

ScPoEconometrics

Confidence Intervals and Hypothesis Testing

Florian Oswald, Gustave Kenedi and Pierre Villedieu
SciencesPo Paris
2020-04-08

Recap from last week

- Sampling: *sampling variation* and *sampling distributions*
- population, population parameter, sample statistic or point estimate, random sampling
- *Unbiased estimator*: $\mathbb{E}[\hat{p}] = p$
- *Central Limit Theorem*: as sample size increases, sampling distribution is more *normally distributed*, centered around the *population parameter*, and has a smaller *standard error*



Recap from last week

- Sampling: *sampling variation* and *sampling distributions*
- population, population parameter, sample statistic or point estimate, random sampling
- *Unbiased estimator*: $\mathbb{E}[\hat{p}] = p$
- *Central Limit Theorem*: as sample size increases, sampling distribution is more *normally distributed*, centered around the *population parameter*, and has a smaller *standard error*

Today: Deeper dive into *statistical inference*¹

- Process of making claims about a population based on information from a sample
- *Confidence intervals*: providing plausible *range* of values
- *Hypothesis testing*: comparing statistics between groups

[1]: This lecture is based on the wonderful *confidence interval* and *hypothesis testing* chapters of *ModernDive*



Back to reality (there goes gravity 😊)



- In real life we only get to take **one** sample from the population (not **1000**!).
- Also, we obviously don't know the true population parameter, that's what we are interested in!
- So what on earth was all of this good for? Fun only?! 😕



Back to reality (there goes gravity 😊)



- In real life we only get to take **one** sample from the population (not **1000**!).
- Also, we obviously don't know the true population parameter, that's what we are interested in!
- So what on earth was all of this good for? Fun only?! 😕

- Even unobserved, we **know** that the sampling distribution does exist, and even better, we know how it behaves!
- Let's see what we can do with this...



Confidence Intervals

From Point Estimates to Confidence Intervals

- Until now, we have only estimated ***point estimates*** from our samples: *sample means*, *sample proportions*, *regression coefficients*, etc.



From Point Estimates to Confidence Intervals

- Until now, we have only estimated ***point estimates*** from our samples: *sample means*, *sample proportions*, *regression coefficients*, etc.
- We know that this ***sample statistic*** differs from the ***true population parameter*** due to ***sampling variation***.



From Point Estimates to Confidence Intervals

- Until now, we have only estimated ***point estimates*** from our samples: *sample means*, *sample proportions*, *regression coefficients*, etc.
- We know that this ***sample statistic*** differs from the ***true population parameter*** due to ***sampling variation***.
- Rather than a point estimate, we could give a ***range of plausible values*** for the population parameter.



From Point Estimates to Confidence Intervals

- Until now, we have only estimated ***point estimates*** from our samples: *sample means*, *sample proportions*, *regression coefficients*, etc.
- We know that this ***sample statistic*** differs from the ***true population parameter*** due to ***sampling variation***.
- Rather than a point estimate, we could give a ***range of plausible values*** for the population parameter.
- This is precisely what a ***confidence interval*** (CI) provides.



Constructing Confidence Intervals

There are several approaches to constructing confidence intervals:

1. *Theory*: use mathematical formulas (*Central Limit Theorem*) to derive the sampling distribution of our point estimate under certain conditions.



Constructing Confidence Intervals

There are several approaches to constructing confidence intervals:

1. *Theory*: use mathematical formulas (**Central Limit Theorem**) to derive the sampling distribution of our point estimate under certain conditions.
2. *Simulation*: use the **bootstrapping** method to *reconstruct* the sampling distribution of our point estimate.



Constructing Confidence Intervals

There are several approaches to constructing confidence intervals:

1. *Theory*: use mathematical formulas (**Central Limit Theorem**) to derive the sampling distribution of our point estimate under certain conditions.
2. *Simulation*: use the **bootstrapping** method to *reconstruct* the sampling distribution of our point estimate.

We'll focus on simulation to give you the intuition and come back to the maths approach next week.



Back to Pasta

- As in real life, imagine we had access to *only one random sample* from our bowl of past.



Back to Pasta

- As in real life, imagine we had access to *only one random sample* from our bowl of past.
- How could we study the effect of sampling variation with a single sample? ➡ **bootstrap resampling with replacement!**



Back to Pasta

- As in real life, imagine we had access to *only one random sample* from our bowl of pasta.
- How could we study the effect of sampling variation with a single sample? ↗ **bootstrap resampling with replacement!**
- Let's start by drawing one random sample of size $n = 50$ from our bowl.

```
bowl <- read.csv("https://www.dropbox.com/s/qpjsk0rfgc0gx80/pasta.csv?dl=1")

my_sample = bowl %>%
  mutate(color = as.factor(ifelse(color == "green", "green", "non-green"))) %>%
  rep_sample_n(size = 50) %>%
  ungroup() %>%
  select(pasta_ID, color)

head(my_sample, 3)

## # A tibble: 3 x 2
##   pasta_ID color
##       <int> <fct>
## 1        4 non-green
## 2       41 non-green
## 3       79 non-green
```



Back to Pasta

- As in real life, imagine we had access to *only one random sample* from our bowl of pasta.
- How could we study the effect of sampling variation with a single sample? ↗ **bootstrap resampling with replacement!**
- Let's start by drawing one random sample of size $n = 50$ from our bowl.

```
bowl <- read.csv("https://www.dropbox.com/s/qpjsk0rfgc0gx80/pasta.csv?dl=1")

my_sample = bowl %>%
  mutate(color = as.factor(ifelse(color == "green", "green", "non-green"))) %>%
  rep_sample_n(size = 50) %>%
  ungroup() %>%
  select(pasta_ID, color)
```

```
head(my_sample, 3)
```

```
## # A tibble: 3 x 2
##   pasta_ID color
##       <int> <fct>
## 1        4 non-green
## 2       41 non-green
## 3       79 non-green
```

```
p_hat = mean(my_sample$color == "green")
p_hat
```

```
## [1] 0.46
```

The proportion of green pasta in this sample is: $\hat{p} = 0.46$.



Resampling our Pasta Sample

How do we obtain a *bootstrap sample*?



Resampling our Pasta Sample

How do we obtain a *bootstrap sample*?

1. Randomly pick *one* pasta from the sample and record the associated color.



Resampling our Pasta Sample

How do we obtain a *bootstrap sample*?

1. Randomly pick *one* pasta from the sample and record the associated color.
2. Put this pasta back in the sample.



Resampling our Pasta Sample

How do we obtain a *bootstrap sample*?

1. Randomly pick *one* pasta from the sample and record the associated color.
2. Put this pasta back in the sample.
3. Repeat steps 1 and 2 49 times, i.e. *until the new sample is of the same size as the original sample*.



Resampling our Pasta Sample

How do we obtain a *bootstrap sample*?

1. Randomly pick *one* pasta from the sample and record the associated color.
2. Put this pasta back in the sample.
3. Repeat steps 1 and 2 49 times, i.e. *until the new sample is of the same size as the original sample*.
4. Compute the proportion of green pasta in the bootstrap sample.



Resampling our Pasta Sample

How do we obtain a *bootstrap sample*?

1. Randomly pick *one* pasta from the sample and record the associated color.
2. Put this pasta back in the sample.
3. Repeat steps 1 and 2 49 times, i.e. *until the new sample is of the same size as the original sample*.
4. Compute the proportion of green pasta in the bootstrap sample.

This procedure is called *resampling with replacement*:

- *resampling*: drawing repeated samples from a sample.
- *with replacement*: each time the drawn pasta is put back in the sample.



Resampling our Pasta Sample

Here is one bootstrap sample:

```
one_bootstrap = my_sample %>%
  rep_sample_n(size = 50, replace = TRUE) %>%
  arrange(pasta_ID)

head(one_bootstrap, 8)
```

```
## # A tibble: 8 x 3
## # Groups:   replicate [1]
##   replicate pasta_ID color
##       <int>     <int> <fct>
## 1         1         4 non-green
## 2         1        41 non-green
## 3         1        41 non-green
## 4         1        79 non-green
## 5         1        79 non-green
## 6         1       103 non-green
## 7         1       103 non-green
## 8         1       103 non-green
```

```
nrow(one_bootstrap)
```

```
## [1] 50
```



Resampling our Pasta Sample

Here is one bootstrap sample:

```
one_bootstrap = my_sample %>%
  rep_sample_n(size = 50, replace = TRUE) %>%
  arrange(pasta_ID)

head(one_bootstrap, 8)

## # A tibble: 8 x 3
## # Groups:   replicate [1]
##   replicate pasta_ID color
##       <int>    <int> <fct>
## 1         1        4 non-green
## 2         1       41 non-green
## 3         1       41 non-green
## 4         1       79 non-green
## 5         1       79 non-green
## 6         1      103 non-green
## 7         1      103 non-green
## 8         1      103 non-green

nrow(one_bootstrap)

## [1] 50
```

Several pasta have been drawn multiple times. How come?

What's the proportion of green pasta in this bootstrap sample?

```
mean(one_bootstrap$color == "green")
## [1] 0.4
```

The proportion is different than that in our sample! This is due to resampling **with replacement**.

What if we repeated this resampling procedure many times? Would the proportion be the same each time?



Obtaining the Bootstrap Distribution

- Let's repeat the resampling procedure 1000 times: there will be 1000 bootstrap samples and 1000 bootstrap estimates!



Obtaining the Bootstrap Distribution

- Let's repeat the resampling procedure 1000 times: there will be 1000 bootstrap samples and 1000 bootstrap estimates!

We use the `infer` package to ease the bootstrapping procedure.

```
library(infer)

bootstrap_distrib = my_sample %>%
  # specify the variable and level of interest
  specify(response = color, success = "green") %>%
  # generate 1000 bootstrap samples
  generate(reps = 1000, type = "bootstrap") %>%
  # calculate the proportion of green pasta for each
  calculate(stat = "prop")
```



Obtaining the Bootstrap Distribution

- Let's repeat the resampling procedure 1000 times: there will be 1000 bootstrap samples and 1000 bootstrap estimates!

We use the `infer` package to ease the bootstrapping procedure.

```
library(infer)

bootstrap_distrib = my_sample %>%
  # specify the variable and level of interest
  specify(response = color, success = "green") %>%
  # generate 1000 bootstrap samples
  generate(reps = 1000, type = "bootstrap") %>%
  # calculate the proportion of green pasta for each
  calculate(stat = "prop")
```

Here are the first 6 rows:

```
head(bootstrap_distrib)

## # A tibble: 6 x 2
##   replicate stat
##       <int> <dbl>
## 1         1  0.44
## 2         2  0.36
## 3         3  0.46
## 4         4  0.46
## 5         5  0.52
## 6         6  0.52
```


```
nrow(bootstrap_distrib)

## [1] 1000
```


Let's visualize this sampling variation!



Bootstrap Distribution




Bootstrap Distribution




The *bootstrap distribution* is an approximation of the *sampling distribution*.



Bootstrap Distribution with Mean




Bootstrap Distribution with Mean



The **bootstrap distribution** mean is very close to the original sample proportion.



Bootstrap Distribution with Mean



Let's use this **bootstrap distribution** to construct confidence intervals!



Understanding Confidence Intervals

- Analogy with fishing:
 - *point estimate*: fishing with a spear.



Understanding Confidence Intervals

- Analogy with fishing:
 - *point estimate*: fishing with a spear.
 - *confidence interval*: fishing with a net.



Understanding Confidence Intervals

- Analogy with fishing:
 - *point estimate*: fishing with a spear.
 - *confidence interval*: fishing with a net.
- In our case the fish is the true proportion of pasta in the bowl that are green (p).



Understanding Confidence Intervals

- Analogy with fishing:
 - *point estimate*: fishing with a spear.
 - *confidence interval*: fishing with a net.
- In our case the fish is the true proportion of pasta in the bowl that are green (p).
- The *point estimate* would be the proportion of green pasta obtained from a random sample (\hat{p}).



Understanding Confidence Intervals

- Analogy with fishing:
 - *point estimate*: fishing with a spear.
 - *confidence interval*: fishing with a net.
- In our case the fish is the true proportion of pasta in the bowl that are green (p).
- The *point estimate* would be the proportion of green pasta obtained from a random sample (\hat{p}).
- The *confidence interval*: from the previous bootstrap distribution, ***where do most proportions lie?***



Understanding Confidence Intervals

- Analogy with fishing:
 - *point estimate*: fishing with a spear.
 - *confidence interval*: fishing with a net.
- In our case the fish is the true proportion of pasta in the bowl that are green (p).
- The *point estimate* would be the proportion of green pasta obtained from a random sample (\hat{p}).
- The *confidence interval*: from the previous bootstrap distribution, ***where do most proportions lie?***
- Method for confidence interval construction: ***percentile method***.



Understanding Confidence Intervals

- Analogy with fishing:
 - *point estimate*: fishing with a spear.
 - *confidence interval*: fishing with a net.
- In our case the fish is the true proportion of pasta in the bowl that are green (p).
- The *point estimate* would be the proportion of green pasta obtained from a random sample (\hat{p}).
- The *confidence interval*: from the previous bootstrap distribution, ***where do most proportions lie?***
- Method for confidence interval construction: ***percentile method***.
- Requires specifying a ***confidence level***: 90%, 95%, and 99% are the most common.



Percentile Method: 95% Confidence Interval

- Construct a confidence interval as the middle 95% of values of the bootstrap distribution.



Percentile Method: 95% Confidence Interval

- Construct a confidence interval as the middle 95% of values of the bootstrap distribution.
- For that, we compute the 2.5% and 97.5% percentile:

```
quantile(bootstrap_distrib$stat, 0.025)
```

```
## 2.5%
## 0.32
```

```
quantile(bootstrap_distrib$stat, 0.975)
```

```
## 97.5%
## 0.6
```

- Therefore the 95% confidence interval is [0.32; 0.6].
- It is a *range* of values.



Percentile Method: 95% Confidence Interval

- Construct a confidence interval as the middle 95% of values of the bootstrap distribution.
- For that, we compute the 2.5% and 97.5% percentile:

```
quantile(bootstrap_distrib$stat, 0.025)
```

```
## 2.5%
## 0.32
```


```
quantile(bootstrap_distrib$stat, 0.975)
```

```
## 97.5%
## 0.6
```


- Therefore the 95% confidence interval is [0.32; 0.6].
- It is a *range* of values.
- Let's see this confidence interval on the sampling distribution.



Percentile Method: 95% Confidence Interval Visually




Percentile Method: 95% Confidence Interval Visually




Does the interval contain the true population proportion?



Percentile Method: 95% Confidence Interval Visually



Percentile Method: 95% Confidence Interval Visually



True population parameter is indeed in our 95% interval! Will it always be?



Interpreting a 95% Confidence Interval

Let's repeatedly draw 100 different samples from our `bowl` and for each sample compute the associated 95% CI using the percentile method.



Interpreting a 95% Confidence Interval

Let's repeatedly draw 100 different samples from our `bowl` and for each sample compute the associated 95% CI using the percentile method.



How many confidence intervals contain the true parameter? Why?

Interpreting a 95% Confidence Interval

Precise interpretation: If we repeated our sampling procedure ***a large number of times***, we ***expect about 95%*** of the resulting confidence intervals to capture the value of the population parameter.

In other words, 95% of the time, the 95% confidence interval will contain the true population parameter.



Interpreting a 95% Confidence Interval

Precise interpretation: If we repeated our sampling procedure ***a large number of times***, we ***expect about 95%*** of the resulting confidence intervals to capture the value of the population parameter.

In other words, 95% of the time, the 95% confidence interval will contain the true population parameter.

Short-hand interpretation: We are ***95% “confident”*** that a 95% confidence interval captures the value of the population parameter.



Interpreting a 95% Confidence Interval

Precise interpretation: If we repeated our sampling procedure ***a large number of times***, we ***expect about 95%*** of the resulting confidence intervals to capture the value of the population parameter.

In other words, 95% of the time, the 95% confidence interval will contain the true population parameter.

Short-hand interpretation: We are ***95% “confident”*** that a 95% confidence interval captures the value of the population parameter.

Questions:

- How does the width of the confidence interval change as the ***confidence level*** increases?
- How does the width of the confidence interval change as the ***sample size*** increases?



Interpreting a 95% Confidence Interval

Precise interpretation: If we repeated our sampling procedure ***a large number of times***, we ***expect about 95%*** of the resulting confidence intervals to capture the value of the population parameter.

In other words, 95% of the time, the 95% confidence interval will contain the true population parameter.

Short-hand interpretation: We are ***95% “confident”*** that a 95% confidence interval captures the value of the population parameter.

Impact of confidence level: the greater the confidence level, the wider the confidence intervals.

- *Intuition:* a greater confidence level means the confidence interval needs to contain the true population parameter more often, and thus needs to be wider to ensure this.



Interpreting a 95% Confidence Interval

Precise interpretation: If we repeated our sampling procedure **a large number of times**, we **expect about 95%** of the resulting confidence intervals to capture the value of the population parameter.

In other words, 95% of the time, the 95% confidence interval will contain the true population parameter.

Short-hand interpretation: We are **95% “confident”** that a 95% confidence interval captures the value of the population parameter.

Impact of confidence level: the greater the confidence level, the wider the confidence intervals.

- *Intuition:* a greater confidence level means the confidence interval needs to contain the true population parameter more often, and thus needs to be wider to ensure this.

Impact of sample size: the greater the confidence level, the wider the confidence intervals.

- *Inuition:* a larger sample size leads to less sampling variation and therefore a narrower bootstrap distribution, which in turn leads to thinner confidence intervals.



From Confidence Intervals to Hypothesis Testing

- *Confidence intervals* can be thought of as an extension of *point estimation*.



From Confidence Intervals to Hypothesis Testing

- *Confidence intervals* can be thought of as an extension of *point estimation*.
- What if we want to **compare** a sample statistic for two groups?
 - *Example:* differences in average wages between men and women. Are the observed differences **significant?**



From Confidence Intervals to Hypothesis Testing

- *Confidence intervals* can be thought of as an extension of *point estimation*.
- What if we want to **compare** a sample statistic for two groups?
 - *Example:* differences in average wages between men and women. Are the observed differences **significant**?
- These comparisons are the realm of ***hypothesis testing***.



From Confidence Intervals to Hypothesis Testing

- *Confidence intervals* can be thought of as an extension of *point estimation*.
- What if we want to **compare** a sample statistic for two groups?
 - *Example:* differences in average wages between men and women. Are the observed differences **significant**?
- These comparisons are the realm of ***hypothesis testing***.
- Just like confidence intervals, hypothesis tests are used to make claims about a population based on information from a sample.
- However, we'll see that the framework for making such inferences is slightly different.



Hypothesis Testing

Is There Gender Discrimination In Promotions?

- We will use data from an [article](#) published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* in 1974 which investigated whether female employees at banks were discriminated against.
- 48 (male) supervisors were given *identical* candidate CVs, differing only with respect to the first name, which was male or female.
 - Each CV was "*in the form of a memorandum requesting a decision on the promotion of an employee to the position of branch manager.*"



Is There Gender Discrimination In Promotions?

- We will use data from an **article** published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* in 1974 which investigated whether female employees at banks were discriminated against.
- 48 (male) supervisors were given *identical* candidate CVs, differing only with respect to the first name, which was male or female.
 - Each CV was "*in the form of a memorandum requesting a decision on the promotion of an employee to the position of branch manager.*"
- **Hypothesis** we want to test: *Is there gender discrimination?*



Is There Gender Discrimination In Promotions?

- We will use data from an **article** published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* in 1974 which investigated whether female employees at banks were discriminated against.
- 48 (male) supervisors were given *identical* candidate CVs, differing only with respect to the first name, which was male or female.
 - Each CV was "*in the form of a memorandum requesting a decision on the promotion of an employee to the position of branch manager.*"
- **Hypothesis** we want to test: *Is there gender discrimination?*
- The data from the experiment are provided in the **promotions** dataset from the **moderndive** package.



Is There Gender Discrimination In Promotions?

- We will use data from an **article** published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* in 1974 which investigated whether female employees at banks were discriminated against.
- 48 (male) supervisors were given *identical* candidate CVs, differing only with respect to the first name, which was male or female.
 - Each CV was "*in the form of a memorandum requesting a decision on the promotion of an employee to the position of branch manager.*"
- **Hypothesis** we want to test: *Is there gender discrimination?*

- The data from the experiment are provided in the **promotions** dataset from the **moderndive** package.

```
library(moderndive)
head(promotions)

## # A tibble: 6 x 3
##       id decision gender
##   <int> <fct>    <fct>
## 1     1 promoted male
## 2     2 promoted male
## 3     3 promoted male
## 4     4 promoted male
## 5     5 promoted male
## 6     6 promoted male
```



Evidence of Discrimination?

How many men and women were offered a promotion (and not)?

```
promotions %>%
  group_by(gender, decision) %>%
  tally() %>%
  mutate(percentage = 100 * n / sum(n))

## # A tibble: 4 x 4
## # Groups:   gender [2]
##   gender decision     n percentage
##   <fct>   <fct>   <int>      <dbl>
## 1 male    not         3        12.5
## 2 male    promoted   21       87.5
## 3 female  not        10       41.7
## 4 female  promoted  14       58.3
```

There is a **29.2 percentage points difference** in promotions between men and women!



Evidence of Discrimination?

How many men and women were offered a promotion (and not)?


```
promotions %>%
  group_by(gender, decision) %>%
  tally() %>%
  mutate(percentage = 100 * n / sum(n))

## # A tibble: 4 x 4
## # Groups:   gender [2]
##   gender decision     n percentage
##   <fct>   <fct>   <int>      <dbl>
## 1 male    not        3       12.5
## 2 male    promoted  21      87.5
## 3 female  not       10      41.7
## 4 female  promoted 14      58.3
```

There is a **29.2 percentage points difference** in promotions between men and women!

Promotion decision

decision ■ not ■ promoted



Evidence of Discrimination?

How many men and women were offered a promotion (and not)?


```
promotions %>%
  group_by(gender, decision) %>%
  tally() %>%
  mutate(percentage = 100 * n / sum(n))

## # A tibble: 4 x 4
## # Groups:   gender [2]
##   gender decision     n percentage
##   <fct>   <fct>   <int>      <dbl>
## 1 male    not        3       12.5
## 2 male    promoted  21      87.5
## 3 female  not       10      41.7
## 4 female  promoted 14      58.3
```

There is a **29.2 percentage points difference** in promotions between men and women!

Promotion decision

decision ■ not ■ promoted



Question: Is this difference **conclusive evidence** of differences in promotion rates between men and women? Could such a difference have been observed **by chance**?



Imposing A Hypothetical World: No Gender Discrimination

- Suppose we lived in a world without gender discrimination: the promotion decision would be completely *independent* from gender.
- Let's randomly reassign `gender` to each row and see how this affects the result.



Imposing A Hypothetical World: No Gender Discrimination

- Suppose we lived in a world without gender discrimination: the promotion decision would be completely *independent* from gender.
- Let's randomly reassign `gender` to each row and see how this affects the result.

```
head(bind_cols(promotions, promotions_shuffled)) %>%
  select(id, decision, gender, gender1) %>%
  rename(shuffled_gender = gender1)

## # A tibble: 6 x 4
##       id decision gender shuffled_gender
##   <int> <fct>    <fct>    <fct>
## 1     1 promoted male    female
## 2     2 promoted male    female
## 3     3 promoted male     male
## 4     4 promoted male    female
## 5     5 promoted male     male
## 6     6 promoted male     male
```

How do the promotion rates look like in our reshuffled sample?



Imposing A Hypothetical World: No Gender Discrimination

- Suppose we lived in a world without gender discrimination: the promotion decision would be completely *independent* from gender.
- Let's randomly reassign `gender` to each row and see how this affects the result.

```
head(bind_cols(promotions, promotions_shuffled)) %>%
  select(id, decision, gender, gender1) %>%
  rename(shuffled_gender = gender1)

## # A tibble: 6 x 4
##       id decision gender shuffled_gender
##   <int> <fct>    <fct>    <fct>
## 1     1 promoted male    female
## 2     2 promoted male    female
## 3     3 promoted male     male
## 4     4 promoted male    female
## 5     5 promoted male     male
## 6     6 promoted male     male
```

How do the promotion rates look like in our reshuffled sample?

```
promotions_shuffled %>%
  group_by(gender, decision) %>%
  tally() %>%
  mutate(percentage = 100 * n / sum(n))

## # A tibble: 4 x 4
## # Groups:   gender [2]
##   gender decision     n percentage
##   <fct>    <fct> <int>      <dbl>
## 1 male     not        6        25
## 2 male     promoted   18       75
## 3 female   not        7       29.2
## 4 female   promoted  17      70.8
```

The difference is much lower: **4.2 percentage points!**




Imposing A Hypothetical World: No Gender Discrimination

- Suppose we lived in a world without gender discrimination: the promotion decision would be completely *independent* from gender.
- Let's randomly reassign `gender` to each row and see how this affects the result.

```
head(bind_cols(promotions, promotions_shuffled)) %>%
  select(id, decision, gender, gender1) %>%
  rename(shuffled_gender = gender1)

## # A tibble: 6 x 4
##       id decision gender shuffled_gender
##   <int> <fct>    <fct>    <fct>
## 1     1 promoted male     female
## 2     2 promoted male     female
## 3     3 promoted male      male
## 4     4 promoted male     female
## 5     5 promoted male      male
## 6     6 promoted male      male
```

How do the promotion rates look like in our reshuffled sample?



Sampling Variation

- In our hypothetical world, the difference in promotion rates was only 4.2 percentage points.
- Can we answer our initial question about the existence of gender discrimination now?



Sampling Variation

- In our hypothetical world, the difference in promotion rates was only 4.2 percentage points.
- Can we answer our initial question about the existence of gender discrimination now?
- No, we must investigate the role of *sampling variation!*
 - What if we reshuffle once again, how different from 4.2% p would the difference be?



Sampling Variation

- In our hypothetical world, the difference in promotion rates was only 4.2 percentage points.
- Can we answer our initial question about the existence of gender discrimination now?
- No, we must investigate the role of *sampling variation!*
 - What if we reshuffle once again, how different from 4.2% p would the difference be?
 - In other words, how representative of that hypothetical world is 4.2% p ?



Sampling Variation

- In our hypothetical world, the difference in promotion rates was only 4.2 percentage points.
- Can we answer our initial question about the existence of gender discrimination now?
- No, we must investigate the role of *sampling variation!*
 - What if we reshuffle once again, how different from 4.2%p would the difference be?
 - In other words, how representative of that hypothetical world is 4.2%p?
 - How likely is a 29%p difference to occur in such a world?



Sampling Variation

- In our hypothetical world, the difference in promotion rates was only 4.2 percentage points.
- Can we answer our initial question about the existence of gender discrimination now?
- No, we must investigate the role of *sampling variation!*
 - What if we reshuffle once again, how different from 4.2%p would the difference be?
 - In other words, how representative of that hypothetical world is 4.2%p?
 - How likely is a 29%p difference to occur in such a world?
- We need to know about the whole sampling distribution under the *no discrimination* hypothesis.




Sampling Variation


- In our hypothetical world, the difference in promotion rates was only 4.2 percentage points.
- Can we answer our initial question about the existence of gender discrimination now?
- No, we must investigate the role of *sampling variation!*
 - What if we reshuffle once again, how different from 4.2%p would the difference be?
 - In other words, how representative of that hypothetical world is 4.2%p?
 - How likely is a 29%p difference to occur in such a world?
- We need to know about the whole sampling distribution under the *no discrimination* hypothesis.
- How? Just by redoing the reshuffling a large number of times, and computing the difference each time.



Sampling Distribution with 1000 Reshufflings



Sampling Distribution with 1000 Reshufflings



How *likely* is it to observe a 0.292 difference in a world with no discrimination?



What did we just do?

- We just demonstrated the statistical procedure known as *hypothesis testing* using a *permutation test*.



What did we just do?

- We just demonstrated the statistical procedure known as *hypothesis testing* using a *permutation test*.
- The question is how likely the observed difference in promotion rates is to occur in a hypothetical universe with no discrimination.



What did we just do?

- We just demonstrated the statistical procedure known as *hypothesis testing* using a *permutation test*.
- The question is how likely the observed difference in promotion rates is to occur in a hypothetical universe with no discrimination.
- We concluded *rather not*, i.e. we tended to *reject* the no discrimination hypothesis.



What did we just do?

- We just demonstrated the statistical procedure known as *hypothesis testing* using a *permutation test*.
- The question is how likely the observed difference in promotion rates is to occur in a hypothetical universe with no discrimination.
- We concluded *rather not*, i.e. we tended to *reject* the no discrimination hypothesis.
- Let's introduce the formal framework of hypothesis testing now.



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- A ***hypothesis test*** consists of a test between ***two competing hypotheses*** about the population parameter:



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- A ***hypothesis test*** consists of a test between ***two competing hypotheses*** about the population parameter:
 - The ***null hypothesis*** (H_0): generally hypothesis of no difference;



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- A ***hypothesis test*** consists of a test between ***two competing hypotheses*** about the population parameter:
 - The ***null hypothesis*** (H_0): generally hypothesis of no difference;
 - The ***alternative hypothesis*** (H_A or H_1): the research hypothesis.



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- A ***hypothesis test*** consists of a test between ***two competing hypotheses*** about the population parameter:
 - The ***null hypothesis*** (H_0): generally hypothesis of no difference;
 - The ***alternative hypothesis*** (H_A or H_1): the research hypothesis.
- In the previous example:

$$H_0 : p_m - p_f = 0$$

$$H_A : p_m - p_f > 0,$$

where p_m = promotion rate of men, and p_f = promotion rate of women.



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- A ***hypothesis test*** consists of a test between ***two competing hypotheses*** about the population parameter:
 - The ***null hypothesis*** (H_0): generally hypothesis of no difference;
 - The ***alternative hypothesis*** (H_A or H_1): the research hypothesis.
- In the previous example:

$$H_0 : p_m - p_f = 0$$

$$H_A : p_m - p_f > 0,$$

where p_m = promotion rate of men, and p_f = promotion rate of women.

- Here, we considered a ***one-sided*** alternative, stating that $p_m > p_f$, i.e. women are discriminated against.
- The ***two-sided*** formulation is just $H_A : p_m - p_f \neq 0$.



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- **Test statistic:** *point estimate/sample statistic formula used for hypothesis testing.*



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- **Test statistic:** point estimate/sample statistic formula used for hypothesis testing.
 - In our previous case: difference in sample proportions $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f$.



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- **Test statistic:** point estimate/sample statistic formula used for hypothesis testing.
 - In our previous case: difference in sample proportions $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f$.
- **Observed test statistic:** value of the test statistic that we observed in real life.



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- **Test statistic:** point estimate/sample statistic formula used for hypothesis testing.
 - *In our previous case:* difference in sample proportions $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f$.
- **Observed test statistic:** value of the test statistic that we observed in real life.
 - *In our previous case:* observed difference $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f = 0.292 = 29.2$ percentage points.



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- **Test statistic:** point estimate/sample statistic formula used for hypothesis testing.
 - *In our previous case:* difference in sample proportions $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f$.
- **Observed test statistic:** value of the test statistic that we observed in real life.
 - *In our previous case:* observed difference $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f = 0.292 = 29.2$ percentage points.
- **Null distribution:** sampling distribution of the test statistic *assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true.*




Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- **Test statistic:** point estimate/sample statistic formula used for hypothesis testing.
 - *In our previous case:* difference in sample proportions $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f$.
- **Observed test statistic:** value of the test statistic that we observed in real life.
 - *In our previous case:* observed difference $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f = 0.292 = 29.2$ percentage points.
- **Null distribution:** sampling distribution of the test statistic *assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true.*
 - *In our previous case:* All the possible values that $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f$ can take assuming there is no discrimination.
 - That's the distribution we have seen just before.



Null Distribution



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

p-value: probability of observing a test statistic *just as or more extreme* than the one we obtained, assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true. 🤔



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

p-value: probability of observing a test statistic *just as or more extreme* than the one we obtained, assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true. 🤔

- How surprised are we that we observed a difference in promotions rates of 0.292 in our sample assuming H_0 is true, that is a world without discrimination? Very surprised? Kind of surprised?



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

p-value: probability of observing a test statistic *just as or more extreme* than the one we obtained, assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true. 🤔

- How surprised are we that we observed a difference in promotions rates of 0.292 in our sample assuming H_0 is true, that is a world without discrimination? Very surprised? Kind of surprised?
- What do we mean by **more extreme**?
 - Defined in terms of the alternative hypothesis: in this case, men are **more likely** to be promoted than women. Therefore, **more extreme** in our case means observing a difference in promotion rates **greater than 0.292**.



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

p-value: probability of observing a test statistic *just as or more extreme* than the one we obtained, assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true. 🤔

- How surprised are we that we observed a difference in promotions rates of 0.292 in our sample assuming H_0 is true, that is a world without discrimination? Very surprised? Kind of surprised?
- What do we mean by **more extreme**?
 - Defined in terms of the alternative hypothesis: in this case, men are **more likely** to be promoted than women. Therefore, **more extreme** in our case means observing a difference in promotion rates **greater than 0.292**.
- **Interpretation:** the lower the p-value, the *less consistent our null hypothesis is with the observed statistic.*



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

p-value: probability of observing a test statistic *just as or more extreme* than the one we obtained, assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true. 🤔

- How surprised are we that we observed a difference in promotions rates of 0.292 in our sample assuming H_0 is true, that is a world without discrimination? Very surprised? Kind of surprised?
- What do we mean by **more extreme**?
 - Defined in terms of the alternative hypothesis: in this case, men are **more likely** to be promoted than women. Therefore, **more extreme** in our case means observing a difference in promotion rates **greater than 0.292**.
- **Interpretation:** the lower the p-value, the *less consistent our null hypothesis is with the observed statistic.*
- When do we decide to **reject** H_0 or not?



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- To decide whether we reject H_0 or not, we set a *significance level* for the test.



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- To decide whether we reject H_0 or not, we set a **significance level** for the test.
- **Significance level (α)**: acts as a *cutoff* on the p-value.
 - Common values are $\alpha = 0.01, 0.05$, or 0.1 .



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- To decide whether we reject H_0 or not, we set a **significance level** for the test.
- **Significance level (α):** acts as a *cutoff* on the p-value.
 - Common values are $\alpha = 0.01, 0.05$, or 0.1 .
- **Decision:**
 - If the p-value falls ***below the cutoff α*** , we "***reject the null hypothesis at the significance level α*** ."



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- To decide whether we reject H_0 or not, we set a **significance level** for the test.
- **Significance level (α):** acts as a *cutoff* on the p-value.
 - Common values are $\alpha = 0.01, 0.05$, or 0.1 .
- **Decision:**
 - If the p-value falls *below the cutoff α* , we "*reject the null hypothesis at the significance level α* ."
 - Alternatively, if the p-value is *greater than α* , we say that we "*fail to reject the null hypothesis H_0 at the significance level α* ."



Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions

- To decide whether we reject H_0 or not, we set a **significance level** for the test.
- **Significance level (α)**: acts as a *cutoff* on the p-value.
 - Common values are $\alpha = 0.01, 0.05$, or 0.1 .
- **Decision**:
 - If the p-value falls *below the cutoff α* , we "**reject the null hypothesis at the significance level α** ."
 - Alternatively, if the p-value is *greater than α* , we say that we "**fail to reject the null hypothesis H_0 at the significance level α** ."
- **Interpretation**: If what we observe is *too unlikely to happen* under the null hypothesis, it means that this hypothesis is **likely to be false**.




Hypothesis Test Notation and Definitions


- To decide whether we reject H_0 or not, we set a **significance level** for the test.
- **Significance level (α):** acts as a *cutoff* on the p-value.
 - Common values are $\alpha = 0.01, 0.05$, or 0.1 .
- **Decision:**
 - If the p-value falls *below the cutoff α* , we "**reject the null hypothesis at the significance level α .**"
 - Alternatively, if the p-value is *greater than α* , we say that we "**fail to reject the null hypothesis H_0 at the significance level α .**"
- **Interpretation:** If what we observe is *too unlikely to happen* under the null hypothesis, it means that this hypothesis is **likely to be false**.
- Let's illustrate how it works in our example.



Visualizing the P-value



Visualizing the P-value



The shaded area corresponds to the p-value!



Obtaining the p-value and Deciding

- Recall the definition of the p-value: *probability of observing a test statistic just as or more extreme than the one we obtained, assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true.*



Obtaining the p-value and Deciding

- Recall the definition of the p-value: *probability of observing a test statistic just as or more extreme than the one we obtained, assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true.*
- The shaded area corresponds to the share of *test statistics under the null hypothesis* that exceed the *observed test statistic* (0.292).

```
p_value <- mean(null_distribution$stat >= 0.292)
p_value
## [1] 0.007
```

- In a world without discrimination, we would get $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f$ superior (or equal) to 0.292 only 0.7% of the time.



Obtaining the p-value and Deciding

- Recall the definition of the p-value: *probability of observing a test statistic just as or more extreme than the one we obtained, assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true.*
- The shaded area corresponds to the share of *test statistics under the null hypothesis* that exceed the *observed test statistic* (0.292).

```
p_value <- mean(null_distribution$stat >= 0.292)
p_value
## [1] 0.007
```

- In a world without discrimination, we would get $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f$ superior (or equal) to 0.292 only 0.7% of the time.
- So, we can reject H_0 , i.e. the absence of discrimination, at the 5% significance level.
 - We also say that $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f = 0.292$ is *statistically significantly different from 0* at the 5% level.



Obtaining the p-value and Deciding

- Recall the definition of the p-value: *probability of observing a test statistic just as or more extreme than the one we obtained, assuming the null hypothesis H_0 is true.*
- The shaded area corresponds to the share of *test statistics under the null hypothesis* that exceed the *observed test statistic* (0.292).

```
p_value <- mean(null_distribution$stat >= 0.292)
p_value
## [1] 0.007
```

- In a world without discrimination, we would get $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f$ superior (or equal) to 0.292 only 0.7% of the time.
- So, we can reject H_0 , i.e. the absence of discrimination, at the 5% significance level.
 - We also say that $\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_f = 0.292$ is *statistically significantly different from 0* at the 5% level.
- **Question:** Suppose we had set $\alpha = 0.01 = 1\%$, would we have rejected the absence of discrimination at this level?



Testing Errors

Working with probabilities implies that sometimes, we make **errors**.



Testing Errors

Working with probabilities implies that sometimes, we make **errors**.

- A 29% p difference may be *unlikely* under H_0 , but that **doesn't mean it's impossible to occur**.
 - In fact, such a difference (or higher) would occur (approximately) in 0.007% of cases.



Testing Errors

Working with probabilities implies that sometimes, we make **errors**.

- A 29% p difference may be *unlikely* under H_0 , but that **doesn't mean it's impossible to occur**.
 - In fact, such a difference (or higher) would occur (approximately) in 0.007% of cases.
- So, it may happen that we sometimes reject H_0 , when in fact it was true.
 - Setting 5% significance level, you make sure it won't happen more than 5% of the time.



Testing Errors

In hypothesis testing, there are **two types of errors**:

	H0 true	HA true
Verdict		
Fail to reject H0	Correct	Type II error
Reject H0	Type I error	Correct

Type I error: reject the null hypothesis when in fact it was true. **false positive**

Type II error: don't reject the null hypothesis when in fact it was false. **false negative**

- In practice, we choose the frequency of a Type I error by setting α and try to minimize the type II error.



How does all of this relate to regression analysis?

- Now you have all the tools to make *statistical inference* for real!



How does all of this relate to regression analysis?

- Now you have all the tools to make *statistical inference* for real!
- Regression analysis is based on a *sample* of data.



How does all of this relate to regression analysis?

- Now you have all the tools to make *statistical inference* for real!
- Regression analysis is based on a *sample* of data.
- So your *regression coefficient* is subject to *sampling variation*, it's not the true population coefficient.



How does all of this relate to regression analysis?

- Now you have all the tools to make *statistical inference* for real!
- Regression analysis is based on a *sample* of data.
- So your *regression coefficient* is subject to *sampling variation*, it's not the true population coefficient.
- *Question:* Is the estimated effect statistically significantly different from 0?



How does all of this relate to regression analysis?

- Now you have all the tools to make **statistical inference** for real!
- Regression analysis is based on a **sample** of data.
- So your **regression coefficient** is subject to **sampling variation**, it's not the true population coefficient.
- **Question:** Is the estimated effect statistically significantly different from 0?
- The answer in the next episode of *Introduction to Econometrics with R!* 🧑



THANKS

To the amazing **moderndive** team!



END

✉ florian.oswald@sciencespo.fr

🔗 Slides

🔗 Book

🐦 @ScPoEcon

Ⓜ️ @ScPoEcon

