

David Moore argued against teaching Bayesian reasoning in the introductory course. His primary reason was that conditional probability is "fatally subtle."

I agree with the truth of his reason.

But why is conditional probability so subtle?

Is it the probability or is it the conditional thinking.

While both are certainly involved,

I assert it is the latter more than the former.



There are different levels of conditional thinking.

We tend to teach conditional probability directly -in confidence intervals and hypothesis tests.

We teach it using certain keywords:

IF, WHEN and GIVEN.

These are words students use

but students use other words as well.

I assert

- 1. there is a much more basic level for teaching conditional thinking.
- 2. Student's have as much trouble at the basic level as the advanced.
- 3. Deficiencies in handling the basics explains most of the problems at the advanced.
- 4. The basics can be taught.
- 5. The basics should be taught before taking on conditional probability.



Consider Arithmetic Comparisons:

Three comparisons: simple difference, simple ratio and relative diff. Each has a different grammar: more than, times as much & % more than

Some ratios are so common, they take into account things so elementary,

that we give them names. These are what I call "Named Ratios".

These include percent, rate and percentage.

They also include the Chance family:

chance, risk, likelihood, odds and probability.

These named ratios have different grammars.

We can also do arithmetic comparisons on these named ratios. But the grammar to handle the named ratio and the comparison is hard.

Finally there are two specialty forms of comparisons of named ratios:

- 1. Likely family (which is most common),
- 2. Attributable to family (which is increasingly common in epidem).



Exercises:

| Conditional Na Thinking V | med R aries I | Ratio by Sc | Usage ource | |
|--|------------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| SOURCE | % of {whole} | Rate | Percentage of {part} | Chance- Probability |
| 1. Intro Statistics Text | 5 | 5 | 0 | 90 |
| 2. Popular Essays | 30 | 20 | 10 | 40 |
| 3. Data: 1998 U.S. Statistical Abstract | 40 | 40 | 20 | 0 |

Look first at the right columns in each row.

In the first row, statistics texts: 90% of named ratios are Chance family And most of these use "probability".

Now look at the bottom row: the US Statistical Abstract. The Chance family is never used.

Now look at the middle row:

03/17/2000 **Kind of Inference** Conditional 6 Thinking Varies by Named Ratio **PERCENTS (%), RATES, OR PERCENTAGES** "X% of this sample/group have Y" Factual: Generalization: "X% of the population have Y." CHANCE FAMILY: risk, likelihood or probability Suppose smokers have a higher rate of colds [than non-smokers]. **Random Sampling Prediction:** "A smoker has a higher risk of a cold [than does a non-smoker]. "If you smoke, you have a higher risk of a cold [than a non-smoker]. **Controlled Prediction:** If non-smokers start smoking, they can expect to cut their risk of colds." If you start smoking, you can expect to increase your risk of a cold." If you smoke, you have a higher risk of a cold than if you don't smoke."



| ditional | Pe | rcen | tage | S | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| inking Amb i | | / of ' | with | ' and | 'to' | i |
| | gang | | | und | · · · | |
| | | | | 2 | | |
| No. 103. Low Birth We | ight and E Women— | Births to 1 -States: 1 | eenage N 990 to 19 | lothers aı 96 | nd to Unn | narried |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| STATE | PERCENT LOW B | OF BIRTH | IS WITH | BIRTH: MOTHEF | S TO TEEN RS, PERCE TOTAL | AGE NT OF |
| STATE | PERCENT LOW E | OF BIRTH BIRTH WEIG | IS WITH GHT ¹ 1996 | BIRTH MOTHEF | S TO TEEN RS, PERCE TOTAL 1995 | IAGE INT OF |
| STATE U.S | PERCENT LOW E 1990 7.0 | OF BIRTH BIRTH WEIG 1995 7.3 | IS WITH GHT ¹ 1996 7.4 | BIRTH MOTHER 1990 12.8 | S TO TEEN RS, PERCE TOTAL 1995 13.1 | IAGE INT OF 1996 12. |
| STATE U.S | PERCENT LOW E 1990 7.0 8.4 | OF BIRTH BIRTH WEIG 1995 7.3 9.0 | IS WITH GHT ¹ 1996 7.4 9.3 | BIRTH MOTHER 1990 12.8 18.2 | S TO TEEN RS, PERCE TOTAL 1995 13.1 18.5 | IAGE INT OF 1996 12. 18. |
| STATE U.S AL AK | PERCENT LOW E 1990 7.0 8.4 4.8 6.4 | OF BIRTH BIRTH WEIG 1995 7.3 9.0 5.3 6 8 | IS WITH GHT ¹ 1996 7.4 9.3 5.5 6.6 | BIRTH: MOTHEF 1990 12.8 18.2 9.7 14.2 | S TO TEEN RS, PERCE TOTAL 1995 13.1 18.5 11.2 15.1 | AGE NT OF 1996 12. 18. 11. |
| STATE U.S AL AK AZ AR | PERCENT LOW E 1990 7.0 8.4 4.8 6.4 8.2 | T OF BIRTH BIRTH WEIG 1995 7.3 9.0 5.3 6.8 8.2 | IS WITH GHT ¹ 1996 7.4 9.3 5.5 6.6 8.5 | BIRTH: MOTHER 1990 12.8 18.2 9.7 14.2 19.7 | S TO TEEN RS, PERCE TOTAL 1995 13.1 18.5 11.2 15.1 19.6 | IAGE INT OF 1996 12. 18. 11. 15. 19. |

Given these probabilities by race of murder,

the relative risk (1.13) is quite small.

Given these probabilities by race of victim,

the relative risk (2.6) is much larger.

But the telling condition is the fact that the high and low percentages of the death penalty by race of victim are outside the high and low percentages of the death penalty by race of murderer. This is what makes a Simpson's Paradox reversal likely in comparing the probability of the death sentence by the race of the murderer.

Recall, this was exactly what happened in our previous slide.

| Conditional Thinking | Grammar of Rates <u>Part</u> is underlined | 9 |
|---|---|---|
| " Rate of " The <u>ra</u> | ' normally indicates the <u>part</u>: <u>te of births</u> is | |
| A modific The <u>bir</u> | er of "rate" normally indicates the part: <u>rth rate</u> is | |
| When ''ra predicate, | ite of'' is followed by a number in the , then the subject and verb indicate the part: | |
| <u>Births</u> <u>o</u> <u>People</u> | <u>occurred</u> at a rate of 30 per 1,000 <u>died</u> at a rate of 20 per 1,000 | |



| Conditional Thinking | Am | R big | ate uity | s ⁄ of | 'by' | | | 11 |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| No. 149. Death [Death rate per 1 | Rates fo 00,000 po | or Injur pulation. I ternational | y by Fii Deaths cla I <i>Classifica</i> | rearms, ssified acc ation of Dis | Sex, R cording to t ceases] | ace, an | d Age: evision of t | 1995 he |
| ITEM | 5-14 yrs. old | 15-24 yrs. old | 25-34 yrs. old | 35-44 yrs. old | 45-54 yrs. old | 55-64 yrs. old | 65-74 yrs. old | 75-84 yrs. old |
| MALE Firearms: White | 2.5 5.5 0.7 0.8 0.8 (B) 0.9 4.1 | 31.4 140.2 1.8 4.3 15.4 13.2 13.6 121.0 | 26.1 94.4 0.8 1.5 15.1 11.9 9.8 80.7 | 21.2 46.6 (B) 14.2 7.6 6.3 38.3 | 19.6 32.1 0.5 (B) 14.9 6.9 4.0 24.6 | 19.9 24.3 0.4 (B) 16.6 7.5 2.8 15.9 | 26.1 22.0 (B) 23.9 10.2 1.5 10.8 | 39.8 20.9 0.7 (B) 38.2 13.9 0.8 (B) |
| 'by mea Source: 1998 | INS OF | Ver | SUS (| categ | GOTIZ 52 for a b | ed by etter title | y' ;) | |

Death and Death Rates for Injury by Firearms, Race and Sex

Death by [means of] firearms is the part.

Race and sex are wholes [broken down by].

Solutions:

•

- (1) Death Rates <u>due to/for/from</u> Firearm Injuries by Race and Sex.
- (2) Firearm-related Death Rates by Race & Sex.



Descriptive Statistics: Must include strong emphasis on count-based statistics: counts, percentages and rates

Conditionality: Can be introduced naturally by using tables.

Proportionality: Very basic concept in mathematics. Use percents and rates.

Measuring association. The simplest form of association is the arithmetic comparison. Students must learn this before they take on correlation.

Data modeling: Modeling is another way to describe an association. Students must learn modeling before they study chance.

From association to causation: Students must learn to distinguish these two both grammatically and in reality.

| Conditional Thinking | An | nbi | ^{03/17} Pei guo | rce Dus | nt: S Pł | nra | se | | | 13 |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| No. 113. Percent Low B [Low birthweight is defined as and South Dak | irthwei weight of tota, whic | ght, by less than h did not | 2,500 g require r | rams (5 l eporting o | b. 8 oz.). | Age, ar Excludes o use dur | d Rac Californi ing pregr | e of M ia, Indian nancy] | other: a, New Yo | 1993 ork, |
| SMOKING STATUS AND RACE OF MOTHER | All ages | Under | 1 | 5-19 yea | AGE rs | OF MO | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-49 |
| | 0 | years | Total | 15-17 years | 18-19 years | years | years | years | years | years |
| All races ¹ Smoker. Nonsmoker Not stated White. Smoker. Nonsmoker Not stated Black. Smoker. Nonsmoker Nonsmoker Not stated. | 7.4 11.8 6.6 9.2 6.1 10.1 5.2 7.6 13.4 22.6 12.0 16.9 | 13.8 14.7 13.8 14.2 10.8 14.0 10.3 (B) 16.1 19.6 15.9 (B) | 9.6 10.8 9.3 11.8 7.9 10.3 7.1 9.7 13.4 17.2 13.1 17.5 | 10.5 11.4 10.3 12.9 8.6 11.0 7.9 10.9 13.9 17.1 13.7 17.5 | 9.0 10.5 8.6 11.1 7.5 9.9 6.6 9.1 13.0 17.3 12.6 17.4 | 7.5 10.4 6.8 9.0 6.1 9.2 5.2 7.8 12.3 18.8 11.4 13.9 | 6.5 11.5 5.6 8.2 5.4 9.4 4.6 6.6 13.2 23.2 11.2 16.9 | 6.8 13.6 5.7 8.7 10.9 4.9 7.4 14.8 26.3 11.8 18.4 | 8.0 16.1 6.8 9.9 6.8 13.3 5.9 8.2 16.6 27.8 13.6 23.7 | 9.0 17.8 7.9 10.3 7.7 14.7 6.9 9.5 17.4 30.4 14.6 22.7 |
| "by" mea | ns " | amc | ong" 998 US | ľ Statistic | 10t ' cal Abst | dist: | ribu | ted | by' | |

Death and Death Rates for Injury by Firearms, Race and Sex

Death by [means of] firearms is the part.

Race and sex are wholes [broken down by].

Solutions:

•

- (1) Death Rates <u>due to/for/from</u> Firearm Injuries by Race and Sex.
- (2) Firearm-related Death Rates by Race & Sex.

| Conditional Thinking Non-stan | ogy17/20 Ra darc | ntes d us | age | of ' <i>k</i> | by' | 14 |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| No. 139. Age-Adjusted I | Death Ra | i tes, by s | Selected | Causes | : 1990 to standard po | 1996 |
| is the total population of the Ur | 1990 | enumerated | d in 1940. S | ee also hea | dnote, Table | e 138] |
| CAUSE OF DEATH | 1990 | 1991 | d in 1940. S | ee also hea | 1994 | e 138] 1995 |
| CAUSE OF DEATH All causes Major cardiovascular diseases | 1990 520.2 189.8 | enumerated 1991 513.7 185.0 | d in 1940. S 1992 504.5 180.4 | ee also hea 1993 513.3 181.8 | 1994 507.4 176.8 | e 138] 1995 503.9 174.9 |
| CAUSE OF DEATH All causes Diseases of heart Dis | 1990 520.2 189.8 152.0 | 1991 513.7 185.0 148.2 | d in 1940. S 1992 504.5 180.4 144.3 | ee also hea 1993 513.3 181.8 145.3 | 1994 507.4 176.8 140.4 | e 138] 1995 503.9 174.9 138.3 |
| CAUSE OF DEATH CAUSE OF DEATH All causes Diseases of heart Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease | 1990 520.2 189.8 152.0 | enumerated 1991 513.7 185.0 148.2 1 4 | d in 1940. S 1992 504.5 180.4 144.3 1.3 | ee also hea 1993 513.3 181.8 145.3 1.3 | 1994 507.4 176.8 140.4 1.2 | e 138] 1995 503. 174.9 138.3 1 |
| Iteration for explanation of the Ur CAUSE OF DEATH All causes Major cardiovascular diseases Diseases of heart Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease Hypertensive heart disease ¹ | 1990 520.2 189.8 152.0 1.5 4.8 | enumerated 1991 513.7 185.0 148.2 1.4 4.7 | d in 1940. S 1992 504.5 180.4 144.3 1.3 4.8 | ee also hea 1993 513.3 181.8 145.3 1.3 4.9 | 1994 507.4 176.8 140.4 1.2 5.0 | e 138] 1995 503. 174. 138. 1. 5. |
| CAUSE OF DEATH CAUSE OF DEATH All causes Major cardiovascular diseases Diseases of heart Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease Hypertensive heart disease Hypertensive heart and renal disease | 1990 520.2 189.8 152.0 1.5 4.8 0.5 | 1991 513.7 185.0 148.2 1.4 4.7 0.5 | d in 1940. S 1992 504.5 180.4 144.3 1.3 4.8 0.5 | ee also hea 1993 513.3 181.8 145.3 1.3 4.9 0.5 | 1994 507.4 176.8 140.4 1.2 5.0 0.5 | e 138] 1995 503. 174. 138. 1. 5. 0. |
| CAUSE OF DEATH CAUSE OF DEATH All causes Align cardiovascular diseases Diseases of heart Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease Hypertensive heart disease Schemic heart disease Other diseases of endocardium | 1990 520.2 189.8 152.0 1.5 4.8 0.5 102.6 | 1991 513.7 185.0 148.2 1.4 4.7 0.5 99.1 2.5 | d in 1940. S 1992 504.5 180.4 144.3 1.3 4.8 0.5 95.7 2.6 | ee also hea 1993 513.3 181.8 145.3 1.3 4.9 0.5 94.9 2.6 | 1994 1994 507.4 176.8 140.4 1.2 5.0 0.5 91.4 2.6 | e 138] 1995 503. 174. 138. 1. 5. 0. 89. 2 |
| CAUSE OF DEATH CAUSE OF DEATH All causes Diseases of heart Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease Hypertensive heart disease Schemic heart disease Other diseases of endocardium Acute mycocardial infraction | 1990 520.2 189.8 152.0 1.5 4.8 0.5 102.6 2.5 53.7 | enumeratec 1991 513.7 185.0 148.2 1.4 4.7 0.5 99.1 2.5 51.5 | d in 1940. S 1992 504.5 180.4 144.3 1.3 4.8 0.5 95.7 2.6 49.1 | ee also hea 1993 513.3 181.8 145.3 1.3 4.9 0.5 94.9 2.6 47.5 | 1994 1994 507.4 176.8 140.4 1.2 5.0 0.5 91.4 2.6 45.6 | e 138] 1995 503. 174. 138. 1. 5. 0. 89. 2. 43. |
| CAUSE OF DEATH CAUSE OF DEATH All causes Diseases of heart Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease Hypertensive heart and renal disease Schemic heart disease Other diseases of endocardium Acute mycocardial infraction and other Other disease | 1990 520.2 189.8 152.0 1.5 4.8 0.5 102.6 2.5 5.3.7 47.8 | enumeratec 1991 513.7 185.0 148.2 1.4 4.7 0.5 99.1 2.5 51.5 46.6 | d in 1940. S 1992 504.5 180.4 144.3 1.3 4.8 0.5 95.7 2.6 49.1 45.7 | ee also hea 1993 513.3 181.8 145.3 1.3 4.9 0.5 94.9 2.6 47.5 46.5 | 1994 1994 507.4 176.8 140.4 1.2 5.0 0.5 91.4 2.6 45.6 45.0 | ■ 138] 1995 503. 174. 138. 1. 5. 0. 89. 2.1 43. 44. |

Given these probabilities by race of murder,

the relative risk (1.13) is quite small.

Given these probabilities by race of victim,

the relative risk (2.6) is much larger.

But the telling condition is the fact that the high and low percentages of the death penalty by race of victim are outside the high and low percentages of the death penalty by race of murderer. This is what makes a Simpson's Paradox reversal likely in comparing the probability of the death sentence by the race of the murderer.

Recall, this was exactly what happened in our previous slide.



Difficulties with conditional probabilities reflect two causes:

- 1. Difficulties dealing with probability
- 2. Difficulties dealing with conditional thinking.

Having taught Critical Thinking for many years, I am strongly convinced that the 2nd element is at least as problematic as the 1st.



Students who can compute the mean, median and even the standard deviation

but cannot evaluate the use of a statistic in an argument

are not statistically literate.

Students who understand probability, sampling distributions, confidence intervals and hypothesis tests

but cannot distinguish association from causation are not statistically literate.

Students who can calculate anything but cannot express themselves are not statistically literate. <page-header><page-header><text><text><text><text><text><text><text>

