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## Histogram

- An Example: Consider a list of 10 hypothetical sample values:

| 2 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Count of sample values within each clas


- Relative frequency table:
$p_{k}=\#$ of data in $k$-th class/(total \# of data)

| k | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $p_{k}$ | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |

- Please note: Histogram shape depends on number and width of classes; rule of thumb for number of classes: $5 * \log _{10}$ (\# of data) and use non-overlapping equal intervals
- Peaked or not

- Numbers of peaks

- Symmetric or not



## Cumulative Histogram

- Ranked sampled data and their relative frequency

| k | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $p_{k}$ | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |

- Cumulative relative frequency

Empirical CDF


- Proportion of sample values less than, or equal to, any given cutoff value
- Probability that any random sample is no greater than and given cutoff value


## Quantiles

## Definition:

- datum value $x_{p}$ corresponding to specific cumulative relative frequency value $p$


## Quantiles



- Commonly used quantiles:
- $\min : x_{0.0}$, lower quantiles: $x_{0.25}$, median: $x_{0.50}$, upper quantile: $x_{0.75}$, max: $x_{1.00}$
- Percentiles: $x_{0.01}, x_{0.02}, \ldots, x_{0.99}$
- Deciles: $x_{0.10}, x_{0.20}, \ldots, x_{0.90}$
- Quantiles are not sensitive to extreme values (outliers)


## Measure of Central Tendency

- mid-range: arithmetic average of highest and lowest values: $\frac{x_{\max }+x_{\text {min }}}{2}$
- mode: most frequently occuring values in data sets
- median: datum value that divides data set into halves; also defined as 50 -th percentiles: $x_{0.5}$
- mean: arithmatic average of values in data set
- sample mean: $m=\bar{x}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{x=1}^{n} x_{i}$
- population mean: $\mu=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{x=1}^{N} x_{i}$
- sample mean is an esimation of population mean
- Note: Most appropriate measure of central tendency depends on distribution shapes


## Measure of Dispersion I

- range: difference between highest and lowest values: $x_{\max }-x_{\min }$
- interquantile range (IQR): difference between upper and lower quantiles: $x_{0.75}-x_{0.25}$
- mean absolute derivation from mean: averange absolute difference between each datum value and the mean: $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i}-\bar{x}\right|$
- median absolute derivation from median: median absolute difference between each datum value and the median: $\left|x_{i}-x_{0.5}\right|_{0.5}$
- variance: average squared difference between any datum values and the mean:
- sample variance: $s^{2}=\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(x_{i}-m\right)^{2}$
- standard deviation: square root of variance $s$ or $\sigma$


## Quantile-Quantile (Q-Q) Plots

Graph for comparing the shapes of distribution

- Normalizing procedure:

1. rank both data sets from smallest to largest values
2. compute quantiles of each data set
3. cross-plot each quantile pair


- Interpretation: straight plot aligned with $45^{\circ}$ line implies two similar distribution


## Boxplot

Graph for describing the the degree of dispersion and skewness and identify outliers

- Non-parametric
- $25 \%, 50 \%$, and $75 \%$ percentiles
- end of the hinge (whisker) could mean differently; most ofen represent the lowest datum within 1.5 IQR of the lower quantile, and the highest datum still within 1.5 $I Q R$ of the upper quantile

- Points outside of range are usually taken as outliers


## Commonly Used Probability Distributions

- Gaussian (or normal) distribution

- The shapes are controlled by mean ( $\mu$ ) and variance ( $\sigma^{2}$ )
- Three sigma rule (68-95-99.7 rule)


## Covariance and Correlation Coefficient

Suppose $X$ and $Y$ are two random variables for a random experiment

- the covariance of $X$ and $Y$ measures how much these two random variables are related
- $\operatorname{cov}(X, Y)=E[(X-E(X)(Y-E(Y)))]$
- The correlation coefficient of $X$ and $Y$ a normalized version of covariance
- $\operatorname{cor}(X, Y)=\frac{\operatorname{cov}(X, Y)}{\sigma_{X} \sigma_{Y}}$
- $\operatorname{cov}(X, Y)=0$ means $X$ and $Y$ are 'unrelated'
- Assuming the null hypothesis is true, the p-value is the probability a test statistics at least as extreme as the one that was actually observed



## Spatial Versus Non-Spatial Statistics

## Classical statistics

- samples assumed realizations of independent and identically distributed random variables (iid)
- most hypothesis testing procedures call for samples from iid random variables
- problems with inference and hypothesis testing in a spatial setting


## Spatial statistics

- multivariate statistics in a spatial/temporal context: each observation is viewed as a realization from a different random variable, but such random variables are auto-correlated in space and/or time
- each sample is not an independent piece of information, because precisely it is redundant with other samples (due to the corresponding random variables being auto-correlated)
- auto- and cross-correlation (in space and/or time) is explicitly accounted for to establish confidence intervals for hypothesis testing


## Some Issues Specific to Spatial Data Analysis

## Spatial dependency

- values that are closer in space tend to be more similar than values that are further apart (Tobler's first law of Geography)
- redundancy in sample data $=$ classical statistical hypothesis testing procedures not applicable
- positive, zero, and negative spatial correlation or dependency

The modified areal unit problem (MAUP)

- spatial aggregations display different spatial characteristics and relationships than original (non-averaged) values
- scale and zoning (aggregation) effects

Ecological fallacy

- problem close related to the MAUP
- relationships established at a specific level of aggregation (e.g., census tracts) do not hold at more detailed levels (e.g., individuals)


## Spatial Dependency (I)

- often termed as spatial similarity, spatial correlation and spatial pattern, spatial pattern, spatial texture ...
- Examples of synthetic maps with same histogram:




## Spatial Dependency (II)

## Spatial statistics

- inference of spatial dependency is the core of spatial statistics
- spatial interpolation, e.g., kriging family of methods
- spatial point pattern analysis
- spatial areal units (regular or irregular)
- often extended into a spatio-temporal domain to investigate the dynamic phenomena and processes, e.g., land use and land cover changes


## The Modified Areal Unit Problem

The same basic data yield different results when aggregated in different ways

- First studied by Gehlke and Biehl (1934)
- Applies where data are aggregated to areal units which could take many forms, e.g., postcode sectors, congressional district, local government units and grid squares.
- Affects many types of spatial analysis, including clustering, correlation and regression analysis.
- Example: Gerrymandering of congressional districts (Bush vs. Gore, Lincoln vs. Douglas)
- Two aspects of this problem: scale effect and zoning (aggregation) effect


## The Modified Areal Unit Problem: Examples

| 200 | 100 | 400 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200 | 300 | 300 | 50 | 10 | 5 |
| 500 | 400 | 100 | 60 | 10 | 20 |
| Base Population |  |  | University degree (count) |  |  |


| $5 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $25 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| $12 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| $6 \%$ |  |  |




Example 1
HOW TO STEAL AN ELECTION


50 PRECINCTS 60\% BLUE 40\% RED

2


5 DISTRICTS 5 BLUE BLUE WINS

3

## The Modified Areal Unit Problem: Scale Effect (1)

Scale effect
Analytical results depending on the size of units used (generally, bigger units lead to stronger correlation)

Example

Table: spatial variable \#1 versus spatial variable \#2

| 87 | 95 | 72 | 37 | 44 | 24 | 72 | 75 | 85 | 29 | 58 | 30 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 40 | 55 | 55 | 38 | 88 | 34 | 50 | 60 | 49 | 46 | 84 | 23 |
| 41 | 30 | 26 | 35 | 38 | 24 | 21 | 46 | 22 | 42 | 45 | 14 |
| 14 | 56 | 37 | 34 | 08 | 18 | 19 | 36 | 48 | 23 | 8 | 29 |
| 49 | 44 | 51 | 67 | 17 | 37 | 38 | 47 | 52 | 52 | 22 | 48 |
| 55 | 25 | 33 | 32 | 59 | 54 | 58 | 40 | 46 | 38 | 35 | 55 |

Table: $\rho(v 1, v 2)=0.83$


## The Modified Areal Unit Problem: Scale Effect (2)

Scale effect
Analytical results depending on the size of units used (generally, bigger units lead to stronger correlation)

Example

Table: spatial aggregation strategy \# 1

| 91.0 | 47.5 | 35.5 | 73.5 | 55.0 | 33.5 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 35.0 | 46.5 | 40.0 | 27.5 | 42.5 | 49.0 |
| 54.5 | 46.5 | 30.5 | 57.0 | 47.5 | 32.0 |
| 35.5 | 59.0 | 32.5 | 35.5 | 52.0 | 42.0 |
| 34.0 | 61.0 | 31.0 | 44.0 | 53.5 | 29.5 |
| 13.0 | 27.0 | 56.5 | 18.5 | 35.0 | 45.0 |

Table: $\rho(v 1, v 2)=0.90$


## The Modified Areal Unit Problem: Zoning Effect

Zoning effect
Analytical results depending on how the study area is divided up, even at the same scale

## Example

Table: spatial aggregation strategy \#2

| 63.5 | 75 | 63.5 | 37.5 | 66 | 29.0 | 61.0 | 67.5 | 67.0 | 37.5 | 71.0 | 26.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27.5 | 43 | 31.5 | 34.5 | 23 | 21 | 20.0 | 41.0 | 35.0 | 32.5 | 26.5 | 21.5 |
| 52.0 | 34.5 | 42 | 49.5 | 38.0 | 45.5 | 48.0 | 43.5 | 49.0 | 45.0 | 28.5 | 51.5 |

Table: $\rho(v 1, v 2)=0.94$


## The Modified Areal Unit Problem: Zoning Effect

Zoning effect: another example


Figure 2 a . Zoning system that ninimises the regression slope coefficient $(-24, r=-.25)$


Fiqure $2 b$. Zoning system that maximises the regression slope coefficient (12, $r=.87$ )

Figure: Image Courtesy of OpenShaw

## Ecological Fallacy (I)

- relationships established at a specific level of aggregation do not hold at more detailed levels

Example

Table: spatial aggregation strategy \# 1

| 91.0 | 47.5 | 35.5 | 73.5 | 55.0 | 33.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 35.0 | 46.5 | 40.0 | 27.5 | 42.5 | 49.0 |
| 54.5 | 46.5 | 30.5 | 57.0 | 47.5 | 32.0 |
| 35.5 | 59.0 | 32.5 | 35.5 | 52.0 | 42.0 |
| 34.0 | 61.0 | 31.0 | 44.0 | 53.5 | 29.5 |
| 13.0 | 27.0 | 56.5 | 18.5 | 35.0 | 45.0 |

Table: $\rho(v 1, v 2)=0.90$


## Ecological Fallacy (II)

- relationships established at a specific level of aggregation do not hold at more detailed levels

Example

Table: spatial variable \#1 versus spatial variable \#2

| 95 | 87 | 37 | 72 | 24 | 44 | 72 | 75 | 85 | 29 | 58 | 30 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 55 | 40 | 38 | 55 | 34 | 88 | 50 | 60 | 49 | 46 | 84 | 23 |
| 30 | 41 | 35 | 26 | 24 | 38 | 21 | 46 | 22 | 42 | 45 | 14 |
| 56 | 14 | 34 | 37 | 18 | 08 | 19 | 36 | 48 | 23 | 8 | 29 |
| 44 | 49 | 67 | 51 | 37 | 17 | 38 | 47 | 52 | 52 | 22 | 48 |
| 25 | 55 | 32 | 33 | 54 | 59 | 58 | 40 | 46 | 38 | 35 | 55 |

Table: $\rho(v 1, v 2)=0.21$


GIS-based packages

- ESRI's Spatial Analyst, Geostatistical Analyst, Spatial Statistics
- opt for "close" or "loose" coupling with specialized external packages when specific functionalities are missing from a GIS


## Statistical packages

- R packages, Matlab (new class will be available this Fall!)
- GeoDa/PySAL
- versatile in modeling, programable
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