

failed to disprove H_0 . Note that this is a one-tailed test, as the question is whether the proportion is lower than it should be. With the usual assumptions, the null hypothesis would only be rejected if $\alpha = 0.05$ if all seven results give minimum signs when compared with the median value: this outcome has a probability, of only, $(1/2)^7 = 1/128$. This method is called the sign test, and it can be extended to other situations, such as comparing two sets of paired results, or studying a possible trend in a sequence of results.

Another simple test in many applications is called the Quick Test (after John W. Tukey, a major figure in non-parametric statistics and initial data analysis) or the Tail Count Test, the latter being a good description of its operation. It is used to compare two independent data sets, which need not be of the same size. Suppose the observations of the level of a atmospheric NO ($\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$) at a roadside site: 128, 121, 117, 125, 131 and 119. At a nearby, off-road site we make six more measurements using the same analytical method, obtaining the results 120, 108, 109, 112, 114 and 110 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$. Is there any evidence that the NO level is lower at the second site than at the first? These two sets of results could be compared using a (one-tailed) test, but the Tukey approach is simpler. We simply count the number of results in the first data set that are higher than all the values in the second set (here are 4 of them), and the number of values in the second set that are lower than all those in the first set (5 of them). If either of these counts is zero, the test ends at once with the null hypothesis (here, that moving away from the road does not affect the NO level) being accepted. Otherwise the two counts are added together to provide the test statistic T ($= 9$ here), and this is compared with the critical value. For a one-tailed test $\alpha = 0.05$, T must be greater than or equal to 6 if H_0 is to be rejected. So H_0 can be rejected here; the NO level at the off-road site does seem to be lower. The merit of the Tukey method is that the total number of measurements is no more than ~ 20 , and if the two sample sizes are not greatly different (conditions often met in analytical practice), the critical T values are independent of sample size! For the rejection of the null hypothesis in a one-tailed test the value of T must be $\geq 6, 7, 10$ and 14 at $\alpha = 0.05, 0.025, 0.005$, and 0.0005 respectively. For a two-tailed test the corresponding critical values of T are 7, 8, 11 and 15 respectively. This remarkable feature of the method means that it can be carried out using minimal arithmetic only.

What is it like?

Many non-parametric methods have been developed, including tests analogous to the familiar t - and F -tests, analysis of variance, and calibration and regression methods, but despite their practical merits only a few have found favour in the analytical sciences. One possible reason for this is that most non-parametric methods need a sample of at least 6 measurements. Another reason is the growing popularity of robust methods (AMCTB 6, 50), which are well suited to the common situation where the error distribution is bimodal but not very different from Gaussian. Furthermore it is evident that in the case of

examples above the fundamental content of the data is not used. In the sign test only the signs of the differences are considered, not their magnitude; and in the Tukey method the test statistic is again a count rather than an accurate reflection of the numerical results. We might therefore expect that non-parametric methods would be poorer than methods using