

Re: DO NOT BELIEVE IN WHAT Jack Tomsky say

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2008-07/msg00408.html>

- *From:* Old Mac User <chendrixstats@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 18 Jul 2008 08:37:16 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 17, 8:20 pm, "David L. Wilson" <dwilson...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Jack Tomsky" <jtom...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:26885585.1216142726395.JavaMail.jakarta@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

For several years now, I've been trying to explain to Afonso the basics of hypothesis testing, but nothing seems to penetrate. I've concluded that nothing will ever penetrate until he takes a class in Statistics 101.

Although not wishing to join the arguing, I would atleast like to understand who agrees with what. It is unclear in the post below who, Jack or Afonso, agrees or disagrees with the statements 1 and 2 below (and similarly in previous posts). I know the whether the statements below, though not mathematically rigorous, are true or not, but would like to know separately simply "yes" or "no" (without arguements) to whether Afonso and Jack agree or disagree with them. If one agrees with them and the other does not, I will know what I think of both's knowledge on this subject. If both agree or disagree with the statements below, then why are we reading them--seems we need ones where there is diagreement.

DO NOT BELIEVE IN WHAT Jack Tomsky say
From the WEB

__1__ "Accepting the null hypothesis" is like acquitting a defendant. It does NOT prove that the null hypothesis is true, or that the defendant is innocent. It means there is a reasonable doubt about the defendant's guilt. In statistical testing, the significance level, Type I risk, or alpha risk is the "reasonable doubt." It is the chance of wrongly rejecting the null hypothesis when it is true. In acceptance sampling, it is the producer's risk, or risk of wrongly rejecting a lot that meets requirements.

And

HyperStat Online Contents
Why the Null Hypothesis is Not Accepted

A null hypothesis is not accepted just because it is not rejected. Data not sufficient to show convincingly that a difference between means is not zero do not prove that the difference is zero. Such data may even suggest that the null hypothesis is false but not be strong enough to make a convincing case that the null hypothesis is false. For example, if the probability value were 0.15, then one would not be ready to present one's case that the null hypothesis is false to the (properly) skeptical scientific community. More convincing data would be needed to do that. However, there would be no basis to conclude that the null hypothesis is true. It may or may not be true, there just is not strong enough evidence to reject it. Not even in cases where there is no evidence that the null hypothesis is false is it valid to conclude the null hypothesis is true. If the null hypothesis is that $\mu_1 - \mu_2$ is zero then the hypothesis is that the difference is exactly zero. No experiment can distinguish between the case of no difference between means and an extremely small difference between means. If data are consistent with the null hypothesis, they are also consistent with other similar hypotheses.

Luis Amaral Afonso [The moderator ??? destroyer]

I agree. I'm as confused about "who agrees with what" as you are. OMU

.