1. Read the article on Benford's Law. Suppose we gather 315 numbers from a tax return. How many 1's do we expect to find as leading digits? How many 2's? Complete the table:

| Leading <br> Digit | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expected <br> Relative <br> Frequency | 0.301 | 0.176 | 0.125 | 0.097 | 0.079 | 0.067 | 0.058 | 0.051 | 0.046 |
| Expected <br> Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2. The actual leading digits from our observed tax return have the following frequencies. Do you believe this tax return is fraudulent? What display can you use to visualize the comparison between the observed leading digits and Benford's Law?

| Leading <br> Digit | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed <br> Frequency | 82 | 38 | 32 | 30 | 50 | 22 | 20 | 21 | 20 |

3. Before we determine if this tax return is fraudulent, let's look at a simpler example. Suppose we toss a die 120 times and observe the following results. We're interested in determining whether or not this die is fair. What are the expected frequencies and relative frequencies for each side of the die?

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expected <br> Relative <br> Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Expected <br> Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observed | 16 | 23 | 28 | 19 | 19 | 15 |
| $\mathrm{~N}=120$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

4. We need to derive a method for determining how "far off" our observations were from our expectations. How would you determine how far off from the expectations this die is?
5. Use your new method to compute a "distance from what we expect" index for the following two tables. Are these tables the same "distance" from their expectations? Should they be?

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Expected <br> Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observed | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 6 |
| $N=30$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expected <br> Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observed | 400 | 600 | 500 | 500 | 400 | 600 |
| $N=3000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

To test the distribution of a categorical variable, we use a Chi-square goodness-of-fit test.
The test statistic is: $\chi_{r-1}^{2}=\sum \frac{\left(O_{i j}-E_{i j}\right)^{2}}{E_{i j}}$ for rows i and columns j.
6. Run a chi-square goodness-of-fit test to determine whether or not the die in question \#3 is fair.
7. Run a chi-square goodness-of-fit test to determine whether or not the tax return numbers are faked.

Oftentimes in statistics, we must make assumptions about the underlying distribution of a random variable. For example, to run an ANOVA, we must assume the data are normally distributed. We can use the chi-square goodness-of-fit test to check the underlying distributional assumptions.

Note: These goodness-of-fit tests are not the best tools to use for this purpose. We can also use normal probability plots, quantile plots, Kolmogorov-Smirnoff tests, and simple histograms to check the validity of the underlying distributional assumptions.

Recall the following properties of the exponential distribution:
It is often used to model waiting times
The cumulative distribution function is: $1-e^{-\lambda y}$

$$
E(X)=\frac{1}{\lambda} \text { and } \operatorname{Var}(X)=\frac{1}{\lambda^{2}}
$$

8. The following data represent the time intervals between breakdowns of a machine. Is the exponential distribution an appropriate model for this data?

| 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.7 |
| 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| 4.9 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| 6.2 | 6.3 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 8.1 | 8.6 | 9.2 | 9.5 | 10.0 |
| 10.3 | 10.6 | 10.9 | 12.3 | 13.9 | 13.7 | 13.9 | 14.8 | 14.9 | 17.3 | 17.6 |

Step \#1: Calculate the distribution parameters.
In this case, we need to calculate $\lambda$. We know $E(X)=\frac{1}{\lambda}$, so we can find the average of the observations.

$$
\bar{X}=4.69=\frac{1}{\lambda}, \text { so } \lambda=\frac{1}{4.69}=0.213
$$

Step \#2: The chi-square test required categorical data, so we must break our continuous data into bins of equal width.

|  | $0-3$ | $3-6$ | $6-9$ | $9-12$ | $12-15$ | $15-18$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed | 40 | 23 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 88 |

Step \#3: We now must calculate the expected frequencies in each bin

| Bin | Expected Relative Frequency | Probability | Expected Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-3 | $P(X<3)$ | $1-e^{-.213(3)}=0.472$ | $=0.472(88)=41.55$ |
| 3-6 | $P(3<x<6)$ | $\left\lfloor 1-e^{-.213(6)}\right\rfloor\left[1-e^{-.213(3)}\right\rfloor=0.249$ | $0.249(88)=21.95$ |
| 6-9 | $P(6<x<9)$ | $\left\lfloor 1-e^{-.213(9)}\right\rfloor\left\lfloor\leq e^{-.213(6)}\right\rfloor=0.1315$ | $0.1315(88)=11.58$ |
| 9-12 | $P(9<x<12)$ | $\left\lfloor 1-e^{-.213(12)}\right\rfloor\left\lfloor 1-e^{-.213(9)}\right\rfloor=0.069$ | $0.069(88)=6.11$ |
| 12-15 | $P(12<x<15)$ | $\left\lfloor 1-e^{-.213(15)}\right\rfloor\left[1-e^{-.213(12)}\right\rfloor=0.037$ | $0.037(88)=3.23$ |
| 15-18 | $P(15<x<18)$ | $\left\lfloor 1-e^{-.213(18)}\right\rfloor\left[1-e^{-.213(15)}\right\rfloor=0.041$ | $0.041(88)=3.61$ |

Step \#4: Now we calculate the chi-square statistic:

|  | $0-3$ | $3-6$ | $6-9$ | $9-12$ | $12-15$ | $15-18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed | 40 | 23 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 2 |
| Expected | 41.55 | 21.95 | 11.58 | 6.11 | 3.23 | 3.61 |
| Obs-Exp | -1.55 | 1.05 | -0.58 | -0.11 | 2.77 | -1.61 |
| $(o b s-\exp )^{2}$ | 2.4025 | 1.1025 | 0.3364 | 0.0121 | 7.6729 | 2.5921 |

Sum $=14.1185$
Compare to a chi-square with (rows - estimated parameters -1 ) degrees of freedom $=(6-1-1)=4$.
According to our table, the critical value is 13.277 at a 0.01 level of significance and 14.860 at a 0.005 level of significance.
Therefore, the $p$-value for this study is: $0.005<p<0.01$

We've seen how to use the chi-square statistic to test the distribution of a single variable. We can also use the chi-square statistic to see if two categorical variables are independent. This is called the chi-square test for independence.
9. Explain in plain language what it means if two variables are independent. Then, give the definition of independence using probability notation.
10. Suppose variables A and B are independent, $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{A})=0.2$, and $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{B})=0.4$. Find $P(A \bigcup B)$ and $P(A \bigcap B)$.
11. Suppose we're interested in the relationship between two variables: (a) gender and (b) the outcome of a coin toss. We get 50 men and 50 women to toss a coin and record the result. Should gender and the outcome of a coin toss be independent of each other? Why or why not?
12. The chi-square test for independence is very similar to the goodness-of-fit test. Our first step is to write out our expectations for the variables. Complete the following $2 x 2$ contingency table by writing the expected frequencies in each cell. Also write out the expected marginal frequencies for each row and column. How did you determine these probabilities?

|  | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Heads |  |  |  |
| Tails |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

13. Suppose we observe the following. Compute a chi-square statistic to determine if gender and coin toss result are independent.

|  | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Heads | 30 | 10 | 40 |
| Tails | 20 | 40 | 60 |
| Total | 50 | 50 | 100 |

14. The chi-square test for independence is useful in many situations where we have two categorical variables. In a study of heart disease in male federal employees, researchers classified 356 volunteer subjects according to their socioeconomic status (SES) and their smoking habits. What can you conclude by examining the data?

|  | High SES | Mid SES | Low SES | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current <br> Smoker | 51 | 22 | 43 | 116 |
| Former <br> Smoker | 92 | 21 | 28 | 141 |
| Never <br> Smoked | 68 | 9 | 22 | 99 |
| Total | 211 | 52 | 93 | 356 |

15. Before running a chi-square test, it's often worthwhile to calculate conditional probabilities. Since we're interested in the effect of SES on smoking habits, let's calculate the probability that an individual is a current smoker given he is either High, Middle, or Low SES. Compute similar conditional probabilities for the other smoking habits.

|  | High SES | Mid SES | Low SES | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current <br> Smoker |  |  |  |  |
| Former <br> Smoker |  |  |  |  |
| Never |  |  |  |  |
| Smoked |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

16. We're interested in determining whether or not SES is related to smoking habits. Write out the null and alternate hypotheses for this study.
17. Now we need to calculate the expected cell frequencies. Recall that when two variables are independent, $P(A \cap B)=P(A) P(B)$. Using this, fill-in the table with your expected frequencies. Derive a general formula for calculating these expected frequencies.

|  | High SES | Mid SES | Low SES | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Smoker | $E_{11}=$ | $E_{12}=$ | $E_{13}=$ | $E_{1} \cdot=$ |
| Former Smoker | $E_{21}=$ | $E_{22}=$ | $E_{23}=$ | $E_{2 \bullet}{ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |
| Never Smoked | $E_{31}=$ | $E_{32}=$ | $E_{33}=$ | $E_{3 \bullet}=$ |
| Total | $E_{\text {•1 }}=$ | $E_{\cdot 2}=$ | $E_{\cdot 3}=$ | $E . .=356$ |

18. We can now run the test.

|  | High SES | Mid SES | Low SES | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Smoker | $\begin{aligned} & O_{11}=51 \\ & E_{11}=68.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{12}=22 \\ & E_{12}=16.94 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{13}=43 \\ & E_{13}=30.31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{1} \cdot=116 \\ & E_{1} \cdot=116 \end{aligned}$ |
| Former Smoker | $\begin{aligned} & O_{21}=92 \\ & E_{21}=83.57 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{22}=21 \\ & E_{22}=20.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{23}=28 \\ & E_{23}=36.83 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{2 \bullet}=141 \\ & E_{2} .=141 \end{aligned}$ |
| Never Smoked | $\begin{aligned} & O_{31}=68 \\ & E_{31}=56.68 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{32}=9 \\ & E_{32}=14.46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{33}=22 \\ & E_{33}=25.86 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{3 \bullet}=99 \\ & E_{3} .=99 \end{aligned}$ |
| Total | $\begin{aligned} & O_{\cdot 1}=211 \\ & E_{\bullet 1}=211 \end{aligned}$ | $O_{\cdot 2}=52$ <br> $E_{\cdot 2}=52$ | $\begin{aligned} & O \cdot 3=93 \\ & E_{\cdot 3}=93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & O_{. .}=356 \\ & E_{. .}=356 \end{aligned}$ |


|  | High SES | Mid SES | Low SES | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current <br> Smoker |  |  |  |  |
| Former <br> Smoker |  |  |  |  |
| Never <br> Smoked |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

19. We can calculate additional statistics when we examine $2 x 2$ contingency tables. In order to see if seat belts help prevent fatalities, records of the last 100 automobile accidents to occur along a particular highway were examined. These 100 accidents involved 242 persons. Each person was classified as using or not using seat belts when the accident occurred and as injured fatally or a survivor.

|  | Fatally <br> Injured | Survived | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seat Belt | 7 | 89 | 96 |
| No Seat Belt | 24 | 122 | 146 |
| Total | 31 | 211 | 242 |

We'll begin by running a chi-square test for independence.

|  | Fatally Injured | Survived |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Seat Belt | $O_{11}=7$ | $O_{12}=89$ |
| $E_{11}=\frac{96(31)}{242}=12.3$ |  |  |
| $\chi^{2}=2.28$ | $E_{12}=\frac{96(211)}{242}=83.7$ |  |
| No Seat Belt | $Z_{21}=\frac{146(31)}{242}=18.7$ <br> $O_{21}=24$ <br> $\chi^{2}=1.50$ | $O_{22}=122$ |

20. Another statistic we can calculate for $2 \times 2$ tables is the phi coefficient. This is an index that measures the degree of dependency between the two variables. A phi-coefficient is calculated as:
$\phi=\frac{a d-b c}{\sqrt{r_{1} r_{2} c_{1} c_{2}}}$, where the letters represent cell frequencies:

|  | Variable \#1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable <br> $\# 2$ | $a$ | $b$ | $r_{1}$ |
|  | $c$ | $d$ | $r_{2}$ |
|  | $c_{1}$ | $c_{2}$ |  |

$$
\phi=\frac{a d-b c}{\sqrt{r_{1} r_{2} c_{1} c_{2}}}=\frac{(7)(122)-(24)(89)}{\sqrt{31(211)(146)(96)}}=\frac{-1282}{9574.897}=-0.134
$$

21. We'll discuss the phi-coefficient more in the next activity. Now, let's look at another measure we can use: odds ratios.

The odds of event A occurring are defined as: $\frac{P(A)}{1-P(A)}$.
Calculate the odds of surviving for individuals who do and do not wear seatbelts.

|  | Fatally <br> Injured | Survived | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seat Belt | 7 | 89 | 96 |
| No Seat <br> Belt | 24 | 122 | 146 |
| Total | 31 | 211 | 242 |

