Lesson 14: Chapter 8 Section 2

Caleb Moxley

BSC Mathematics

21 October 15

Comparative studies are very common, and the most typical thing compared are the proportion of the two populations which have a certain characteristic.

Comparative studies are very common, and the most typical thing compared are the proportion of the two populations which have a certain characteristic. For example, we might be interested in the proportion of subjects in who received a vaccine and were later infected with a virus as compared with the proportion of subjects who did not receive a vaccine and were later infected with a virus.

Comparative studies are very common, and the most typical thing compared are the proportion of the two populations which have a certain characteristic. For example, we might be interested in the proportion of subjects in who received a vaccine and were later infected with a virus as compared with the proportion of subjects who did not receive a vaccine and were later infected with a virus. To do, this we can use methods of statistical inference for two proportions.

Comparative studies are very common, and the most typical thing compared are the proportion of the two populations which have a certain characteristic. For example, we might be interested in the proportion of subjects in who received a vaccine and were later infected with a virus as compared with the proportion of subjects who did not receive a vaccine and were later infected with a virus. To do, this we can use methods of statistical inference for two proportions. We usually use the statistic concerning the difference between the two proportions:

Comparative studies are very common, and the most typical thing compared are the proportion of the two populations which have a certain characteristic. For example, we might be interested in the proportion of subjects in who received a vaccine and were later infected with a virus as compared with the proportion of subjects who did not receive a vaccine and were later infected with a virus. To do, this we can use methods of statistical inference for two proportions. We usually use the statistic concerning the difference between the two proportions:

$$D=\hat{p}_1-\hat{p}_2.$$

To conduct inference on the statistic D, we will need to know how it is distributed!

To conduct inference on the statistic D, we will need to know how it is distributed! Because both \hat{p}_1 and \hat{p}_2 are normally distributed, we know that D will be normally distributed — because it is a linear transformation of two normal random variables!

To conduct inference on the statistic D, we will need to know how it is distributed! Because both \hat{p}_1 and \hat{p}_2 are normally distributed, we know that D will be normally distributed — because it is a linear transformation of two normal random variables! Thus, we need only to find the mean and the standard deviation of D in order to compute the z test statistic.

Let's see why the mean and standard deviation of the distribution for D are

$$p_1-p_2 \text{ and } \sqrt{rac{p_1(1-p_1)}{n_1}+rac{p_2(1-p_2)}{n_2}}.$$

Let's see why the mean and standard deviation of the distribution for D are

$$p_1-p_2$$
 and $\sqrt{rac{p_1(1-p_1)}{n_1}+rac{p_2(1-p_2)}{n_2}}.$

Of course, we don't know p_1 or p_2 , so we approximate this with the estimates \hat{p}_1 and \hat{p}_2 . And we get all our resulting methods!

Definition (large samples confidence interval for two proportions)

Choose a SRS of size n_1 from a large population with unknown proportion of success p_1 and a SRS of size n_2 from a large population with unknown proportion of success p_2 . The estimate for the difference in proportions is $D = \hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2$. The standard error of D is

$$\mathsf{SE}_D = \sqrt{rac{\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}{n_1} + rac{\hat{p}_2(1-\hat{p}_2)}{n_2}},$$

and the margin of error for confidence C is $m=z^*SE_D$, where z^* is the value of the N(0,1) RV with area C between $-z^*$ and z^* . The approximate level C confidence interval for p is

$$D \pm m$$
.

As always, there are caveats for any inferential method, and in this case, we must have the number of successes and failures in each sample be both 10 or more.

As always, there are caveats for any inferential method, and in this case, we must have the number of successes and failures in each sample be both 10 or more. If we don't have at least 10 successes and failures in each sample, we can use the **plus four confidence interval** just as in our previous method for a single proportion.

As always, there are caveats for any inferential method, and in this case, we must have the number of successes and failures in each sample be both 10 or more. If we don't have at least 10 successes and failures in each sample, we can use the **plus four confidence interval** just as in our previous method for a single proportion. We, instead would use

$$\tilde{D}=\tilde{p}_1-\tilde{p}_2,$$

where
$$\tilde{p}_1 = \frac{X_1+1}{n_1+2}$$
 and $\tilde{p}_2 = \frac{X_2+1}{n_2+2}$.

As always, there are caveats for any inferential method, and in this case, we must have the number of successes and failures in each sample be both 10 or more. If we don't have at least 10 successes and failures in each sample, we can use the **plus four confidence interval** just as in our previous method for a single proportion. We, instead would use

$$\tilde{D}=\tilde{p}_1-\tilde{p}_2,$$

where $\tilde{p}_1 = \frac{X_1+1}{n_1+2}$ and $\tilde{p}_2 = \frac{X_2+1}{n_2+2}$. With this new statistic, we end up using the same method as in the previous slide, computing $SE_{\tilde{D}}$.

As always, there are caveats for any inferential method, and in this case, we must have the number of successes and failures in each sample be both 10 or more. If we don't have at least 10 successes and failures in each sample, we can use the **plus four confidence interval** just as in our previous method for a single proportion. We, instead would use

$$\tilde{D}=\tilde{p}_1-\tilde{p}_2,$$

where $\tilde{p}_1 = \frac{X_1+1}{n_1+2}$ and $\tilde{p}_2 = \frac{X_2+1}{n_2+2}$. With this new statistic, we end up using the same method as in the previous slide, computing $SE_{\tilde{D}}$.

Basically, we're just adding two observations to each sample, assuming that one was a success and one was a failure.

As always, there are caveats for any inferential method, and in this case, we must have the number of successes and failures in each sample be both 10 or more. If we don't have at least 10 successes and failures in each sample, we can use the **plus four confidence interval** just as in our previous method for a single proportion. We, instead would use

$$\tilde{D}=\tilde{p}_1-\tilde{p}_2,$$

where $\tilde{p}_1 = \frac{X_1+1}{n_1+2}$ and $\tilde{p}_2 = \frac{X_2+1}{n_2+2}$. With this new statistic, we end up using the same method as in the previous slide, computing $SE_{\tilde{D}}$.

Basically, we're just adding two observations to each sample, assuming that one was a success and one was a failure. In order to use the plus four confidence interval method, we have to have that the sample sizes are at least five for each sample.

Example (pass rates)

Students study for the same test in two different ways. One group of students studies individually. Another studies in groups of 5. A SRS of 100 independent-study students showed that 85 students passed. A SRS of 120 group-study students showed that 105 students passed. Create a 85% confidence interval for the difference of the proportion of students who passed in the independent-study population and the proportion of students who passed in the group-study population.

Example (pass rates)

Students study for the same test in two different ways. One group of students studies individually. Another studies in groups of 5. A SRS of 100 independent-study students showed that 85 students passed. A SRS of 120 group-study students showed that 105 students passed. Create a 85% confidence interval for the difference of the proportion of students who passed in the independent-study population and the proportion of students who passed in the group-study population.

Answer: Well, D = -0.025.

Example (pass rates)

Students study for the same test in two different ways. One group of students studies individually. Another studies in groups of 5. A SRS of 100 independent-study students showed that 85 students passed. A SRS of 120 group-study students showed that 105 students passed. Create a 85% confidence interval for the difference of the proportion of students who passed in the independent-study population and the proportion of students who passed in the group-study population.

Answer: Well, D = -0.025. And $SE_D = 0.04676$.

Example (pass rates)

Students study for the same test in two different ways. One group of students studies individually. Another studies in groups of 5. A SRS of 100 independent-study students showed that 85 students passed. A SRS of 120 group-study students showed that 105 students passed. Create a 85% confidence interval for the difference of the proportion of students who passed in the independent-study population and the proportion of students who passed in the group-study population.

Answer: Well, D = -0.025. And $SE_D = 0.04676$. And $z^* = 1.44$.

Example (pass rates)

Students study for the same test in two different ways. One group of students studies individually. Another studies in groups of 5. A SRS of 100 independent-study students showed that 85 students passed. A SRS of 120 group-study students showed that 105 students passed. Create a 85% confidence interval for the difference of the proportion of students who passed in the independent-study population and the proportion of students who passed in the group-study population.

Answer: Well, D = -0.025. And $SE_D = 0.04676$. And $z^* = 1.44$. Thus, m = 0.067, and our confidence interval is (-0.092, 0.042).

Example (pass rates)

Students study for the same test in two different ways. One group of students studies individually. Another studies in groups of 5. A SRS of 100 independent-study students showed that 85 students passed. A SRS of 120 group-study students showed that 105 students passed. Create a 85% confidence interval for the difference of the proportion of students who passed in the independent-study population and the proportion of students who passed in the group-study population.

Answer: Well, D=-0.025. And ${\rm SE}_D=0.04676$. And $z^*=1.44$. Thus, m=0.067, and our confidence interval is (-0.092,0.042). Does it seem like there's a significant difference between the two pass rates?

Example (pass rates)

Students study for the same test in two different ways. One group of students studies individually. Another studies in groups of 5. A SRS of 100 independent-study students showed that 85 students passed. A SRS of 120 group-study students showed that 105 students passed. Create a 85% confidence interval for the difference of the proportion of students who passed in the independent-study population and the proportion of students who passed in the group-study population.

Answer: Well, D=-0.025. And $SE_D=0.04676$. And $z^*=1.44$. Thus, m=0.067, and our confidence interval is (-0.092,0.042). Does it seem like there's a significant difference between the two pass rates? No.

Example (arrive on time)

A commuter is interested in which of two routes will help her arrive on time to work most frequently. She drives Route A 10 days and arrives on time 9 times. She drives Route B 12 times and arrives on time 10 times.

Example (arrive on time)

A commuter is interested in which of two routes will help her arrive on time to work most frequently. She drives Route A 10 days and arrives on time 9 times. She drives Route B 12 times and arrives on time 10 times. Create a 95% confidence interval for the difference between the proportion of on-time arrivals in Route A and the proportion of on-time arrivals using Route B.

Example (arrive on time)

A commuter is interested in which of two routes will help her arrive on time to work most frequently. She drives Route A 10 days and arrives on time 9 times. She drives Route B 12 times and arrives on time 10 times. Create a 95% confidence interval for the difference between the proportion of on-time arrivals in Route A and the proportion of on-time arrivals using Route B.

Answer: $\tilde{D} = 0.04762$.

Example (arrive on time)

A commuter is interested in which of two routes will help her arrive on time to work most frequently. She drives Route A 10 days and arrives on time 9 times. She drives Route B 12 times and arrives on time 10 times. Create a 95% confidence interval for the difference between the proportion of on-time arrivals in Route A and the proportion of on-time arrivals using Route B.

Answer: $\tilde{D} = 0.04762$. And $SE_{\tilde{D}} = 0.1536$.

Example (arrive on time)

A commuter is interested in which of two routes will help her arrive on time to work most frequently. She drives Route A 10 days and arrives on time 9 times. She drives Route B 12 times and arrives on time 10 times. Create a 95% confidence interval for the difference between the proportion of on-time arrivals in Route A and the proportion of on-time arrivals using Route B.

Answer: $\tilde{D} = 0.04762$. And $SE_{\tilde{D}} = 0.1536$. And $z^* = 1.96$.

Example (arrive on time)

A commuter is interested in which of two routes will help her arrive on time to work most frequently. She drives Route A 10 days and arrives on time 9 times. She drives Route B 12 times and arrives on time 10 times. Create a 95% confidence interval for the difference between the proportion of on-time arrivals in Route A and the proportion of on-time arrivals using Route B.

Answer: $\tilde{D} = 0.04762$. And $SE_{\tilde{D}} = 0.1536$. And $z^* = 1.96$. Thus, m = 0.3011, and our confidence interval is (-0.2535, 0.3487).

Definition (z significance test for comparing two proportions)

To test the hypothesis H_0 : $p_1 = p_2$ based on two SRSs of sizes n_1 & n_2 from populations with unknown proportions, compute the **test statistic**

$$z=\frac{\hat{p}_1-\hat{p}_2}{\mathsf{SE}_{Dp}}.$$

For a N(0,1) RV, the P-value for a test of H_0 against

$$H_a: p_1 > p_2$$
 is $P(Z > z)$
 $H_a: p_1 < p_2$ is $P(Z < z)$
 $H_a: p_1 \neq p_2$ is $2P(Z > |z|)$

4 L P 4 DF P 4 E P 4 E P 9 Q C

What's SE_{Dp} , you say? Is it the same standard error as before?

What's SE_{Dp} , you say? Is it the same standard error as before? No! It's not the same thing as SE_D . Because in the P-value test we're assuming under the null hypothesis that the two proportions are equal, we need to pool them! We calculate a new proportion by combining all successes and observations into a single proportion:

What's SE_{Dp} , you say? Is it the same standard error as before? No! It's not the same thing as SE_D . Because in the P-value test we're assuming under the null hypothesis that the two proportions are equal, we need to pool them! We calculate a new proportion by combining all successes and observations into a single proportion:

$$\hat{p}=\frac{X_1+X_2}{n_1+n_2}.$$

What's SE_{Dp} , you say? Is it the same standard error as before? No! It's not the same thing as SE_D . Because in the P-value test we're assuming under the null hypothesis that the two proportions are equal, we need to pool them! We calculate a new proportion by combining all successes and observations into a single proportion:

$$\hat{p}=\frac{X_1+X_2}{n_1+n_2}.$$

We then use this proportion to calculate SE_{Dp} .

What's SE_{Dp} , you say? Is it the same standard error as before? No! It's not the same thing as SE_D . Because in the P-value test we're assuming under the null hypothesis that the two proportions are equal, we need to pool them! We calculate a new proportion by combining all successes and observations into a single proportion:

$$\hat{p} = \frac{X_1 + X_2}{n_1 + n_2}.$$

We then use this proportion to calculate SE_{Dp} .

$$\mathsf{SE}_{Dp} = \sqrt{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})\left(rac{1}{n_1} + rac{1}{n_2}
ight)}.$$

What're our requirements?

What're our requirements?

■ The *P*-values are based on the normal approximation to the binomial random variable, so the *P*-values are approximate.

What're our requirements?

- The *P*-values are based on the normal approximation to the binomial random variable, so the *P*-values are approximate.
- We need at least five successes and five failures in each of the samples.

What're our requirements?

- The *P*-values are based on the normal approximation to the binomial random variable, so the *P*-values are approximate.
- We need at least five successes and five failures in each of the samples.
- Always remember to use SE_{Dp} when you're assuming that the population proportions are equal in the null hypothesis.

A note about comparing two population proportions in more generality:

A note about comparing two population proportions in more generality: In general, your null hypothesis doesn't have to be that $p_1 = p_2$, which is equivalent to saying that D = 0.

A note about comparing two population proportions in more generality: In general, your null hypothesis doesn't have to be that $p_1=p_2$, which is equivalent to saying that D=0. You could possible assume that $p_1-p_2=0.15$, which is like saying that Population 1 has a proportion 15% higher than Population 2.

A note about comparing two population proportions in more generality: In general, your null hypothesis doesn't have to be that $p_1=p_2$, which is equivalent to saying that D=0. You could possible assume that $p_1-p_2=0.15$, which is like saying that Population 1 has a proportion 15% higher than Population 2. Our method for P-values before would work fine, but we would no longer need to pool our proportions because we wouldn't be assuming that they are equal!

A note about comparing two population proportions in more generality: In general, your null hypothesis doesn't have to be that $p_1=p_2$, which is equivalent to saying that D=0. You could possible assume that $p_1-p_2=0.15$, which is like saying that Population 1 has a proportion 15% higher than Population 2. Our method for P-values before would work fine, but we would no longer need to pool our proportions because we wouldn't be assuming that they are equal! So we'd use SE_D instead of SE_{Dp} .

Example (which drug is better)

Antibiotic A was given to 15 patients with a particular infection. After the treatment, 5 were still infected. Antibiotic B was given to 25 patients with the same infection. After treatment, 6 were still infected.

Example (which drug is better)

Antibiotic A was given to 15 patients with a particular infection. After the treatment, 5 were still infected. Antibiotic B was given to 25 patients with the same infection. After treatment, 6 were still infected. Conduct a P-value test to test the claim that Antibiotic B is more effective than Antibiotic A. Use $\alpha=0.20$.

Example (which drug is better)

Antibiotic A was given to 15 patients with a particular infection. After the treatment, 5 were still infected. Antibiotic B was given to 25 patients with the same infection. After treatment, 6 were still infected. Conduct a P-value test to test the claim that Antibiotic B is more effective than Antibiotic A. Use $\alpha=0.20$.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p} = 0.725$.

Example (which drug is better)

Antibiotic A was given to 15 patients with a particular infection. After the treatment, 5 were still infected. Antibiotic B was given to 25 patients with the same infection. After treatment, 6 were still infected. Conduct a P-value test to test the claim that Antibiotic B is more effective than Antibiotic A. Use $\alpha=0.20$.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p} = 0.725$. And $SE_{Dp} = 0.14583$.

Example (which drug is better)

Antibiotic A was given to 15 patients with a particular infection. After the treatment, 5 were still infected. Antibiotic B was given to 25 patients with the same infection. After treatment, 6 were still infected. Conduct a P-value test to test the claim that Antibiotic B is more effective than Antibiotic A. Use $\alpha=0.20$.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p}=0.725$. And $SE_{Dp}=0.14583$. And z=-0.64.

Example (which drug is better)

Antibiotic A was given to 15 patients with a particular infection. After the treatment, 5 were still infected. Antibiotic B was given to 25 patients with the same infection. After treatment, 6 were still infected. Conduct a P-value test to test the claim that Antibiotic B is more effective than Antibiotic A. Use $\alpha=0.20$.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p}=0.725$. And $SE_{Dp}=0.14583$. And z=-0.64. Thus, the P-value is 0.2611, and we fail to reject H_0 and do not support our claim.

Example (college graduates in cities)

Dalton wants to compare the proportion of college graduates in its city to that in Kingman. A SRS of 200 Dalton residents finds that 174 are college graduates while a SRS of 150 Kingman residents finds that 130 are college graduates. With $\alpha=0.05$, test the claim that Dalton and Kingman have the same proportion of college graduates.

Example (college graduates in cities)

Dalton wants to compare the proportion of college graduates in its city to that in Kingman. A SRS of 200 Dalton residents finds that 174 are college graduates while a SRS of 150 Kingman residents finds that 130 are college graduates. With $\alpha=0.05$, test the claim that Dalton and Kingman have the same proportion of college graduates.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p} = 0.86857$.

Example (college graduates in cities)

Dalton wants to compare the proportion of college graduates in its city to that in Kingman. A SRS of 200 Dalton residents finds that 174 are college graduates while a SRS of 150 Kingman residents finds that 130 are college graduates. With $\alpha=0.05$, test the claim that Dalton and Kingman have the same proportion of college graduates.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p} = 0.86857$. And $SE_{Dp} = 0.036494$.

Example (college graduates in cities)

Dalton wants to compare the proportion of college graduates in its city to that in Kingman. A SRS of 200 Dalton residents finds that 174 are college graduates while a SRS of 150 Kingman residents finds that 130 are college graduates. With $\alpha=0.05$, test the claim that Dalton and Kingman have the same proportion of college graduates.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p} = 0.86857$. And $SE_{Dp} = 0.036494$. And z = 0.09.

Example (college graduates in cities)

Dalton wants to compare the proportion of college graduates in its city to that in Kingman. A SRS of 200 Dalton residents finds that 174 are college graduates while a SRS of 150 Kingman residents finds that 130 are college graduates. With $\alpha=0.05$, test the claim that Dalton and Kingman have the same proportion of college graduates.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p}=0.86857$. And $SE_{Dp}=0.036494$. And z=0.09. Thus, the P-value is 0.92722, and we fail to reject H_0 and support our claim.

Example (good eggs)

A new method of refrigeration is being considered to keep eggs fresher longer. 100 eggs were tested using the old method, and 90 were still good after 2 weeks. 120 eggs were tested using the new method, and 102 were good after two weeks. Use $\alpha=0.15$ to test the claim that the old method is better than the new method.

Example (good eggs)

A new method of refrigeration is being considered to keep eggs fresher longer. 100 eggs were tested using the old method, and 90 were still good after 2 weeks. 120 eggs were tested using the new method, and 102 were good after two weeks. Use $\alpha=0.15$ to test the claim that the old method is better than the new method.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p} = 0.87273$.

Example (good eggs)

A new method of refrigeration is being considered to keep eggs fresher longer. 100 eggs were tested using the old method, and 90 were still good after 2 weeks. 120 eggs were tested using the new method, and 102 were good after two weeks. Use $\alpha=0.15$ to test the claim that the old method is better than the new method.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p} = 0.87273$. And $SE_{Dp} = 0.045126$.

Example (good eggs)

A new method of refrigeration is being considered to keep eggs fresher longer. 100 eggs were tested using the old method, and 90 were still good after 2 weeks. 120 eggs were tested using the new method, and 102 were good after two weeks. Use $\alpha=0.15$ to test the claim that the old method is better than the new method.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p}=0.87273$. And $SE_{Dp}=0.045126$. And z=1.11.

Example (good eggs)

A new method of refrigeration is being considered to keep eggs fresher longer. 100 eggs were tested using the old method, and 90 were still good after 2 weeks. 120 eggs were tested using the new method, and 102 were good after two weeks. Use $\alpha=0.15$ to test the claim that the old method is better than the new method.

Answer: Well, $\hat{p}=0.87273$. And $SE_{Dp}=0.045126$. And z=1.11. Thus, the P-value is 0.1339, and we reject H_0 and support our claim.

There are other methods for comparing two proportions.

There are other methods for comparing two proportions. Sometimes we use the relative risk model:

$$RR = rac{\hat{p}_1}{\hat{p}_2}.$$

There are other methods for comparing two proportions. Sometimes we use the relative risk model:

$$RR = \frac{\hat{p}_1}{\hat{p}_2}.$$

You may read about relative risk on page 520 in the text.