

1. each trial, $P(\text{pick odd one out}) = \frac{1}{3}$.

H_0 : picking at random ($p = \frac{1}{3}$)

H_1 : can detect the odd one out ($p > \frac{1}{3}$)

Assume H_0 to be true. $\alpha = 5\%$, one-tail test

let X = no. times correctly pick odd one out

$$X \sim B(7, \frac{1}{3})$$

$$p\text{-value} = P(X \geq 5)$$

$$= 0.045267 \quad \text{from } \text{binomcdf}(7, \frac{1}{3}, 5, 7)$$

as $p\text{-value} < 5\%$, we are in critical region

So we have evidence to reject H_0

We conclude that there is sufficient evidence to back up her claim of being able to tell margarine from butter.

2.

H_0 : equally likely men/women as section head ($p = \frac{1}{2}$)

H_1 : women are being discriminated against ($p < \frac{1}{2}$)

Assume H_0 to be true

$\alpha = 5\%$, 1 tail test

let X = no. section heads who are women.

under H_0 , $X \sim B(10, \frac{1}{2})$

$$p\text{-value} = P(X \leq 2)$$

$$= 0.054688 \quad \text{from binomcdf}(10, \frac{1}{2}, 0, 2)$$

$> 5\%$.

Hence we are not in critical region and we do not have evidence to reject H_0

We therefore conclude that we don't have evidence that women are being discriminated against.

3. let $X =$ no. correctly identified suits.

$$X \sim B(10, p)$$

$$H_0: \text{no ESP } (p = \frac{1}{4})$$

$$H_1: \text{ESP present } (p > \frac{1}{4})$$

Assume H_0 to be true

$\alpha = 5\%$, 1 tail test

under H_0 , $X \sim B(10, \frac{1}{4})$

$$p\text{-value} = P(X \geq 7)$$

$$= 0.003506 \quad \text{from binomcdf}(10, \frac{1}{4}, 7, 10)$$

$$< 0.05$$

Hence we do have evidence to reject H_0 and conclude that there is evidence for ESP on the results of this one experiment.