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## Outline

- Some examples
- A bit about the Lineup Protocol
- Inference in the lineup protocol


## Why Visual Inference?

- Graphics are essential tools for data exploration, but ...

- ... post-hoc inferential results are invalid (data fishing, trawling, snooping ...)
- Need: quantitative assessment of significance of graphical finding based directly on graphic
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Normal Q-Q plot

Obvious deviations from normality assumption but ...
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What is the $p$-value of this finding?
data is in panel \#l3

12/72 participants identified \#|3 as the most different

Heike Hofmann, lowa State University

## Back up:

- Lineup protocol in general
- Construction of Lineup in this example


## Graphical vs Classical

|  | Mathematical Inference | Visual Inference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hypothesis | $\begin{gathered} H_{0}: \beta=0 \text { vs } H_{1}: \beta \neq 0 \\ \downarrow \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} H_{0}: \beta=0 \text { vs } H_{1}: \beta \neq 0 \\ \\ \downarrow \end{gathered}$ |
| Test statistic | $T(y)=\frac{\hat{\beta}}{\sec (\hat{\beta})}$ | $T(y)=\ldots$ |
|  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Null Distribution | $f_{T(y)}(t)$; |  |
| Reject $H_{0}$ if | observed $T$ is extreme | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { observed }} T$ is identifiable |

## Test

Compare test statistic to values generated consistently with the null distribution
Classical

reject null, if test statistic is here
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## Test

Compare test statistic to values generated consistently with the null distribution
Classical

reject null, if test statistic is here
reject null, if data plot is 'identifiable'

## Visual p-values

- Assume K independent observers evaluate a lineup
- Let $X$ denote the number of data identifications
- quantify visual $p$-value: $\operatorname{Pr}\left(X \geq x \mid H_{0}\right.$ true $)$
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What is the $p$-value of this finding?
data is in panel \#l3

12/72 participants identified \#|3 as the most different

Heike Hofmann, lowa State University

## The Electoral

 Building- result from the 2012 US election
- each state a rectangle: width: margin of majority party over minority
height: \#electoral votes
the test statistic



## Null plots

- Null hypothesis: election outcome is consistent with polling results
- Each null plot consists of sample from a pollster's predictions


## Lineup

- Data is randomly placed among the null plots
- If the data is indistinguishable from the null, the election results are consistent with the poll
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## Lineup

- Data is randomly placed among the null plots
- If the data is indistinguishable from the null, the election results are consistent with the poll

visual p-value: $P(\#$ data plot picks $\geq I 2$ )


## Data from lineup evaluation

- For lineup of size $m$ we observe
$X=\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}\right) \sim$ Mult $_{\mathrm{pl}, \mathrm{p} 2}, \ldots, \mathrm{pm}$
- with $0 \leq \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{i}} \leq \mathrm{I}$ and $\sum_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{pi}_{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{I}$
- w.lo.g. data plot in panel m , ie $X_{m} \sim \operatorname{Binom}\left(K, P_{m}\right)$
$K$ independent evaluations
- What is distribution of $X_{m}$ under null?
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## Evaluating lineup evaluations

- Assuming $X \sim \operatorname{Binom}(72, \mathrm{I} / 20)$
- $p$-value for 12 data picks is $P(X \geq 12)=0.00023$


## fails the sniff test!

Problem: if all plots were
 indistinguishable, we could assume $\mathrm{pm}_{\mathrm{m}}=1 / \mathrm{m}\left(\right.$ and all $\left.\mathrm{pi}_{\mathrm{i}}=1 / \mathrm{m}\right)$

Generally: Pm depends on $\mathrm{PI}, \ldots$, Pm-ı, varies with lineup

## Null Distribution of $p$

- Two other plots were selected at least as often as the data plot
- Distribution of null plot picks far from uniform



## Null Distribution of $p$

- $P_{i}$ is probability to pick panel $i$
- Assume that under the null, all panels have the same distribution:
$p=(\mathrm{P}, \ldots, \mathrm{Pm}) \sim \operatorname{Dirichlet}(\alpha), \alpha>0$ a flat Dirichlet distribution
- Estimate rate $\alpha$ from observed ( $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{I}}, \ldots, \mathrm{Pm}_{\mathrm{I}}$ )' where ( $\mathrm{p}, \ldots, \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{l}}$ )' is rescaled without data plot


## Distribution of (PI, ..., Pm-ı)'

- flat Dirichlet $(\alpha)$ for ( $\mathrm{P}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Pm}_{\mathrm{I}}$ ) ' seems reasonable
- no obvious preference for location
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Dirichlet distributions estimated for each of nine different
experiments
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## Distribution of (Pı, ..., Pm-ı)'

- flat Dirichlet $(\alpha)$ for ( $\mathrm{P}, \ldots, \mathrm{Pm}_{\mathrm{I}}$ )' seems reasonable
- no obvious preference for location



## visual $p$-value

- p-value based on $\operatorname{Binom}(72, \mathrm{I} / 20)$ $P(X \geq 12)=0.00023$


12/72 participants identified \#I3 as the most different

- $p$-value based on Dirichlet approach: $P(X \geq 12)=0.11396$


## visual $p$-value

- p-value based on $\operatorname{Binom}(23, \mathrm{I} / 20)$ $P(X \geq 20) \leq 0.0000$ I

20/23 participants identified \#I3 as the most different

- $p$-value based on Dirichlet approach: $P(X \geq 20)=0.001842$


## Dirichlet distributions for null

- seems to work in practice - theoretical densities and observed frequencies of picking null plots match
- $\alpha$ gives a rough estimate of the spread of null distribution/difficulty of a lineup (without regarding : small $\alpha=$ small number of null plots attract picks)
- Weirdly, strong signal in data plot makes estimating $\alpha$ harder: Rorschach for $\alpha$


## Conclusions

- Use lineup scenario to get valid p-values for visual findings
- useful in situations where conventional methods break down
- lineups allow us to ask for 'why' ... insight to visual reasoning of participants

