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## Statistical Literacy

Statistical literacy is the ability to read and interpret summary statistics in everyday life.
Statistical Literacy studies
(1) the relation between statistical associations and causation, and
(2) the full-range of influences on a statistic or on a statistical association. [Take CARE]

| Talke CARE: Context |
| :--- |
| The influence of factors taken into account by |
| - data broken out by subgroups in tables and graphs |
| - averages, ratios and comparisons of averages and ratios |
| - epidemiological models (cf., deaths attributed to obesity) |
| - regression models and |
| - the study design (cf., longitudinal vs. cross-sectional; |
| experiment vs. observational study). |
| The influence of related factors (confounders) |
| not taken into account in the study and |
| not blocked by the study design. |

## Controlling for a confounder can NULLIFY an association

MD has 3 times as much prison expense as KS

| Controlling for a confounder ${ }^{5}$ <br> Can NULLIFY an association |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | | MD has 3 times as much prison expense as KS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State Total \# Inmates <br> MD $\$ 481 \mathrm{M}$ 21,623 <br> KS $\$ 159 \mathrm{M}$ 7,148 |
| MD has three times as many inmates as KS |
| MD has the same prison expense per inmate as KS |

MD has three times as many inmates as KS
MD has the same prison expense per inmate as KS

Controlling for a confounder can DECREASE an association

MN has 3.8 times as much prison expense as ME

| State | Total | \# Inmates | Per Inmate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MN | $\$ 184 \mathrm{M}$ | 4,865 | $\$ 37,825$ |
| ME | $\$ 48 \mathrm{M}$ | 1,424 | $\$ 33,711$ |

MN has 3.4 times as many inmates as ME
MN has $25 \%$ more prison expense per inmate than ME

Controlling for a confounder can REVERSE an association

CA has $50 \%$ more prison expense than NY

| State | Total | \# Inmates | Per Inmate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CA | $\$ 2.9 \mathrm{~B}$ | 136 K | $\$ 21,385$ |
| NY | $\$ 1.9 \mathrm{~B}$ | 69 K | $\$ 28,426$ |

CA has almost twice as many inmates as NY
CA has $25 \%$ less prison expense per inmate than NY

## Controlling for a confounder can INCREASE an association

MN has $27 \%$ more prison expense than IA

| State | Total | \# Inmates | Per Inmate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MN | $\$ 184 \mathrm{M}$ | 4,865 | $\$ 37,825$ |
| IA | $\$ 144 \mathrm{M}$ | 5,929 | $\$ 24,286$ |

MN has $18 \%$ fewer inmates than IA
MN has $56 \%$ more prison expense per inmate than IA


## Multivariate Analysis can be Complex

To simplify, consider cases with

- a binary outcome,
- a binary predictor and
- a binary confounder.

What are the necessary conditions for nullification or a reversal?

See Schield (1999) and Schield and Burnham (2003)


| SAT VERBAT SCORESE FIAT |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GROUP | 1981 | 2002 | CHANGE |
| White | 519 (85\%) | 527 (65\%) | 8 |
| Black | 412 (9\%) | 431 (11\%) | 19 |
| Asian | 474 (3\%) | 501 (10\%) | 27 |
| Mexican | 438 (2\%) | 446 (4\%) | 8 |
| Puerto Rican | 437 (1\%) | 455 (3\%) | 18 |
| American Indian | 471 (0\%) | 479 (1\%) | 8 |
| ALL Test takers | 504 (100\%) | 504 (100\%) | ZERO |


| City Rospital: <br> Fospital of Death?? |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hospital Total Died Death Rate <br> City 1,000 55 $5.50 \%$ <br> Rural 1,000 35 $3.50 \%$ <br> Both 2,000 90 $4.50 \%$ <br> Condition Total Died Death Rate <br> Good 800 15 $1.90 \%$ <br> Poor 1,200 75 $6.30 \%$ |  |  |  |



| Confounder Reverses; <br> City Fospital is Better |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | Hospital | Total | Died | 14 <br> Reath <br> Rate |
| Good | City | 100 | 1 | $1.00 \%$ |
|  | Rural | 700 | 14 | $2.00 \%$ |
|  | Total | 800 | 15 | $1.90 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor | City | 900 | 54 | $6.00 \%$ |
|  | Rural | 300 | 21 | $7.00 \%$ |
|  | Total | 1,200 | 75 | $6.30 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |









## Conclusion

Statistical educators must show students how confounders can influence associations and change statistical significance.
The failure of educators to do this may be seen as "statistical negligence."

Schield (1999). Simpson's Paradox and Cornfield's Conditions, See www.StatLit.org/pdf/1999SchieldASA.pdf.
Schield, Milo (2006). Presenting Confounding and Standardization Graphically. STATS Magazine, ASA. Fall 2006. pp. 14-18. Draft at www.StatLit.org/pdf/2006SchieldSTATS.pdf.
Schield, Milo (2009). Confound Those Speculative Statistics. 2009 ASA Proceedings of the Section on Statistical Education. [CDROM] 4255-4266. www.StatLit.org/pdf/2009SchieldASA.pdf

# Statistical Literacy: Confounding 

MILO SCHIELD,
Augsburg College
Director, W. M. Keck Statistical Literacy Project Vice President, National Numeracy Network
US Rep., International Statistical Literacy Project
January 13, 2011
University of Texas San Antonio (UTSA) Slides at www.StatLit.org/pdf/ 2011-Schield-UTSA-Confounding-Slides.pdf

## Statistical Literacy

Statistical literacy is the ability to read and interpret summary statistics in everyday life.

Statistical Literacy studies
(1) the relation between statistical associations and causation, and
(2) the full-range of influences on a statistic or on a statistical association. [Take CARE]

## Talke CARE: Context

The influence of factors taken into account by

- data broken out by subgroups in tables and graphs
- averages, ratios and comparisons of averages and ratios
- epidemiological models (cf., deaths attributed to obesity)
- regression models and
- the study design (cf., longitudinal vs. cross-sectional; experiment vs. observational study).

The influence of related factors (confounders) not taken into account in the study and not blocked by the study design.

## Controlling for a confounder can DECREASE an association

MN has 3.8 times as much prison expense as ME

| State | Total | \# Inmates | Per Inmate |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| MN | $\$ 184 \mathrm{M}$ | 4,865 | $\$ 37,825$ |
| ME | $\$ 48 \mathrm{M}$ | 1,424 | $\$ 33,711$ |

MN has 3.4 times as many inmates as ME
MN has $25 \%$ more prison expense per inmate than ME

## Controlling for a confounder can NULLIFY an association

MD has 3 times as much prison expense as KS

| State | Total | \# Inmates | Per Inmate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MD | $\$ 481 \mathrm{M}$ | 21,623 | $\$ 22,250$ |
| KS | $\$ 159 \mathrm{M}$ | 7,148 | $\$ 22,250$ |

MD has three times as many inmates as KS
MD has the same prison expense per inmate as KS

## Controlling for a confounder can REVERSE an association

CA has $50 \%$ more prison expense than NY

| State | Total | \# Inmates | Per Inmate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CA | $\$ 2.9 \mathrm{~B}$ | 136 K | $\$ 21,385$ |
| NY | $\$ 1.9 \mathrm{~B}$ | 69 K | $\$ 28,426$ |

CA has almost twice as many inmates as NY
CA has $25 \%$ less prison expense per inmate than NY

## Controlling for a confounder can INCREASE an association

MN has 27\% more prison expense than IA

| State | Total | \# Inmates | Per Inmate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MN | $\$ 184 \mathrm{M}$ | 4,865 | $\$ 37,825$ |
| IA | $\$ 144 \mathrm{M}$ | 5,929 | $\$ 24,286$ |

MN has 18\% fewer inmates than IA
MN has $56 \%$ more prison expense per inmate than IA


Adjusting for Land Size: Standardize on Average Lot


## SAT VERBAL SCORES: FLAT

| GROUP | $\mathbf{1 9 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | CHANGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | $519(85 \%)$ | $527(65 \%)$ | 8 |
| Black | $412(9 \%)$ | $431(11 \%)$ | 19 |
| Asian | $474(3 \%)$ | $501(10 \%)$ | 27 |
| Mexican | $438(2 \%)$ | $446(4 \%)$ | 8 |
| Puerto Rican | $437(1 \%)$ | $455(3 \%)$ | 18 |
| American Indian | $471(0 \%)$ | $479(1 \%)$ | 8 |
| ALL Test takers | $\mathbf{5 0 4}(100 \%)$ | $\mathbf{5 0 4}(100 \%)$ | ZERO |

## Multivariate Analysis can be Complex

To simplify, consider cases with

- a binary outcome,
- a binary predictor and
- a binary confounder.

What are the necessary conditions for nullification or a reversal?

See Schield (1999) and Schield and Burnham (2003)

## City Hospital: Hospital of Death??

| Hospital | Total | Died | Death Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City | 1,000 | 55 | $5.50 \%$ |
| Rural | 1,000 | 35 | $3.50 \%$ |
| Both | 2,000 | 90 | $4.50 \%$ |


| Condition | Total | Died | Death Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Good | 800 | 15 | $1.90 \%$ |
| Poor | 1,200 | 75 | $6.30 \%$ |

## Can this confounder nullify or reverse this association?

Death Rates


## Confounder Reverses; City Hospital is Better

| Condition | Hospital | Total | Died | Death <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Good | City | 100 | 1 | $1.00 \%$ |
|  | Rural | 700 | 14 | $2.00 \%$ |
|  | Total | 800 | 15 | $1.90 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor | City | 900 | 54 | $6.00 \%$ |
|  | Rural | 300 | 21 | $7.00 \%$ |
|  | Total | 1,200 | 75 | $6.30 \%$ |

## Two-Group Rates with a Binary Confounder



B : confounder.

## Compare Hospital Death Rates Confounder: Patient Condition



## Standardize on combined confounder percentage

Standardizing Can Reverse A Difference





Income: US Families by Race \& Structure



## Controlling Can Change Statistical Significance

Percentage of Babies who have low Birth-Weight


## Conclusion

Statistical educators must show students how confounders can influence associations and change statistical significance. The failure of educators to do this may be seen as "statistical negligence."

Schield (1999). Simpson's Paradox and Cornfield's Conditions, See www.StatLit.org/pdf/1999SchieldASA.pdf.
Schield, Milo (2006). Presenting Confounding and Standardization Graphically. STATS Magazine, ASA. Fall 2006. pp. 14-18. Draft at www.StatLit.org/pdf/2006SchieldSTATS.pdf.
Schield, Milo (2009). Confound Those Speculative Statistics. 2009 ASA Proceedings of the Section on Statistical Education. [CDROM] 4255-4266. www.StatLit.org/pdf/2009SchieldASA.pdf

