

Extract from:

Bradley Efron and Trevor Hastie

*Computer Age Statistical Inference: Algorithms, Evidence, and Data Science*

*Cambridge University Press, 2016*

[https://web.stanford.edu/~hastie/CASI\\_files/PDF/casi.pdf](https://web.stanford.edu/~hastie/CASI_files/PDF/casi.pdf)

Modern Bayesian practice uses various strategies to construct an appropriate “prior”  $g(\mu)$  in the absence of prior experience, leaving many statisticians unconvinced by the resulting Bayesian inferences. Our second example illustrates the difficulty.

**Table 3.1** Scores from two tests taken by 22 students, *mechanics* and *vectors*.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
mechanics	7	44	49	59	34	46	0	32	49	52	44
vectors	51	69	41	71	42	40	40	45	57	64	61

  

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
mechanics	44	36	42	5	22	18	41	48	31	42	46	63
vectors	61	59	60	30	58	51	63	38	42	69	49	63

Table 3.1 shows the scores on two tests, *mechanics* and *vectors*, achieved by  $n = 22$  students. The sample correlation coefficient between the two scores is  $\hat{\theta} = 0.498$ ,

$$\hat{\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^{22} (m_i - \bar{m})(v_i - \bar{v}) / \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{22} (m_i - \bar{m})^2 \sum_{i=1}^{22} (v_i - \bar{v})^2 \right]^{1/2}$$

with  $m$  and  $v$  short for *mechanics* and *vectors*,  $\bar{m}$  and  $\bar{v}$  their averages.