

# Inference for Categorical Data

# Categorical Variables

# Reading

- Textbook sections 6.3, 6.4
- OpenIntro Slides:
  - $\chi^2$  test of goodness-of-fit: [http://www.openintro.org/redirect.php?go=gdoc\\_os3\\_slides\\_6-3&referrer=os3\\_pdf](http://www.openintro.org/redirect.php?go=gdoc_os3_slides_6-3&referrer=os3_pdf)
  - $\chi^2$  test of independence: [http://www.openintro.org/redirect.php?go=gdoc\\_os3\\_slides\\_6-4&referrer=os3\\_pdf](http://www.openintro.org/redirect.php?go=gdoc_os3_slides_6-4&referrer=os3_pdf)
- Recommended Exercise: 6.39, 6.40, 6.41, 6.42, 6.45, 6.47, 6.48

# Examples of Analyses with Categorical Data

Let's say we are doing a survey where we ask people what was their first pet.

If we ask 10 people, and our responses are: dog, cat, dog, hamster, goldfish, dog, dog, ferret, cat, no pet

Then, how do we calculate average??

# Examples of Analyses with Categorical Data

Let's say we are doing a survey where we ask people what was their first pet.

If we ask 10 people, and our responses are: dog, cat, dog, hamster, goldfish, dog, dog, ferret, cat, no pet

Then, how do we calculate average??

**We can't!**

# Examples of Analyses with Categorical Data

Let's say we are doing a survey where we ask people what was their first pet.

If we ask 10 people, and our responses are: dog, cat, dog, hamster, goldfish, dog, dog, ferret, cat, no pet

Then, how do we calculate average??

**We can't!**

Can we still do analysis??

# Examples of Analyses with Categorical Data

Let's say we are doing a survey where we ask people what was their first pet.

If we ask 10 people, and our responses are: dog, cat, dog, hamster, goldfish, dog, dog, ferret, cat, no pet

Then, how do we calculate average??

**We can't!**

Can we still do analysis??

**Yep!!!!!! Can use  $\chi^2$  tests**

# Contingency Table Recap



# Contingency Tables

	Air France	US Air	Row Totals
excellent	27	36	63
fair	10	19	29
good	24	55	79
poor	5	14	19
Col Totals	66	124	190

---

Before we discuss the test, recall what a contingency table is.

The following contingency table shows:

- count of people using Air France or US Air
- count of service quality score of *poor*, *fair*, *good* or *excellent* for each person's airline

# Recall Calculating Probabilities

	Air France	US Air	Row Totals
excellent	27	36	63
fair	10	19	29
good	24	55	79
poor	5	14	19
Col Totals	66	124	190

First define the following terms

- $n_{ij}$  = count in  $i^{th}$  row,  $j^{th}$  column

- $n_{i.}$  = total for  $i^{th}$  row

- $n_{.j}$  = total for  $j^{th}$  col

- $n_{..}$  = total count

-e.g.  $n_{11} = 27$ ,  $n_{1.} = 63$ ,  $n_{.1} = 66$ ,  
 $n_{..} = 190$

# Recall Calculating Probabilities

	Air France	US Air	Row Totals
excellent	27	36	63
fair	10	19	29
good	24	55	79
poor	5	14	19
Col Totals	66	124	190

Probability randomly selected person flew Air France?

$$\begin{aligned} &= P(\text{Air France}) = \frac{\text{\# of Air France Ratings}}{\text{total \# of people}} \\ &= \frac{66}{190} = \frac{n_{.1}}{n_{..}} \end{aligned}$$

Probability randomly selected rated their service quality as excellent?

$$\begin{aligned} &= P(\text{Excellent}) = \frac{\text{\# of Excellent Ratings}}{\text{total \# of people}} \\ &= \frac{63}{190} = \frac{n_{1.}}{n_{..}} \end{aligned}$$

# Recall Calculating Probabilities

	Air France	US Air	Row Totals
excellent	27	36	63
fair	10	19	29
good	24	55	79
poor	5	14	19
Col Totals	66	124	190

Probability randomly selected person flew Air France and rated it excellent?

$$\begin{aligned} &= P(\text{Air France and Excellent}) \\ &= \frac{\text{\# of Excellent Air France Ratings}}{\text{total \# of people}} = \frac{27}{190} = \frac{n_{11}}{n_{..}} \end{aligned}$$

# Recall Calculating Probabilities

	Air France	US Air	Row Totals
excellent	27	36	63
fair	10	19	29
good	24	55	79
poor	5	14	19
Col Totals	66	124	190

Note that if service quality is *independent* of airline, then

$$P(\text{Air France and Excellent}) \\ = P(\text{Air France}) * P(\text{Excellent})$$

Here we had

$$P(\text{Air France and Excellent}) = 0.142 \\ \neq 0.115 = P(\text{Air France})P(\text{Excellent})$$

Does this mean Service Quality is *independent* of airline?

# Recall Calculating Probabilities

	Air France	US Air	Row Totals
excellent	27	36	63
fair	10	19	29
good	24	55	79
poor	5	14	19
Col Totals	66	124	190

Note that if service quality is *independent* of airline, then

$$P(\text{Air France and Excellent}) \\ = P(\text{Air France}) * P(\text{Excellent})$$

Here we had

$$P(\text{Air France and Excellent}) = 0.142 \\ \neq 0.115 = P(\text{Air France})P(\text{Excellent})$$

Does this mean service quality is *independent* of airline?

**Nope!**

# Estimating Count

Since the probabilities calculated on the last slide were estimates of the true probabilities, we cannot yet conclude that service quality and airline are independent.

# Estimating Count

Since the probabilities calculated on the last slide were estimates of the true probabilities, we cannot yet conclude that service quality and airline are independent.

$$\text{Let } \hat{E}_{ij} = \frac{n_{i.}}{n_{..}} \frac{n_{.j}}{n_{..}} n_{..} = \frac{n_{i.} n_{.j}}{n_{..}}$$

This is the expected count of the  $ij^{th}$  cell, **if the variables are independent.**



# Estimating Count

Since the probabilities calculated on the last slide were estimates of the true probabilities, we cannot yet conclude that service quality and airline are independent.

$$\text{Let } \hat{E}_{ij} = \frac{n_{i.}}{n_{..}} \frac{n_{.j}}{n_{..}} n_{..} = \frac{n_{i.} n_{.j}}{n_{..}}$$

This is the expected count of the  $ij^{th}$  cell, **if the variables are independent.**

Therefore we can reject the independence assumption if the cell counts,  $n_{ij}$  are *far away* from the expected cell counts under independence  $\hat{E}_{ij}$

# Estimating Count

Since the probabilities calculated on the last slide were estimates of the true probabilities, we cannot yet conclude that service quality and airline are independent.

$$\text{Let } \hat{E}_{ij} = \frac{n_{i.}}{n_{..}} \frac{n_{.j}}{n_{..}} n_{..} = \frac{n_{i.} n_{.j}}{n_{..}}$$

This is the expected count of the  $ij^{th}$  cell, **if the variables are independent**.

Therefore we can reject the independence assumption if the cell counts,  $n_{ij}$  are *far away* from the expected cell counts under independence  $\hat{E}_{ij}$

**This** is the intuition for Pearson's Chi-Squared test.

# Comparing Observed vs Expected Table

Observed Table

	Air France	US Air
excellent	27	36
fair	10	19
good	24	55
poor	5	14

Expected Table

	Air France	US Air
excellent	$\hat{E}_{11} = \frac{n_{1.}n_{.1}}{n_{..}}$	$\frac{n_{1.}n_{.2}}{n_{..}}$
fair	$\frac{n_{2.}n_{.1}}{n_{..}}$	$\frac{n_{2.}n_{.2}}{n_{..}}$
good	$\frac{n_{3.}n_{.1}}{n_{..}}$	$\frac{n_{3.}n_{.2}}{n_{..}}$
poor	$\frac{n_{4.}n_{.1}}{n_{..}}$	$\frac{n_{4.}n_{.2}}{n_{..}}$

# Comparing Observed vs Expected Table

Observed Table

	Air France	US Air
excellent	27	36
fair	10	19
good	24	55
poor	5	14

Expected Table

	Air France	US Air
excellent	21.9	41.1
fair	10.1	18.9
good	27.4	51.6
poor	6.6	12.4

# Chi-Square Test for Independence

# Hypotheses

$H_0$ : There is no association between the two variables (independence)

$H_a$ : The variables are associated (service quality depends on airline)

# Test Statistic

For  $r$  rows, and  $c$  columns, the test statistic is

$$X^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^c \frac{(n_{ij} - \hat{E}_{ij})^2}{\hat{E}_{ij}} \stackrel{H_0}{\sim} \chi_{df}^2$$

where  $df = (r - 1)(c - 1)$

Why this degrees of freedom?

# Pvalue for this test

Since we know the distribution of  $X^2$  under the null, and we know the larger  $X^2$  is, the more in favor of the alternative our statistic is, we can calculate our pvalue as:

$$pvalue = P(X^2 > \chi^2_{(r-1)(c-1)})$$

In R

```
#if X2 is your chi square statistic  
#r is number of rows, c number of columns  
1-pchisq(X2, df = (r-1)*(c-1))
```



# Running everything in R

```
t(table(data))
```

```
##           airline
## quality   Air France US Air
## excellent      27    36
## fair           10    19
## good           24    55
## poor            5    14
```

```
chisq.test(airline, quality)
```

```
##
## Pearson's Chi-squared test
##
## data:  airline and quality
## X-squared = 3.0891, df = 3, p-value = 0.3781
```

**Conclusion:** Since the pvalue  $> 0.05$ , at the 5% significance level we do not have evidence of dependence of in service quality and airline.

# Quick Hair Color vs Iris Color Example

```
HairEyeColor[, , 1]
```

What can we conclude here?

```
##           Eye
## Hair      Brown Blue Hazel Green
## Black      32   11    10     3
## Brown      53   50    25    15
## Red        10   10     7     7
## Blond       3   30     5     8
```

```
chisq.test(HairEyeColor[, , 1])
```

```
##
## Pearson's Chi-squared test
##
## data:  HairEyeColor[, , 1]
## X-squared = 41.28, df = 9, p-value = 4.447e-06
```

# Quick Hair Color vs Iris Color Example

```
HairEyeColor[, , 1]
```

```
##           Eye
## Hair      Brown Blue Hazel Green
## Black      32   11   10     3
## Brown      53   50   25    15
## Red        10   10    7     7
## Blond       3   30    5     8
```

```
chisq.test(HairEyeColor[, , 1])
```

```
##
## Pearson's Chi-squared test
##
## data:  HairEyeColor[, , 1]
## X-squared = 41.28, df = 9, p-value = 4.447e-06
```

What can we conclude here?

Eye Color and Hair Color is dependent at the 5% significance level.

# Required Assumptions

- Each cell has at least 5 observations
- More than 2 degrees of freedom
- Independent observations

# Chi-Square test for Goodness of Fit

# Goodness of Fit

What if instead we have one categorical random variable?

For example, in the original example about “first pet”, we might think 30% of people had a dog, 30% had a cat, 30% had other, and 10% had none.

Can we test this?

# Goodness of Fit

What if instead we have one categorical random variable?

For example, in the original example about “first pet”, we might think 30% of people had a dog, 30% had a cat, 30% had other, and 10% had none.

Can we test this?

**You bet we can!**

# Goodness of Fit

If we have a distribution in mind, we can get the expected number of observations in a category by

$$E_i = n * P(\text{ in category } i ).$$

Then we can calculate our test statistic as:

$$X^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{(n_i - E_i)^2}{E_i} \sim \chi_{r-1}^2$$

We're still interested in if our observed count is close to the expected count.

(Why  $r - 1$  degrees of freedom?)



# Goodness of Fit Example

According to the 2000 census, the education level of adult residents in New York breaks down as follows:

No HS diploma	HS grad	Some college	Assoc or BA	Grad degree
20.8%	27.8%	16.8%	22.8%	11.8%

A state grand jury appoints 64 persons. This jury has the following composition

No HS diploma	HS grad	Some college	Assoc or BA	Grad degree
3	10	16	20	15

Is the education level of the state grand jury representative of that in the general population?

# Goodness of Fit Example in R

```
table.ed
```

```
## Education
##   Assoc or BA      Grad      HS Grad No HS Diploma  Some Collage
##           20          15          10           3           16
```

```
chisq.test(table.ed, p = c(0.228, 0.118, 0.278, 0.208, 0.168))
```

```
##
## Chi-squared test for given probabilities
##
## data:  table.ed
## X-squared = 23.312, df = 4, p-value = 0.0001097
```

Requirements to run this test are the same as for independence testing!