

# Hypothesis Testing: Decision Making under Uncertainty

**Hypotheses:** For our purposes a **hypothesis** is a testable statement about reality.

**Hypothesis Test:** A **hypothesis test** is a procedure for deciding between two or more competing hypotheses using data.

**Null and Alternative Hypotheses:** In this course we will be concerned with testing two mutually exclusive and exhaustive hypotheses:

**$H_1$ :** alternative or research hypothesis

1. Hypothesis for which we seek evidence
2. Initially assumed false

**$H_0$ :** null hypothesis

1. Initially assumed true
2. Contradictory to  $H_1$

By exhaustive we mean that between them  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  cover (“exhaust”) all possibilities.

**Proof by Contradiction:** Our hypothesis testing procedure uses proof by contradiction: we seek to prove the research hypothesis  $H_1$  by contradicting  $H_0$  using data.

**Exercise 1.** Give an example of proof by contradiction.

**Exercise 2:** Suppose a friend has a nickel, either one-headed or two-headed. She won’t show us the nickel but she will flip it repeatedly and give us the outcomes. Suppose we want to prove the coin is two-headed. Answer the following:

1. Identify the alternative and null hypotheses,  $H_1$  and  $H_0$ .
2. In terms of the outcomes from repeatedly flipping the coin, what must occur for you to reject  $H_0$  and thereby conclude  $H_1$  is true?
3. Suppose your friend gets 10 heads in a row. Does this result contradict  $H_0$ ?
4. Suppose your friend gets 20 heads in a row. Does this result contradict  $H_0$ ?

**Problem: Proof by Contradiction Using Random Data.** Note that no matter how many heads in a row your friend reports,  $H_0$  is not contradicted. Why? Because we can always reconcile such a result with  $H_0$ , coin is one-headed, by appealing to chance. Something really unlikely - but not impossible - occurred. This being the case, how can we ever prove  $H_1$  is true?

**Solution: Proof by Contradiction Using Random Data.** When doing proof by contradiction using random data, we proceed as follows. Although we can usually reconcile any outcome with  $H_0$  using chance, at some point this reconciliation is too implausible so we reject  $H_0$  and conclude  $H_1$  is true.

**Problem: Need to Measure Plausibility of  $H_0$ /Data Reconciliation via Chance?**  
In order to implement the above solution/procedure, we need an objective, *quantitative* measure of the plausibility of reconciling  $H_0$  with the data using chance.

**Solution: P-value Measures Plausibility of  $H_0$ /Data Reconciliation via Chance.**  
The p-value, a probability, quantifies the plausibility of reconciling the data and  $H_0$  by appealing to chance. The smaller the p-value, the smaller this plausibility and thus the stronger the evidence against  $H_0$  in favor of  $H_1$ .

**P-value:** Probability, **assuming  $H_0$  true**, of repeating experiment and getting data at least as contradictory to  $H_0$  (and favoring  $H_1$ ) as the actual data.

**Exercise 3:** For the coin-tossing scenario of exercise 2, do the following:

1. Suppose your friend gets 10 heads in a row. What is the p-value for this data?
2. Suppose your friend gets 20 heads in a row. What is the p-value for this data?

**When to Reject  $H_0$ ?** Since the p-value measures the plausibility of reconciling the data with  $H_0$  using chance we see that

1. the smaller the p-value the smaller the plausibility of the chance explanation;
2. the smaller the p-value the greater the evidence **against**  $H_0$ ; and
3. the smaller the p-value the greater the evidence **for**  $H_1$ .

Thus **when the p-value is low we reject  $H_0$ !** But how low/small must the p-value be for us to reject  $H_0$  and assert  $H_1$  is true? In order to answer this question, we must consider the errors we can commit doing hypothesis testing.

## Hypothesis Testing Errors: Type I and Type II Errors

**Hypothesis Testing Errors:** Because hypothesis testing is a form of induction, it is an error-prone process. The following table sets out the various possibilities:

Outcome	$H_0$ True	$H_0$ False
Fail to Reject $H_0$	Correct	Type II Error
Reject $H_0$	Type I Error	Correct

Note that there are two possible errors we can make, depending on whether  $H_0$  is true or not:

**Type I Error:** Rejecting  $H_0$  when  $H_0$  is true

**Type II error:** Failing to reject  $H_0$  when  $H_0$  is false

We have names for the probabilities of committing these errors:

$\alpha$ : Probability of committing a type I error

$\beta$ : Probability of committing a type II error

**What  $\alpha$  to Use:** Since  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are error probabilities, we want to test our hypotheses in such a way that  $\alpha = \beta = 0$ . Unfortunately, this is not possible. In almost all cases we face a trade-off when attempting to minimize these error probabilities. For a fixed amount of data (sample size  $n$ ) if we decrease  $\alpha$ , we increase  $\beta$ . Likewise, if we decrease  $\beta$ , we increase  $\alpha$ . The only way to simultaneously decrease  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  is to increase the amount of information (sample size  $n$ ) or to use a better hypothesis testing method. Since acquiring data is usually expensive, we can never fully escape the trade-off between the two error probabilities. Thus we determine a suitable trade-off using the Neyman-Pearson approach: we weigh the costs associated with the two types of error and determine the maximum type I error probability we can tolerate. We then conduct the hypothesis test so that the probability of a type I error does not exceed this maximum value, which is called the *significance level*, or  $\alpha$ , of the test. The rationale of the Neyman-Pearson approach is this: By using the largest type I error probability we can tolerate, we keep the probability of a type II error as low as possible. In other words, using a smaller  $\alpha$  than necessary will cause  $\beta$  to be larger than necessary.

**Conducting  $\alpha$ -level Hypothesis Test:** Once we have decided what level of significance or  $\alpha$  to use, how do we test our hypotheses so as to achieve  $\alpha$ ? We use the following decision rule:

**Hypothesis Testing Decision Rule:** If the p-value  $\leq \alpha$ , reject  $H_0$ ; otherwise, fail to reject  $H_0$ .

**Hypothesis Testing Outline:** Summarizing the preceding, we arrive at the following hypothesis testing procedure:

1. Identify  $H_0$  and  $H_1$
2. Determine the significance level  $\alpha$
3. Acquire suitable data
4. Compute the p-value
5. If the p-value  $\leq \alpha$  reject  $H_0$  and assert  $H_1$  true; otherwise, fail to reject  $H_0$ .