June 1975

Tom Swift and his electric regression analysis machine: 1973

J. Scott Armstrong

University of Pennsylvania, armstrong@wharton.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/marketing_papers

Recommended Citation

Armstrong, J. S. (1975). Tom Swift and his electric regression analysis machine: 1973. Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/marketing_papers/37

Postprint version. Published in *Psychological Reports*, Volume 36, Number 3, June 1975, page 806. The author has asserted his/her right to include this material in *ScholarlyCommons@Penn*.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/marketing_papers/37
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Tom Swift and his electric regression analysis machine: 1973

Abstract

Presents the "1973 Tom Swift Award for Data Abuse."

Comments

Postprint version. Published in *Psychological Reports*, Volume 36, Number 3, June 1975, page 806. The author has asserted his/her right to include this material in *ScholarlyCommons@Penn*.

Published in *Psychological Reports*, 36, 1975, 806.

Tom Swift and His Electric Regression Analysis Machine: 1973

J. Scott Armstrong

Tom Swift, who began his career with factor analysis (1967) , is pleased to announce that the “1973 Tom Swift Award for Data Abuse” has been won by LeRoy Stone and James Brosseau. They originally (Stone, *et al.*, 1973) used 115 variables in a stepwise regression analysis to explain differences among 19 observations. They then claimed (Stone & Brosseau, 1973) to have tested the predictive validity of this model. This was done by regressing the 14 variables from the model on data from 18 new subjects. This “cross-validation” yielded a final model with six variables and an R^2 of 0.76.

They went beyond the call of duty by collecting all of these data since comparable results could have been obtained with random data (Ando & Kaufman, 1966; Armstrong, 1970) . This may be shown also as follows. Assuming that there was *no* relationship, the calculated R^2 from 18 observations with 14 variables can be obtained from (Montgomery & Morrison, 1973):

$$R^2 = k/n$$

where k is the number of independent variables and n is the number of observations. Thus, expected R^2 would be 0.78 if all 14 variables were included, and close to this if only the best six variables were included. The R^2 obtained by Stone and Brosseau (1973) was, of course, less than this at 0.76. The evidence, then, did *not* support their conclusion that the model would “. . . quite accurately predict success of trainees . . .”.

References

- Ando, A. & Kaufman, G. M. (1966), “Evaluation of an ad hoc procedure for estimating parameters of some linear models,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 48, 334-340.
- Armstrong, J. S. (1967), “The derivation of theory by means of factor analysis or Tom Swift and electric factor analysis machine,” *American Statistician*, 21, 17-21.
- Armstrong, J. S. (1970), “How to avoid exploratory research,” *Journal of Advertising Research*, 10, 27-30.
- Montgomery, D. B. & Morrison, D. G. (1973), “A note on adjusting R^2 ,” *Journal of Finance*, 28, 1009-1013.
- Stone, L. A., Bassett, G. R., Brosseau, J. D., Demers, J., & Stiening, J. A. (1973), “Psychological test characteristics associated with training-success in a Medex (physician's extension) training program,” *Psychological Reports*, 32, 231-234.
- Stone, L. & Brosseau, J. D. (1973), “Cross-validation of a system for predicting training success of Medex trainees,” *Psychological Reports*, 33, 917-918.