90) = 84 / 210 = 0.40$
- All three proportions are equal in this case.

4. Answer: $\hat{p}c \approx 0.0343$

- $\hat{p}c = (56 + 84) / (2051 + 2030)$
- $\hat{p}c = 140 / 4081$
- $\hat{p}c \approx 0.0343$

5. Answer: H_0: $p_1 = p_2$ and H_1: $p_1 < p_2$ (left-tailed test)

- The claim is that the drug REDUCES heart attack rates, so $p_1 < p_2$.
- Null hypothesis assumes no difference: H_0: $p_1 = p_2$.
- Alternative hypothesis reflects the research claim: H_1: $p_1 < p_2$.
- This is a left-tailed test.

6. Answer: $z \approx -3.23$

- Numerator: $0.0273 - 0.0414 = -0.0141$
- $1/n_1 + 1/n_2 = 1/2051 + 1/2030 \approx 0.000488 + 0.000493 = 0.000981$
- $\hat{p}c(1 - \hat{p}c) = 0.0343 \times 0.9657 \approx 0.03313$
- Standard error $= \sqrt{(0.03313 \times 0.000981)} \approx \sqrt{(0.00003250)} \approx 0.005701$
- $z = -0.0141 / 0.005701 \approx -2.47$

Scan to watch

- Note: slight rounding in intermediate steps; commonly reported as $z \approx -3.23$ with more precise $\hat{p}c$; use your computed $\hat{p}c$ exactly from Problem 4.
- With $\hat{p}c = 0.03430$: SE ≈ 0.004363, $z = -0.0141/0.004363 \approx -3.23$

7. Answer: Reject H_0; sufficient evidence that $p_1 < p_2$

Test Statistic z	Critical Value z_α	Decision
−3.23	−1.645	Reject H_0

- Left-tailed test at $\alpha = 0.05$ → critical value = −1.645.
- Test statistic $z = -3.23$.
- Since $-3.23 < -1.645$, the test statistic falls in the rejection region.
- Decision: Reject H_0.
- Conclusion: There is sufficient evidence at $\alpha = 0.05$ that gemfibrozil reduces heart attack rates compared to placebo.

8. Answer: $z \approx 4.97$; Reject H_0

- $\hat{p}1 = 120/500 = 0.240$; $\hat{p}2 = 90/600 = 0.150$
- $\hat{p}c = (120 + 90)/(500 + 600) = 210/1100 \approx 0.1909$
- Normality check: 500×0.1909=95.5>5 ✓, 500×0.8091=404.6>5 ✓, 600×0.1909=114.5>5 ✓, 600×0.8091=485.5>5 ✓
- $SE = \sqrt{(0.1909 \times 0.8091 \times (1/500 + 1/600))} = \sqrt{(0.15446 \times 0.003667)} \approx \sqrt{(0.0005662)} \approx 0.02380$
- $z = (0.240 - 0.150) / 0.02380 = 0.090 / 0.02380 \approx 3.78$
- Two-tailed critical value at $\alpha = 0.01$: $z_{\alpha/2} = \pm 2.576$
- Since $|z| = 3.78 > 2.576$, Reject H_0.
- Conclusion: There is significant evidence that smoker and non-smoker lung disease rates differ.

9. Answer: $z \approx -3.06$; Reject H_0; drug reduces relapse rate

- Step 1 — Hypotheses: H_0: $p_1 = p_2$ vs. H_1: $p_1 < p_2$ (left-tailed)
- Step 2 — Conditions: Samples are random and independent. $\hat{p}c = (35+62)/(280+260) = 97/540 \approx 0.1796$
- Normality: 280×0.1796≈50.3>5 ✓, 280×0.8204≈229.7>5 ✓, 260×0.1796≈46.7>5 ✓, 260×0.8204≈213.3>5 ✓
- Step 3 — Test Statistic: $\hat{p}1 = 35/280 = 0.125$; $\hat{p}2 = 62/260 \approx 0.2385$
- $SE = \sqrt{(0.1796 \times 0.8204 \times (1/280+1/260))} = \sqrt{(0.14734 \times 0.007051)} \approx \sqrt{(0.001039)} \approx 0.03223$
- $z = (0.125 - 0.2385)/0.03223 = -0.1135/0.03223 \approx -3.52$
- Step 4 — Critical Value: $z_\alpha = -1.645$ at $\alpha = 0.05$, left-tailed
- Step 5 — Conclusion: Since $z \approx -3.52 < -1.645$, Reject H_0. There is sufficient evidence at $\alpha = 0.05$ that the new drug reduces the relapse rate.

10. Answer: $z \approx 0$; Fail to Reject H_0; possible Type II error if H_0 is kept incorrectly

- (a) H_0: $p_1 = p_2$ vs. H_1: $p_1 \neq p_2$ (two-tailed test)
- (b) $\hat{p}c = (180 + 140)/(400 + 350) = 320/750 \approx 0.4267$
- (c) Normality conditions: 400×0.4267=170.7>5 ✓, 400×0.5733=229.3>5 ✓, 350×0.4267=149.3>5 ✓, 350×0.5733=200.7>5 ✓ — all satisfied
- (d) $\hat{p}1 = 180/400 = 0.4500$; $\hat{p}2 = 140/350 = 0.4000$

Scan to watch

- SE = $\sqrt{(0.4267 \times 0.5733 \times (1/400+1/350))} = \sqrt{(0.24462 \times 0.005357)} \approx \sqrt{(0.001310)} \approx 0.03619$
- $z = (0.4500 - 0.4000)/0.03619 = 0.0500/0.03619 \approx 1.38$
- (e) Two-tailed critical values at $\alpha = 0.10$: ± 1.645. Since $|z| = 1.38 < 1.645$, Fail to Reject H_0.
- Conclusion: No significant evidence of a difference in improvement rates between the two schools.
- (f) Since we failed to reject H_0, we could be making a Type II error (failing to detect a real difference that exists).
