

Re: Statistics in Psychology?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.edu/2006-06/msg00060.html>

- *From:* "Reef Fish" <Large_Nassau_GrOuper@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 20 Jun 2006 11:10:10 -0700
-

Herman Rubin wrote:

In article <lv2dnSXdt9zqogrZnZ2dnUVZ_v6dnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxx>, Jerry Dallal <gdallal@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Brett Magill wrote:

On Mon, 19 Jun 2006 01:42:48 -0700, Reef Fish wrote:

.....

There are more data—important data—than fully trained statisticians to analyze them.

The problem in a nutshell is that the statistics profession as a whole has not done a good job of coming up with a way to train people analogous to the training of a PA or NP. Some masters biostat programs do a good job, but many in the profession take the position that nothing less than a complete statistical education can produce someone capable of serious analysis. Maybe they are right. While there are limits—there's little one can do in a single semester to turn someone into a serious analyst—I think there are things that could be done to train a statistical NP with perhaps four semester courses of hard work spread out over two years. The real trick—as many of the posts in sci.stat.* demonstrate—is teaching people to recognize when they are out of their depths, the equivalent of an NP knowing when to refer to an MD.

My answer is that the most important part is missed; we cannot TRAIN people to carry out the analyses, especially the ones which should be done and are not being done.

The entire miseducational systems trains instead of educating.

Re: Statistics in Psychology?

Herman and I agree on our "miseducational system", but we also disagree on the HOW and WHY. The quibble about the word "training" and "educating" seems to me at best rhetorical.

I have heard Herman's old refrain and his commandments before, and I am sure he had heard some of mine.

But it's worth repeating — just for the COUNTERPOIN