

Re: resampling methods are serious procedure?

Re: resampling methods are serious procedure?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2009-02/msg00041.html>

- *From:* Old Mac User <chendrixstats@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 3 Feb 2009 12:59:42 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 3, 2:00 pm, illywhacker <illywac...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 3, 6:38 pm, Old Mac User <chendrixst...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

When I mentioned "sampling" I meant sampling.

I am not attacking you personally, and I do not understand why the tone of your post is hostile; obviously I hit a button. In fact, you never used the word 'sampling', only 're-sampling', and you first mentioned it right before you described sampling. You never described re-sampling. Perhaps you can see why I was confused.

I take exception to saying they "should never be taught at all".

Why would you take exception? I am sure you are an excellent teacher. However, you are teaching an approach to statistics, however implicitly, and whether you use the words or not, that is wrong. Take, for example, confidence intervals. People can never explain them because they are nonsensical: theoretically wrong and practically incorrect, even incoherent.

illywhacker;

Illywhacker,

I apologize for my hostile tone. I thought I casually mentioned sampling early on. Aside from that, the concept of "sampling" a physical material or "sampling" a population of people is something we (or at least I) tend to take for granted. That's usually a mistake. You never know.

Yes I can see why you were confused. My bad, and I'm sorry for that.

Well, I'm still not lined up with you re: confidence intervals.

Re: resampling methods are serious procedure?

Re: resampling methods are serious procedure?

I profess they can be explained and they do purposes. I've watched statisticians wax and wane over this one. For a