

Re: Jack are you a MAN or a RAT?

## Re: Jack are you a MAN or a RAT?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2006-08/msg00722.html>

---

- *From:* "Reef Fish" <Large\_Nassau\_GrOuper@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 18 Aug 2006 13:49:33 -0700
- 

Jack Tomsky wrote:

"Luis A. Afonso" wrote:

two minutes AFTER my post on "Hypothesis Testing – the TEST STATISTIC) today (and yesterday's post) both of which had throughly refuted Afonso's arguments for his mistakes.

I had already followed up to his present post of pure noise.

I can't resist playing the role of Jack in response to Afonso's questions because I know Jack will be too polite in his response if he responds at all.

Jack Tomsky

Why didn't you ask Bob Ling how he found

$Z = -0.9542$   
(Aug 16, 2006, 11:43) OBVIOUSLY WRONG. WHY?

I don't have to ask, because he was correct in correcting your errors, and the value of Z is correct for the test.

Reef Fish did make a careless slip in omitting  $(1/n_1 + 1/n_2)$  in the pooled variance formula, which would have made his  $Z = -0.35487$ , though it would not have altered his statistical

Re: Jack are you a MAN or a RAT?

Re: Jack are you a MAN or a RAT?

conclusion, or yours, based on your use of the wrong variance.

Why you didn't admit that my way to find the variance is the ONLY CORRECT in order to solve the problem was started this thread?

That was your error. Bob had already pointed out to you, and explained why, your variance is correct if used in a confidence interval statement, but is the wrong one to use for the test statistic in testing  $H_0: p_1 = p_2$ .

Why you not comment my checking throughout simulations?

Because it is irrelevant to the issue explained by Bob?

Have you feared of Bob Ling's reaction or are you trying to give him a hand?

Bob is doing rather well without my help. I merely asked you WHERE Bob "insisted" as you alleged when he had already said your variance was fine for confidence interval construction of the difference of proportions. If he had insisted on one, how could he have said your variance is correct for confidence intervals?

Don't you think you are missing the point entirely that the issue is what TEST STATISTIC is the correct one to use for hypothesis testing and what is correct for confidence intervals in the particular problem?

Re: Jack are you a MAN or a RAT?

Have you the opinion that I am an ignorant (as Bob

Ling classified me) or else the bundle is called Reef Fish?

If the bundle is called Reef Fish, why didn't you address him as Reef Fish, instead of Bob Ling. Bob Ling has never posted a single post in sci.stat.math using the posting name Bob Ling — though we all know who he is. All of his posts, thousands of them, were all posted under the name Reef Fish.

You must to answer this questions in order the

Readers respect you.

I don't have to answer your question about your ignorance. The readers can decide it for themselves. For the same reason, I'll chance that your theory is wrong that if I don't answer your question about your ignorance I would suffer the disrespect from Readers that you proclaim.

\_\_\_\_licas (Luis A. Afonso)

— Reef Fish Bob (playing JackTomsy on TV).

— Reef Fish Bob (playing Jack Tomsy on a TV re-run with 4 lines changed).

One of these days, I will return the favor and play Reef Fish Bob by calling Afonso a "quack".

Jack

No, Jack. Everyone (except those who stepped into sci.stat.math for

Re: Jack are you a MAN or a RAT?

Re: Jack are you a MAN or a RAT?

less than  
a week or so) already knew Afonso is a Quack. Most old-timers tuned  
him out  
completely.

He is dangerous only to those few innocent visitors who think he is not  
a  
Quack. :-) They might leave not knowing they had suffered permanent  
damage from Afonso's posts.

The other aspect of it is that there are THREE (or may be even FOUR)  
different Afonsos. The easiest giveaway of those other Afonsos is that  
they can write a complete English sentence that is grammatically  
correct, and does not the word "raison". :-)

Those are more dangerous because they are much more likely to be  
taken semi-seriously than the ORIGINAL Afonso — the one posting  
NOW.

Thanks again for catching my careless slip, and I am glad to have to  
change my TV script by four lines

— Reef Fish Bob.

.