2: Conditional Probability

Fall 2023

Matthew Blackwell

Gov 2002 (Harvard)

- 1. Conditional Probability
- 2. Bayes's Rule
- 3. Independence

1/ Conditional Probability

Conditional probability

- **Conditional probability**: if we know that *B* has occurred, what is the probability of *A*?
 - Conditioning our analysis on *B* having occurred.
- Examples:
 - What is probability of two states going to war **if** they are both democracies?
 - What is the probability of a judge ruling in a pro-choice direction **conditional** on having daughters?
 - What is the probability that there will be a coup in a country **conditional** on having a presidential system?
- Conditional probability is the cornerstone of quantitative social science.

Conditional Probability definition

• Definition: If $\mathbb{P}(B) > 0$ then the **conditional probability** of A given B is

$$\mathbb{P}(A|B) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(A \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)}$$

- How often A and B occur divided by how often B occurs.
- WARNING! $\mathbb{P}(A|B)$ does **not**, in general, equal $\mathbb{P}(B|A)$.
 - $\mathbb{P}(\text{smart} \mid \text{in gov 2002}) \text{ is high}$
 - $\mathbb{P}(\text{in gov 2002} \mid \text{smart}) \text{ is low.}$
 - There are many many smart people who are not in this class!
 - Also known as the **prosecutor's fallacy**

Intuition



 $A = \{$ you get an A grade $\}$ $B = \{$ everyone gets an A grade $\}$

- If *B* occurs then *A* must also occur, so Pr(A|B) = 1.
 - Does this mean that Pr(B|A) = 1 as well?
- Now let $A = \{you \text{ get a B grade}\}.$
 - The intersection $A \cap B = \emptyset$, so that Pr(A|B) = 0.
 - Intuitively, it's because B occurring precludes A from occurring.

	Democrats	Republicans	Independents	Total
Men	33	40	2	75
Women	15	9	1	25
Total	48	49	3	100

- Choose one senator at random from this population
- What is the probability that a randomly selected Republican is a Woman:

•
$$\mathbb{P}(Woman \mid Republican) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Woman \cap Republican)}{\mathbb{P}(Republican)} = \frac{9/100}{49/100} = \frac{9}{49} = 0.184$$

- Choose two senators at random:
 - $\mathbb{P}(2 \text{ women } | \text{ one draw is a woman})?$
 - $\mathbb{P}(2 \text{ women } | \text{ one draw is a Liz Warren})?$

Conditional probabilities are probabilities

- Condition probabilities $\mathbb{P}(A|B)$ are valid probability functions:
 - 1. $\mathbb{P}(A|B) \ge 0$
 - 2. $\mathbb{P}(\Omega|B) = 1$
 - 3. If A_1 and A_2 are disjoint, then $\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cup A_2|B) = \mathbb{P}(A_1|B) + \mathbb{P}(A_2|B)$
- \rightsquigarrow rules of probability apply to left-hand side of conditioning bar (A)
 - All probabilities **normalized** to event B, $\mathbb{P}(B \mid B) = 1$.
- Not for right-hand side, so even if B and C are disjoint,

 $\mathbb{P}(A|B\cup C) \neq \mathbb{P}(A|B) + \mathbb{P}(A|C)$

Joint probabilities from conditionals

- · Joint probabilities: probability of two events occurring (intersections)
 - Often replace \cap with commas: $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B \cap C) = \mathbb{P}(A, B, C)$
- Definition of conditional prob. implies:

 $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) \equiv \mathbb{P}(A, B) = \mathbb{P}(B)\mathbb{P}(A \mid B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B \mid A)$

· What about three events?

 $\mathbb{P}(A, B, C) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B \mid A)\mathbb{P}(C \mid A, B)$

• Generalize to the intersection of N events:

 $\mathbb{P}(A_1,\ldots,A_N) = \mathbb{P}(A_1)\mathbb{P}(A_2 \mid A_1)\mathbb{P}(A_3 \mid A_1,A_2)\cdots\mathbb{P}(A_N \mid A_1,\ldots,A_{N-1})$

- Draw three cards at random from a deck without replacement.
- What's the probability that we draw three Aces?

 $\mathbb{P}(\mathsf{Ace}_1 \cap \mathsf{Ace}_2 \cap \mathsf{Ace}_3) = \mathbb{P}(\mathsf{Ace}_1)\mathbb{P}(\mathsf{Ace}_2 \mid \mathsf{Ace}_1)\mathbb{P}(\mathsf{Ace}_3 \mid \mathsf{Ace}_2 \cap \mathsf{Ace}_1)$

- What are these probabilities?
 - 4 Aces to pick out of 52 cards $\rightsquigarrow \mathbb{P}(Ace_1) = \frac{4}{52}$
 - 3 Aces left in the 51 remaining cards $\rightarrow \mathbb{P}(Ace_2 \mid Ace_1) = \frac{3}{51}$
 - 2 Aces left in the 50 remaining cards $\rightsquigarrow \mathbb{P}(Ace_3 \mid Ace_2 \cap Ace_1) = \frac{2}{50}$
- Thus, $\mathbb{P}(\text{Ace}_1 \cap \text{Ace}_2 \cap \text{Ace}_3) = \frac{4}{52} \times \frac{3}{51} \times \frac{2}{50} = 0.00018$

- Suppose we observed country-dyads over 3 years
- In each year the dyad can be at war (W_t) or at peace (P_t) .
- What's the probability that a war starts in year 1 ends after 2 years?

 $\mathbb{P}(W_1, W_2, P_3) = \mathbb{P}(W_1)\mathbb{P}(W_2 \mid W_1)\mathbb{P}(P_3 \mid W_1, W_2)$

• Actual Research QuestionTM: modeling the continuation probability of war, $\mathbb{P}(W_2 \mid W_1)$ and the probability of conflict resolution, $\mathbb{P}(P_3 \mid W_1, W_2)$.

Law of Total Probability



- Often we only have disaggregated probabilities.
 - *B* = sampling a Trump supporter from either Cambridge or Somerville.
 - We know the prop. of Trump supporters in each city from precinct data.
 - How to calculate the overall probability of B?
- A **partition** is a set of mutually disjoint events whose union is Ω .
- The **law of total probability** (LTP) states if A_1, \ldots, A_k is a partition:

$$\mathbb{P}(B) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(B \mid A_j) \mathbb{P}(A_j)$$

- Overall probability = weighted sum of within-partition probabilities
- Weights are the probability of the particular partition

A mixture of cities

- Randomly drawing voters from either Cambridge or Somerville:
 - Camb. had 50k voters and Somer. had around 40k, so:
 - Pr(Camb.) = 0.56 and so Pr(Somer.) = 0.44
- The state provides the following election results for each city:
 - Pr(Trump|Camb.) = 0.066
 - Pr(Trump|Somer.) = 0.103
- To get the overall turnout rate, $\mathbb{P}(\text{Trump})$, we can apply the LTP:

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Pr}(\mathsf{Trump}) &= \mathsf{Pr}(\mathsf{Trump}|\mathsf{Camb.}) + \mathsf{Pr}(\mathsf{Trump}|\mathsf{Somer.}) \ \mathsf{Pr}(\mathsf{Somer.}) \\ &= 0.066 \times 0.56 + 0.103 \times 0.44 \\ &= 0.082 \end{aligned}$

2/ Bayes's Rule

QAnon



You meet a man named Steve and he tells you that he is a Republican. You have been interested in meeting someone who believes in the QAnon conspiracy theory. Given what you know about Steve, would you guess that he believes in QAnon or not?

- Common response: probably believes in QAnon since believers tend to be Republicans.
- Base rate fallacy: ignores how uncommon QAnon believers are!

Visualizing QAnon support



Chance a random Republican believes QAnon = $\frac{\mathbb{P}(R|Q)\mathbb{P}(Q)}{\mathbb{P}(R|Q)\mathbb{P}(Q) + \mathbb{P}(R|\text{not } Q)\mathbb{P}(\text{not } Q)}$



- Reverend Thomas Bayes (1701–61): English minister and statistician
- **Bayes' rule**: if $\mathbb{P}(B) > 0$, then:

$$\mathbb{P}(A \mid B) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(B \mid A)\mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(B \mid A)\mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(B \mid A)\mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(B \mid A^c)\mathbb{P}(A^c)}$$

Why is Bayes' rule useful?

- What is the probability of some hypothesis given some evidence?
 - $\mathbb{P}(QAnon \mid Republican)$?
- Often easier to know probability of evidence given hypothesis.
 - $\mathbb{P}(\text{Republican} \mid \text{QAnon})$
- Combine this with the **prior probability** of the hypothesis.
 - Prior: $\mathbb{P}(QAnon)$
 - **Posterior**: $\mathbb{P}(QAnon | Republican)$
- Applying Bayes' rule is often called **updating the prior**.
 - $\mathbb{P}(QAnon) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{P}(QAnon \mid Republican)$
 - How does the evidence change the chance of the hypothesis being true?

- Medical testing:
 - Want to know: $\mathbb{P}(\text{Disease} \mid \text{Test Positive})$
 - + Have: $\mathbb{P}(\text{Test Positive} \mid \text{Disease}) \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(\text{Disease})$
- Predicting traits from names:
 - Want to know: $\mathbb{P}(\text{African American} \mid \text{Last Name})$
 - + Have: $\mathbb{P}(\text{Last Name} \mid \text{African American}) \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(\text{African American})$
- Spam filtering:
 - Want to know: ℙ(Spam | Email text)
 - Have: $\mathbb{P}(\text{Email text} \mid \text{Spam})$ and $\mathbb{P}(\text{Spam})$

- Suppose you go and get a COVID-19 test and it comes back positive!
 - Let a positive test be *PT*.
- What's the probability you actually have COVID-19?
 - Let having COVID be labeled C.
 - Question: What is $\mathbb{P}(C \mid PT)$?
- Components for calculating Bayes' rule:
 - $\mathbb{P}(PT|C) = 0.8$: true positive rate
 - $\mathbb{P}(PT \mid C^c) = 0.005$: false positive rate
 - $\mathbb{P}(C) = 0.007$ rough prevalance of active COVID cases.

Applying Bayes' rule to COVID tests

• Use the law of total probability to get the denominator:

$$\mathbb{P}(PT) = \mathbb{P}(PT \mid C)\mathbb{P}(C) + \mathbb{P}(PT \mid C^{c})\mathbb{P}(C^{c})$$
$$= (0.8 \times 0.007) + (0.005 \times 0.993)$$
$$= 0.011$$

• Now plug in all values to Bayes' rule:

$$\mathbb{P}(C \mid PT) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(PT \mid C)\mathbb{P}(C)}{\mathbb{P}(PT)} = \frac{0.8 \times 0.007}{0.0106} \approx 0.53$$

• If false positive rate goes up to 1% $\rightsquigarrow \mathbb{P}(C \mid PT) \approx 0.36$

3/ Independence

Independence

- Heart of Bayes's rule: knowing *B* occurs often changes probability of *A*.
 - What if *B* provides no information? → independence
- Two events A and B are **independent** if $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)$
 - Sometimes written as $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$
 - **Symmetric:** $A \perp\!\!\perp B$ equivalent to $B \perp\!\!\perp A$
 - Events that are not independent are dependent.
- Important consequence: if $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$ and $\mathbb{P}(B) > 0$ then:

$$\mathbb{P}(A|B) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(A \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \mathbb{P}(A)$$

- Knowing B occurs has no impact on the probability of A.
- Works other way too: if P(A) > 0 and $A \perp B \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{P}(B \mid A) = \mathbb{P}(B)$.
- Common misunderstanding: independent is different than disjoint!
 - Mutually exclusive events provide information!

- If we have a gathering of size *n* drawn randomly from population of MA with current COVID infection rate of 1.37%, what's the probability someone in attendance is infected?
- When seeing "prob. of at least one" \rightsquigarrow work with complement:

 $\mathbb{P}(\text{At least one COVID case at gathering})$ $= 1 - \mathbb{P}(\text{No COVID cases at gathering})$

Independence and random sampling

- How we draw the random sample matters:
 - Sample n > 1 with replacement \rightsquigarrow independent events
 - Sample n > 1 without replacement \rightsquigarrow dependent events
- Sampling with replacement *n* for gathering:

 $\mathbb{P}(No \ COVID \ cases \ at \ gathering)$

 $= \mathbb{P}(\text{No COVID for Person 1} \cap \dots \cap \text{No COVID for Person } n)$

 $= \mathbb{P}(\text{No COVID for Person 1}) \cdots \mathbb{P}(\text{No COVID for Person } n)$

 $= (1 - 0.007)^n$

• Using the complement:

 $\mathbb{P}(\text{At least one COVID case at gathering}) = 1 - (1 - 0.007)^n$

- $n = 5 \rightsquigarrow \text{prob of } 0.035$
- $n = 100 \rightsquigarrow \text{prob of } 0.5$

• A and B are conditionally independent given E if

 $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B \mid E) = \mathbb{P}(A \mid E)\mathbb{P}(B \mid E)$

- Massively important in statistics and causal inference.
- **Warning**: independence \neq conditional independence.
 - Cond. ind. \Rightarrow ind.: flipping a coin with unknown bias.
 - Ind. \Rightarrow cond. ind.: test scores, athletics, and college admission.