

Re: large negative parameter correlations in regression

Re: large negative parameter correlations in regression

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2006-09/msg01079.html>

- *From:* "Reef Fish" <Large_Nassau_GrOuper@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 27 Sep 2006 07:56:22 -0700
-

Anon. wrote:

Reef Fish wrote:

Anon. wrote:

Reef Fish wrote:

Stephen Clark wrote:

<snip>

I would suggest you pay little attention to what Bob O'Hara says in Regression matters. He is full of thumbs and a frequent Quack on that subject.

Well, kindly show why what I suggested was wrong. If I've made a mistake, I'd be happy to know what it was.

--

Bob O'Hara
Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Perhaps someone ELSE can do that honor. I think even m00es may be able to tell you a thing or three you don't know even though he is rather deficient in the Hypothesis Testing subject itself.

I see. So, you're not going to help the OP by showing what bits of my advice were wrong: you merely malign me without feeling the need to justify your insults.

Re: large negative parameter correlations in regression

I had already given the OP all the help I could, interpreting everything he mentioned, and suggested that he was missing the information on partial correlations if he wants to know more about the exact severity of his multicollinearity problem.

So, no change there.

Bob O'Hara
Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Your reply was so non-specific, so speculative, so name-dropping without knowing what you were talking about that it would require FREE tuition to explain it to YOU, without benefiting the OP.

You had already PROVEN yourself to be DEFICIENT in regression methods, in Linear Models, and in every statistical topic your stuck your nose into that no further proof is necessary.

I had mentioned over and over again that you're a disgrace to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics in Helsinki, and to the entire country of Finland by associating your name with theirs, in your anti-Netiquette 11-line sig.

I FINALLY noticed line 10 of your sig
WWW: <http://www.RNI.Helsinki.FI/~boh/>

that you actually had an honest self-confession:

*> I am forever unclear about whether I am a biologist or a
*> statistician (I think it depends on who I'm talking to).

I take that to mean you tell a biologist you are a statistician and to a statistician that you're a biologist. :-) Not a bad strategy given your absence of knowledge about STATISTICS.

*> I am presently employed by the Academy of Finland as a
*> research fellow, which means that I can avoid doing too
*> much teaching.

A research fellow in biology is about as low an academic appointment anyone can get and claim to know anything about statistics. It's a credit to the Department of Math and Statistics that they would NOT ALLOW you to teach anything!

Re: large negative parameter correlations in regression

Your background is about the same as that of Richard Ulrich for being the top-two Quacks in sci.stat.math. He used to have some research associate appointment (but with an Asst. Prof. title) in the Department of Psychiatry. His statistical knowledge is apparently all self-taught, from SPSS manuals and other computer manuals.

Now we have m00es, who is infinitely more knowledgeable than you two put together, with blissfully IGNORANT about some fundamental and basic concepts in APPLIED statistics.

Perhaps he'll join you two if he revealed that he is some kind of self-taught graduate student at the unimaa.nl in the Netherlands.

Then we would ALL know why such Quackery come out of the mouths of the posters like you, Richard Ulrich, and m00es.

If it's any consolation to all three of you, I believe you are, each of you, statistically significantly different from Luis A. Afonso, in the sense of "better". But that's only STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE. When it comes to PRACTICAL significance (or USEFULNESS), now being discussed in a thread in sci.stat.consult and sci.stat.edu, I think all of you ranked about the same, compared to Afonso, in the amount of NOISE you make, relative to the small amount of statistical SUBSTANCE you produce.

Hope the above helps all of you.

Did anyone ever tell any of you that "Silence is Golden" when you are bankrupt in the statistical subject matter under discussion?

-- Reef Fish Bob.

.