

Simple example on sampling

It is commonly said that an image is worth a thousand words, so here is an example to help you with problems in Handout 14. I will use a test case the ongoing study on Covid-19 prevalence: the goal is to determine the proportion of persons who have developed antigens, because they have been in contact with the virus, knowingly or unknowingly. Thus, we want to estimate **a proportion**.

The study is based in 90.000 tests, of which about 60.000 are expected to be made (people may refuse or not be available, for various reasons). The following questions and answers may help you to understand the computations required in simple, non-stratified sampling.

What standard error of estimation can be expected from a sample size $n = 60.000$?

If p is totally unknown, we must make provision for the worst case scenario of $p = q = 0.50$. If T is the total number of positives, our estimate of p will be:

$$\hat{p} = \frac{T}{n}$$

with variance

$$\frac{pq}{n} \leq 0.25/n$$

If we replace n by 60.000 we get a variance of $0.25/60000 = 4.166667 \times 10^{-6}$ which translates to an standard error of ≈ 0.002041 .

What would be a 95% confidence interval for p with said sample?

It can be computed as,

$$\hat{p} \pm 1.96 \times 0.002041 = \hat{p} \pm 0.004001$$

Arrived at this point you may ask yourself: do we really need a precision of under one half of a percentage point in the estimation of p ? The answer is that probably not, if all we want is the proportion for the whole of Spain; but see below on what are the needs if we want to have results at the provincial level.

Would the results above change much if we account for the finite population of Spain?

Assuming the total population is 47 million people, the variance would be reduced by a factor of

$$\left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right) = 1 - \frac{60000}{47000000} = 0.9987$$

and the standard deviation by the square root of that: $\sqrt{0.9987} \approx 0.9993615$. Hardly worth considering.

If all we want is an estimation error under 1% with confidence 95%, what sample size is needed?

We would obtain it from:

$$0.01 = 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{0.25}{n}}$$

giving

$$n = \frac{1.96^2 \times 0.25}{0.01^2} = 9604$$

We make no correction for a finite population as we have seen it is negligible.

If we knew that in no event more than 10% of the population can possibly be infected, how would the previous sample size change?

The upper bound for pq would now be $0.10 \times 0.90 = 0.09$; then, a sample of

$$n = \frac{1.96^2 \times 0.09}{0.01^2} = 3457$$

would be enough.

We make no correction for a finite population as we have seen it is negligible.

If we want a 95% estimation error at the province level, what sample size do we need to use?

This is tedious to answer by hand, so we can make use of R. A file with the provinces populations has been obtained from INE, that we read here:

```
pop <- read.csv("2852bsc.csv", sep=";", )  
pop
```

```
##          Provincias Sexo Periodo     Total  
## 1             Total Total 2019 47026208  
## 2            02 Albacete Total 2019 388167  
## 3           03 Alicante/Alacant Total 2019 1858683  
## 4            04 Almería Total 2019 716820  
## 5           01 Araba/Álava Total 2019 331549  
## 6            33 Asturias Total 2019 1022800  
## 7            05 Ávila Total 2019 157640  
## 8            06 Badajoz Total 2019 673559  
## 9          07 Balears, Illes Total 2019 1149460  
## 10          08 Barcelona Total 2019 5664579  
## 11          48 Bizkaia Total 2019 1152651  
## 12          09 Burgos Total 2019 356958  
## 13          10 Cáceres Total 2019 394151  
## 14          11 Cádiz Total 2019 1240155  
## 15          39 Cantabria Total 2019 581078  
## 16        12 Castellón/Castelló Total 2019 579962  
## 17          13 Ciudad Real Total 2019 495761  
## 18          14 Córdoba Total 2019 782979  
## 19          15 Coruña, A Total 2019 1119596  
## 20          16 Cuenca Total 2019 196329  
## 21          20 Gipuzkoa Total 2019 723576  
## 22          17 Girona Total 2019 771044  
## 23          18 Granada Total 2019 914678  
## 24        19 Guadalajara Total 2019 257762  
## 25          21 Huelva Total 2019 521870  
## 26          22 Huesca Total 2019 220461  
## 27          23 Jaén Total 2019 633564  
## 28          24 León Total 2019 460001  
## 29          25 Lleida Total 2019 434930  
## 30          27 Lugo Total 2019 329587
```

```

## 31          28 Madrid Total    2019 6663394
## 32          29 Málaga Total   2019 1661785
## 33          30 Murcia Total   2019 1493898
## 34          31 Navarra Total  2019 654214
## 35          32 Ourense Total 2019 307651
## 36          34 Palencia Total 2019 160980
## 37          35 Palmas, Las Total 2019 1120406
## 38          36 Pontevedra Total 2019 942665
## 39          26 Rioja, La Total 2019 316798
## 40          37 Salamanca Total 2019 330119
## 41 38 Santa Cruz de Tenerife Total 2019 1032983
## 42          40 Segovia Total   2019 153129
## 43          41 Sevilla Total   2019 1942389
## 44          42 Soria Total    2019 88636
## 45          43 Tarragona Total 2019 804664
## 46          44 Teruel Total   2019 134137
## 47          45 Toledo Total   2019 694844
## 48          46 Valencia/València Total 2019 2565124
## 49          47 Valladolid Total 2019 519546
## 50          49 Zamora Total   2019 172539
## 51          50 Zaragoza Total 2019 964693
## 52          51 Ceuta Total    2019 84777
## 53          52 Melilla Total   2019 86487

```

We omit the first row and second and third columns:

```
pop <- pop[-1,-(2:3)]
```

```
pop
```

```

##                  Provincias  Total
## 2          02 Albacete 388167
## 3          03 Alicante/Alacant 1858683
## 4          04 Almería 716820
## 5          01 Araba/Álava 331549
## 6          33 Asturias 1022800
## 7          05 Ávila 157640
## 8          06 Badajoz 673559
## 9          07 Balears, Illes 1149460
## 10         08 Barcelona 5664579
## 11         48 Bizkaia 1152651
## 12         09 Burgos 356958
## 13         10 Cáceres 394151
## 14         11 Cádiz 1240155
## 15         39 Cantabria 581078
## 16         12 Castellón/Castelló 579962
## 17         13 Ciudad Real 495761
## 18         14 Córdoba 782979
## 19         15 Coruña, A 1119596
## 20         16 Cuenca 196329
## 21         20 Gipuzkoa 723576
## 22         17 Girona 771044
## 23         18 Granada 914678
## 24         19 Guadalajara 257762
## 25         21 Huelva 521870
## 26         22 Huesca 220461

```

```

## 27           23 Jaén   633564
## 28           24 León   460001
## 29           25 Lleida  434930
## 30           27 Lugo    329587
## 31           28 Madrid  6663394
## 32           29 Málaga  1661785
## 33           30 Murcia  1493898
## 34           31 Navarra 654214
## 35           32 Ourense 307651
## 36           34 Palencia 160980
## 37           35 Palmas, Las 1120406
## 38           36 Pontevedra 942665
## 39           26 Rioja, La 316798
## 40           37 Salamanca 330119
## 41 38 Santa Cruz de Tenerife 1032983
## 42           40 Segovia  153129
## 43           41 Sevilla   1942389
## 44           42 Soria    88636
## 45           43 Tarragona 804664
## 46           44 Teruel    134137
## 47           45 Toledo    694844
## 48           46 Valencia/València 2565124
## 49           47 Valladolid 519546
## 50           49 Zamora   172539
## 51           50 Zaragoza  964693
## 52           51 Ceuta    84777
## 53           52 Melilla   86487

```

We will complete this data frame with two columns giving the sample sizes required for the desired precision with and without finite population correction.

```

pop <- cbind(pop, n.inf=NA, n.fin=NA)
pop[, "n.inf"] <- round( (1.96^2) * 0.25 / 0.01^2 )
pop[, "n.fin"] <- round( ((1.96)^2 * 0.25) / (0.01^2 + 0.25/pop[, "Total"]) )

```

(We have made the simplification $N = N - 1$.)

Results can be seen next:

```
pop
```

	Provincias	Total	n.inf	n.fin
## 2	02 Albacete	388167	9604	9543
## 3	03 Alicante/Alacant	1858683	9604	9591
## 4	04 Almería	716820	9604	9571
## 5	01 Araba/Álava	331549	9604	9532
## 6	33 Asturias	1022800	9604	9581
## 7	05 Ávila	157640	9604	9454
## 8	06 Badajoz	673559	9604	9568
## 9	07 Balears, Illes	1149460	9604	9583
## 10	08 Barcelona	5664579	9604	9600
## 11	48 Bizkaia	1152651	9604	9583
## 12	09 Burgos	356958	9604	9537
## 13	10 Cáceres	394151	9604	9543
## 14	11 Cádiz	1240155	9604	9585
## 15	39 Cantabria	581078	9604	9563
## 16	12 Castellón/Castelló	579962	9604	9563

```

## 17      13 Ciudad Real  495761  9604  9556
## 18          14 Córdoba  782979  9604  9573
## 19          15 Coruña, A 1119596  9604  9583
## 20          16 Cuenca   196329  9604  9483
## 21          20 Gipuzkoa 723576  9604  9571
## 22          17 Girona   771044  9604  9573
## 23          18 Granada  914678  9604  9578
## 24          19 Guadalajara 257762  9604  9512
## 25          21 Huelva   521870  9604  9558
## 26          22 Huesca   220461  9604  9496
## 27          23 Jaén     633564  9604  9566
## 28          24 León     460001  9604  9552
## 29          25 Lleida   434930  9604  9549
## 30          27 Lugo     329587  9604  9532
## 31          28 Madrid   6663394  9604  9600
## 32          29 Málaga   1661785  9604  9590
## 33          30 Murcia   1493898  9604  9588
## 34          31 Navarra   654214  9604  9567
## 35          32 Ourense   307651  9604  9527
## 36          34 Palencia  160980  9604  9457
## 37          35 Palmas, Las 1120406  9604  9583
## 38          36 Pontevedra 942665  9604  9579
## 39          26 Rioja, La  316798  9604  9529
## 40          37 Salamanca 330119  9604  9532
## 41 38 Santa Cruz de Tenerife 1032983  9604  9581
## 42          40 Segovia   153129  9604  9450
## 43          41 Sevilla   1942389  9604  9592
## 44          42 Soria     88636   9604  9341
## 45          43 Tarragona 804664  9604  9574
## 46          44 Teruel    134137  9604  9428
## 47          45 Toledo    694844  9604  9570
## 48          46 Valencia/València 2565124  9604  9595
## 49          47 Valladolid 519546  9604  9558
## 50          49 Zamora   172539  9604  9467
## 51          50 Zaragoza  964693  9604  9579
## 52          51 Ceuta     84777   9604  9329
## 53          52 Melilla   86487   9604  9334

```

We see two things: that the finite population correction hardly matters for large provinces, but it becomes significant for Soria, Ceuta, Melilla, where the sample is a non negligible portion of the total population. If we add up the provincial sample sizes, we get a whooping total sample size of nearly half a million, about nine times as much as the projected 60.000 used in the study, which we now realize is by no means excessive.

```
colSums(pop[,3:4])
```

```

## n.inf  n.fin
## 499408 496029

```

This shows clearly how expensive is the detail: 9604 persons were enough for the estimation of a global p with 95% confidence error of 1%, but if we want the same precision at the province level, 52 times as much is necessary (if you do not account for finite population size) and nearly as much if you make the finite population correction.