

A worthy citation (Wikipedia)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2008-08/msg00129.html>

- *From:* "Luis A. Afonso" <[licas @xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:licas@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
 - *Date:* Sat, 09 Aug 2008 04:39:10 EDT
-

A worthy citation (Wikipedia)

(Taken literally the Null Hypotheses is always FALSE, then $H_0: m=0$ must be understood as There s NO SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO REJECT THAT THE PARAMETER IS NULL).

*** A little thought reveals a fact widely understood among statisticians: The null hypothesis, taken literally (and that's the only way you can take it in formal hypothesis testing), is almost always false in the real world.... If it is false, even to a tiny degree, it must be the case that a large enough sample will produce a significant result and lead to its rejection. So if the null hypothesis is always false, what's the big deal about rejecting it?" (The above criticism only applies to point hypothesis tests. If one were testing, for example, whether a parameter is greater than zero, it would not apply.).

Coen, J. 1990. Things I have learned (so far). American Psychologist 45: 1304–1312. ***

The IMBECILE DUO, Jack Tomsy/ John Smith believe that the parameter is said to be NULL when the test statistics fall in the Acceptance Region (Two-Tailed Test).

Luis Amaral Afonso [The Moderator Destroyer]

.