

# -<br>INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION MEЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ПО СТАНДАРТИЗАЦИИ ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION

# Statistical interpretation of data - Techniques of estimation and tests relating to means and variances

Interprétation statistique des données - Techniques d'estimation et tests portant sur des moyennes et des variances

First edition - 1976-02-15

Descriptors : statistical analysis, statistical tests, estimation, mean, variance (statistics).

Ref. No. ISO 2854-1976 (E)

#### **FOREWORD**

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards institutes (ISO Member Bodies). The work of developing International Standards is carried out through ISO Technical Committees. Every Member Body interested in a subject for which a Technical Committee has been set up has the right to be represented on that Committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work.

Draft International Standards adopted by the Technical Committees are circulated to the Member Bodies for approval before their acceptance as International Standards by the ISO Council.

International Standard ISO 2854 was drawn up by Technical Committee ISO/TC 69, Applications of statistical methods, and circulated to the Member Bodies in October 1973.

It has been approved by the Member Bodies of the following countries :



The Member Bodies of the following countries expressed disapproval of the document on technical grounds :

> Sweden **U.S.A.**

© International Organization for Standardization, 1976 .

Printed in Switzerland







## SECTION TWO : EXPLANATORY NOTES AND EXAMPLES



This page intentionally left blank

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

# Statistical interpretation of data - Techniques of estimation and tests relating to means and variances

#### SECTION ONE: PRESENTATION OF CALCULATIONS

#### **GENERAL REMARKS**

1) This International Standard specifies the techniques reauired:

a) to estimate the mean or the variance of populations;

b) to examine certain hypotheses concerning the value of those parameters, from samples.

2) The techniques used are valid only if, in each of the populations under consideration, the sample elements are drawn at random and are independent. In the case of a finite population, elements drawn at random may be considered as independent when the population size is sufficiently large or when the sampling fraction is sufficiently small (for instance smaller than 1/10).

3) The distribution of the observed variable is assumed to be normal in each population. However, if the distribution does not deviate very much from the normal, the techniques described remain approximately valid to an extent sufficient for most practical applications, provided the sample size is not too small. For tables A, B, C and D, the sample size should be of the order of 5 to 10 at least; for all the other tables, it should be not less than about  $20.1$ 

4) A certain number of techniques exist which permit the verification of the hypothesis of normality. This subject is dealt with briefly in the examples in section two and will also be dealt with in a further document (yet to be prepared). Nevertheless, this hypothesis may be admitted on the basis of information other than that provided by the sample itself. In the case where the hypothesis of normality should be rejected, the obvious method to follow is to resort to non-parametric tests or to use suitable transformations for obtaining normally distributed populations, for example  $1/x$ ,  $log(x + a)$ ,  $\sqrt{x+a}$ , but the conclusions reached by applying these procedures described in this International Standard are only directly valid for the transformed variate; caution should be used in the translation to the original variate. For example exp (mean log  $x$ ) is equal to the geometric mean of  $x$ not the arithmetic mean.

If what is really needed is an estimate of the mean or standard deviation of the variate  $X$  itself then, whether the population distribution is normal or not, an unbiassed estimation of the mean m and the population variance  $\sigma^2$  is produced by the sample mean  $\bar{x}$  and characteristic s<sup>2</sup>.

5) It is desirable to accompany each statistical operation with all the particulars relevant to the source or to the method of obtaining the observations which may clarify this statistical analysis, and in particular to give the unit or the smallest unit of measurement having practical meaning.

6) It is not permissible to discard any observations or to apply any corrections to apparently doubtful observations without a justification based on experimental, technical or other evident grounds which should be clearly given. In any case the discarded or corrected values and the reason for discarding or correcting them must be mentioned.

7) In problems of estimation, the confidence level  $1 - \alpha$  is the probability that the confidence interval covers the true value of the estimated parameter. Its most usual values are 0,95 and 0,99, or  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

8) In problems of testing a hypothesis, the significance level is, in the two-sided cases, the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis (or tested hypothesis) if it is true (error of the first kind); in the one-sided cases, the significance level is the maximum value of this probability (maximum value of the error of the first kind). Values of  $\alpha = 0.05$ (1 in 20 chance) or 0,01 (1 in 100 chance) are very commonly employed according to the risk which the user is prepared to take. Since a hypothesis may be rejected using  $\alpha = 0.05$ , but not when using 0,01, it is often appropriate to use the phrase: "the hypothesis is rejected at the 5 % level" or, if this is the case. "at the 1% level". Attention is drawn to the existence of an error of the second kind. This error is committed if the null hypothesis is accepted when it is false. Terms concerning statistical tests are defined in clause 2 of ISO 3534, Statistics - Vocabulary 2).

<sup>1)</sup> Studies about normal distributions are in progress in TC 69/SC 2.

<sup>2)</sup> At present at the stage of draft.

9) The calculations can often be greatly reduced by making a Change of origin and/or unit on the data. In the case of data classified into groups, reference may be made to the formulae in ISO 2602, Statistical interpretation of test results  $-$  Estimation of the mean  $-$  Confidence in terval.

NOTE - A change of origin may be essential to obtain sufficient accuracy when calculating a variance using the stated formulae with a low precision calculator or computer.

IO) The methods shown in tables C and C' deal with the comparison of two means. They assume that the corresponding samples are independent. For the study of certain problems, it may be interesting to pair the observations (for instance in the comparison of two methods or the comparison of two instruments). The statistical treatment of paired observations is the subject of  $ISO$  3301, Statistical interpretation of data  $-$  Comparison of two means in the case of paired observations, but in annex A an example of treatment of paired observations is given. It uses formally the data of table A".

11) The Symbols and their definitions used in this International Standard are in conformity with ISO 3207, Statistical interpretation of data  $-$  Determination of a statistical tolerance interval.

## TABLES

- $A -$  Comparison of a mean with a given value (variance known)
- $A' -$  Comparison of a mean with a given value (variance unknown)
- $B -$  Estimation of a mean (variance known)
- $B' -$  Estimation of a mean (variance unknown)
- C Comparison of two means (variances known)
- $C'$  Comparison of two means (variances unknown, but may be assumed equal)
- $D -$  Estimation of the difference of two means (variances known)
- $D' -$  Estimation of the difference of two means (variances unknown, but may be assumed equal)
- $E -$  Comparison of a variance or of a standard deviation with a given value
- $F -$  Estimation of a variance or of a standard deviation
- $G -$  Comparison of two variances or two standard deviations
- $H -$  Estimation of the ratio of two variances or of two standard deviations

## TABLE  $A -$  Comparison of a mean with a given value (variance known)



## **Results**

Comparison of the population mean with the given value  $m_0$ :

Two-sided case :

The hypothesis of the equality of the population mean to the given value (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
|\bar{x} - m_0| > [u_{1-\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n}] \sigma
$$

One-sided cases :

a) The hypothesis that the population mean is not smaller than  $m_0$  (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
\bar{x} < m_0 - \left[ u_{1-\alpha}/\sqrt{n} \right] \sigma
$$

b) The hypothesis that the population mean is not greater than  $m_0$  (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

 $\bar{x} > m_0 + [u_{1-\alpha}/\sqrt{n}] \sigma$ 

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (8) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The significance level  $\alpha$  (see § 8 of the "General remarks") is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when this hypothesis is true.

2) U stands for the standardized normal variate : the value  $u_{\alpha}$  is defined by :

$$
P[U < u_{\alpha}] = \alpha
$$

Since the distribution of U is symmetrical around zero,  $u_{\alpha} = -u_{1-\alpha}$ .

We therefore have :

$$
P[U > u_{\alpha}] = 1 - \alpha
$$
  

$$
P[-u_{1-\alpha/2} < U < u_{1-\alpha/2}] = 1 - \alpha
$$



3)  $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$  is the standard deviation of the mean  $\bar{x}$ , in a sample of n observations.

4) For convenience in application, values of  $u_{1-\alpha}/\sqrt{n}$  and  $u_{1-\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n}$  are given in table 1 of annex B for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0,01.$ 

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

#### TABLE A' - Comparison of a mean with a given value (variance unknown)



## **Results**

Comparison of the population mean with the given value  $m_0$ :

Two-sided case :

The hypothesis of the equality of the population mean to the given value (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
|\bar{x}-m_0| > [t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)/\sqrt{n}]s
$$

One-sided cases :

a) The hypothesis that the population mean is not smaller than  $m_0$  (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
\bar{x} < m_0 - [t_{1-\alpha}(v)/\sqrt{n}]s
$$

b) The hypothesis that the population mean is not greater than  $m_0$  (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

 $\bar{x} > m_0 + [t_{1-\alpha}(\nu)/\sqrt{n}]s$ 

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (8) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The significance level  $\alpha$  (see  $\S$  8 of the "General remarks") is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when this hypothesis is true.

2)  $t(v)$  stands for Student's variate with  $v = n - 1$  degrees of freedom : the value  $t_{\alpha}(v)$  is defined by

$$
P[t(\nu) < t_\alpha(\nu)] = \alpha
$$

Since the distribution of  $t(v)$  is symmetrical around zero,  $t_{\alpha}(v) = -t_{1-\alpha}(v)$ .

We therefore have :

$$
P[t(\nu) > t_{\alpha}(\nu)] = 1 - \alpha
$$
  

$$
P[-t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu) < t(\nu) < t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)] = 1 - \alpha
$$



3)  $\sigma^*/\sqrt{n}$  is the estimated standard deviation of the mean  $\bar{x}$ , in a sample of *n* observations.

4) For convenience in application, values of  $t_{1-\alpha/2}(v)/\sqrt{n}$  and  $t_{1-\alpha}(v)/\sqrt{n}$  are given in table IIb of annex B for  $\alpha = 0.05$ and  $\alpha = 0,01$ 

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

## TABLE  $B -$  Estimation of a mean (variance known)



NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (7) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The confidence level  $1 - \alpha$  (see § 7 of the "General remarks") is the probability that the confidence interval covers the true value of the mean.

2) U stands for the standardized normal variate : the value  $u_{\alpha}$  is defined by :

$$
P[U < u_\alpha] = \alpha
$$

Since the distribution of U is symmetrical around zero,  $u_{\alpha} = -u_{1-\alpha}$ 

We therefore have :

$$
P[U > u_{\alpha}] = 1 - \alpha
$$
  

$$
P[-u_{1-\alpha/2} < U < u_{1-\alpha/2}] = 1 - \alpha
$$



3)  $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$  is the standard deviation of the mean  $\bar{x}$ , in a sample of n observations.

4) For convenience in application, values of  $u_{1-\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n}$  and  $u_{1-\alpha}/\sqrt{n}$  are given in table I of annex B for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

## TABLE  $B'$  - Estimation of a mean (variance unknown)



## **Results**

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

Estimation of the population mean  $m$  :

$$
m^* = \overline{x} =
$$

Two-sided confidence interval :

$$
\bar{x} - \left[t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)/\sqrt{n}\right]s < m < \bar{x} + \left[t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)/\sqrt{n}\right]s
$$

One-sided confidence intervals :

$$
m < \bar{x} + [t_{1-\alpha}(v)/\sqrt{n}]s
$$
  
or  

$$
m > \bar{x} - [t_{1-\alpha}(v)/\sqrt{n}]s
$$

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (7) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The confidence level  $1 - \alpha$  (see § 7 of the "General remarks") is the probability that the confidence interval covers the true value of the mean.

2)  $t(v)$  stands for Student's variate with v degrees of freedom; the value  $t_{\alpha}(v)$  is defined by

$$
P[t(\nu) < t_\alpha(\nu)] = \alpha
$$

Since the distribution of  $t(v)$  is symmetrical around zero,  $t_{\alpha}(v) = -t_{1-\alpha}(v)$ .

We therefore have :

$$
P[t(v) > t_{\alpha}(v)] = 1 - \alpha
$$
  

$$
P[-t_{1-\alpha/2}(v) < t(v) < t_{1-\alpha/2}(v)] = 1 - \alpha
$$



3)  $\sigma^*/\sqrt{n}$  is the estimated standard deviation of the mean  $\bar{x}$ , in a sample of *n* observations.

4) For convenience in application, values of  $t_{1-\alpha/2}(v)/\sqrt{n}$  and  $t_{1-\alpha}(v)/\sqrt{n}$  are given in table IIb of annex B for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

## TABLE  $C -$  Comparison of two means (variances known)



1) The significance level  $\alpha$  (see § 8 of the "General remarks") is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when this hypothesis is true.

2) U stands for the standardized normal variate : the value  $u_{\alpha}$  is defined by :

$$
P[U<\iota_{\alpha}]=\alpha
$$

Since the distribution of U is symmetrical around zero,  $u_{\alpha} = -u_{1-\alpha}$ .

We therefore have :

$$
P[U > u_{\alpha}] = 1 - \alpha
$$
  

$$
P[-u_{1-\alpha/2} < U < u_{1-\alpha/2}] = 1 - \alpha
$$



 $\sqrt{ }$  . 3)  $\sigma_{-} = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{2} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{2}}$  is the standard deviation of the difference  $d = \bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2$  of the means of the two samples of  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  $n_1$   $n_2$ observations respectively.

4) The values  $u_{1 - \alpha/2}$  and  $u_{1 - \alpha}$  must be read for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$  on the line  $n = 1$  of table 1 of annex B.

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

## TABLE  $C'$  - Comparison of two means (variances unknown, but may be assumed equal)

The hypothesis of the equality of the variances of the two populations can be tested as indicated in table G.



#### Results

Comparison of the two populations means :

Two-sided case :

The hypothesis of the equality of the means (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
|\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2| > t_{1-\alpha/2}(v) s_d
$$

One-sided cases :

a) The hypothesis that the first mean is not smaller than the second (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
\overline{x}_1 < \overline{x}_2 - t_{1-\alpha}(v) \, s_d
$$

b) The hypothesis that the first mean is not greater than the second (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

 $\overline{x}_1 > \overline{x}_2 + t_{1-\alpha}(\nu) s_d$ 

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (8) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The significance level  $\alpha$  (see § 8 of the "General remarks") is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when this hypothesis is true.

2)  $t(\nu)$  stands for Student's variate with  $\nu = n_1 + n_2 - 2$  degrees of freedom; the value  $t_\alpha(\nu)$  is defined by :

$$
P[t(v) < t_\alpha(v)] = \alpha
$$

Since the distribution of  $t(v)$  is symmetrical around zero,  $t_{\alpha}(v) = -t_{1-\alpha}(v)$ .

We therefore have :

$$
P[t(\nu) > t_{\alpha}(\nu)] = 1 - \alpha
$$

$$
P[-t_{1-\alpha/2}(v) < t(v) < t_{1-\alpha/2}(v)] = 1 - \alpha
$$



3)  $\sigma_d^*$  is the estimated standard deviation of the difference  $d = \bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2$  of the means of the two samples of  $n_1$  and  $n_2$ observations respectively.

4) The values  $t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)$  and  $t_{1-\alpha}(\nu)$  are given in table IIa of annex B for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

## TABLE D - Estimation of the difference of two means (variances known)



## **Results**

Estimation of the difference of the two populations means  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ :

$$
(m_1 - m_2)^* = \bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2 =
$$

Two-sided confidence interval :

$$
(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) - u_{1-\alpha/2} \sigma_{\rm d} < m_1 - m_2 < (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) + u_{1-\alpha/2} \sigma_{\rm d}
$$

One-sided confidence intervals :

$$
m_1 - m_2 < (\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2) + u_{1-\alpha} \sigma_{\alpha}
$$

or 
$$
m_1 - m_2 > (\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2) - u_{1-\alpha}\sigma_d
$$

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (7) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The confidence level  $1 - \alpha$  (see  $\S 7$  of the "General remarks") is the probability that the calculated confidence interval covers the true value of the difference between the means.

2) U stands for the standardized normal variate : the value  $u_{\alpha}$  is defined by :

$$
P[U
$$

Since the distribution of U is symmetrical around zero,  $u_{\alpha} = -u_{1-\alpha}$ .

We therefore have :

$$
P[U > u_{\alpha}] = 1 - \alpha
$$
  

$$
P[-u_{1-\alpha/2} < U < u_{1-\alpha/2}] = 1 - \alpha
$$



3)  $\sigma_d = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{n_2}}$  is the standard deviation of the difference  $d = \bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2$  between the means of the two samples of  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  observations respectively.

4) The values  $u_{1 - \alpha/2}$  and  $u_{1 - \alpha}$  must be read for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$  on the line  $n =$  of table 1 of annex B.

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

## TABLE D' - Estimation of the difference of two means (variances unknown, but may be assumed equal)





#### **Results**

Estimation of the difference of the two populations means  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ :

$$
(m_1 - m_2)^* = \overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2 =
$$

Two-sided confidence interval :

$$
(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) - t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu) s_{\alpha} < m_1 - m_2 < (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) + t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu) s_{\alpha}
$$

 $\bar{\lambda}$ 

One-sided confidence intervals :

or 
$$
m_1 - m_2 < (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) + t_{1-\alpha}(\nu) s_d
$$
  
 $m_1 - m_2 > (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) - t_{1-\alpha}(\nu) s_d$ 

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (7) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The confidence level  $1 - \alpha$  (see § 7 of the "General remarks") is the probability that the calculated confidence interval covers the true value of the difference between the means.

2)  $t(v)$  stands for Student's variate with  $v = n_1 + n_2 - 2$  degrees of freedom; the value  $t_\alpha(v)$  is defined by

$$
P[t(\nu) < t_\alpha(\nu)] = \alpha
$$

Since the distribution of  $t(v)$  is symmetrical around zero,  $t_\alpha(v) = - t_{1-\alpha}(v)$ .

We therefore have :

$$
P[t(\nu) > t_{\alpha}(\nu)] = 1 - \alpha
$$
  

$$
P[-t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu) < t(\nu) < t_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)] = 1 - \alpha
$$



3)  $\sigma_d^*$  is the estimated standard deviation of the difference  $d = \bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2$  between the means of the two samples of  $n_1$  and  $n_2$ observations respectively.

4) The values  $t_{1 - \alpha/2}(\nu)$  and  $t_{1 - \alpha}(\nu)$  are given in table IIa of annex B for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

#### TABLE  $E -$  Comparison of a variance or of a standard deviation with a given value



#### Results

Comparison of the population variance with the given value  $\sigma_0^2$  :

Two-sided case :

The hypothesis that the population variance is equal to the given value (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
\frac{\Sigma (x-\bar{x})^2}{\sigma_0^2} < \chi^2_{\alpha/2}(\nu) \text{ or } \frac{\Sigma (x-\bar{x})^2}{\sigma_0^2} > \chi^2_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)
$$

One-sided cases :

a) The hypothesis that the population variance is not larger than the given value (null hypothesis) is rejected if:

$$
\frac{\sum (x-\bar{x})^2}{\sigma_0^2} > \chi^2_{1-\alpha}(\nu)
$$

b) The hypothesis that the population variance is not smaller than the given value (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
\frac{\sum (x-\bar{x})^2}{\sigma_0^2} < \chi_\alpha^2(\nu)
$$

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (8) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The significance level  $\alpha$  (see  $\S$  8 of the "General remarks") is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when this hypothesis is true.

2)  $\chi^2(\nu)$  stands for the  $\chi^2$  variate with  $\nu$  degrees of freedom; the value  $\chi^2_\alpha(\nu)$  is defined by

$$
P\left[\chi^2(\nu) < \chi^2_{\alpha}(\nu)\right] = \alpha
$$

We therefore have :

$$
P[\chi^2(\nu) > \chi^2_{\alpha}(\nu)] = 1 - \alpha
$$
  

$$
P[\chi^2_{\alpha/2}(\nu) < \chi^2(\nu) < \chi^2_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)] = 1 - \alpha
$$



3) The values  $\chi^2_\alpha(\nu)$ ,  $\chi^2_{1-\alpha}(\nu)$ ,  $\chi^2_{\alpha/2}(\nu)$  and  $\chi^2_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)$  are given in table III of annex B for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

EXAMPLE : see section two, "'Explanatory notes and examples".

#### TABLE  $F -$  Estimation of a variance or of a standard deviation



1) The limits of the confidence intervals of the standard deviation  $\sigma$  are the square roots of the limits of the confidence intervals of the  $variance -2$ 

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (7) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The confidence level  $1 - \alpha$  (see § 7 of the "General remarks") is the probability that the calculated confidence interval covers the true value of the variance.

2)  $\chi^2(\nu)$  stands for the  $\chi^2$  variate with  $\nu = n - 1$  degrees of freedom; the value  $\chi^2_{\alpha}(\nu)$  is defined by

$$
P[\chi^2(\nu) < \chi^2_{\alpha}(\nu)] = \alpha
$$

We therefore have :

$$
P[\chi^{2}(\nu) > \chi^{2}_{\alpha}(\nu)] = 1 - \alpha
$$
  

$$
P[\chi^{2}_{\alpha/2}(\nu) < \chi^{2}(\nu) < \chi^{2}_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu)] = 1 - \alpha
$$



3) The values  $x^2_i(\nu)$ ,  $x^2_{i,j}(\nu)$ ,  $x^2_{i,j}(\nu)$  and  $x^2_{i,j}(\nu)$  are given in table III of annex B for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$ 

 $\mathsf{EXAMPLE}$  is seed section two. "Explanatory notes and examples

## TABLE  $G -$  Comparison of two variances or of two standard deviations



#### **Results**

Comparison of the population variances :

Tvvo-sided case :

The hypothesis of the equality of the variances (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
\frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} < \frac{1}{F_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu_2, \nu_1)} \text{ or } \frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} > F_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu_1, \nu_2)
$$

One-sided cases :

a) The hypothesis that the first variance is not greater than the second (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
\frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} > F_{1-\alpha}(\nu_1, \nu_2)
$$

b) The hypothesis that the first variance is not smaller than the second (null hypothesis) is rejected if :

$$
\frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} < \frac{1}{F_{1-\alpha}(\nu_2, \nu_1)}
$$

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (8) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The significance level  $\alpha$  (see  $\S$  8 of the "General remarks") is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when this hypothesis is true.

 $2$  F( $\nu_1$ ,  $\nu_2$ ) stands for the variance ratio with  $\nu_1 = n_1 - 1$  and  $\nu_2 = n_2 - 1$  degrees of freedom; the value  $F_\alpha(\nu_1,\nu_2)$  is defined by :

 $P[F(\nu_1, \nu_2) < F_{\alpha}(\nu_1, \nu_2)] = \alpha$ 

We therefore have :

$$
P\left[F(\nu_1, \nu_2) > F_{\alpha}(\nu_1, \nu_2)\right] = 1 - \alpha
$$
\n
$$
P\left[F_{\alpha/2}(\nu_1, \nu_2) < F(\nu_1, \nu_2) < F_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu_1, \nu_2)\right] = 1 - \alpha
$$

We also have :

$$
F_{\alpha}(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \frac{1}{F_{1-\alpha}(\nu_2, \nu_1)}
$$



 $3$ ) The values  $F_1 = \alpha$  and  $F_1 = \alpha/2$  are given in table TV of annex B as functions of the numbers of degrees of freedom, for  $\alpha$   $=$  0,05 and  $\alpha$   $=$  0,01. The values  $F_{\alpha}$  and  $F_{\alpha/2}$  may be derived as indicated above from the values  $F_{1-\alpha}$  and  $F_{1-\alpha/2}$ .

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

#### TABLE H - Estimation of the ratio of two variances or of two standard deviations



#### Resuits

Estimation of the ratio of the two population variances  $\sigma_1^2$  and  $\sigma_2^2$ :

$$
\left(\frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_2^2}\right)^* = \frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} = \frac{\sum (x_1 - \overline{x}_1)^2 / (n_1 - 1)}{\sum (x_2 - \overline{x}_2)^2 / (n_1 - 1)}
$$

Two-sided confidence interval1) :

$$
\frac{1}{\digamma_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu_1,\nu_2)}\frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} < \frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_2^2} < \digamma_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu_2,\nu_1)\frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2}
$$

One-sided confidence intervals<sup>1)</sup> :

$$
\frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_2^2} < F_{1-\alpha}(\nu_2, \nu_1) \frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} \text{ or } \frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_2^2} > \frac{1}{F_{1-\alpha}(\nu_1, \nu_2)} \frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2}
$$

1) The limits of the confidence intervals of the ratio of the standard deviations  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are the square roots of the limits of the confidence intervals of the ratio of the variances  $\sigma_{\bf 1}^2$  and  $\sigma_{\bf 2}^2$ .

NOTE - The numbers (5), (6) and (7) refer to the corresponding paragraphs of the "General remarks".

1) The confidence level  $1 - \alpha$  (see  $\S 7$  of the "General remarks") is the probability that the calculated confidence interval covers the true value of the ratio of the two variances.

2)  $F(v_1, v_2)$  stands for the variance ratio with  $v_1 = n_1 - 1$  and  $v_2 = n_2 - 1$  degrees of freedom; the value  $F_\alpha(v_1, v_2)$  is defined by:

$$
P\left[F(\nu_1,\nu_2)\leq F_\alpha(\nu_1,\nu_2)\right]=\alpha
$$

We therefore have :

$$
P\left[F(v_1, v_2) > F_{\alpha}(v_1, v_2)\right] = 1 - \alpha
$$
\n
$$
P\left[F_{\alpha/2}(v_1, v_2) < F(v_1, v_2) < F_{1 - \alpha/2}(v_1, v_2)\right] = 1 - \alpha
$$

We also have :

$$
F_{\alpha}(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \frac{1}{F_{1-\alpha}(\nu_2, \nu_1)}
$$

Probability density of  $F(v_1, v_2)$ , with  $v_1 = n_1 - 1$  and  $v_2 = n_2 - 1$  degrees of freedom



3) The values  $F_{1 - \alpha}$  and  $F_{1 - \alpha/2}$  are given in table IV of annex B as functions of the numbers of degrees of freedon for  $\alpha$  = 0,05 and  $\alpha$  = 0,01. The values  $F_{\alpha}$  and  $F_{\alpha/2}$  may be derived from the values  $F_{1-\alpha}$  and  $F_{1-\alpha/2}$  as indicated above.

EXAMPLE : see section two, "Explanatory notes and examples".

## SECTION TWO : EXPLANATORY NOTES AND EXAMPLES

#### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1) The tables given in section one of this International Standard set out formally twelve different procedures which can be applied to data observed in samples in order to help answer a variety of questions regarding the larger population or populations from which it is supposed that the Sample(s) has (have) been randomly drawn. To add to the understanding of the more formal presentation given in tables A to H, the procedures will now be illustrated on numerical data consisting of measurements of breaking load for two samples of yarn. The most important characteristics of the samples are printed beside the observations in table X.

The unit in which the numerical data and the calculations results are expressed is the newton.

#### TABLE  $X$  - Breaking load of yarn (in newtons)

(For the meanings of the symbols, see, for instance, table G)



Sample sizes :

 $n_1 = 10$   $n_2 = 12$ 

Sum of observed values  $\Sigma x$ :

21,761 30,241

Mean values :

 $\bar{x}_1 = 2,176$   $\bar{x}_2 = 2,520$  $\bar{x}_2$  = 2.520

Sum of squares of observed values,  $\Sigma x^2$  :

48,610477 77,599609

Sum of squares of differences about means,  $\Sigma (x - \overline{x})^2$ :

1,256 365 1,389 769

Estimates of variance :

 $s_1^2 = 0,139\,60$   $s_2^2 = 0,126\,34$ 

2) lt is not suggested that answers to the whole set of questions would ever be required in a given investigation, but to simplify the presentation it is convenient to use the same illustrative material in each case. As a result it seems only necessary to illustrate numerically the complete formal presentation of the twelve tables in two cases: the single-sample case of table A and the two-sample case of table C.

In general the question or questions to be asked will be decided upon before the data are analyzed; indeed, it is best that they should determine the way in which the data are collected. However, a plot of the observations which are to be used in the examples will illustrate the kind of question which may be of interest. Some of these are as follows :

Allowing for Chance sampling fluctuations, are the means or the Standard deviations in the two samples consistent with the hypothesis that the two population means and/or standard deviations are identical?

If they are not identical, by how much may they differ?

The procedures set out in tables A to H give an objective backing, in terms of probability statements, to answers which may be suggested more tentatively by inspection of plots such as these.

3) Since the procedures to be followed depend on the assumption that the populations sampled are approximately represented by the normal density function, which in standardized form has the equation

$$
f(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right)
$$

as a start it is usually desirable to make a rough examination of this assumption, unless of course an adequate assurance of normality has been established from past examination of similar data. When the number of data is not very large, this examination may be made graphically used one of several alternative methods, two of which will be described here. Both involve arranging the observations in ascending order of magnitude<sup>1)</sup>, so that in a sample of n observations,  $x_i$ 

$$
x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \ldots \leq x_n
$$

<sup>1)</sup> With quite simple modification, the observations could alternatively be arranged in descending order of magnitude, i.e.  $x_1 \ge x_2 \ge ... \ge x_n$ .

In the case of the second of the two samples of yarn given in table X, the twelve ordered observations are :

$$
2,104 - 2,222 - 2,247 - 2,286 - 2,327 - 2,367 - 2,388 - 2,512 - 2,707 - 2,751 - 3,158 - 3,172
$$

These ordered observations are termed the "order statistics of the Sample", and in either method will be used as ordinates in the diagram to be plotted. The two methods differ in the abscissae used; in one, a), the expected values of the normal Order statistics, are taken; in the second, b), the plotting is done on so-called "normal probability paper" and the chosen abscissa is the expected value of the cumulative probability associated with the Order statistic.

a) Use of expected values of normal Order statistics, say  $\xi(i|n)$ 

For random samples of size  $n$  from a standardized normal distribution (i.e. with mean zero and unit standard deviation), these expected values,  $\xi(i|n)$  are given in table V of annex B for  $n = 2(1)50$ ,  $i = 1, 2, ..., n/2$  for n even and  $i = 1, 2, \dots$   $(n + 1)/2$  for n odd. H.L. Harter tables<sup>1)</sup> give values of  $\xi(i|n)$  for  $n = 1(1)100$  and afterwards for rather wider intervals up to  $n = 400$ . The remaining values are obtained by giving negative signs to the values tabled, i.e. the expected order statistics for  $i = n$ ,  $n - 1$ ,  $n - 2$ , ..., are those for  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , with signs reversed. If the twelve observed Order statistics are plotted as ordinates against the corresponding expected values  $\xi(i|n)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, ... 12$ , the result is the diagram shown in figure 2.

If the population distribution is strictly normal, the plotted points should only diverge from a straight line through Chance sampling fluctuations. The slope of the line provides an estimate of the population standard deviation. This straight line gives an approximate estimation of the population mean (ordinate 2,52 of the abscissa point 0,0 of the straight line) and of its standard deviation (slope of the straight line, let for example  $0,355 =$  the difference of ordinates between the two points of abscissa 1 and 0 of the straight line).

#### b) Use of normal probability paper

lt is necessary to preface the description of this procedure with a few words about the nature of this paper, which may usually be obtained from any firm selling ruled papers having a variety of scales of grid.

If  $X$  is a random variate from a population having mean = m, standard deviation =  $\sigma$ , and if  $U = (X - m)/\sigma$ , it is clear that if we have n values of  $x_i$ , and plot  $x_i$  as ordinate against  $u_i$  as abscissa, the points  $(u_i, x_i)$  will fall on a straight line which will have slope  $\sigma$  and will pass through the point with co-ordinates  $(0, m)$ . If the population sampled is normal having a density function  $F(u)$  as defined

above, the uniform abscissa-scale,  $u$ , may be replaced by the probability scale,  $P(u)$ , where

$$
P(u_i) = \int_{-\infty}^{u_i} e^{-u^2/2} du/\sqrt{2\pi}
$$

The following table indicates certain corresponding values of 100  $P$  and  $u$ .



Figure 3 Shows a uniformly spaced vertical set of rules for  $x$ , while the horizontal rules are drawn against the scale of  $P(u)$ , rather than the uniformly spaced scale u. In the standard form of normal probability paper the scale  $u$  is, in fact, omitted.

In practice, of course, the population values of  $m$  and  $\sigma$  will generally be unknown so that neither the  $u_i$  or  $P(u_i)$ corresponding to  $x_i$  can be determined. It is, however, known that if repeated random samples of  $n$  observations are drawn from a normal population and the individual observations in each sample arranged in ascending order of magnitude,  $x_i$  being the *i*th order statistic, then whatever be m and  $\sigma$ , the average or expected value of  $P(x_i)$  is equal to  $i/(n + 1)$ , that is it lies at a fixed point on the P-scale.

Given a single sample of size  $n$ , the graphical test fordeparture from normality, based on the use of normal probability paper, consists therefore in

a) assigning to the vertical  $x$ -grid a suitable scale according to the observed range of values of  $x$  in the sample:

b) plotting the ith normal order statistic  $x_i$  as ordinated against  $P_i = i/(n + 1)$  as abscissa.

<sup>1)</sup> Taken from H.L. Harter, Order Statistics and their Use in Testing and Estimations, Volume 2.







Expected normal order statistic,  $\xi(i|n)$ 





31

In those conditions, if the distribution is strictly normal, the quantiles  $x_i$  with probability  $i/(n + 1)$  of this distribution will be represented graphically by points lying on the straight line passing through the point with co-ordinates  $(0, m)$  and having a slope  $\sigma$ . As a consequence, for a single sample, the points with co-ordinates  $[i/(n + 1), x_i]$  will only diverge through Chance fluctuations from this line.

0n the other hand, it is clear that in this second method of graphical representation, the mean position of the point representing  $x_i$  will not lie on this straight line, although it will be very near to  $it<sup>1</sup>$ .

In figure 3, the  $n = 12$  ordered observations for the second of the two samples of yarn have been plotted, using a suitable x-scale, against abscissa  $P = 1/13, 2/13, \ldots, 12/13$ . It will be seen that the spot pattern in figure 3 is very closely similar to that in figure 2, but not precisely so, since  $\xi(i|12)$  does not equal  $u(P_i = i/13)$  exactly.

The sloping straight line has been drawn using for the unknown population  $m$  and  $\sigma$ , the sample estimates  $\bar{x} = 2,520$ , s = 0,355.

50th these graphical methods may be used if the hypothetical population is not normal but has some other form, for example that of a negative exponential, or a gamma (or  $\chi^2$ ) distribution. But it will then be necessary to have

- a) another, appropriate table of the expected values of order statistics,  $\xi(i|n)$ ; or
- b) probability paper with a vertical grid drawn to another scale.

Such tables and paper exist.

An alternative graphical method sometimes employed combines elements of the two methods described under a) and b) above. Normal probability paper is again used, the order statistic of the sample,  $x_i$ , being plotted as ordinates against abscissa

$$
P\{\xi(i|n)\}=\int_{-\infty}^{\xi(i|n)} e^{-u^2/2} du/\sqrt{2\pi}
$$

instead of against  $P_i = i/(n + 1)$  as in method b). The values of  $P\langle \xi(i|n) \rangle$  may be found by entering a table of the normal probability function with the values of  $\xi(i|n)$  given in table V. Again, if the population sampled is normal, the plotted points will lie roughly on a sloping straight line.

The weakness of the graphical method is that it provides no objective means of judging whether, as in this case, the departure of the points from a straight line is important. As stated in paragraph 4 of the "General remarks" introducing

section one of this International Standard it is possible to apply the test of Shapiro and Wilk (provided  $n \leq 50$ ), which was developed with the idea of giving precision to this graphical approach. This method will be described with others in more detail in a further document. If this test is applied to the observations on yarn 2 and also to the  $n = 10$  observations on yarn 1 it is found that in neither case are the results inconsistent with sampling from normal populations.

4) The graphical method described may be particularly helpful in reaching a decision as to whether one of the transformations suggested in Paragraph 4 of the "General  $remarks''$  is likely to make a variable  $x$  more closely normal. As an example of this kind the following data are quoted for the results of a rotating bend fatigue test applied to 15 specimens of an aero-engine component.

The variable,  $x$ , measures endurance. If the 15 values of

- a)  $x<sub>r</sub>$
- b)  $log_{10}(10x)$ .

already arranged in ascending order of magnitude, are plotted against the corresponding expected normal Order statistics  $\xi$ (*i*|15),  $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ , 15 taken from table V of annex B, it is at once found (see figure 4) that the plot using log x is approximately linear, while that for  $x$  is decidedly not so. This suggests that in testing hypotheses, the analysis of the kind suggested in tables A, A', C, C', E and G should be applied to log x rather than  $x$ . This suggestion was confirmed by fuller test data. If, however, the requirement was to obtain confidence intervals, say, for the mean and standard deviation of  $x$ , these could not be derived directly from the confidence intervals for the mean and standard deviation of  $log x$ . However, tolerance limits for the whole population of x could be found using log x as the variate.

Rotating-bend fatigue tests, x and  $log_{10}(10 x)$ 

Specimen i	$x_i$	$log_{10}(10 x_i)$
	0,200	0,301
2	0,330	0,519
3	0,450	0.653
4	0,490	0,690
5	0,780	0,892
6	0,920	0,964
	0.950	0,978
8	0.970	0,987
9	1,040	1,017
10	1,710	1,233
11	2.220	1,346
12	2,275	1.357
13	3,650	1,562
14	7,000	1,845
15	8,800	1,944

<sup>1)</sup> The amount by which the true line of means differs from the straight line is greatest when  $i=1$  or  $n$ , but is even then small compare the sample variations about the means,  $\xi(i|n)$ .



Normal order statistic,  $\xi(i|n)$ 

# FIGURE 4 - Rotating-bend fatigue data. Graphical test for normality

5) Being satisfied, therefore, that it is appropriate to use the procedures described below for the analysis of normally distributed variables, the only pieces of numerical information required from the samples are the number of observations, n (the sample size), and the statistics  $\Sigma(x)$  and  $\sum(x - \overline{x})^2$ . These, with their derived sample estimates, the means  $m_1$  " =  $x_1$ ,  $m_2$  " =  $x_2$ , and the variances  $\sigma_1^2$  =  $s_1^2$  and  $\sigma_2^2$  \* =  $s_2^2$ , are set out beside the basic data in table X. As previously stated in illustrating the procedure contained in the twelve tables A to H, a complete formal presentation of data and computational workings will only be given for table A (Single-Sample test on the mean with variance known) and table C (comparison of two means, variances assumed known and not necessarily equal). In the other ten cases the illustration in the following notes will be confined to

a) stating the question to be put to the data;

b) inserting into the formulae of the formulae table the appropriate numerical values taken from table X and from tables I to IV of annex B;

c) discussing the conclusion reached.

6) The methods described above in tables C and C' concern the comparison of means derived from two completely independent samples. In certain situations, however, the observations in the two samples are related in pairs, say  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, ..., n$ ). The problem of practical interest may then be to study the differences  $d_i = y_i - x_i$ , either in regard to the mean value or the variance of  $d_i$ . Problems of this kind will be considered fully in a further document. However, to avoid possible misuse of table C' where table A' should be used, an illustration of such a problem is set out in annex A although no formal presentation of the procedure has been given in section one of this International Standard.

7) Finally, it is possible to summarize the relationship between the situations presented in the twelve tables A to H and I to IV of annex B as follows :

a) If the question asked concerns the relationship between sample and/or population means, and the

variances are specified or believed known from past experience (tables A, B, C, D), then the procedures can be based on the use of the standardized normal deviate  $U$  of table  $1$  of annex  $B^+$ 

b) If on the other hand, when dealing with mean values, the variances must be estimated from the sample data (tables  $A'$ ,  $B'$ ,  $C'$ ,  $D'$ ) then the procedure must be based on the use of the distribution of "Student's"  $t$  of table ll of annex B. Inevitably in this case, conclusions are reached with somewhat less precision, but it is better that this should be so than that an erroneous value of the variance or Standard deviation should be introduced under a) above.

c) If the question asked concerns the relationship between a Sample variance and a population variance (tables E, F), then the procedures make use of the distribution of  $\chi^2$  of table III of annex B;

d) If it is desired to compare two variances or to derive an estimate of the Iimits within which the ratio of the two unknown population variances lies (tables G, H), then the procedure makes use of the distribution of the variance ratio  $F$  (sometimes called Snedecor's ratio) of table IV of annex B.

#### NUMERICAL ILLUSTRATION OF PROCEDURES

TABLE  $A -$  Comparison of a mean with a given value (variance known)

Suppose it is necessary to examine whether the tests on the sample of 10 pieces of yarn (yarn 1 of table  $X$ ) are consistent with the manufacturer's claim that the mean breaking load of his yarn has a given value,  $m_0 = 2.40$ . It will be supposed that earlier measurements have shown that the Variation from consignment to consignment, if not the mean value, is stable and may be represented by a standard deviation of  $\sigma = 0.331$  5. Following the scheme given in table A, the formal presentation of the numerical data would then be as follows :

Technical characteristics of the population studied : The batch consists of a consignment of cotton yarn received on 1969-08-03 from supplier H consisting of 10 000 bobbins packed in 100 boxes with 100 bobbins in each.

Technical characteristics of the Sample elements : 10 boxes were drawn at random and one bobbin drawn at random out of each of these boxes. Test pieces of 50 cm length of yarn were tut out from the bobbins at about 5 m distance from the free end. The actual tests were carried out on the central 25 cm of these test pieces, the breaking load in newtons being measured on each piece.

Discarded observations : none

Statistical data Sample size :  $n = 10$ Sum of the observed values :  $\Sigma x = 21.761$ Calculations  $\bar{x} = \frac{21,761}{10} = 2,176$ Given value :  $\qquad \qquad$  Using table 1 of annex B,  $m_0 = 2,40$  $(\mu_{_{\mathbf{0},975}}/\!\sqrt{10})~\sigma$  = 0,620  $\times$  0,331 5 = 0,205 5 Known value of the standard deviation :  $\sigma = 0,331.5$ Significance level chosen :  $\alpha = 0.05$ Results Comparison of the population mean with the given value  $m_0$ :

Two-sided case :

$$
|\bar{x} - m_0| = |2,176 - 2,40| = 0,224 > 0,2055
$$

The hypothesis that the population mean equals 2,40 is rejected at the 5 % level.

 $I$ ABLE  $A'$   $-$  Comparison of a mean with a given value (variance unknown)

The problem is the same as that described under table A, but in this case the variance must be estimated from the Sample, either because no earlier measurements are available or because it is thought that they are no longer appropriate. We apply the formal procedure of table A' to the data of yarn 1, using the numerical values already given in table X.

In this case  $\sigma^* = s = \sqrt{0.139\,60} = 0.373\,6$  and  $\sigma^*/\sqrt{10}=0.118$  1,  $\nu=10-1=9$ .

Taking a two-sided test with  $\alpha = 0.05$ , we find from table Ha of annex B that  $t_{0,975}(9) = 2,262$ , so that  $t_{0.975}(\sigma^*/\sqrt{10}) = 0.267.$ 

Comparing the sample mean,  $\bar{x} = 2.176$  with the manufacturer's claimed value of 2,40, we find

$$
|\bar{x} - m_0| = 0.224 \leq 0.267
$$

It follows that the sample results are not inconsistent with the manufacturer's Claim. Note that the Sample estimate of  $\sigma$ , i.e.  $\sigma^* = s = 0.373$  6, is larger than that assumed in the illustration of table A ( $\sigma = 0.3315$ ) and as a result we cannot now be confident that the population mean has fallen below 2,40.

If it is preferred to use table Ilb, of annex B, giving values of the ratio  $t_1 = \alpha/2 \langle v \rangle / \sqrt{n}$  for  $v = n - 1 = 9$ , we must compare  $|\bar{x} - m_0|$  with  $[t_{0.975}(9)/\sqrt{10}]^* = 0.715 \times 0.3736 = 0.267$ , the same critical figure as obtained using table Ha.

TABLE  $B -$  Interval estimation of a mean (variance known)

In this case we do not test whether the population mean has a specified value  $m_0$ , but seek limits within which the unknown true mean,  $m$ , lies. We then associate a probability  $1 - \alpha$  with the statement that the limits include m.

The formal procedure of table B can be applied to the data of yarn 1. lt will be supposed that it is again justifiable to use the population Standard deviation, derived from earlier measurements, i.e. that  $\sigma = 0.3315$ . For a two-sided confidence interval associated with a probability  $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ , we have

$$
\overline{x} = 2,176
$$

and 
$$
(u_{0,975}/\sqrt{10})\sigma = 0.620 \times 0.3315 = 0.2055
$$

from table I of annex B. lt follows that the 95 % confidence interval for  $m$  is

$$
2,176-0,205 \le m \le 2,176+0,2055
$$

or 
$$
1,970 \le m \le 2,382
$$

TABLE  $B'$  - Interval estimation of a mean (variance unknown)

The problem is the same as that just described except that the estimate  $\sigma^* = s$  is substituted for  $\sigma$  and the probability limits of  $t$ (or  $t/\sqrt{n}$ ) are used instead of those for  $u/\sqrt{n}$ .

Applying the procedure of table B' to derive two-sided confidence limits for m, with  $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ , using the same sample of yarn 1, we have  $n = 10$ ,  $\nu = 9$ ,  $\overline{x} = 2,176$ ,  $s = 0.373$  6,  $t_{0.975}$ (s/ $\sqrt{10}$ ) = 0.267 as in the illustration of table A', so that the 95 % confidence interval derived from the sample is given by the statement :

$$
2,176-0,267 \le m \le 2,176+0,267
$$

or 
$$
1,909 \le m \le 2,443
$$

It it is desired to obtain limits, necessarily wider, to which greater confidence can be assigned, we could take  $1 - \alpha = 0.99$ .

Then table lla of annex B gives  $t_{0.995}(9) = 3{,}250$ or, alternatively, table lib of annex B gives  $t_{0.995}(9)/\sqrt{10} = 1.028$ .

As a result, by either means we find

$$
t_{0.995}(s/\sqrt{10}) = (t_{0.995}/\sqrt{10}) s = 0.384
$$

The 99 % confidence interval is now given by the statement

$$
2,176-0,384=1,792 \le m \le 2,560=2,176+0,384
$$

This interval is clearly wider than that just derived using the scheme of table B, under which it was supposed that the variance was known. This is the penalty which must be paid for having to estimate the variance from a small sample. On the other hand it may be safer to use an estimate derived from the sample if there is any doubt whether the variance based on past experience is still relevant.

#### TABLE  $C -$  Comparison of two means (variances known)

This will be illustrated by comparing the means of the samples of yarn 1 and yarn 2 given in table X. It is supposed that the population variances have been satisfactorily established from earlier measurements as

$$
\sigma_1^2 = 0,10989, \sigma_1 = 0,3315
$$

$$
\sigma_2^2 = 0,09685, \sigma_2 = 0,3112
$$

The formal presentation of the numerical data would ther be as follows :

Technical characteristics of the population : 2 batches of yarn received on 1969-08-03 from supplier H and on 1969-08-05 from supplier F, consisting of 10 000 and 12 000 bobbins respectively, packed in boxes of 100 bobbins.

Technical characteristics of the samples : IO and 12 boxes, respectively, were drawn at random from each batch and one bobbin was drawn at random from each of these boxes. Test pieces of 50 cm length were tut at about 5 m distance from the free end of the bobbins sampled. The actual tests were carried out on the central 25 cm of these test pieces, the breaking load in newtons being measured on each piece.

Discarded observations : none.



#### Results

Comparison of the two population means :

Two-sided case :

$$
|2,176-2,520|=0,344>0,271
$$

The null hypothesis that the means are equal is rejected at the 5 % level. The second type of yarn has the breaking load accepted as the largest.

If we are not prepared to take so large a risk as 0,05, or 1 in 20, of being wrong in our conclusion, we may take  $\alpha$  = 0,01. We then have

$$
u_{0.995}\sigma = 2,576 \times 0,1381 = 0,356
$$

Hence, for the two-sided case

 $|2,176 - 2,520| = 0,344 < 0,356$ 

and we should not be able to reject the null hypothesis at the 1 % level.

TABLE C' - Comparison of two means (variances unknown but may be assumed equal)

The problem differs from that last described because as will commonly happen it is not considered justifiable to accept the values  $\sigma_1^2$  and  $\sigma_2^2$  based on previous measurements. It is therefore necessary to obtain an estimate of variance from the Sample data. The test is strictly valid only if the two unknown population variances are equal, but it will be very little in error, particularly if the sample sizes  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are nearly equal, if we use the pooled estimate  $\sigma_d^*$  quoted in table C'.

The two samples of yarn given in table X will be used and the table need not be repeated. In this case we have

$$
\bar{x}_1 = 2,176
$$
  $\bar{x}_2 = 2,520$ 

Sums of squares of differences about mean :



Estimate of the standard deviation of the different between  $\overline{x}_1$  and  $\overline{x}_2$ :

$$
\sigma_{\rm d}^* = \sqrt{\frac{22}{10 \times 12} \times \frac{2,646 \, 134}{20}} = 0,155 \, 7
$$

Using a two-sided test with  $\alpha = 0.05$ , we have

$$
t_{0,975}(20) \sigma_d^* = 2,086 \times 0,1557 = 0,325
$$
  
 $|\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2| = |2,176 - 2,520| = 0,344 > 0,325$ 

The hypothesis of equal population means :  $m_1 = m_2$  is therefore just rejected at the 5 % level. lt would not be rejected at the 1 % level.

#### TABLE  $D -$  Estimation of the difference of two means (variances known)

In this case we do not test whether the two populations have a common mean value but use the two samples to estimate the difference between their two means,  $m_1$  and  $m<sub>2</sub>$ . We obtain confidence limits for this difference,  $m_1 - m_2$ , associated with a probability  $1 - \alpha$ .

The same data will again be used and it will be supposed that the variances  $\sigma^2 = 0.109.89$  and  $\sigma^2 = 0.096.85$  are  $k$  power from previous measurements. The standard deviation of the difference in sample means,  $\overline{x}_1$  and  $\overline{x}_2$ , will again as in table C be  $\sigma_{d} = 0.138$  1, and

$$
u_{0,975}\sigma_d = 1,96 \times 0,138 \cdot 1 = 0,271
$$
  

$$
\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2 = -0,344
$$

lt follows that the two-sided 95 % confidence interval for  $m_1 - m_2$  is

$$
-0.344 - 0.271 \le m_1 - m_2 \le -0.344 + 0.271
$$

or 
$$
0.073 \le m_2 - m_1 \le 0.615
$$

TABLE  $D'$  - Estimation of the difference of two means (variances unknown, but may be assumed equal)

lt is required to estimate a confidence interval for the differente between the mean breaking loads of the two types of yarn. In this case there are no acceptable values of  $\sigma_1^2$  and  $\sigma_2^2$  based on past measurements, but assuming that the unknown variances are equal, or nearly so, we use the common value obtained from the pooled data, as derived above, namely

$$
\sigma_{\rm d}^* = 0.155\,7
$$

and proceed to find a two-sided confidence interval for  $m_1 - m_2$ . The procedure is as in table D except that  $\sigma_d^*$  is substituted for  $\sigma_d$  and  $t_{0.975}(\nu)$  for  $u_{0.975}$ , giving

$$
t_{0.975}(20) \sigma_{\alpha}^{*} = 2,086 \times 0,155 \tau = 0,325
$$

This gives the inequality

$$
-0.344 - 0.325 < m_1 - m_2 < -0.344 + 0.325
$$

or 0,019  $\leq m_2 - m_1 \leq 0.669$ 

associated with a probability of  $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ . Note that in this case where the variance has to be estimated, the interval based on the f-distribution is somewhat wider than that found in the example illustrating table D.

#### TABLE  $E -$  Comparison of a variance with a given value

The preceding examples have been concerned with relationships between sample and population mean values. In the present example and in the three which follow it is the relationship between Sample and population variances or standard deviations which are of interest. Take the 10 observations of breaking load of yarn 1 from table X and ask whether these are consistent with the hypothesis that the population variance does not exceed a specified value of  $\sigma_0^2 = 0,090$  0.

This is the one-sided case a) of table E. Heing the results given in table X, we have

$$
\frac{\Sigma(x-\bar{x})^2}{\sigma_0^2} = \frac{1,256\,365}{0,090\,0} = 13,96
$$

Reference to table III of annex B shows that for degrees of freedom  $\nu = 9$ , the upper 5 % point of  $\chi^2$  is 16,92, so that the observed Sample variance is not inconsistent with the null hypothesis (that  $\sigma^2 \leq 0.0900$ ). Though the sample variance,  $s_1^2 = 0.1396$  is a good deal larger than the specified value of 0,090 0, such a difference might well occur through Chance in a Sample of only 10 observations.

#### TABLE  $F -$  Estimation of a variance

The data of the sample of yarn 1 may also be used to derive lower and upper confidence limits for the unknown  $\sigma^2$ . If we take  $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ , table III of annex B gives for degrees of freedom  $\nu = 9$ .

$$
\chi_{0.025}^2(9) = 2,700
$$
  

$$
\chi_{0.975}^2(9) = 19,02
$$

Hence

$$
\frac{\Sigma(x - \bar{x})^2}{\chi_{0.025}^2} = \frac{1,2563}{2,700} = 0,4653
$$

$$
\frac{\Sigma(x - \bar{x})^2}{\chi_{0.975}^2} = \frac{1,2563}{19.02} = 0,0661
$$

and a probability of 0,95, or odds of 19 over 20, can be associated with the statement

0,066 
$$
1 < \sigma^2 < 0,4653
$$
, or 0,257  $< \sigma < 0,682$ 

If it were desired to obtain limits, necessarily wider, for which the probability of including the unknown variance were greater, for example 0,99 instead of 0,95, values of  $\chi_{0.005}^2(9)$  and  $\chi_{0.995}^2(9)$  could be obtained from table III of annex B. The confidence limits now become

$$
0.053\; 26 \leq \sigma^2 \leq 0.724, \text{or } 0.231 \leq \sigma \leq 0.851
$$

#### TABLE  $G -$  Comparison of two variances

lt is required to determine whether the results for the samples of yarn 1 and yarn 2 given in table X are consistent with the hypothesis that the two populations have a common but unspecified breaking-load variance,  $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$ .

TABLE X gives

$$
v_1 = 10 - 1 = 9, v_2 = 12 - 1 = 11
$$
  
 $s_1^2 = 0,139\ 60, s_2^2 = 0,126\ 34$ 

It follows that  $F = s_1^2/s_2^2 = 1,10$ 

From table IV of annex B we find by rough interpolati that

$$
F_{1-\alpha/2}(\nu_1,\nu_2)=F_{0,975}(9,11)=3,6
$$

$$
F_{\alpha/2}(\nu_1,\nu_2)=1/F_{0,975}(11,9)=1/4,0=0,25
$$

The observed ratio of 1,10 lies well within these limits so that there is no reason to doubt the hypothesis that  $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$ .

#### TABLE  $H -$  Estimation of the ratio of two variances

Taking the two samples of breaking load in yarn (data in table X) limits are required for the ratio of population variances,  $\sigma_1^2/\sigma_2^2$ .

Besides the approximate values

$$
F_{0,975}(9, 11) = 3,6
$$
  

$$
F_{0,025}(9, 11) = 0,25
$$

already obtained by in terpolation in table IV of annex B in the preceding example, we can similarly find

$$
F_{0,995}(9, 11) = 5.6
$$
  

$$
F_{0,005}(9, 11) = \frac{1}{F_{0,995}(11, 9)} = \frac{1}{6.4} = 0.16
$$

The rule of table H therefore provides the following confidence intervals, since  $s_1^2/s_2^2 = 1,10$ 

Confidence

\nLimits for ratio of population variances 
$$
\sigma_1^2/\sigma_2^2
$$

\n0.95  $\frac{1}{3.6} \times 1.10 = 0.31 < \sigma_1^2/\sigma_2^2 < 4.4 = 4 \times 1.10$ 

\nor

\n0.56  $\frac{1}{3.6} \times 1.10 = 0.20 < \sigma_1/\sigma_2 < 2.1$ 

\n0.99  $\frac{1}{5.6} \times 1.10 = 0.20 < \sigma_1^2/\sigma_2^2 < 7.0 = 6.4 \times 1.10$ 

\nor

\n0.45  $\frac{1}{3.6} \times \sigma_1/\sigma_2 < 2.6$ 

Again it will be noted that for samples as small as 10 and 12 the limits associated with a confidence level of 0,95 or odds of 19 over 20 are very wide. If greater assurance still is needed (Odds of 99 over 100) that the limits will include the unknown true ratio, the limits for the ratio of variances are so wide as to be almost valueless, although expressed as a ratio of standard deviations they do not appear so extreme. In other words, much larger samples are needed to estimate a ratio of variances, or indeed a single variance, with any degree of accuracy.

#### ANNEX A

#### COMPARISON OF PAIRED OBSERVATIONS USING STUDENT'S t-TEST

In connection with the procedure illustrated under the headings of tables  $C'$  and  $D'$ , it is of importance to note that a different procedure has to be used when the two sets of values, say  $x_i$  and  $y_i$ , are not independent, but paired. This for example is the case if a single sample of  $n$  items is drawn from a population and two observations of the Same character are made on each sample element,  $i$ , an observation  $x_i$  and an observation  $y_i$   $(i = 1, 2, ..., n)$ . Usually the latter Observation is made after some treatment has been applied and the former before or without the application of treatment. Detecting a difference between the means of the two variates then amounts to assessing an effect of the treatment (or difference in treatments) on the Character studied.

The data tabled below were collected in an investigation designed to determine whether the average rate of shaft-wear caused by various bearing metals in an internal combustion engine differed between metals.

(Data from W.E. Duckworth, Statistical Techniques in Technological Research, published by Methuen and Co.)

Shaft-wear after a given working time in 0.000 1 in

Trial	Wear with							
i)		white metal $(x_i)$ copper lead $(y_i)$ $d_i = y_i - x_i$						
1	1.5	3.5	2.0					
2	1.3	2.0	0.7					
3	4.5	4.7	0.2					
4	2.5	2.8	0.3					
5	4.5	6.5	2.0					
6	1.7	2.2	0.5					
7	1.8	2.5	0.7					
8	3.3	5.8	2.5					
9	2.3	4.2	1.9					
Totals	23.4	34.2	10.8					

If these data are treated as two completely independent samples of  $n = 9$  observations following the procedure of table C', it is found that

$$
\bar{x} = 2.60, \Sigma(x - \bar{x})^2 = 12.16
$$

$$
\overline{y} = 3.80, \Sigma(y - \overline{y})^2 = 20.84
$$

Following the procedure of table C', we find

$$
t = 1.2 / \sqrt{\frac{12.16 + 20.84}{16} \times \frac{2}{9}} = 1.77
$$

With  $\nu = 16$  degrees of freedom, table IIa of annex B gives for  $\alpha/2 = 0.025$ ,  $t_{1 - \alpha/2} = 2.12$ , so that the difference in means is not significant at the 5 % level (two-sided test).

However, as is clear from a comparison of corresponding values  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  in the table, the observations are correlated in pairs. To eliminate possible effects due to differences in rate of wear on different shafts, the experiment was

designed so that in each engine a white-metal bearing and a copper-lead bearing were tested together on the same shaft. This means that the  $(x_i, y_i)$  form nine pairs, each derived from metals tested under as nearly the same conditions as possible.

It may be assumed that the common contribution to  $x_i$ and  $y_i$  due to the two metals being tested together on the same, *i*th, shaft may be represented by an additive term  $z_i$ so that

$$
x_i = z_i + v_i, y_i = z_i + w_i
$$

where  $v_i$  and  $w_i$  are independent normally distributed Chance variables, that is to say

$$
d_i = y_i - x_i = w_i - v_i
$$

will be normally distributed. The hypothesis tested is that the mean shaft-wear is independent of the metal selected, i.e. if the differences  $d_i$ , vary only from chance causes about a mean of zero. To examine this hypothesis we apply the single-sample *t*-test as in table A'. The nine values of  $d_i$ are shown in the last column of the table above, and we find

$$
\Sigma (d_i - d)^2 = 6,26
$$
  

$$
s_d = \sqrt{6,26/8} = 0,884 \text{ } 6
$$
  
Hence,  $t = \frac{(\overline{d} - 0)\sqrt{9}}{s_d} = 1,2 \times 3/0,884 \text{ } 6 = 4,07$ 

 $\overline{d}$  = 10,8/9 = 1,2

From table IIa, with  $y = 9 - 1 = 8$  degrees of freedom, it is seen that  $t_{1-\alpha/2} = 3.35$  for  $\alpha/2 = 0.005$  so that the difference between the mean wear rates of the two metals is now shown to be highly significant, the wear rate for the copper lead being clearly the greater.

In the same way a narrower confidence interval for the mean difference between wear rates could be obtained using the paired differences and the procedure of table B', rather than following that of table D'.

Note that if the additive relations  $x_i = z_i + v_i$ ,  $y_i = z_i + w_i$ are true or approximately true, there is no need for the "shaft effects",  $z_i$ , to be normally distributed, as  $z$  vanishes in taking the differences. Of course, in the case of comparing the two yarns, this pairing would not be possible. Suppose, however, that it had been wished to compare the effect of two different treatments on the Same yarn, the breaking loads could have been determined by giving the two treatments in pairs to short lengths of yarn cut off close together. In this way the effect of possible long-term fluctuations in strength along the whole length of the yarn (represented by the term  $z_i$ ) could be largely eliminated and the test made more sensitive to a real treatment difference.

### ANNEX B

## STATISTICAL TABLES

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

TABLE I – Values of the ratio  $u_1 = \alpha/\sqrt{n}$ 

TABLE IIa - Fractiles of Student's distribution

TABLE IIb – Values of the ratio  $t_1 = \alpha \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{n}}$  for  $\nu = n - 1$ 

TABLE III - Fractiles of the chi-squared distribution

TABLE IV - Upper percentage points of  $F$ 

TABLE V - Expected values of normal order statistics,  $\xi(i|n)$ 



# TABLE I - Values of the ratio  $u_{1-\alpha}/\sqrt{n}$

TABLE IIa - Fractiles of Student's distribution

ν		Two-sided case	One-sided case			
	$t_{0,975}$	$t_{0.995}$	$t_{0.95}$	t0,99		
1	12,706	63,657	6,314	31,821		
$\overline{\mathbf{c}}$	4,303	9,925	2,920	6,965		
з	3,182	5,841	2,353	4,541		
4	2,776	4,604	2,132	3,747		
5	2,571	4,032	2,015	3,365		
6	2,447	3,707	1,943	3,143		
7	2.365	3,499	1,895	2,998		
8	2,306	3,355	1,860	2,896		
9	2,262	3,250	1,833	2,821		
10	2,288	3,169	1,812	2,764		
11	2,201	3,106	1,796	2,718		
12	2,179	3,055	1,782	2,681		
13	2,160	3,012	1,771	2,650		
14	2,145	2,977	1,761	2,624		
15	2,131	2,947	1,753	2,602		
16	2,120	2,921	1,746	2,583		
17	2,110	2,898	1,740	2,567		
18	2,101	2,878	1,734	2,552		
19	2,093	2,861	1,729	2,539		
20	2,086	2,845	1,725	2,528		
21	2,080	2,831	1,721	2.518		
22	2,074	2,819	1,717	2,508		
23	2,069	2,807	1,714	2,500		
24	2,064	2,797	1,711	2,492		
25	2,060	2,787	1,708	2,485		
26	2,056	2,779	1,706	2,479		
27	2,052	2,771	1,703	2,473		
28	2,048	2,763	1,701	2,467		
29	2,045	2,756	1,699	2.462		
30	2,042	2,750	1,697	2,457		
40	2,021	2,704	1,684	2,423		
60	2,000	2,660	1,671	2,390		
120	1,980	2,617	1,658	2,358		
$\infty$	1,960	2,576	1,645	2,326		

Taken from E.S. Pearson and H.O. Hartley, Biometrika Tables for Statisticians, Vol. I (1954).

NOTE - For interpolation when  $v > 30$ , take  $z = 120/v$  as argument.

#### Example :



 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

<code>TABLE</code>  $\sf I\!+\!\sf b$   $-$  Values of the ratio  $t_1 = \alpha^{(p)}/\sqrt{n}$  for  $p = n - 1$ 

		Two-sided case	One-sided case			
$\nu = n - 1$	$t_{0,975}$ $\sqrt{n}$	$t_{0,995}$ $\sqrt{n}$	$t_{0,95}$ $\sqrt{n}$	$_{t_{0,99}}$ $\sqrt{n}$		
1	8,985	45,013	4,465	22,501		
$\overline{a}$	2,434	5,730	1,686	4,021		
3	1,591	2,920	1,177	2,270		
4	1,242	2.059	0,953	1,676		
5	1,049	1,646	0,823	1,374		
6	0,925	1,401	0,734	1,188		
7	0,836	1,237	0,670	1,060		
8	0,769	1,118	0,620	0,966		
9	0,715	1,028	0,580	0,892		
10	0,672	0,956	0,546	0,833		
11	0,635	0,897	0,518	0,785		
12	0,604	0,847	0,494	0,744		
13	0,577	0,805	0,473	0,708		
14	0,554	0,769	0,455	0.678		
15	0,533	0,737	0,438	0,651		
16	0,514	0,708	0,423	0,626		
17	0,497	0,683	0,410	0,605		
18	0,482	0,660	0,398	0,586		
19	0,468	0,640	0,387	0,568		
20	0,455	0,621	0,376	0,552		
21	0,443	0,604	0,367	0,537		
22	0,432	0,588	0,358	0,523		
23	0.422	0,573	0,350	0,510		
24	0,413	0,559	0,342	0,498		
25	0,404	0.547	0,335	0,487		
26	0,396	0.535	0,328	0,477		
27	0,388	0,524	0,322	0,467		
28	0,380	0,513	0,316	0,458		
29	0,373	0,503	0,310	0,449		
30	0,367	0,494	0,305	0,441		
40	0,316	0,422	0,263	0,378		
50	0,281	0,375	0,235	0,337		
60	0,256	0,341	0,214	0,306		
70	0,237	0,314		0,283		
80	0,221	0,293	0,185	0,264		
90	0,208	0,276	0,174	0,248		
100	0,197	0,261	0,165	0,235		
200	0,139	0,183	0,117	0,165		
500	0,088	0,116	0,074	0,104		
$\infty$	0	0	0	0		



## TABLE  $III -$  Fractiles of the chi-squared distirbution

Taken from E.S. Pearson and H.O. Hartley, Biometrika Tables for Statisticians, Vol. I (1954). See note to table IIa.





Taken from table 18, Biometrika Tables for Statisticians, Vol. 1, 1966.

NOTES

- 1) For the lower 100  $\alpha$  % points,  $F_{\alpha}(v_1, v_2) = 1/F_{1-\alpha}(v_2, v_1)$ .
- 2) For interpolation
	- a) between  $v_1$ ,  $v_2 = 10$  and 20 take  $z = 60/v$  as argument;
	- b) beyond  $v_1$ ,  $v_2 = 20$  take  $z' = 120/v$  as argument.

n j	31)	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
$\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{\mathbf{c}}$ 3 4 5 6 $\overline{7}$	0,846 0,000	1,029 0,297	1,163 0,495 0,000	1,267 0,642 0,202	1,352 0,757 0,353 0,000	1,424 0,852 0,473 0,153	1,485 0,932 0,572 0,275 0,000	1,539 1,001 0,656 0,376 0,123	1,586 1,062 0,729 0,462 0,225 0,000	1,629 1,116 0.793 0,537 0,312 0,103	1,668 1,164 0,850 0,603 0,388 0,191 0,000	1,703 1,208 0,901 0,662 0,456 0,267 0,088
n Ť	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
$\mathbf{1}$ $\sqrt{2}$ 3 4 5 6 $\overline{7}$ 8 9 10 11 12 13	1,736 1,248 0,948 0,715 0,516 0,335 0,165 0,000	1,766 1,285 0,990 0,763 0,570 0,396 0,234 0,077	1,794 1,319 1,029 0,807 0,619 0,451 0,295 0,146 0,000	1,820 1,350 1,066 0,848 0,665 0,502 0,351 0,208 0,069	1,844 1,380 1,099 0,886 0,707 0,548 0,402 0,264 0,131 0,000	1,867 1,408 1,131 0,921 0,745 0,590 0,448 0,315 0,187 0,062	1,889 1,434 1,160 0,954 0,781 0,630 0,491 0,362 0,238 0,118 0,000	1,910 1,458 1,188 0,985 0,815 0,667 0,532 0,406 0,286 0,170 0,056	1,929 1,481 1,214 1,014 0,847 0,701 0,569 0,446 0,330 0,218 0,108 0,000	1,948 1,503 1,239 1.041 0,877 0,734 0,604 0,484 0,370 0,262 0,156 0,052	1,965 1,524 1,263 1,067 0,905 0,764 0,637 0,519 0,409 0,303 0,200 0,100 0,000	1,982 1,544 1,285 1,091 0,932 0,793 0,668 0,553 0,444 0,341 0,241 0,144 0,048
n	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	$34\,$	35	36	37	38
$\mathbf{1}$ $\boldsymbol{2}$ 3 $\overline{\mathbf{4}}$ 5 6 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	1,998 1,563 1,306 1,115 0,957 0,820 0,697 0,584 0,478 0,377 0,280 0,185 0,092 0,000	2,014 1,581 1,327 1,137 0,981 0,846 0,725 0,614 0,510 0,411 0,316 0,224 0,134 0,044	2,029 1,599 1,346 1,158 1,004 0,871 0,751 0,642 0,540 0,443 0,350 0,260 0,172 0,086 0,000	2,043 1,616 1,365 1,179 1,026 0,894 0,777 0,669 0,568 0,473 0,382 0,294 0,209 0,125 0,041	2,056 1,632 1,383 1,198 1,047 0,917 0,801 0,694 0,595 0,502 0,413 0,327 0,243 0,161 0,080 0,000	2,070 1,647 1,400 1,217 1,067 0,938 0,824 0,719 0,621 0,529 0,442 0,358 0,276 0,196 0,117 0,039	2,082 1,662 1,416 1,235 1,087 0,959 0,846 0,742 0,646 0,556 0,469 0,387 0,307 0.228 0,151 0,076 0,000	2,095 1,676 1,432 1,252 1,105 0,979 0,867 0,764 0,670 0,580 0.496 0,414 0,336 0,259 0,184 0,110 0,037	2,107 1,690 1,448 1,269 1,123 0,998 0,887 0,786 0,692 0,604 0,521 0,441 0,364 0,289 0,215 0,143 0,071 0,000	2,118 1,704 1,462 1,285 1,140 1,016 0,906 0,806 0,714 0,627 0,545 0,466 0,390 0,317 0,245 0,174 0,104 0,035	2,129 1,717 1,477 1,300 1,157 1,034 0,925 0,826 0.735 0,649 0,568 0,490 0,416 0,343 0,273 0,203 0,135 0,06/ 0,000	2,140 1,729 1,491 1,315 1,173 1,051 0,943 0,845 0,755 0,670 0,590 0,514 0,440 0,369 0,300 0,232 0,165 0,099 0,033
$\boldsymbol{n}$	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
1 $\overline{\mathbf{c}}$ 3 4 5 6 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	2,151 1,741 1,504 1,330 1,188 1,067 0,960 0,863 0,774 0,690 0,611 0,536 0,463 0,393 0,325 0,258 0,193 0,128 0,064 0,000	2,161 1,753 1,517 1,344 1,203 1,083 0,977 0,881 0,793 0,710 0,632 0,557 0,486 0,417 0,350 0,284 0,220 0,156 0,094 0,031	2,171 1,765 1,530 1,357 1,218 1,099 0,993 0,898 0,811 0,729 0,651 0,578 0,507 0,439 0,373 0,309 0,246 0,183 0,122 0,061 0,000	2,180 1,776 1,542 1,370 1,232 1,114 1,009 0,915 0,828 0,747 0,671 0,598 0,528 0,461 0,396 0,333 0,270 0,209 0,149 0,089 0,030	2,190 1,787 1,554 1,383 1,246 1,128 1,024 0,931 0,845 0,764 0,689 0,617 0,548 0,482 0,418 0,355 0,294 0,234 0,175 0,116 0,058 0,000	2,199 1,797 1,565 1,396 1,259 1,142 1,039 0,946 0,861 0,781 0,707 0,636 0,568 0,502 0,439 0,377 0,317 0,258 0,200 0,142 0,085 0,028	2,208 1,807 1,577 1,408 1,272 1,156 1,054 0,961 0,877 0,798 0,724 0,654 0,586 0,522 0,459 0,398 0,339 0,281 0,224 0,167 0,111 0,055 0,000	2,216 1,817 1,588 1,420 1,284 1,169 1,068 0,976 0,892 0,814 0,740 0,671 0,604 0,540 0,479 0,419 0,360 0,303 0,247 0,191 0,136 0,081 0,027	2,225 1,827 1,598 1,431 1,296 1,182 1,081 0,990 0,907 0,829 0,757 0,688 0,622 0,559 0,498 0,438 0,381 0,324 0,269 0,214 0,160 0,106 0,053 0,000	2,233 1,837 1,609 1,442 1,308 1,194 1,094 1,004 0,921 0,844 0,772 0,704 0,639 0,576 0,516 0,457 0,400 0,345 0,290 0,236 0,183 0,130 0,078 0,026	2,241 1,846 1,619 1,453 1,320 1,207 1,107 1,017 0,935 0,859 0,787 0,720 0,655 0,593 0,534 0,476 0,419 0,364 0,310 0,257 0,205 0,153 0,102 0,051 0,000	2,249 1,855 1,629 1,464 1,331 1,218 1,119 1,030 0,949 0,873 0,802 0,735 0,671 0,610 0,551 0,494 0,438 0,384 0,330 0,278 0,227 0,176 0,125 0,075 0,025

TABLE V - Expected values of normal order statistics,  $\xi(i|n)$ 

1) For  $n = 2$ ,  $\xi(1|2) = 0,564$ .

Taken from H.L. Harter, Order Statistics and their Use in Testing and Estimations, Volume 2.

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\math$  $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{$ 

# This page intentionally left blank

 $\sim$  3  $^{-1}$ 

This page intentionally left blank

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  ,  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$