

Stat 13, Intro. to Statistical Methods for the Life and Health Sciences.

1. Lefties example, continued.
2. Comparing two groups, good or bad year example.
3. Comparing two proportions, swimming with dolphins example.

Read chapter 5.

HW2 is due Wed, Feb12, 1159pm. 2.3.15, 3.3.18, and 4.1.23.

Midterm is Mon Feb24 in class.

The course website is <http://www.stat.ucla.edu/~frederic/13/W25> .

# 1. Lefties example, continued.

All sorts of causal conclusions were made about how this shows that the stress of being lefthanded in our righthanded world leads to premature death.

**The New York Times**

**U.S.**

WORLD

U.S.

N.Y. / REGION

BUSINESS

TECHNOLOGY


SCIENCE

HEALTH

SPORTS


OPINION

POLITICS EDUCATION TEXAS



0% APR up to 72 months  
**\$1,000 Special Bonus Cash\***  
ON A 2016 SMART FORTWO COUPE

GET OFFER




\* DISCLAIMER


## Being Left-Handed May Be Dangerous To Life, Study Says

Reuters  
Published: April 4, 1991

**BOSTON, April 3**— Left-handed people tend to live significantly shorter lives than right-handers, perhaps because they face more perils in a world dominated by the right-handed, according to new research.

 FACEBOOK

 TWITTER

 GOOGLE+

# Lefties example.

- Is this an observational study or an experiment?

# Lefties example.

- Is this an observational study or an experiment?


It is an observational study.

- Are there plausible confounding factors you can think of?

# Lefties example.

## Left handedness 1900-1976

% of population



Source: Chris McManus Right Hand, Left Hand

# Unit 2. Comparing Two Groups

- In Unit 1, we learned the basic process of statistical inference using tests and confidence intervals. We did all this by focusing on a single proportion.
- In Unit 2, we will take these ideas and extend them to comparing two groups. We will compare two proportions, two independent means, and paired data.

2. Comparing two proportions using numerical and visual summaries, and the good or bad year example.

## Section 5.1

# Example 5.1:

## Positive and Negative Perceptions

- Consider these two questions:
  - Are you having a good year?
  - Are you having a bad year?
- Do people answer each question in such a way that would indicate the same answer? (e.g. Yes for the first one and No for the second.)



# Positive and Negative Perceptions

- Researchers questioned 30 students (randomly giving them one of the two questions).
- They then recorded if a positive or negative response was given.
- They wanted to see if the wording of the question influenced the answers.

# Positive and negative perceptions

- Observational units
  - The 30 students
- Variables
  - Question wording (good year or bad year)
  - Perception of their year (positive or negative)
- Which is the explanatory variable and which is the response variable?
- Is this an observational study or experiment?

# Raw Data in a Spreadsheet

Individual	Type of Question	Response
1	Good Year	Positive
2	Good Year	Negative
3	Bad Year	Positive
4	Good Year	Positive
5	Good Year	Negative
6	Bad Year	Positive
7	Good Year	Positive
8	Good Year	Positive
9	Good Year	Positive
10	Bad Year	Negative
11	Good Year	Negative
12	Bad Year	Negative
13	Good Year	Positive
14	Bad Year	Negative
15	Good Year	Positive

Individual	Type of Question	Response
16	Good Year	Positive
17	Bad Year	Positive
18	Good Year	Positive
19	Good Year	Positive
20	Good Year	Positive
21	Bad Year	Negative
22	Good Year	Positive
23	Bad Year	Negative
24	Good Year	Positive
25	Bad Year	Negative
26	Good Year	Positive
27	Bad Year	Negative
28	Good Year	Positive
29	Bad Year	Positive
30	Bad Year	Negative

# Two-Way Tables

- A **two-way table** organizes data
  - Summarizes *two* categorical variables
  - Also called contingency table
- Are students more likely to give a positive response if they were given the good year question?

	Good Year	Bad Year	Total
Positive response	15	4	19
Negative response	3	8	11
Total	18	12	30


# Two-Way Tables

- Conditional proportions will help us better determine if there is an association between the question asked and the type of response.
- We can see that the subjects with the positive question were ***more likely*** to respond positively.

	Good Year	Bad Year	Total
Positive response	$15/18 \approx 0.83$	$4/12 \approx 0.33$	19
Negative response	3	8	11
Total	18	12	30

# Segmented Bar Graphs

- We can also use segmented bar graphs to see this association between the "good year" question and a positive response.



# Statistic

- The statistic we will mainly use to summarize this table is the difference in proportions of positive responses is  $0.83 - 0.33 = 0.50$ .

	Good Year	Bad Year	Total
Positive response	15 (83%)	4 (33%)	19
Negative response	3	8	11
Total	18	12	30

# Another Statistic

- Another statistic that is often used, called **relative risk**, is the ratio of the proportions:  $0.83 / 0.33 = 2.5$ .
- We can say that those who were given the good year question were 2.5 times as likely to give a positive response.

	Good Year	Bad Year	Total
Positive response	15 (83%)	4 (33%)	19
Negative response	3	8	11
Total	18	12	30



# 3. Comparing two proportions with CIs and testing using simulation, dolphin example.

Section 5.2

# Swimming with Dolphins

Example 5.2

# Swimming with Dolphins

**Is swimming with dolphins therapeutic for patients suffering from clinical depression?**

- Researchers Antonioli and Reveley (2005), in British Medical Journal, recruited 30 subjects aged 18-65 with a clinical diagnosis of mild to moderate depression
- Discontinued antidepressants and psychotherapy 4 weeks prior to and throughout the experiment
- 30 subjects went to an island near Honduras where they were randomly assigned to two treatment groups

# Swimming with Dolphins

- Both groups engaged in one hour of swimming and snorkeling each day
- One group swam in the presence of dolphins and the other group did not
- Participants in both groups had identical conditions except for the dolphins
- After two weeks, each subjects' level of depression was evaluated, as it had been at the beginning of the study
- The response variable is whether or not the subject achieved substantial reduction in depression

# Swimming with Dolphins

**Null hypothesis:** Dolphins do not help.

- Swimming with dolphins is not associated with substantial improvement in depression

**Alternative hypothesis:** Dolphins help.

- Swimming with dolphins **increases** the probability of substantial improvement in depression symptoms

# Swimming with Dolphins

- The parameter is the (long-run) difference between the probability of improving when receiving dolphin therapy and the prob. of improving with the control ( $\pi_{\text{dolphins}} - \pi_{\text{control}}$ )
- So we can write our hypotheses as:

$$\mathbf{H}_0: \pi_{\text{dolphins}} - \pi_{\text{control}} = 0.$$

$$\mathbf{H}_a: \pi_{\text{dolphins}} - \pi_{\text{control}} > 0.$$

or

$$\mathbf{H}_0: \pi_{\text{dolphins}} = \pi_{\text{control}}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_a: \pi_{\text{dolphins}} > \pi_{\text{control}}$$

(Note: we are not saying our parameters equal any certain number.)

# Swimming with Dolphins

## Results:

	Dolphin group	Control group	Total
Improved	10 (66.7%)	3 (20%)	13
Did Not Improve	5	12	17
Total	15	15	30

The difference in proportions of improvers is:

$$\hat{p}_d - \hat{p}_c = 0.667 - 0.20 = \mathbf{0.467}.$$

# Swimming with Dolphins

- There are two possible explanations for an observed difference of 0.467.
  - A tendency to be more likely to improve with dolphins (alternative hypothesis)
  - The 13 subjects were going to show improvement with or without dolphins and random chance assigned more improvers to the dolphins (null hypothesis)