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## Kolmogorov

- Andrey Nikolaevich Kolmogorov
- Soviet Russian mathematician
- Advanced various scientific fields
- probability theory
- topology
- classical mechanics

- computational complexity.

- 1922: Constructed a Fourier series that diverges almost everywhere, gaining international recognition.
- 1933: Published the book, Foundations of the Theory of Probability, laying the modern axiomatic foundations of probability theory and establishing his reputation as the world's leading living expert in this field. This book is available at


## I learned probability theory from
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Toby Berger


## Not too far from Kolmogorov
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## Daniel Kahneman

- Daniel Kahneman
- Israeli-American psychologist
- 2002 Nobel laureate

- Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.
- Professor emeritus of psychology and public affairs at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School.
- With Amos Tversky, Kahneman studied and clarified the kinds of misperceptions of randomness that fuel many of the common fallacies.


## K\&T: Q1

Imagine a woman named Linda, 31 years old, single, outspoken, and very bright. In college she majored in philosophy. While a student she was deeply concerned with discrimination and social justice and participated in antinuclear demonstrations.


- K\&T presented this description to a group of 88 subjects and asked them to
rank the eight statements (shown on the next slide) on a scale of 1 to 8 according to their probability, with

1 representing the most probable and
8 representing the least probable.

## K\&T: Q1 - Results

- Here are the results - from most to least probable

Statement Average Probability Rank

Linda is active in the feminist movement. 2.1

Linda is a psychiatric social worker. 3.1
Linda works in a bookstore and takes yoga classes.

Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist
movement.

Linda is a teacher in an elementary school. 5.2
Linda is a member of the League of Women Voters. 5.4
Linda is a bank teller. 6.2
Linda is an insurance salesperson.

## K\&T: Q1 - Results (2)

- At first glance there may appear to be nothing unusual in these results: the description was in fact designed to be
- representative of an active feminist and
- unrepresentative of a bank teller or an insurance salesperson.

|  | Statement Average Probability Rank |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Most probable | Linda is active in the feminist movement. | 2.1 |  |
|  | Linda is a psychiatric social worker. | 3.1 |  |
|  | Linda works in a bookstore and takes yoga classes. | 3.3 |  |
|  | Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement. | 4.1 | $\longleftarrow$ |
|  | Linda is a teacher in an elementary school. | 5.2 |  |
|  | Linda is a member of the League of Women Voters. | 5.4 |  |
| $\downarrow$ | Linda is a bank teller. | 6.2 | $\leftarrow$ |
| Least likely | Linda is an insurance salesperson. | 6.4 |  |

## K\&T: Q1 - Results (3)

- Let's focus on just three of the possibilities and their average ranks.
- This is the order in which 85 percent of the respondents ranked the three possibilities:

Statement
Average Probability Rank
Linda is active in the feminist movement. 2.1
Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement.
4.1

Linda is a bank teller. 6.2

- If nothing about this looks strange, then K\&T have fooled you


## K\&T: Q1 - Contradiction

The probability that two events will both occur can never be greater than the probability that each will occur individually!

Statement
Average Probability Rank
Linda is active in the feminist movement. 2.1
Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement.
4.1

Linda is a bank teller.

## K\&T: Q2

- K\&T were not surprised by the result because they had given their subjects a large number of possibilities, and the connections among the three scenarios could easily have gotten lost in the shuffle.
- So they presented the description of Linda to another group, but this time they presented only three possibilities:
- Linda is active in the feminist movement.
- Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement.
- Linda is a bank teller.
- Is it now obvious that the middle one is the least likely?


## K\&T: Q2 - Results

- To their surprise, 87 percent of the subjects in this trial also incorrectly ranked the probability that "Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement" higher than the probability that "Linda is a bank teller".
- If the details we are given fit our mental picture of something, then the more details in a scenario, the more real it seems and hence the more probable we consider it to be
- even though any act of adding less-than-certain details to a conjecture makes the conjecture less probable.
- Even highly trained doctors make this error when analyzing symptoms.
- 91 percent of the doctors fall prey to the same bias.
[AmosTversky and Daniel Kahneman, "Extensional versus Intuitive Reasoning: The Conjunction Fallacy in Probability Judgment," Psychological Review 90, no. 4 (October 1983): 293-315.]


## Misuse of probability in law

- It is not uncommon for experts in DNA analysis to testify at a criminal trial that a DNA sample taken from a crime scene matches that taken from a suspect.
- How certain are such matches?
- When DNA evidence was first introduced, a number of experts testified that false positives are impossible in DNA testing.
- Today DNA experts regularly testify that the odds of a random person's matching the crime sample are less than 1 in 1 million or 1 in 1 billion.
- In Oklahoma a court sentenced a man namedTimothy Durham to prison even though eleven witnesses had placed him in another state at the time of the crime.


## Misuse of probability in law

- It is not uncommon for experts in DNA analysis to testify at a criminal trial that a DNA sample taken from a crime scene matches that taken from a suspect.
- How certain are such matches?
- When DNA evidence was first introduced, a number of experts testified that false positives are impossible in DNA testing.
- Today DNA experts regularly testify that the odds of a random person's matching the crime sample are less than 1 in 1 million or 1 in 1 billion.
- In Oklahoma a court sentenced a man namedTimothy Durham to more than 3,100 years in prison even though eleven witnesses had placed him in another state at the time of the crime.


## Lab Error

## (Human and Technical Errors)

- There is another statistic that is often not presented to the jury, one having to do with the fact that labs make errors, for instance, in collecting or handling a sample, by accidentally mixing or swapping samples, or by misinterpreting or incorrectly reporting results.
- Each of these errors is rare but not nearly as rare as a random match.
- The Philadelphia City Crime Laboratory admitted that it had swapped the reference sample of the defendant and the victim in a rape case
- A testing firm called Cellmark Diagnostics admitted a similar error.


## Timothy Durham's case

- It turned out that in the initial analysis the lab had failed to completely separate the DNA of the rapist and that of the victim in the fluid they tested, and the combination of the victim's and the rapist's DNA produced a positive result when compared with Durham's.
- A later retest turned up the error, and Durham was released after spending nearly four years in prison.


## DNA-Match Error + Lab Error

- Estimates of the error rate due to human causes vary, but many experts put it at around 1 percent.
- Most jurors assume that given the two types of error-the 1 in 1 billion accidental match and the 1 in 100 lab-error match-the overall error rate must be somewhere in between, say 1 in 500 million, which is still, for most jurors, beyond a reasonable doubt.

