The equations shown below assume a 2×2 as follows:

	B = 0	B = 1	Total
A = 0	а	b	m
A = 1	С	d	n
Total	r	S	N

The SPSS CROSSTABS procedure computes a chi-square test that it labels *Linear-by-Linear Association*. The SPSS algorithms page for CROSSTABS describes it as the *Mantel-Haenszel Test of Linear Association*, and gives the formula shown in Equation 1, where $r = \text{Pearson's correlation.}^1$

$$\chi_{MH}^2 = (N-1)r^2 \tag{1}$$

For a 2×2 table, Pearson's chi-square can be computed using the formula shown in Equation 2.

Pearson
$$\chi^2 = \frac{N(ad - bc)^2}{mnrs}$$
 (2)

The N-1 chi-square is computed using that same formula, but with (N-1) in place of N in the numerator—see Equation 3.

$$(N-1) \text{ chi-square} = \frac{(N-1)(ad-bc)^2}{mnrs}$$
 (3)

When Pearson's correlation is computed for two dichotomous variables, such as one has for a 2×2 table, it is often described as the *Phi* coefficient (r_{ϕ}) . Before desktop computers and statistical software packages were readily available, r_{ϕ} and r_{ϕ}^2 were typically computed using the shortcuts shown in Equations 4 and 5.

$$r_{\phi} = \frac{ad - bc}{\sqrt{mnrs}} \tag{4}$$

$$r_{\phi}^2 = \frac{(ad - bc)^2}{mnrs} \tag{5}$$

Finally, multiplying the right side of Equation 5 by (*N*-1) yields Equation 3, which is the most common formula for the *N*-1 chi-square.

B. Weaver (25-Jul-2013)

 $^{^{1}}$ It actually uses W in place of N, but the W stands for the total number of observations in the contingency table.

Putting it all together in a single equation, we get the following:

$$\chi_{MH}^2 = (N-1)r^2 = \frac{(N-1)(ad-bc)^2}{mnrs} = \text{ the } N-1 \text{ chi-square}$$
 (6)

Thus, for 2×2 tables, the *Linear-by-Linear Association* test computed by the SPSS CROSSTABS procedure is equivalent to the *N*-1 chi-square.

Acknowledgements

I thank Sacha Dubois for raising the question of whether the *Linear-by-Linear Association* chi-square was equivalent to the *N*-1 chi-square after noticing that they were the same for some data he was analyzing. His question prompted me to examine the formulae for the two measures. I also thank Ray Koopman for checking my work.