A11102 903123

REFERENCE

NBS PUBLICATIONS

NAT'L INST OF STANDARDS & TECH R.I.C.
A11102903123
Ku, Harry H/Statistical concepts in metr
QC100 .U57 NO.747 1988 V1988 C.1 NBS-PUB

T OF COMMERCE
Standards

NBS Special Publication 747

Statistical Concepts in Metrology—With a Postscript on Statistical Graphics

Harry H. Ku

NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS National Bureau of Standards NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS
NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS NBS

QC
100
.U57
No.747
1988

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

The National Bureau of Standards[1] was established by an act of Congress on March 3, 1901. The Bureau's overall goal is to strengthen and advance the Nation's science and technology and facilitate their effective application for public benefit. To this end, the Bureau conducts research to assure international competitiveness and leadership of U.S. industry, science and technology. NBS work involves development and transfer of measurements, standards and related science and technology, in support of continually improving U.S. productivity, product quality and reliability, innovation and underlying science and engineering. The Bureau's technical work is performed by the National Measurement Laboratory, the National Engineering Laboratory, the Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology, and the Institute for Materials Science and Engineering.

The National Measurement Laboratory

Provides the national system of physical and chemical measurement; coordinates the system with measurement systems of other nations and furnishes essential services leading to accurate and uniform physical and chemical measurement throughout the Nation's scientific community, industry, and commerce; provides advisory and research services to other Government agencies; conducts physical and chemical research; develops, produces, and distributes Standard Reference Materials; provides calibration services; and manages the National Standard Reference Data System. The Laboratory consists of the following centers:

- Basic Standards[2]
- Radiation Research
- Chemical Physics
- Analytical Chemistry

The National Engineering Laboratory

Provides technology and technical services to the public and private sectors to address national needs and to solve national problems; conducts research in engineering and applied science in support of these efforts; builds and maintains competence in the necessary disciplines required to carry out this research and technical service; develops engineering data and measurement capabilities; provides engineering measurement traceability services; develops test methods and proposes engineering standards and code changes; develops and proposes new engineering practices; and develops and improves mechanisms to transfer results of its research to the ultimate user. The Laboratory consists of the following centers:

- Computing and Applied Mathematics
- Electronics and Electrical Engineering[2]
- Manufacturing Engineering
- Building Technology
- Fire Research
- Chemical Engineering[3]

The Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology

Conducts research and provides scientific and technical services to aid Federal agencies in the selection, acquisition, application, and use of computer technology to improve effectiveness and economy in Government operations in accordance with Public Law 89-306 (40 U.S.C. 759), relevant Executive Orders, and other directives; carries out this mission by managing the Federal Information Processing Standards Program, developing Federal ADP standards guidelines, and managing Federal participation in ADP voluntary standardization activities; provides scientific and technological advisory services and assistance to Federal agencies; and provides the technical foundation for computer-related policies of the Federal Government. The Institute consists of the following divisions:

- Information Systems Engineering
- Systems and Software Technology
- Computer Security
- Systems and Network Architecture
- Advanced Systems

The Institute for Materials Science and Engineering

Conducts research and provides measurements, data, standards, reference materials, quantitative understanding and other technical information fundamental to the processing, structure, properties and performance of materials; addresses the scientific basis for new advanced materials technologies; plans research around cross-cutting scientific themes such as nondestructive evaluation and phase diagram development; oversees Bureau-wide technical programs in nuclear reactor radiation research and nondestructive evaluation; and broadly disseminates generic technical information resulting from its programs. The Institute consists of the following divisions:

- Ceramics
- Fracture and Deformation[3]
- Polymers
- Metallurgy
- Reactor Radiation

[1] Headquarters and Laboratories at Gaithersburg, MD, unless otherwise noted; mailing address Gaithersburg, MD 20899.
[2] Some divisions within the center are located at Boulder, CO 80303.
[3] Located at Boulder, CO, with some elements at Gaithersburg, MD.

NBS
QC100
.U57
no.747
1988

NBS Special Publication 747

Statistical Concepts in Metrology – With a Postscript on Statistical Graphics

Harry H. Ku

Statistical Engineering Division
Center for Computing and Applied Mathematics
National Engineering Laboratory
National Bureau of Standards
Gaithersburg, MD 20899

August 1988



U.S. Department of Commerce
C. William Verity, Secretary

National Bureau of Standards
Ernest Ambler, Director

Library of Congress
Catalog Card Number: 88-600569
National Bureau of Standards
Special Publication 747
Natl. Bur. Stand. (U.S.),
Spec. Publ. 747,
48 pages (Aug. 1988)
CODEN: XNBSAV

U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington: 1988

For sale by the Superintendent
of Documents,
U.S. Government Printing Office,
Washington, DC 20402

Contents

Statistical Concepts of a Measurement Process 1
Arithmetic Numbers and Measurement Numbers 1
Computation and Reporting of Results 2
Properties of Measurement Numbers 3
The Limiting Mean 3
Range, Variance, and Standard Deviation 4
Population and the Frequency Curve 4
The Normal Distribution 6
Estimates of Population Characteristics 8
Interpretation and Computation of Confidence Interval and Limits 9
Precision and Accuracy 11
Index of Precision 11
Interpretation of Precision 12
Accuracy 13

Statistical Analysis of Measurement Data 13
Algebra for the Manipulation of Limiting Means and Variances 14
Basic Formulas 14
Propagation of Error Formulas 16
Pooling Estimates of Variances 18
Component of Variance Between Groups 19
Comparison of Means and Variances 20
Comparison of a Mean with a Standard Value 20
Comparison Among Two or More Means 21
Comparison of Variances or Ranges 23
Control Charts Technique for Maintaining Stability and Precision 24
Control Chart for Averages 24
Control Chart for Standard Deviations 25
Linear Relationship and Fitting of Constants by Least Squares 28
References 29

Postscript on Statistical Graphics 31
Plots for Summary and Display of Data 31
Stem and Leaf 31
Box Plot 33
Plots for Checking on Models and Assumptions 35
Residuals 36
Adequacy of Model 36
Testing of Underlying Assumptions 38
Stability of a Measurement Sequence 40
Concluding Remarks 42
References 42

List of Figures

2-1	A symmetrical distribution	5
2-2	(A) The uniform distribution. (B) The log-normal distribution.	5
2-3	Uniform and normal distribution of individual measurements having the same mean and standard deviation, and the corresponding distribution(s) of arithmetic means of four independent measurements	7
2-4	Computed 90% confidence intervals for 100 samples of size 4 drawn at random from a normal population with $m = 10$, $\sigma = 1$	11
2-5	Control chart on $\bar{x}$ for NB'10 gram	25
2-6	Control chart on s for the calibration of standard cells	26
1	Stem and leaf plot. 48 values of isotopic ratios, bromine (79/81)	32
2	Box plot of isotopic ratio, bromine (79/91)	34
3	Magnesium content of specimens taken	35
4	Plot of deflection vs load	37
5	Plot of residuals after linear fit	37
6	Plot of residuals after quadratic fit	38
7	Plot of residuals after linear fit. Measured depth of weld defects vs true depth	39
8	Normal probability plot of residuals after quadratic fit	39
9	Differences of linewidth measurements from NBS values. Measurements on day 5 inconsistent with others—Lab A	40
10	Trend with increasing linewidths—Lab B	41
11	Significant isolated outliers—Lab C	41
12	Measurements (% reg) on the power standard at 1-year and 3-month intervals	42

List of Tables

2-1	Area under normal curve between $m - k\sigma$ and $m + k\sigma$	6
2-2	A brief table of values of t	10
2-3	Propagation of error formulas for some simple functions	17
2-4	Estimate of σ from the range	19
2-5	Computation of confidence limits for observed corrections, NB'10 gm	21
2-6	Calibration data for six standard cells	27
1	Y—Ratios 79/81 for reference sample	32

Statistical Concepts in Metrology—With a Postscript on Statistical Graphics

Harry H. Ku

Statistical Engineering Division, National Bureau of Standards, Gaithersburg, MD 20899

"Statistical Concepts in Metrology" was originally written as Chapter 2 for the Handbook of Industrial Metrology published by the American Society of Tool and Manufacturing Engineers, 1967. It was reprinted as one of 40 papers in NBS Special Publication 300, Volume I, Precision Measurement and Calibration; Statistical Concepts and Procedures, 1969. Since then this chapter has been used as basic text in statistics in Bureau-sponsored courses and seminars, including those for Electricity, Electronics, and Analytical Chemistry.

While concepts and techniques introduced in the original chapter remain valid and appropriate, some additions on recent development of graphical methods for the treatment of data would be useful. Graphical methods can be used effectively to "explore" information in data sets prior to the application of classical statistical procedures. For this reason additional sections on statistical graphics are added as a postscript.

Key words: graphics; measurement; metrology; plots; statistics; uncertainty.

STATISTICAL CONCEPTS OF A MEASUREMENT PROCESS

Arithmetic Numbers and Measurement Numbers

In metrological work, digital numbers are used for different purposes and consequently these numbers have different interpretations. It is therefore important to differentiate the two types of numbers which will be encountered.

Arithmetic numbers are exact numbers. 3, $\sqrt{2}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, e, or π are all exact numbers by definition, although in expressing some of these numbers in digital form, approximation may have to be used. Thus, π may be written as 3.14 or 3.1416, depending on our judgment of which is the proper one to use from the combined point of view of accuracy and convenience. By the

usual rules of rounding, the approximations do not differ from the exact values by more than ± 0.5 units of the last recorded digit. The accuracy of the result can always be extended if necessary.

Measurement numbers, on the other hand, are not approximations to exact numbers, but numbers obtained by operation under approximately the same conditions. For example, three measurements on the diameter of a steel shaft with a micrometer may yield the following results:

No.	*Diameter in cm*	*General notation*
1	0.396	x_1
2	0.392	x_2
3	0.401	x_3
	Sum 1.189	$\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i$
	Average 0.3963	$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1}^{n} x_i$
	Range 0.009	$R = x_{\max} - x_{\min}$

There is no rounding off here. The last digit in the measured value depends on the instrument used and our ability to read it. If we had used a coarser instrument, we might have obtained 0.4, 0.4, and 0.4; if a finer instrument, we might have been able to record to the fifth digit after the decimal point. In all cases, however, the last digit given certainly does not imply that the measured value differs from the diameter D by less than ± 0.5 unit of the last digit.

Thus we see that measurement numbers differ by their very nature from arithmetic numbers. In fact, the phrase "significant figures" has little meaning in the manipulation of numbers resulting from measurements. Reflection on the simple example above will help to convince one of this fact.

Computation and Reporting of Results. By experience, the metrologist can usually select an instrument to give him results adequate for his needs, as illustrated in the example above. Unfortunately, in the process of computation, both arithmetic numbers and measurement numbers are present, and frequently confusion reigns over the number of digits to be kept in successive arithmetic operations.

No general rule can be given for all types of arithmetic operations. If the instrument is well-chosen, severe rounding would result in loss of information. One suggestion, therefore, is to treat all measurement numbers as exact numbers in the operations and to round off the final result only. Another recommended procedure is to carry two or three extra figures throughout the computation, and then to round off the final reported value to an appropriate number of digits.

The "appropriate" number of digits to be retained in the final result depends on the "uncertainties" attached to this reported value. The term "uncertainty" will be treated later under "Precision and Accuracy"; our only concern here is the number of digits in the expression for uncertainty.

A recommended rule is that the uncertainty should be stated to no more than two significant figures, and the reported value itself should be stated

to the last place affected by the qualification given by the uncertainty statement. An example is:

> "The apparent mass correction for the nominal 10 g weight is +0.0420 mg with an overall uncertainty of ±0.0087 mg using three standard deviations as a limit to the effect of random errors of measurement, the magnitude of systematic errors from known sources being negligible."

The sentence form is preferred since then the burden is on the reporter to specify exactly the meaning of the term uncertainty, and to spell out its components. Abbreviated forms such as $a \pm b$, where a is the reported value and b a measure of uncertainty in some vague sense, should always be avoided.

Properties of Measurement Numbers

The study of the properties of measurement numbers, or the Theory of Errors, formally began with Thomas Simpson more than two hundred years ago, and attained its full development in the hands of Laplace and Gauss. In the next subsections some of the important properties of measurement numbers will be discussed and summarized, thus providing a basis for the statistical treatment and analysis of these numbers in the following major section.

The Limiting Mean. As shown in the micrometer example above, the results of *repeated measurements of a single physical quantity under essentially the same conditions* yield a set of measurement numbers. Each member of this set is an estimate of the quantity being measured, and has equal claims on its value. By convention, the numerical values of these n measurements are denoted by $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$, the arithmetic mean by $\bar{x}$, and the range by R, i.e., the difference between the largest value and the smallest value obtained in the n measurements.

If the results of measurements are to make any sense for the purpose at hand, we must require these numbers, though different, to behave as a group in a certain predictable manner. Experience has shown that this is indeed the case under the conditions stated in italics above. In fact, let us adopt as the postulate of measurement a statement due to N. Ernest Dorsey (reference 2)*.

> "The mean of a family of measurements—of a number of measurements for a given quantity carried out by the same apparatus, procedure, and observer—approaches a definite value as the number of measurements is indefinitely increased. Otherwise, they could not properly be called measurements of a given quantity. In the theory of errors, this limiting mean is frequently called the 'true' value, although it bears no necessary relation to the true quaesitum, to the actual value of the quantity that the observer desires to measure. This has often confused the unwary. Let us call it the limiting mean."

Thus, according to this postulate, there exists a limiting mean m to which $\bar{x}$ approaches as the number of measurements increases indefinitely, or, in symbols $\bar{x} \rightarrow m$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, if the true value is τ, there is usually a difference between m and τ, or $\Delta = m - \tau$, where Δ is defined as the bias or systematic error of the measurements.

*References are listed at the end of this chapter.

In practice, however, we will run into difficulties. The value of m cannot be obtained since one cannot make an infinite number of measurements. Even for a large number of measurements, the conditions will not remain constant, since changes occur from hour to hour, and from day to day. The value of τ is unknown and usually unknowable, hence also the bias. Nevertheless, this seemingly simple postulate does provide a sound foundation to build on toward a mathematical model, from which estimates can be made and inference drawn, as will be seen later on.

Range, Variance, and Standard Deviation. The range of n measurements, on the other hand, does not enjoy this desirable property of the arithmetic mean. With one more measurement, the range may increase but cannot decrease. Since only the largest and the smallest numbers enter into its calculation, obviously the additional information provided by the measurements in between is lost. It will be desirable to look for another measure of the dispersion (spread, or scattering) of our measurements which will utilize each measurement made with equal weight, and which will approach a definite number as the number of measurements is indefinitely increased.

A number of such measures can be constructed; the most frequently used are the variance and the standard deviation. The choice of the variance as the measure of dispersion is based upon its mathematical convenience and maneuverability Variance is defined as the value approached by the average of the sum of squares of the deviations of individual measurements from the limiting mean as the number of measurements is indefinitely increased, or in symbols:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum (x_i - m)^2 \longrightarrow \sigma^2 = \text{variance, as } n \longrightarrow \infty$$

The positive square root of the variance, σ, is called the standard deviation (of a single measurement); the standard deviation is of the same dimensionality as the limiting mean.

There are other measures of dispersion, such as average deviation and probable error. The relationships between these measures and the standard deviation can be found in reference 1.

Population and the Frequency Curve. We shall call the limiting mean m the location parameter and the standard deviation σ the scale parameter of the population of measurement numbers generated by a particular measurement process. By population is meant the conceptually infinite number of measurements that can be generated. The two numbers m and σ describe this population of measurements to a large extent, and specify it completely in one important special case.

Our model of a measurement process consists then of a defined population of measurement numbers with a limiting mean m and a standard deviation σ. The result of a single measurement X^* can take randomly any of the values belonging to this population. The probability that a particular measurement yields a value of X which is less than or equal to x' is the proportion of the population that is less than or equal to x', in symbols

$$P\{X \leq x'\} = \text{proportion of population less than or equal to } x'$$

*Convention is followed in using the capital X to represent the value that might be produced by employing the measurement process to obtain a measurement (i.e., a random variable), and the lower case x to represent a particular value of X observed.

Similar statements can be made for the probability that X will be greater than or equal to x'', or for X between x' and x'' as follows: $P\{X \geq x''\}$, or $P\{x' \leq X \leq x''\}$.

For a measurement process that yields numbers on a continuous scale, the distribution of values of X for the population can be represented by a smooth curve, for example, curve C in Fig. 2-1. C is called a frequency curve. The area between C and the abscissa bounded by any two values (x_1 and x_2) is the proportion of the population that takes values between the two values, or the probability that X will assume values between x_1 and x_2. For example, the probability that $X \leq x'$, can be represented by the shaded area to the left of x'; the total area between the frequency curve and the abscissa being one by definition.

Note that the shape of C is not determined by m and σ alone. Any curve C' enclosing an area of unity with the abscissa defines the distribution of a particular population. Two examples, the uniform distribution and the log-normal distribution are given in Figs. 2-2A and 2-2B. These and other distributions are useful in describing certain populations.




Fig. 2-1. A symmetrical distribution.




Fig. 2-2. (A) The uniform distribution (B) The log-normal distribution.

The Normal Distribution. For data generated by a measurement process, the following properties are usually observed:

1. The results spread roughly symmetrically about a central value.
2. Small deviations from this central value are more frequently found than large deviations.

A measurement process having these two properties would generate a frequency curve similar to that shown in Fig. 2-1 which is symmetrical and bunched together about m. The study of a particular theoretical representation of a frequency curve of this type leads to the celebrated bell-shaped normal curve (Gauss error curve.). Measurements having such a normal frequency curve are said to be normally distributed, or distributed in accordance with the normal law of error.

The normal curve can be represented exactly by the mathematical expression

$$y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sigma} e^{-1/2[(x-m)^2/\sigma^2]} \tag{2-0}$$

where y is the ordinate and x the abscissa and $e \doteq 2.71828$ is the base of natural logarithms.

Some of the important features of the normal curve are:

1. It is symmetrical about m.
2. The area under the curve is one, as required.
3. If σ is used as unit on the abscissa, then the area under the curve between constant multiples of σ can be computed from tabulated values of the normal distribution. In particular, areas under the curve for some useful intervals between $m - k\sigma$ and $m + k\sigma$ are given in Table 2-1. Thus about two-thirds of the area lies within one σ of m, more than 95 percent within 2σ of m, and less than 0.3 percent beyond 3σ from m.

Table 2-1. Area under normal curve between $m - k\sigma$ and $m + k\sigma$

k:	0.6745	1.00	1.96	2.00	2.58	3.00
Percent area under curve (approx.):	50.0	68.3	95.0	95.5	99.0	99.7

4. From Eq. (2-0), it is evident that the frequency curve is completely determined by the two parameters m and σ.

The normal distribution has been studied intensively during the past century. Consequently, if the measurements follow a normal distribution, we can say a great deal about the measurement process. The question remains: How do we know that this is so from the limited number of repeated measurements on hand?

The answer is that we don't! However, in most instances the metrologist may be willing

1. to assume that the measurement process generates numbers that follow a normal distribution approximately, and act as if this were so,
2. to rely on the so-called Central Limit Theorem, one version of which is the following*: "If a population has a finite variance σ^2 and mean m, then the distribution of the sample mean (of n independent

*From Chapter 7, *Introduction to the Theory of Statistics*, by A. M. Mood, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1950.

measurements) approaches the normal distribution with variance σ^2/n and mean m as the sample size n increases." This remarkable and powerful theorem is indeed tailored for measurement processes. First, every measurement process must by definition have a finite mean and variance. Second, the sample mean $\bar{x}$ is the quantity of interest which, according to the theorem, will be approximately normally distributed for large sample sizes. Third, the measure of dispersion, i.e., the standard deviation of the sample mean, is reduced by a factor of $1/\sqrt{n}$! This last statement is true in general for all measurement processes in which the measurements are "independent" and for all n. It is therefore not a consequence of the Central Limit Theorem. The theorem guarantees, however, that the distribution of sample means of *independent* measurements will be *approximately* normal with the specified limiting mean and standard deviation $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$ *for large n.*

In fact, for a measurement process with a frequency curve that is symmetrical about the mean, and with small deviations from the mean as compared to the magnitude of the quantity measured, the normal approximation to the distribution of $\bar{x}$ becomes very good even for n as small as 3 or 4. Figure 2-3 shows the uniform and normal distribution having the same mean and standard deviation. The peaked curve is actually two curves, representing the distribution of arithmetic means of four independent measurements from the respective distributions. These curves are indistinguishable to this scale.




Fig. 2-3. Uniform and normal distribution of individual measurements having the same mean and standard deviation, and the corresponding distribution(s) of arithmetic means of four independent measurements.

A formal definition of the concept of "independence" is out of the scope here. Intuitively, we may say that n normally distributed measurements are independent if these measurements are not correlated or associated in any

way. Thus, a sequence of measurements showing a trend or pattern are not independent measurements.

There are many ways by which dependence or correlation creeps into a set of measurement data; several of the common causes are the following:

1. Measurements are correlated through a factor that has not been considered, or has been considered to be of no appreciable effect on the results.
2. A standard correction constant has been used for a factor, e.g., temperature, but the constant may overcorrect or undercorrect for particular samples.
3. Measurements are correlated through time of the day, between days, weeks, or seasons.
4. Measurements are correlated through rejection of valid data, when the rejection is based on the size of the number in relation to others of the group.

The traditional way of plotting the data in the sequence they are taken, or in some rational grouping, is perhaps still the most effective way of detecting trends or correlation.

Estimates of Population Characteristics. In the above section it is shown that the limiting mean m and the variance σ^2 completely specify a measurement process that follows the normal distribution. In practice, m and σ^2 are not known and cannot be computed from a finite number of measurements. This leads to the use of the sample mean $\bar{x}$ as an estimate of the limiting mean m and s^2, the square of the computed standard deviation of the sample, as an estimate of the variance. The standard deviation of the average of n measurements, $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$, is sometimes referred to as the standard error of the mean, and is estimated by $s/\sqrt{n}$.

We note that the making of n independent measurements is equivalent to drawing a sample of size n at random from the population of measurements. Two concepts are of importance here:

1. The measurement process is established and under control, meaning that the limiting mean and the standard deviation do possess definite values which will not change over a reasonable period of time.
2. The measurements are randomly drawn from this population, implying that the values are of equal weights, and there is no prejudice in the method of selection. Suppose out of three measurements the one which is far apart from the other two is rejected, then the result will not be a random sample.

For a random sample we can say that $\bar{x}$ is an unbiased estimate of m, and s^2 is an unbiased estimate of σ^2, i.e., the limiting mean of $\bar{x}$ is equal to m and of s^2 to σ^2, where

$$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i$$

and

$$s^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \left[\sum x_i^2 - \frac{(\sum x_i)^2}{n} \right]$$

In addition, we define

$$s = \sqrt{s^2} = \text{computed standard deviation}$$

Examples of numerical calculations of $\bar{x}$ and s^2 and s are shown in Tables 2-5 and 2-6.

Interpretation and Computation of Confidence Interval and Limits

By making k sets of n measurements each, we can compute and arrange k, $\bar{x}$'s, and s's in a tabular form as follows:

Set	*Sample mean*	*Sample standard deviation*
1	$\bar{x}_1$	s_1
2	$\bar{x}_2$	s_2
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
j	$\bar{x}_j$	s_j
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
k	$\bar{x}_k$	s_k

In the array of $\bar{x}$'s, no two will be likely to have exactly the same value. From the Central Limit Theorem it can be deduced that the $\bar{x}$'s will be approximately normally distributed with standard deviation $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$. The frequency curve of $\bar{x}$ will be centered about the limiting mean m and will have the scale factor $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$. In other words, $\bar{x} - m$ will be centered about zero, and the quantity

$$z = \frac{\bar{x} - m}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}$$

has the properties of a single observation from the "standardized" normal distribution which has a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one.

From tabulated values of the standardized normal distribution it is known that 95 percent of z values will be bounded between -1.96 and $+1.96$. Hence the statement

$$-1.96 < \frac{\bar{x} - m}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} < +1.96$$

or its equivalent,

$$\bar{x} - 1.96\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} < m < \bar{x} + 1.96\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$$

will be correct 95 percent of the time in the long run. The interval $\bar{x} - 1.96(\sigma/\sqrt{n})$ to $\bar{x} + 1.96(\sigma/\sqrt{n})$ is called a *confidence interval* for m. The probability that the confidence interval will cover the limiting mean, 0.95 in this case, is called the confidence level or confidence coefficient. The values of the end points of a confidence interval are called confidence limits. It is to be borne in mind that $\bar{x}$ will fluctuate from set to set, and the interval calculated for a particular $\bar{x}_j$ may or may not cover m.

In the above discussion we have selected a two-sided interval symmetrical about $\bar{x}$. For such intervals the confidence coefficient is usually denoted by $1 - \alpha$, where $\alpha/2$ is the percent of the area under the frequency curve of z that is cut off from each tail.

In most cases, σ is not known and an estimate of σ is computed from the same set of measurements we use to calculate $\bar{x}$. Nevertheless, let us form a quantity similar to z, which is

$$t = \frac{\bar{x} - m}{s/\sqrt{n}}$$

and if we know the distribution of t, we could make the same type of statement as before. In fact the distribution of t is known for the case of normally distributed measurements.

The distribution of t was obtained mathematically by William S. Gosset under the pen name of "Student," hence the distribution of t is called the Student's distribution. In the expression for t, both $\bar{x}$ and s fluctuate from set to set of measurements. Intuitively we will expect the value of t to be larger than that of z for a statement with the same probability of being correct. This is indeed the case. The values of t are listed in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2. A brief table of values of t

Degrees of freedom	Confidence Level: $1 - \alpha$			
ν	0.500	0.900	0.950	0.990
1	1.000	6.314	12.706	63.657
2	.816	2.920	4.303	9.925
3	.765	2.353	3.182	5.841
4	.741	2.132	2.776	4.604
5	.727	2.015	2.571	4.032
6	.718	1.943	2.447	3.707
7	.711	1.895	2.365	3.499
10	.700	1.812	2.228	3.169
15	.691	1.753	2.131	2.947
20	.687	1.725	2.086	2.845
30	.683	1.697	2.042	2.750
60	.679	1.671	2.000	2.660
∞	.674	1.645	1.960	2.576

*Adapted from *Biometrika Tables for Statisticians*, Vol. I, edited by E. S. Pearson and H. O. Hartley, The University Press, Cambridge, 1958.

To find a value for t, we need to know the "degrees of freedom" (ν) associated with the computed standard deviation s. Since $\bar{x}$ is calculated from the same n numbers and has a fixed value, the nth value of x_i is completely determined by $\bar{x}$ and the other $(n - 1)x$ values. Hence the degrees of freedom here are $n - 1$.

Having the table for the distribution of t, and using the same reasoning as before, we can make the statement that

$$\bar{x} - t\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} < m < \bar{x} + t\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}$$

and our statement will be correct $100(1 - \alpha)$ percent of the time in the long run. The value of t depends on the degrees of freedom ν and the probability level. From the table, we get for a confidence level of 0.95, the following lower and upper confidence limits:

ν	$L_l = \bar{x} - t(s/\sqrt{n})$	$L_u = \bar{x} + t(s/\sqrt{n})$
1	$\bar{x} - 12.706(s/\sqrt{n})$	$\bar{x} + 12.706(s/\sqrt{n})$
2	$\bar{x} - 4.303(s/\sqrt{n})$	$\bar{x} + 4.303(s/\sqrt{n})$
3	$\bar{x} - 3.182(s/\sqrt{n})$	$\bar{x} + 3.182(s/\sqrt{n})$

The value of t for $\nu = \infty$ is 1.96, the same as for the case of known σ. Notice that very little can be said about m with two measurements. However, for n larger than 2, the interval predicted to contain m narrows down steadily, due to both the smaller value of t and the divisor $\sqrt{n}$.

It is probably worthwhile to emphasize again that each particular confidence interval computed as a result of n measurements will either include m or fail to include m. The probability statement refers to the fact that if we make a long series of sets of n measurements, and if we compute a confidence interval for m from each set by the prescribed method, we would expect 95 percent of such intervals to include m.




Fig. 2-4. Computed 90% confidence intervals for 100 samples of size 4 drawn at random from a normal population with $m = 10$, $\sigma = 1$.

Figure 2-4 shows the 90 percent confidence intervals ($P = 0.90$) computed from 100 samples of $n = 4$ from a normal population with $m = 10$, and $\sigma = 1$. Three interesting features are to be noted:

1. The number of intervals that include m actually turns out to be 90, the expected number.
2. The surprising variation of the sizes of these intervals.
3. The closeness of the mid-points of these intervals to the line for the mean does not seem to be related to the spread. In samples No. 2 and No. 3, the four values must have been very close together, but both of these intervals failed to include the line for the mean.

From the widths of computed confidence intervals, one may get an intuitive feeling whether the number of measurements n is reasonable and sufficient for the purpose on hand. It is true that, even for small n, the confidence intervals will cover the limiting mean with the specified probability, yet the limits may be so far apart as to be of no practical significance. For detecting a specified magnitude of interest, e.g., the difference between two means, the approximate number of measurements required can be solved by equating the half-width of the confidence interval to this difference and solving for n, using σ when known, or using s by trial and error if σ is not known. Tables of sample sizes required for certain prescribed conditions are given in reference 4.

Precision and Accuracy

Index of Precision. Since σ is a measure of the spread of the frequency curve about the limiting mean, σ may be defined as an index of precision. Thus a measurement process with a standard deviation σ_1 is said to be more precise than another with a standard deviation σ_2 if σ_1 is smaller than σ_2. (In fact, σ is really a measure of imprecision since the imprecision is directly proportional to σ.)

Consider the means of sets of n independent measurements as a new derived measurement process. The standard deviation of the new process is $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$. It is therefore possible to derive from a less precise measurement process a new process which has a standard deviation equal to that of a more precise process. This is accomplished by making more measurements.

Suppose $m_1 = m_2$, but $\sigma_1 = 2\sigma_2$. Then for a derived process to have $\sigma_1' = \sigma_2$, we need

$$\sigma_1' = \frac{\sigma_1}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{2\sigma_2}{\sqrt{4}}$$

or we need to use the average of four measurements as a single measurement. Thus for a required degree of precision, the number of measurements, n_1 and n_2, needed for measurement processes I and II is proportional to the squares of their respective standard deviations (variances), or in symbols

$$\frac{n_1}{n_2} = \frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_2^2}$$

If σ is not known, and the best estimate we have of σ is a computed standard deviation s based on n measurements, then s could be used as an estimate of the index of precision. The value of s, however, may vary considerably from sample to sample in the case of a small number of measurements as was shown in Fig. 2-4, where the lengths of the intervals are constant multiples of s computed from the samples. The number n or the degrees of freedom ν must be considered along with s in indicating how reliable an estimate s is of σ. In what follows, whenever the terms standard deviation about the limiting mean (σ), or standard error of the mean ($\sigma_{\bar{x}}$), are used, the respective estimates s and $s/\sqrt{n}$ may be substituted, by taking into consideration the above reservation.

In metrology or calibration work, the precision of the reported value is an integral part of the result. In fact, precision is the main criterion by which the quality of the work is judged. Hence, the laboratory reporting the value must be prepared to give evidence of the precision claimed. Obviously an estimate of the standard deviation of the measurement process based only on a small number of measurements cannot be considered as convincing evidence. By the use of the control chart method for standard deviation and by the calibration of one's own standard at frequent intervals, as subsequently described, the laboratory may eventually claim that the standard deviation is in fact known and the measurement process is stable, with readily available evidence to support these claims.

Interpretation of Precision. Since a measurement process generates numbers as the results of repeated measurements of a single physical quantity under essentially the same conditions, the method and procedure in obtaining these numbers must be specified in detail. However, no amount of detail would cover all the contingencies that may arise, or cover all the factors that may affect the results of measurement. Thus a single operator in a single day with a single instrument may generate a process with a precision index measured by σ. Many operators measuring the same quantity over a period of time with a number of instruments will yield a precision index measured by σ'. Logically σ' must be larger than σ, and in practice it is usually considerably larger. Consequently, modifiers of the words "precision" are recommended by ASTM* to qualify in an unambiguous manner what

*"Use of the Terms Precision and Accuracy as Applied to the Measurement of a Property of a Material," ASTM Designation, E177-61T, 1961.

is meant. Examples are "single-operator-machine," "multi-laboratory," "single-operator-day," etc. The same publication warns against the use of the terms "repeatability" and "reproducibility" if the interpretation of these terms is not clear from the context.

The standard deviation σ or the standard error $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$ can be considered as a yardstick with which we can gage the difference between two results obtained as measurements of the same physical quantity. If our interest is to compare the results of one operator against another, the single-operator precision is probably appropriate, and if the two results differ by an amount considered to be large as measured by the standard errors, we may conclude that the evidence is predominantly against the two results being truly equal. In comparing the results of two laboratories, the single-operator precision is obviously an inadequate measure to use, since the precision of each laboratory must include factors such as multi-operator-day-instruments.

Hence the selection of an index of precision depends strongly on the purposes for which the results are to be used or might be used. It is common experience that three measurements made within the hour are closer together than three measurements made on, say, three separate days. However, an index of precision based on the former is generally not a justifiable indicator of the quality of the reported value. For a thorough discussion on the *realistic* evaluation of precision see Section 4 of reference 2.

Accuracy. The term "accuracy" usually denotes in some sense the closeness of the measured values to the true value, taking into consideration both precision and bias. Bias, defined as the difference between the limiting mean and the true value, is a constant, and does not behave in the same way as the index of precision, the standard deviation. In many instances, the possible sources of biases are known but their magnitudes and directions are not known. The overall bias is of necessity reported in terms of estimated bounds that reasonably include the combined effect of all the elemental biases. Since there are no accepted ways to estimate bounds for elemental biases, or to combine them, these should be reported and discussed in sufficient detail to enable others to use their own judgment on the matter.

It is recommended that an index of accuracy be expressed as a pair of numbers, one the credible bounds for bias, and the other an index of precision, usually in the form of a multiple of the standard deviation (or estimated standard deviation). The terms "uncertainty" and "limits of error" are sometimes used to express the sum of these two components, and their meanings are ambiguous unless the components are spelled out in detail.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF MEASUREMENT DATA

In the last section the basic concepts of a measurement process were given in an expository manner. These concepts, necessary to the statistical analysis to be presented in this section, are summarized and reviewed below. By making a measurement we obtain a number intended to express quantitatively a measure of "the property of a thing." Measurement numbers differ from ordinary arithmetic numbers, and the usual "significant figure" treatment is not appropriate. Repeated measurement of a single physical

quantity under essentially the same conditions generates a sequence of numbers $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$. A measurement process is established if this conceptually infinite sequence has a limiting mean m and a standard deviation σ.

For many measurement processes encountered in metrology, the sequence of numbers generated follows approximately the normal distribution, specified completely by the two quantities m and σ. Moreover, averages of n independent measurement numbers tend to be normally distributed with the limiting mean m and the standard deviation $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$, regardless of the distribution of the original numbers. Normally distributed measurements are independent if they are not correlated or associated in any way. A sequence of measurements showing a trend or pattern are not independent measurements. Since m and σ are usually not known, these quantities are estimated by calculating $\bar{x}$ and s from n measurements, where

$$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1}^{n} x_i$$

and

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})^2} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \left[\sum_{1}^{n} x_i^2 - \frac{(\sum x_i)^2}{n} \right]}$$

The distribution of the quantity $t = (\bar{x} - m)/(s/\sqrt{n})$ (for x normally distributed) is known. From the tabulated values of t (see Table 2-2), confidence intervals can be constructed to bracket m for a given confidence coefficient $1 - \alpha$ (probability of being correct in the long run).

The confidence limits are the end points of confidence intervals defined by

$$L_l = \bar{x} - t\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}$$

$$L_u = \bar{x} + t\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}$$

where the value of t is determined by two parameters, namely, the degrees of freedom v associated with s and the confidence coefficient $1 - \alpha$.

The width of a confidence interval gives an intuitive measure of the uncertainty of the evidence given by the data. Too wide an interval may merely indicate that more measurements need to be made for the objective desired.

Algebra for the Manipulation of Limiting Means and Variances

Basic Formulas. A number of basic formulas are extremely useful in dealing with a quantity which is a combination of other measured quantities.

1. Let m_x and m_y be the respective limiting means of two measured quantities X and Y, and a, b be constants, then

$$\left.\begin{aligned} m_{x+y} &= m_x + m_y \\ m_{x-y} &= m_x - m_y \\ m_{ax+by} &= am_x + bm_y \end{aligned}\right\} \quad (2\text{-}1)$$

2. If, in addition, X and Y are independent, then it is also true that

$$m_{xy} = m_x m_y \quad (2\text{-}2)$$

For paired values of X and Y, we can form the quantity Z, with

$$Z = (X - m_x)(Y - m_y) \quad (2\text{-}3)$$

Then by formula (2-2) for independent variables,

$$\begin{aligned} m_z &= m_{(x-m_x)}m_{(y-m_y)} \\ &= (m_x - m_x)(m_y - m_y) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus $m_z = 0$ when X and Y are independent.

3. The limiting mean of Z in (2-3) is defined as the covariance of X and Y and is usually denoted by cov (X, Y), or σ_{xy}. The covariance, similar to the variance, is estimated by

$$s_{xy} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y}) \tag{2-4}$$

Thus if X and Y are correlated in such a way that paired values are likely to be both higher or lower than their respective means, then s_{xy} tends to be positive. If a high x value is likely to be paired with a low y value, and vice versa, then s_{xy} tends to be negative. If X and Y are not correlated, s_{xy} tends to zero (for large n).

4. The correlation coefficient ρ is defined as:

$$\rho = \frac{\sigma_{xy}}{\sigma_x \sigma_y} \tag{2-5}$$

and is estimated by

$$r = \frac{s_{xy}}{s_x s_y} = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \sum (y_i - \bar{y})^2}} \tag{2-6}$$

Both ρ and r lie between -1 and $+1$.

5. Let σ_x^2 and σ_y^2 be the respective variances of X and Y, and σ_{xy} the covariance of X and Y, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{x+y}^2 &= \sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 + 2\sigma_{xy} \\ \sigma_{x-y}^2 &= \sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 - 2\sigma_{xy} \end{aligned} \tag{2-7}$$

If X and Y are independent, $\sigma_{xy} = 0$, then

$$\sigma_{x+y}^2 = \sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 = \sigma_{x-y}^2 \tag{2-8}$$

Since the variance of a constant is zero, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{ax+b}^2 &= a^2\sigma_x^2 \\ \sigma_{ax+by}^2 &= a^2\sigma_x^2 + b^2\sigma_y^2 + 2ab\sigma_{xy} \end{aligned} \tag{2-9}$$

In particular, if X and Y are independent and normally distributed, then $aX + bY$ is normally distributed with limiting mean $am_x + bm_y$ and variance $a^2\sigma_x^2 + b^2\sigma_y^2$.

For measurement situations in general, metrologists usually strive to get measurements that are independent, or can be assumed to be independent. The case when two quantities are dependent because both are functions of other measured quantities will be treated under propagation of error formulas (see Eq. 2-13).

6. Standard errors of the sample mean and the weighted means (of independent measurements) are special cases of the above. Since $\bar{x} = (1/n) \sum x_i$ and the x_i's are independent with variance σ_x^2, it follows, by (2-9), that

$$\sigma_{\bar{x}}^2 = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 \sigma_{x_1}^2 + \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 \sigma_{x_2}^2 + \cdots \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 \sigma_{x_n}^2 = \frac{\sigma_x^2}{n} \tag{2-10}$$

as previously stated.

If $\bar{x}_1$ is an average of k values, and $\bar{x}_2$ is an average of n values, then for the over-all average, $\bar{\bar{x}}$, it is logical to compute

$$\bar{\bar{x}} = \frac{x_1 + \cdots + x_k + x_{k+1} + \cdots + x_{k+n}}{k + n}$$

and $\sigma^2_{\bar{\bar{x}}} = \sigma^2_x/(k + n)$. However, this is equivalent to a weighted mean of $\bar{x}_1$ and $\bar{x}_2$, where the weights are proportional to the number of measurements in each average, i.e.,

$$w_1 = k, \qquad w_2 = n$$

and

$$\bar{\bar{x}} = \left(\frac{w_1}{w_1 + w_2}\right)\bar{x}_1 + \left(\frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right)\bar{x}_2$$

$$= \frac{k}{n + k}\,\bar{x}_1 + \frac{n}{n + k}\,\bar{x}_2$$

Since

$$\frac{\sigma^2_{\bar{x}_1}}{\sigma^2_{\bar{x}_2}} = \frac{\sigma^2/k}{\sigma^2/n} = \frac{n}{k} = \frac{w_2}{w_1}$$

the weighting factors w_1 and w_2 are therefore also inversely proportional to the respective variances of the averages. This principle can be extended to more than two variables in the following manner.

Let $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \ldots, \bar{x}_k$ be a set of averages estimating the same quantity. The over-all average may be computed to be

$$\bar{\bar{x}} = \frac{1}{w_1 + w_2 + \cdots + w_k}(w_1\bar{x}_1 + w_2\bar{x}_2 + \cdots + w_k\bar{x}_k)$$

where

$$w_1 = \frac{1}{\sigma^2_{\bar{x}_1}}, \qquad w_2 = \frac{1}{\sigma^2_{\bar{x}_2}}, \qquad \ldots, \qquad w_k = \frac{1}{\sigma^2_{\bar{x}_k}}$$

The variance of $\bar{\bar{x}}$ is, by (2-9),

$$\sigma^2_{\bar{\bar{x}}} = \frac{1}{w_1 + w_2 + \cdots + w_k} \tag{2-11}$$

In practice, the estimated variances $s^2_{\bar{x}}$ will have to be used in the above formulas, and consequently the equations hold only as approximations.

Propagation of error formulas. The results of a measurement process can usually be expressed by a number of averages $\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \ldots$, and the standard errors of these averages $s_{\bar{x}} = s_x/\sqrt{n}$, $s_{\bar{y}} = s_y/\sqrt{k}$, etc. These results, however, may not be of direct interest; the quantity of interest is in the functional relationship $m_w = f(m_x, m_y)$. It is desired to estimate m_w by $\bar{w} = f(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and to compute $s_{\bar{w}}$ as an estimate of $\sigma_{\bar{w}}$.

If the errors of measurements of these quantities are small in comparison with the values measured, the propagation of error formulas usually work surprisingly well. The $\sigma^2_{\bar{w}}$, $\sigma^2_{\bar{x}}$, and $\sigma^2_{\bar{y}}$ that are used in the following formulas will often be replaced in practice by the computed values $s^2_{\bar{w}}$, $s^2_{\bar{x}}$, and $s^2_{\bar{y}}$.

The general formula for $\sigma^2_{\bar{w}}$ is given by

$$\sigma^2_{\bar{w}} = \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\right]^2\sigma^2_{\bar{x}} + \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\right]^2\sigma^2_{\bar{y}} + 2\left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\right]\left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\right]\rho_{\bar{x}\bar{y}}\sigma_{\bar{x}}\sigma_{\bar{y}} \tag{2-12}$$

where the partial derivatives in square brackets are to be evaluated at the averages of x and y. If X and Y are independent, $\rho = 0$ and therefore the last term equals zero. If X and Y are measured in pairs, $s_{\bar{x}\bar{y}}$ (Eq. 2-4) can be used as an estimate of $\rho_{\bar{x}\bar{y}}\sigma_{\bar{x}}\sigma_{\bar{y}}$.

If W is functionally related to U and V by

$$m_w = f(m_u, m_v)$$

and both U and V are functionally related to X and Y by

$$m_u = g(m_x, m_y)$$
$$m_v = h(m_x, m_y)$$

then U and V are functionally related. We will need the covariance $\sigma_{u\bar{v}} = \rho_{u\bar{v}}\sigma_u\sigma_{\bar{v}}$ to calculate $\sigma^2_{\bar{w}}$. The covariance $\sigma_{u\bar{v}}$ is given approximately by

$$\sigma_{u\bar{v}} = \left[\frac{\partial g}{\partial x} \cdot \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}\right]\sigma^2_{\bar{x}} + \left[\frac{\partial g}{\partial y} \cdot \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}\right]\sigma^2_{\bar{y}} + \left\{\left[\frac{\partial g}{\partial x} \cdot \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}\right] + \left[\frac{\partial g}{\partial y} \cdot \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}\right]\right\}\rho_{x\bar{y}}\sigma_{\bar{x}}\sigma_{\bar{y}} \tag{2-13}$$

The square brackets mean, as before, that the partial derivatives are to be evaluated at $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$. If X and Y are independent, the last term again vanishes.

These formulas can be extended to three or more variables if necessary. For convenience, a few special formulas for commonly encountered functions are listed in Table 2-3 with X, Y assumed to be independent. These may be derived from the above formulas as exercises.

Table 2-3. Propagation of error formulas for some simple functions

(X and Y are assumed to be independent.)

Function form	Approximate formula for $s^2_{\bar{w}}$
$m_w = Am_x + Bm_y$	$A^2s^2_{\bar{x}} + B^2s^2_{\bar{y}}$
$m_w = \dfrac{m_x}{m_y}$	$\left(\dfrac{\bar{x}}{\bar{y}}\right)^2\left(\dfrac{s^2_{\bar{x}}}{\bar{x}^2} + \dfrac{s^2_{\bar{y}}}{\bar{y}^2}\right)$
$m_w = \dfrac{1}{m_y}$	$\dfrac{s^2_{\bar{y}}}{\bar{y}^4}$
$m_w = \dfrac{m_x}{m_x + m_y}$	$\left(\dfrac{\bar{w}}{\bar{x}}\right)^4(\bar{y}^2s^2_{\bar{x}} + \bar{x}^2e^2_{\bar{y}})$
$m_w = \dfrac{m_x}{1 + m_x}$	$\dfrac{s^2_{\bar{x}}}{(1 + \bar{x})^4}$
*$m_w = m_xm_y$	$(\bar{x}\bar{y})^2\left(\dfrac{s^2_{\bar{x}}}{\bar{x}^2} + \dfrac{s^2_{\bar{y}}}{\bar{y}^2}\right)$
*$m_w = m^2_x$	$4\bar{x}^2s^2_{\bar{x}}$
$m_w = \sqrt{m_x}$	$\dfrac{1}{4}\dfrac{s^2_{\bar{x}}}{\bar{x}}$
*$m_w = \ln m_x$	$\dfrac{s^2_{\bar{x}}}{\bar{x}^2}$
*$m_w = km^a_xm^b_y$	$\bar{w}^2\left(a^2\dfrac{s^2_{\bar{x}}}{\bar{x}^2} + b^2\dfrac{s^2_{\bar{y}}}{\bar{y}^2}\right)$
*$m_w = e^{m_x}$	$e^{2\bar{x}}s^2_{\bar{x}}$
$W = 100\dfrac{s_x}{\bar{x}}$ (= coefficient of variation)	$\dfrac{\bar{w}^2}{2(n-1)}$ (not directly derived from the formulas)†

*Distribution of $\bar{w}$ is highly skewed and normal approximation could be seriously in error for small n.

†See, for example, *Statistical Theory with Engineering Applications*, by A. Hald, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1952, p. 301.

In these formulas, if

(a) the partial derivatives when evaluated at the averages are small, and

(b) σ_x, σ_y are small compared to $\bar{x}$, $\bar{y}$,

then the approximations are good and $\bar{w}$ tends to be distributed normally (the ones marked by asterisks are highly skewed and normal approximation could be seriously in error for small n).

Pooling Estimates of Variances. The problem often arises that there are several estimates of a common variance σ^2 which we wish to combine into a single estimate. For example, a gage block may be compared with the master block n_1 times, resulting in an estimate of the variance s_1^2. Another gage block compared with the master block n_2 times, giving rise to s_2^2, etc. As long as the nominal thicknesses of these blocks are within a certain range, the precision of calibration can be expected to remain the same. To get a better evaluation of the precision of the calibration process, we would wish to combine these estimates. The rule is to combine the computed variances weighted by their respective degrees of freedom, or

$$s_p^2 = \frac{\nu_1 s_1^2 + \nu_2 s_2^2 + \cdots + \nu_k s_k^2}{\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \cdots + \nu_k} \tag{2-14}$$

The pooled estimate of the standard deviation, of course, is $\sqrt{s_p^2} = s_p$. In the example, $\nu_1 = n_1 - 1$, $\nu_2 = n_2 - 1, \ldots,$ $\nu_k = n_k - 1$, thus the expression reduces to

$$s_p^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2 + \cdots + (n_k - 1)s_k^2}{n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_k - k} \tag{2-15}$$

The degrees of freedom for the pooled estimate is the sum of the degrees of freedom of individual estimates, or $\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \cdots \nu_k = n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_k - k$. With the increased number of degrees of freedom, s_p is a more dependable estimate of σ than an individual s. Eventually, we may consider the value of s_p to be equal to that of σ and claim that we know the precision of the measuring process.

For the special case where k sets of duplicate measurements are available, the above formula reduces to:

$$s_p^2 = \frac{1}{2k} \sum_1^k d_i^2 \tag{2-16}$$

where d_i = difference of duplicate readings. The pooled standard deviation s_p has k degrees of freedom.

For sets of normally distributed measurements where the number of measurements in each set is small, say less than ten, an estimate of the standard deviation can be obtained by multiplying the range of these measurements by a constant. Table 2-4 lists these constants corresponding to the number n of measurements in the set. For large n, considerable information is lost and this procedure is not recommended.

If there are k sets of n measurements each, the average range $\bar{R}$ can be computed. The standard deviation can be estimated by multiplying the average range by the factor for n.

Table 2-4. Estimate of σ from the range

n	*Multiplying factor*
2	0.886
3	0.591
4	0.486
5	0.430
6	0.395
7	0.370
8	0.351
9	0.337
10	0.325

*Adapted from *Biometrika Tables for Statisticians*, Vol. I, edited by E. S. Pearson and H. O. Hartley, The University Press, Cambridge, 1958.

Component of Variance Between Groups. In pooling estimates of variances from a number of subgroups, we have increased confidence in the value of the estimate obtained. Let us call this estimate the within-group standard deviation, σ_w. The within-group standard deviation σ_w is a proper measure of dispersions of values within the same group, but not necessarily the proper one for dispersions of values belonging to different groups.

If in making calibrations there is a difference between groups, say from day to day, or from set to set, then the limiting means of the groups are not equal. These limiting means may be thought of as individual measurements; thus, it could be assumed that the average of these limiting means will approach a limit which can be called the limiting mean for all the groups. In estimating σ_w^2, the differences of individuals from the respective group means are used. Obviously σ_w does not include the differences between groups. Let us use σ_b^2 to denote the variance corresponding to the differences between groups, i.e., the measure of dispersion of the limiting means of the respective groups about the limiting mean for all groups.

Thus for each individual measurement x, the variance of X has two components, and

$$\sigma^2 = \sigma_b^2 + \sigma_w^2$$

For the group mean $\bar{x}$ with n measurements in the group,

$$\sigma_{\bar{x}}^2 = \sigma_b^2 + \frac{\sigma_w^2}{n}$$

If k groups of n measurements are available giving averages $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \ldots, \bar{x}_k$, then an estimate of $\sigma_{\bar{x}}^2$ is

$$s_{\bar{x}}^2 = \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{\bar{x}})^2$$

with $k - 1$ degrees of freedom, where $\bar{\bar{x}}$ is the average of all nk measurements.

The resolution of the total variance into components attributable to identifiable causes or factors and the estimation of such components of variances are topics treated under analysis of variance and experimental design. For selected treatments and examples see references 5, 6, and 8.

Comparison of Means and Variances

Comparison of means is perhaps one of the most frequently used techniques in metrology. The mean obtained from one measurement process may be compared with a standard value; two series of measurements on the same quantity may be compared; or sets of measurements on more than two quantities may be compared to determine homogeneity of the group of means.

It is to be borne in mind in all of the comparisons discussed below, that we are interested in comparing the limiting means. The sample means and the computed standard errors are used to calculate confidence limits on the difference between two means. The "t" statistic derived from normal distribution theory is used in this procedure since we are assuming either the measurement process is normal, or the sample averages are approximately normally distributed.

Comparison of a Mean with a Standard Value. In calibration of weights at the National Bureau of Standards, the weights to be calibrated are intercompared with sets of standard weights having "accepted" corrections. Accepted corrections are based on years of experience and considered to be exact to the accuracy required. For instance, the accepted correction for the NB'10 gram weight is -0.4040 mg.

The NB'10 is treated as an unknown and calibrated with each set of weights tested using an intercomparison scheme based on a 100-gm standard weight. Hence the observed correction for NB'10 can be computed for each particular calibration. Table 2-5 lists eleven observed corrections of NB'10 during May 1963.

Calculated 95 percent confidence limits from the eleven observed corrections are -0.4041 and -0.3995. These values include the accepted value of -0.4040, and we conclude that the observed corrections agree with the accepted value.

What if the computed confidence limits for the observed correction do not cover the accepted value? Three explanations may be suggested:

1. The accepted value is correct. However, in choosing $\alpha = 0.05$, we know that 5 percent of the time in the long run we will make an error in our statement. By chance alone, it is possible that this particular set of limits would not cover the accepted value.
2. The average of the observed corrections does not agree with the accepted value because of certain systematic error, temporary or seasonal, particular to one or several members of this set of data for which no adjustment has been made.
3. The accepted value is incorrect, e.g., the mass of the standard has changed.

In our example, we would be extremely reluctant to agree to the third explanation since we have much more confidence in the accepted value than the value based only on eleven calibrations. We are warned that something may have gone wrong, but not unduly alarmed since such an event will happen purely by chance about once every twenty times.

The control chart for mean with known value, to be discussed in a following section, would be the proper tool to use to monitor the constancy of the correction of the standard mass.

Table 2-5. Computation of confidence limits for observed corrections, NB'10 gm *

Date	i	X_i Observed Corrections to standard 10 gm wt in mg
5–1–63	1	−0.4008
5–1–63	2	−0.4053
5–1–63	3	−0.4022
5–2–63	4	−0.4075
5–2–63	5	−0.3994
5–3–63	6	−0.3986
5–6–63	7	−0.4015
5–6–63	8	−0.3992
5–6–63	9	−0.3973
5–7–63	10	−0.4071
5–7–63	11	−0.4012

$\sum x_i = -4.4201$ $\qquad \sum x_i^2 = 1.77623417$

$\bar{x} = -0.40183$ mg $\qquad \frac{(\sum x_i)^2}{n} = 1.77611673$

difference $= 0.00011744$

$$s^2 = \frac{1}{n-1}(0.00011744) = 0.000011744$$

$s = 0.00343$ = computed standard deviation of an observed correction about the mean.

$\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} = 0.00103$ = computed standard deviation of the mean of eleven corrections.

= computed standard error of the mean.

For a two-sided 95 percent confidence interval for the mean of the above sample of size 11, $\alpha/2 = 0.025$, $v = 10$, and the corresponding value of t is equal to 2.228 in the table of t distribution. Therefore,

$$L_l = \bar{x} - t\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} = -0.40183 - 2.228 \times 0.00103 = -0.40412$$

and

$$L_u = \bar{x} + t\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} = -0.40183 + 2.228 \times 0.00103 = -0.39954$$

*Data supplied by Robert Raybold, Metrology Division, National Bureau of Standards.

Comparison Among Two or More Means. The difference between two quantities X and Y to be measured is the quantity

$$m_{x-y} = m_x - m_y$$

and is estimated by $\bar{x} - \bar{y}$, where $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ are averages of a number of measurements of X and Y respectively.

Suppose we are interested in knowing whether the difference m_{x-y} could be zero. This problem can be solved by a technique previously introduced, i.e., the confidence limits can be computed for m_{x-y}, and if the upper and lower limits include zero, we could conclude that m_{x-y} may take the value zero; otherwise, we conclude that the evidence is against $m_{x-y} = 0$.

Let us assume that measurements of X and Y are independent with known variances σ_x^2 and σ_y^2 respectively.

By Eq. (2.10)

$$\sigma_{\bar{x}}^2 = \frac{\sigma_x^2}{n} \text{ for } \bar{x} \text{ of } n \text{ measurements}$$

$$\sigma_{\bar{y}}^2 = \frac{\sigma_y^2}{k} \text{ for } \bar{y} \text{ of } k \text{ measurements}$$

then by (2.8),

$$\sigma^2_{\bar{x}-\bar{y}} = \frac{\sigma_x^2}{n} + \frac{\sigma_y^2}{k}$$

Therefore, the quantity

$$z = \frac{(\bar{x} - \bar{y}) - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_x^2}{n} + \frac{\sigma_y^2}{k}}} \tag{2-17}$$

is approximately normally distributed with mean zero and a standard deviation of one under the assumption $m_{x-y} = 0$.

If σ_x and σ_y are not known, but the two can be assumed to be approximately equal, e.g., $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ are measured by the same process, then s_x^2 and s_y^2 can be pooled by Eq. (2-15), or

$$s_p^2 = \frac{(n-1)s_x^2 + (k-1)s_y^2}{n + k - 2}$$

This pooled computed variance estimates

$$\sigma^2 = \sigma_x^2 = \sigma_y^2$$

so that

$$\sigma^2_{\bar{x}-\bar{y}} = \frac{\sigma_x^2}{n} + \frac{\sigma_y^2}{k} = \frac{n+k}{nk}\sigma^2$$

Thus, the quantity

$$t = \frac{(\bar{x} - \bar{y}) - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{n+k}{nk}}s_p} \tag{2-18}$$

is distributed as Student's "t", and a confidence interval can be set about m_{x-y} with $\nu = n + k - 2$ and $p = 1 - \alpha$. If this interval does not include zero, we may conclude that the evidence is strongly against the hypothesis $m_x = m_y$.

As an example, we continue with the calibration of weights with NB'10 gm. For 11 subsequent observed corrections during September and October, the confidence interval (computed in the same manner as in the preceding example) has been found to be

$$L_l = -0.40782$$

$$L_u = -0.40126$$

Also,

$$\bar{Y} = -0.40454 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{s}{\sqrt{k}} = 0.00147$$

It is desired to compare the means of observed corrections for the two sets of data. Here

$$n = k = 11$$

$$\bar{x} = -0.40183, \qquad \bar{y} = -0.40454$$

$$s_x^2 = 0.000011669, \qquad s_y^2 = 0.000023813$$

$$s_p^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}(0.000035482) = 0.000017741$$

$$\frac{n+k}{nk} = \frac{11 + 11}{121} = \frac{2}{11}$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{n+k}{nk}}s_p = \sqrt{\frac{2}{11} \times 0.000017741} = 0.00180$$

For $\alpha/2 = 0.025$, $1 - \alpha = 0.95$, and $\nu = 20$, $t = 2.086$. Therefore,

$$L_u = (\bar{x} - \bar{y}) + t\sqrt{\frac{n+k}{nk}}\, s_p = 0.00271 + 2.086 \times 0.00180$$
$$= 0.00646$$

$$L_l = (\bar{x} - \bar{y}) - t\sqrt{\frac{n+k}{nk}}\, s_p = -0.00104$$

Since $L_l < 0 < L_u$ shows that the confidence interval includes zero, we conclude that there is no evidence against the hypothesis that the two observed average corrections are the same, or $m_x = m_y$. Note, however, that we would reach a conclusion of no difference wherever the magnitude of $\bar{x} - \bar{y}$ (0.00271 mg) is less than the half-width of the confidence interval ($2.086 \times 0.00180 = 0.00375$ mg) calculated for the particular case. When the true difference m_{x-y} is large, the above situation is not likely to happen; but when the true difference is small, say about 0.003 mg, then it is highly probable that a conclusion of no difference will still be reached. If a detection of difference of this magnitude is of interest, more measurements will be needed.

The following additional topics are treated in reference 4.

1. Sample sizes required under certain specified conditions—Tables A-8 and A-9.
2. σ_x^2 cannot be assumed to be equal to σ_y^2—Section 3-3.1.2.
3. Comparison of several means by Studentized range—Sections 3-4 and 15-4.

Comparison of variances or ranges. As we have seen, the precision of a measurement process can be expressed in terms of the computed standard deviation, the variance, or the range. To compare the precision of two processes a and b, any of the three measures can be used, depending on the preference and convenience of the user.

Let s_a^2 be the estimate of σ_a^2 with ν_a degrees of freedom, and s_b^2 be the estimate of σ_b^2 with ν_b degrees of freedom. The ratio $F = s_a^2/s_b^2$ has a distribution depending on ν_a and ν_b. Tables of upper percentage points of F are given in most statistical textbooks, e.g., reference 4, Table A-5 and Section 4-2.

In the comparison of means, we were interested in finding out if the absolute difference between m_a and m_b could reasonably be zero; similarly, here we may be interested in whether $\sigma_a^2 = \sigma_b^2$, or $\sigma_a^2/\sigma_b^2 = 1$. In practice, however, we are usually concerned with whether the imprecision of one process exceeds that of another process. We could, therefore, compute the ratio of s_a^2 to s_b^2, and the question arises: If in fact $\sigma_a^2 = \sigma_b^2$, what is the probability of getting a value of the ratio as large as the one observed? For each pair of values of ν_a and ν_b, the tables list the values of F which are exceeded with probability α, the upper percentage point of the distribution of F. If the computed value of F exceeds this tabulated value of $F_{\alpha', \nu_a, \nu_b}$, then we conclude that the evidence is against the hypothesis $\sigma_a^2 = \sigma_b^2$; if it is less, we conclude that σ_a^2 could be equal to σ_b^2.

For example, we could compute the ratio of s_y^2 to s_x^2 in the preceding two examples.

Here the degrees of freedom $\nu_y = \nu_x = 10$, the tabulated value of F which is exceeded 5 percent of the time for these degrees of freedom is 2.98, and

$$\frac{s_y^2}{s_x^2} = \frac{0.000023813}{0.000011669} = 2.041$$

Since 2.04 is less than 2.98, we conclude that there is no reason to believe that the precision of the calibration process in September and October is poorer than that of May.

For small degrees of freedom, the critical value of F is rather large, e.g., for $\nu_a = \nu_b = 3$, and $\alpha' = 0.05$, the value of F is 9.28. It follows that a small difference between σ_a^2 and σ_b^2 is not likely to be detected with a small number of measurements from each process. The table below gives the approximate number of measurements required to have a four-out-of-five chance of detecting whether σ_a is the indicated multiple of σ_b (while maintaining at 0.05 the probability of incorrectly concluding that $\sigma_a > \sigma_b$, when in fact $\sigma_a = \sigma_b$).

Multiple	*No. of measurements*
1.5	39
2.0	15
2.5	9
3.0	7
3.5	6
4.0	5

Table A-11 in reference 4 gives the critical values of the ratios of ranges, and Tables A-20 and A-21 give confidence limits on the standard deviation of the process based on computed standard deviation.

Control Charts Technique for Maintaining Stability and Precision

A laboratory which performs routine measurement or calibration operations yields, as its daily product, numbers—averages, standard deviations, and ranges. The control chart techniques therefore could be applied to these numbers as products of a manufacturing process to furnish graphical evidence on whether the measurement process is in statistical control or out of statistical control. If it is out of control, these charts usually also indicate where and when the trouble occurred.

Control Chart for Averages. The basic concept of a control chart is in accord with what has been discussed thus far. A measurement process with limiting mean m and standard deviation σ is assumed. The sequence of numbers produced is divided into "rational" subgroups, e.g., by day, by a set of calibrations, etc. The averages of these subgroups are computed. These averages will have a mean m and a standard deviation $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$ where n is the number of measurements within each subgroup. These averages are approximately normally distributed.

In the construction of the control chart for averages, m is plotted as the center line, $m + k(\sigma/\sqrt{n})$ and $m - k(\sigma/\sqrt{n})$ are plotted as control limits, and the averages are plotted in an orderly sequence. If k is taken to be 3, we know that the chance of a plotted point falling outside of the limits, if the process is in control, is very small. Therefore, if a plotted point falls outside these limits, a warning is sounded and investigative action to locate the "assignable" cause that produced the departure, or corrective measures, are called for.

The above reasoning would be applicable to actual cases only if we have chosen the proper standard deviation σ. If the standard deviation is estimated by pooling the estimates computed from each subgroup and denoted by σ_w (within group), obviously differences, if any, between group averages have

not been taken into consideration. Where there are between-group differences the variance of the individual $\bar{x}$ is not σ_w^2/n, but, as we have seen before, $\sigma_b^2 + (\sigma_w^2/n)$, where σ_b^2 represents the variance due to differences between groups. If σ_b^2 is of any consequence as compared to σ_w^2, many of the $\bar{x}$ values would exceed the limits constructed by using σ_w alone.

Two alternatives are open to us: (1) remove the cause of the between-group variation; or, (2) if such variation is a proper component of error, take it into account as has been previously discussed.

As an illustration of the use of a control chart on averages, we use again the NB'10 gram data. One hundred observed corrections for NB'10 are plotted in Fig. 2-5, including the two sets of data given under comparison of means (points 18 through 28, and points 60 through 71). A three-sigma limit of 8.6 μg was used based on the "accepted" value of standard deviation.

We note that all the averages are within the control limits, excepting numbers 36, 47, 63, 85, and 87. Five in a hundred falling outside of the three-sigma limits is more than predicted by the theory. No particular reasons, however, could be found for these departures.

Since the accepted value of the standard deviation was obtained by pooling a large number of computed standard deviations for within-sets of calibrations, the graph indicates that a "between-set" component may be present. A slight shift upwards is also noted between the first 30 points and the remainder.




Fig. 2-5. Control chart on $\bar{x}$ for NB'10 gram.

Control Chart for Standard Deviations. The computed standard deviation, as previously stated, is a measure of imprecision. For a set of calibrations, however, the number of measurements is usually small, and consequently also the degrees of freedom. These computed standard deviations with few degrees of freedom can vary considerably by chance alone, even though the precision of the process remains unchanged. The control chart on the computed standard deviations (or ranges) is therefore an indispensable tool.

The distribution of s depends on the degrees of freedom associated with it, and is not symmetrical about m_s. The frequency curve of s is limited on the left side by zero, and has a long "tail" to the right. The limits, therefore,

are not symmetrical about m_s. Furthermore, if the standard deviation of the process is known to be σ, m_s is not equal to σ, but is equal to $c_2\sigma$, where c_2 is a constant associated with the degrees of freedom in s.

The constants necessary for the construction of three-sigma control limits for averages, computed standard deviations, and ranges, are given in most textbooks on quality control. Section 18-3 of reference 4 gives such a table. A more comprehensive treatment on control charts is given in ASTM "Manual on Quality Control of Materials," Special Technical Publication 15-C.

Unfortunately, the notation employed in quality control work differs in some respect from what is now standard in statistics, and correction factors have to be applied to some of these constants when the computed standard deviation is calculated by the definition given in this chapter. These corrections are explained in the footnote under the table.

As an example of the use of control charts on the precision of a calibration process, we will use data from NBS calibration of standard cells.* Standard cells in groups of four or six are usually compared with an NBS standard cell on ten separate days. A typical data sheet for a group of six cells, after all the necessary corrections, appears in Table 2-6. The standard deviation of a comparison is calculated from the ten comparisons for each cell and the standard deviation for the average value of the ten comparisons is listed in the line marked SDA. These values were plotted as points 6 through 11 in Fig. 2-6.




Fig. 2-6. Control chart on s for the calibration of standard cells.

Let us assume that the precision of the calibration process remains the same. We can therefore pool the standard deviations computed for each cell (with nine degrees of freedom) over a number of cells and take this value as the current value of the standard deviation of a comparison, σ. The corresponding current value of standard deviation of the average of ten comparisons will be denoted by $\sigma' = \sigma/\sqrt{10}$. The control chart will be made on $s' = s/\sqrt{10}$.

*Illustrative data supplied by Miss Catherine Law, Electricity Division, National Bureau of Standards.

For example, the SDA's for 32 cells calibrated between June 29 and August 8, 1962, are plotted as the first 32 points in Fig. 2-6. The pooled standard deviation of the average is 0.114 with 288 degrees of freedom. The between-group component is assumed to be negligible.

Table 2-6. Calibration data for six standard cells

Day	Corrected Emf's and standard deviations, Microvolts					
1	27.10	24.30	31.30	33.30	32.30	23.20
2	25.96	24.06	31.06	34.16	33.26	23.76
3	26.02	24.22	31.92	33.82	33.22	24.02
4	26.26	24.96	31.26	33.96	33.26	24.16
5	27.23	25.23	31.53	34.73	33.33	24.43
6	25.90	24.40	31.80	33.90	32.90	24.10
7	26.79	24.99	32.19	34.39	33.39	24.39
8	26.18	24.98	32.18	35.08	33.98	24.38
9	26.17	25.07	31.97	34.27	33.07	23.97
10	26.16	25.16	31.96	34.06	32.96	24.16
R	1.331	1.169	1.127	1.777	1.677	1.233
AVG	26.378	24.738	31.718	34.168	33.168	24.058
SD	0.482	0.439	0.402	0.495	0.425	0.366
SDA	0.153	0.139	0.127	0.157	0.134	0.116

Position	Emf, volts	Position	Emf, volts
1	1.0182264	4	1.0182342
2	1.0182247	5	1.0182332
3	1.0182317	6	1.0182240

Since $n = 10$, we find our constants for three-sigma control limits on s' in Section 18-3 of reference 4 and apply the corrections as follows:

$$\text{Center line} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-1}}\, c_2\sigma' = 1.054 \times 0.9227 \times 0.114 = 0.111$$

$$\text{Lower limit} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-1}}\, B_1\sigma' = 1.054 \times 0.262 \times 0.114 = 0.031$$

$$\text{Upper limit} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-1}}\, B_2\sigma' = 1.054 \times 1.584 \times 0.114 = 0.190$$

The control chart (Fig. 2-6) was constructed using these values of center line and control limits computed from the 32 calibrations. The standard deviations of the averages of subsequent calibrations are then plotted.

Three points in Fig. 2-6 far exceed the upper control limit. All three cells, which were from the same source, showed drifts during the period of calibration. A fourth point barely exceeded the limit. It is to be noted that the data here were selected to include these three points for purposes of illustration only, and do not represent the normal sequence of calibrations.

The main function of the chart is to justify the precision statement on the report of calibration, which is based on a value of σ estimated with perhaps thousands of degrees of freedom and which is shown to be in control. The report of calibration for these cells ($\sigma = 0.117 \doteq 0.12$) could read:

> "Each value is the mean of ten observations made between ____ and ____. Based on a standard deviation of 0.12 microvolts for the means, these values are correct to 0.36 microvolts relative to the volt as maintained by the national reference group."

Linear Relationship and Fitting of Constants by Least Squares

In using the arithmetic mean of n measurements as an estimate of the limiting mean, we have, knowingly or unknowingly, fitted a constant to the data by the method of least squares, i.e., we have selected a value $\hat{m}$ for m such that

$$\sum_1^n (y_i - \hat{m})^2 = \sum_1^n d_i^2$$

is a minimum. The solution is $\hat{m} = \bar{y}$. The deviations $d_i = y_i - \hat{m} = y_i - \bar{y}$ are called residuals.

Here we can express our measurements in the form of a mathematical model

$$Y = m + \epsilon \tag{2-19}$$

where Y stands for the observed values, m the limiting mean (a constant), and ϵ the random error (normal) of measurement with a limiting mean zero and a standard deviation σ. By (2-1) and (2-9), it follows that

$$m_y = m + m_\epsilon = m$$

and

$$\sigma_y^2 = \sigma^2$$

The method of least squares requires us to use that estimator $\hat{m}$ for m such that the sum of squares of the residuals is a minimum (among all possible estimators). As a corollary, the method also states that the sum of squares of residuals divided by the number of measurements n less the number of estimated constants p will give us an estimate of σ^2, i.e.,

$$s^2 = \frac{\sum (y_i - \hat{m})^2}{n - p} = \frac{\sum (y_i - \bar{y})^2}{n - 1} \tag{2-20}$$

It is seen that the above agrees with our definition of s^2.

Suppose Y, the quantity measured, exhibits a linear functional relationship with a variable which can be controlled accurately; then a model can be written as

$$Y = a + bX + \epsilon \tag{2-21}$$

where, as before, Y is the quantity measured, a (the intercept) and b (the slope) are two constants to be estimated, and ϵ the random error with limiting mean zero and variance σ^2. We set X at x_i, and observe y_i. For example, y_i might be the change in length of a gage block steel observed for n equally spaced temperatures x_i within a certain range. The quantity of interest is the coefficient of thermal expansion b.

For any estimates of a and b, say $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$, we can compute a value $\hat{y}_i$ for each x_i, or

$$\hat{y}_i = \hat{a} + \hat{b}x_i$$

If we require the sum of squares of the residuals

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$$

to be a minimum, then it can be shown that

$$\hat{b} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \tag{2-22}$$

and

$$\hat{a} = \bar{y} - \hat{b}\bar{x} \tag{2-23}$$

The variance of Y can be estimated by

$$s^2 = \frac{\sum (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{n - 2} \tag{2-24}$$

with $n - 2$ degrees of freedom since two constants have been estimated from the data.

The standard errors of $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{a}$ are respectively estimated by $s_{\hat{b}}$ and $s_{\hat{a}}$, where

$$s_{\hat{b}}^2 = \frac{s^2}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \tag{2-25}$$

$$s_{\hat{a}}^2 = s^2\left[\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}\right] \tag{2-26}$$

With these estimates and the degrees of freedom associated with s^2, confidence limits can be computed for $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$ for the confidence coefficient selected if we assume that errors are normally distributed.

Thus, the lower and upper limits of a and b, respectively, are:

$$\hat{a} - ts_{\hat{a}}, \qquad \hat{a} + ts_{\hat{a}}$$

$$\hat{b} - ts_{\hat{b}}, \qquad \hat{b} + ts_{\hat{b}}$$

for the value of t corresponding to the degree of freedom and the selected confidence coefficient.

The following problems relating to a linear relationship between two variables are treated in reference 4, Section 5-4.

1. Confidence intervals for a point on the fitted line.
2. Confidence band for the line as a whole.
3. Confidence interval for a single predicted value of Y for a given X.

Polynomial and multivariate relationships are treated in Chapter 6 of the same reference.

REFERENCES

The following references are recommended for topics introduced in the first section of this chapter:

1. Wilson, Jr., E. B., *An Introduction to Scientific Research*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1952, Chapters 7, 8, and 9.
2. Eisenhart, Churchill, "Realistic Evaluation of the Precision and Accuracy of Instrument Calibration System," *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards*, Vol. 67C, No. 2, 1963.
3. Youden, W. J., *Experimentation and Measurement*, National Science Teacher Association Vista of Science Series No. 2, Scholastic Book Series, New York.

In addition to the three general references given above, the following are selected with special emphasis on their ease of understanding and applicability in the measurement science:

Statistical Methods

4. Natrella, M. G., *Experimental Statistics*, NBS Handbook 91, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963.
5. Youden, W. J., *Statistical Methods for Chemists*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1951.
6. Davies, O. L., *Statistical Method in Research and Production* (3rd ed.), Hafner Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1957.

Textbooks

7. Dixon, W. J. and F. J. Massey, *Introduction to Statistical Analysis* (2nd ed.), McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1957.
8. Brownlee, K. A., *Statistical Theory and Methodology in Science and Engineering*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1960.
9. Areley, N. and K. R. Buch, *Introduction to the Theory of Probability and Statistics*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1950.

Additional Books on Treatment of Data

10. American Society for Testing and Materials, *Manual on Presentation of Data and Control Chart Analysis* (STP 15D), 1976, 162 p.
11. American Society for Testing and Materials, *ASTM Standard on Precision and Accuracy for Various Applications*, 1977, 249 p.
12. Box, G. E. P., Hunter, W. G., and Hunter, J. S., *Statistics for Experimenters, an Introduction to Design, Data Analysis, and Model Building,* John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1978, 575 p.
13. Cox, D. R., *Planning of Experiments*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1958, 308 p.
14. Daniel, C. and Wood, F. S., *Fitting Equations to Data, Computer Analysis of Multifactor Data*, 2d ed., John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1979, 343 p.
15. Deming, W. E., *Statistical Adjustment of Data,* John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1943, 261 p.
16. Draper, N. R. and Smith, H., *Applied Regression Analysis,* John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966, 407 p.
17. Himmelblau, D. M., *Process Analysis by Statistical Methods,* John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1970, 464 p.
18. Ku, H. H., ed., *Precision Measurement and Calibration: Statistical Concepts and Procedures,* Natl. Bur. Stand. (U.S.) Spec. Publ. 300, 1969, v.p.
19. Mandel, J., *The Statistical Analysis of Experimental Data,* Interscience, New York, 1964, 410 p.
20. Mosteller, F. and Tukey, J. W., *Data Analysis and Regression, a Second Course in Statistics,* Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1977, 588 p.

POSTSCRIPT ON STATISTICAL GRAPHICS

Over the years since the publication of the above article, it has become apparent that some additions on recent developments for the treatment of data may be useful. It is equally apparent that the concepts and techniques introduced in the original article remain as valid and appropriate as when first written. For this reason, a few additional sections on statistical graphics are added as a postscript.

The power of small computers and the associated sophisticated software have pushed graphics into the forefront. Plots and graphs have always been popular with engineers and scientists, but their use has been limited by the time and work involved. Graphics packages now-a-days allow the user to do plots and graphs with ease, and a good statistical package will also automatically present a number of pertinent plots for examination. As John Tukey said, "the greatest value of a picture is when it forces us to notice what we never expected to see." [1] An outlier? Skewed distribution of values? Poor modelling? What is the data trying to say? Answers to all these come naturally through inspection of plots and graphs, whereas columns of numbers reveal little, if anything.

Control charts for the mean (Fig. 2-5) and standard deviation (Fig. 2-6) are classical examples of graphical methods. Control charts were introduced by Walter Shewhart some 60 years ago, yet the technique remains a popular and most useful tool in business and industry. Simplicity (once constructed), self-explanatory nature, and robustness (not depending on assumptions) are, and should be, the main desirable attributes of all graphs and plots.

Since statistical graphics is a huge subject, only a few basic techniques that are particularly useful to the treatment of measurement data will be discussed, together with references for further reading.

Plots for Summary and Display of Data

Stem and Leaf. The stem and leaf plot is a close relative of the histogram, but it uses digits of data values themselves to show features of the data set instead of areas of rectangles. First proposed by John W. Tukey, a stem and leaf plot retains more information from the data than the histogram and is particularly suited for the display of small to moderate-sized data sets.

Fig. 1 is a stem and leaf plot of 48 measurements of the isotopic ratio of ^{79}Bromine to ^{81}Bromine. Values of these 48 data points, listed in Table 1, range from 1.0261 to 1.0305, or 261 to 305 after coding. The leaves are the last digits of the data values, 0 to 9. The stems are 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30. Thus 261 is split into two parts, plotted as 26 | 1. In this case, because of the heavy concentration of values in stems 28 and 29, two lines are given to each stem, with leaves 0 to 4 on the first line, and 5 to 9 on the second. Stems are shown on the left side of the vertical line and individual leaves on the right side. There is no need for a separate table of data values - they are all shown in the plot!

The plot shows a slight skew towards lower values. The smallest value separates from the next by 0.7 units. Is that an outlier? These data will be examined again later.

26	1
26.	89
27	034
27.	9
28	00334
28.	566678889
29	001233344444
29.	5666678999
30	0022
30.	5

Fig. 1. Stem and leaf plot. 48 values of isotopic ratios, bromine (79/81). Unit = $(Y - 1.0) \times 10^4$, thus 26|1 = 1.0261.

Table 1. Y—Ratios 79/81 for reference sample

	DETERMINATION I		DETERMINATION II	
	Instrument #4	Instrument #1	Instrument #4	Instrument #1
	1.0292	1.0289	1.0296	1.0284
	1.0294	1.0285	1.0293	1.0270
	1.0298	1.0287	1.0302	1.0279
	1.0302	1.0297	1.0305	1.0269
	1.0294	1.0290	1.0288	1.0273
	1.0296	1.0286	1.0294	1.0261
	1.0293	1.0291	1.0299	1.0286
	1.0295	1.0293	1.0290	1.0286
	1.0300	1.0288	1.0296	1.0293
	1.0297	1.0298	1.0299	1.0283
	1.0296	1.0274	1.0299	1.0263
	1.0294	1.0280	1.0300	1.0280
Ave.	1.029502	1.028792	1.029675	1.027683
S^2	.00000086	.00000041	.00000024	.00000069
S	.00029	.00064	.00049	.00083
S_y	.00008	.00018	.00014	.00024

Box Plot. Customarily, a batch of data is summarized by its average and standard deviation. These two numerical values characterize a normal distribution, as explained in expression (2-0). Certain features of the data, e.g., skewness and extreme values, are not reflected in the average and standard deviation. The box plot (due also to Tukey) presents graphically a five-number summary which, in many cases, shows more of the original features of the batch of data then the two number summary.

To construct a box plot, the sample of numbers are first ordered from the smallest to the largest, resulting in

$$x_{(1)}, x_{(2)}, \ldots x_{(n)}.$$

Using a set of rules, the median, m, the lower fourth, F_ℓ, and the upper fourth, F_u, are calculated. By definition, the interval $(F_u - F_\ell)$ contains half of all data points. We note that m, F_u, and F_ℓ are not disturbed by outliers.

The interval $(F_u - F_\ell)$ is called the fourth spread. The lower cutoff limit is

$$F_\ell - 1.5(F_u - F_\ell)$$

and the upper cutoff limit is

$$F_u + 1.5(F_u - F_\ell).$$

A "box" is then constructed between F_ℓ and F_u, with the median line dividing the box into two parts. Two tails from the ends of the box extend to $x_{(1)}$ and $x_{(n)}$ respectively. If the tails exceed the cutoff limits, the cutoff limits are also marked.

From a box plot one can see certain prominent features of a batch of data:

1. Location - the median, and whether it is in the middle of the box.
2. Spread - The fourth spread (50 percent of data): - lower and upper cut off limits (99.3 percent of the data will be in the interval if the distribution is normal and the data set is large).
3. Symmetry/skewness - equal or different tail lengths.
4. Outlying data points - suspected outliers.

The 48 measurements of isotopic ratio bromine (79/81) shown in Fig. 1 were actually made on two instruments, with 24 measurements each. Box plots for instrument I, instrument II, and for both instruments are shown in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. Box plot of isotopic ratio, bromine (79/91).

The five number summary for the 48 data point is, for the combined data:

Smallest:	$X(1)$	=	261
Median X_m:	m	=	$(n+1)/2 = (48+1)/2 = 24.5$
	X_m	=	$x_{(m)}$ if m is an integer;
		=	$[x_{(M)} + x_{(M+1)}]/2$ if not; where M is the largest integer not exceeding m.
	X_m	=	$(291+292)/2 = 291.5$
Lower Fourth X_ℓ:	ℓ	=	$(M+1)/2 = (24+1)/2 = 12.5$
	X_ℓ	=	$x_{(\ell)}$ if ℓ is an integer;
		=	$[x_{(L)} = x(L+1)]/2$ if not, where L is the largest integer not exceeding ℓ.
	X_ℓ	=	$(284+285)/2 = 284.5$
Upper Fourth X_u:	u	=	$n+1-\ell = 49-12.5 = 36.5$
	X_u	=	$x_{(u)}$ if u is an integer;
		=	$[x_{(U)} + x_{(U+1)}]/2$ if not, where U is the largest integer not exceeding u.
	X_u	=	$(296+296)/2 = 296$
Largest:	$X_{(n)}$	=	305

Box plots for instruments I and II are similarly constructed. It seems apparent from these two plots that (a) there was a difference between the results for these two instruments, and (b) the precision of instrument II is better than that of instrument I. The lowest value of instrument I, 261, is less than the lower cutoff for the plot of the combined data, but it does not fall below the lower cutoff for instrument I alone. As an exercise, think of why this is the case.

Box plots can be used to compare several batches of data effectively and easily. Fig. 3 is a box plot of the amount of magnesium in different parts of a long alloy rod. The specimen number represents the distance, in meters, from the edge of the 100 meter rod to the place where the specimen was taken. Ten determinations were made at the selected locations for each specimen. One outlier appears obvious; there is also a mild indication of decreasing content of magnesium along the rod.

Variations of box plots are given in [3] and [4].




Fig. 3. Magnesium content of specimens taken.

Plots for Checking on Models and Assumptions

In making measurements, we may consider that each measurement is made up of two parts, one fixed and one variable, i.e.,

Measurement = fixed part + variable part,

or, in other words,

Data = model + error.

We use measured data to estimate the fixed part, (the Mean, for example), and use the variable part (perhaps summarized by the standard deviation) to assess the goodness of our estimate.

Residuals. Let the ith data point be denoted by y_i, let the fixed part be a constant M, and let the random error be ϵ_i as used in equation (2-19). Then

$$y_i = M + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., n.$$

If we use the method of least squares to estimate m, the resulting estimate is

$$m = \bar{y} = \sum_i y_i / n,$$

or the average of all measurements.

The ith residual, r_i, is defined as the difference between the ith data point and the fitted constant, i.e.

$$r_i = y_i - \bar{y}.$$

In general, the fixed part can be a function of another variable X (or more than one variable). Then the model is

$$y_i = F_(x_i) + \epsilon_i$$

and the ith residual is defined as

$$r_i = y_i - F(x_i),$$

where $F(x_i)$ is the value of the function computed with the fitted parameters. If the relationship between Y and X is linear as in (2-21), then $r_i = y_i - (a + bx_i)$ where a and b are the intercept and the slope of the fitted straight line, respectively.

When, as in calibration work, the values of $F(x_i)$ are frequently considered to be known, the differences between measured values and known values will be denoted d_i, the i th deviation, and can be used for plots instead of residuals.

Adequacy of Model. Following is a discussion of some of the issues involved in checking the adequacy of models and assumptions. For each issue, pertinent graphical techniques involving residuals or deviations are presented.

In calibrating a load cell, known deadweights are added in sequence and the deflections are read after each additional load. The deflections are plotted against loads in Fig. 4. A straight line model looks plausible, i.e.,

$$(\text{deflection}_i) = b_o + b_1(\text{load}_i).$$

A line is fitted by the method of least squares and the residuals from the fit are plotted in Fig. 5. The parabolic curve suggests that this model is inadequate, and that a second degree equation might fit better:

$$(\text{deflection}_i) = b_o + b_1(\text{load}_i) + b_2(\text{load}_i)^2.$$




Fig. 4. Plot of deflection vs load.




Fig. 5. Plot of residuals after linear fit.

This is done and the residuals from this second degree model are plotted against loads, resulting in Fig. 6. These residuals look random, yet a pattern may still be discerned upon close inspection. These patterns can be investigated to see if they are peculiar to this individual load cell, or are common to all load cells of similar design, or to all load cells.

Uncertainties based on residuals resulting from an inadequate model could be incorrect and misleading.




Fig. 6. Plot of residuals after quadratic fit.

Testing of Underlying Assumptions. In equation (2-19),

$$Y = m + \epsilon,$$

the assumptions are made that ϵ represents the random error (normal) and has a limiting mean zero and a standard deviation σ. In many measurement situations, these assumptions are approximately true. Departures from these assumptions, however, would invalidate our model and our assessment of uncertainties. Residual plots help in detecting any unacceptable departures from these assumptions.

Residuals from a straight line fit of measured depths of weld defects (radiographic method) to known depths (actually measured) are plotted against the known depths in Fig. 7. The increase in variability with depths of defects is apparent from the figure. Hence the assumption of constant σ over the range of $F(x)$ is violated. If the variability of residuals is proportional to depth, fitting of $\ln(y_i)$ against known depths is suggested by this plot.

The assumption that errors are normally distributed may be checked by doing a normal probability plot of the residuals. If the distribution is approximately normal, the plot should show a linear relationship. Curvature in the plot provides evidence that the distribution of errors is other than




Fig. 7. Plot of residuals after linear fit. Measured depth of weld defects vs true depth.




Fig. 8. Normal probability plot of residuals after quadratic fit.

normal. Fig. 8 is a normal probability plot of the residuals in Fig. 6, showing some evidence of departure from normality. Note the change in slope in the middle range.

Inspection of normal probability plots is not an easy job, however, unless the curvature is substantial. Frequently symmetry of the distribution of

errors is of main concern. Then a stem and leaf plot of data or residuals serves the purpose just as well as, if not better than, a normal probability plot. See, for example, Fig. 1.

Stability of a Measurement Sequence. It is a practice of most experimenters to plot the results of each run in sequence to check whether the measurements are stable over runs. The run- sequence plot differs from control charts in that no formal rules are used for action. The stability of a measurement process depends on many factors that are recorded but are not considered in the model because their effects are thought to be negligible.

Plots of residuals versus days, sets, instruments, operators, temperatures, humidities, etc., may be used to check whether effects of these factors are indeed negligible. Shifts in levels between days or instruments (see Fig. 2), trends over time, and dependence on environmental conditions are easily seen from a plot of residuals versus such factors.

In calibration work, frequently the values of standards are considered to be known. The differences between measured values and known values may be used for a plot instead of residuals.

Figs. 9, 10, and 11 are multi-trace plots of results from three laboratories of measuring linewidth standards using different optical imaging methods. The difference of 10 measured line widths from NBS values are plotted against NBS values for 7 days. It is apparent that measurements made on day 5 were out of control in Fig. 9. Fig. 10 shows a downward trend of differences with increasing line widths; Fig. 11 shows three significant outliers. These plots could be of help to those laboratories in locating and correcting causes of these anomalies. Fig. 12 plots the results of calibration of standard watt- hour meters from 1978 to 1982. It is evident that the variability of results at one time, represented by σ_w (discussed under Component of Variance Between Groups, p. 19), does not reflect the variability over a period of time, represented by σ_b (discussed in the same section). Hence, three measurements every three months would yield better variability information than, say, twelve measurements a year apart.




Fig. 9. Differences of linewidth measurements from NBS values. Measurements on day 5 inconsistent with others—Lab A.




Fig. 10. Trend with increasing linewidths—Lab B.




Fig. 11. Significant isolated outliers—Lab C.




Fig. 12. Measurements (% reg) on the power standard at 1-year and 3-month intervals.

Concluding Remarks

About 25 years ago, John W. Tukey pioneered "Exploratory Data Analysis" [1], and developed methods to probe for information that is present in data, prior to the application of conventional statistical techniques. Naturally graphs and plots become one of the indispensable tools. Some of these techniques, such as stem and leaf plots, box plots, and residual plots, are briefly described in the above paragraphs. References [1] through [5] cover most of the recent work done in this area. Reference [7] gives an up- to-date bibliography on Statistical Graphics.

Many of the examples used were obtained through the use of DATAPLOT [6]. I wish to express my thanks to Dr. J. J. Filliben, developer of this software system. Thanks are also due to M. Carroll Croarkin for the use of Figs. 9 thru 12, Susannah Schiller for Figs. 2 and 3 and Shirley Bremer for editing and typesetting.

References

[1] Tukey, John W., *Exploratory Data Analysis,* Addision-Wesley, 1977.

[2] Cleveland, William S., *The Elements of Graphing Data*, Wadsworth Advanced Book and Software, 1985.

[3] Chambers, J.M., Cleveland, W. S., Kleiner, B., and Tukey, P. A., *Graphical Methods for Data Analysis*, Wadsworth International Group and Duxbury Press, 1983.

[4] Hoaglin, David C., Mosteller, Frederick, and Tukey, John W., *Understanding Robust and Exploratory Data Analysis*, John Wiley & Sons, 1983.

[5] Velleman, Paul F., and Hoaglin, David C., *Applications, Basics, and Computing of Exploratory Data Analysis,* Duxbury Press, 1981.

[6] Filliben, James J., 'DATAPLOT - An Interactive High-level Language for Graphics, Nonlinear Fitting, Data Analysis and Mathematics,' *Computer Graphics, Vol. l5, No. 3*, August, 1981.

[7] Cleveland, William S., et al., 'Research in Statistical Graphics,' *Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 82, No. 398*, June 1987, pp. 419-423.

NBS-114A (REV. 2-8C)

U.S. DEPT. OF COMM. BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET (See instructions)	1. PUBLICATION OR REPORT NO. NBS/SP-747	2. Performing Organ. Report No.	3. Publication Date August 1988

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Statistical Concepts in Metrology -- With a Postscript on Statistical Graphics

5. AUTHOR(S)

Harry H. Ku

6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION (If joint or other than NBS, see instructions)

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
GAITHERSBURG, MD 20899

7. Contract/Grant No.

8. Type of Report & Period Covered

Final

9. SPONSORING ORGANIZATION NAME AND COMPLETE ADDRESS (Street, City, State, ZIP)

Same as item 6.

10. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 88-600569

☐ Document describes a computer program; SF-185, FIPS Software Summary, is attached.

11. ABSTRACT (A 200-word or less factual summary of most significant information. If document includes a significant bibliography or literature survey, mention it here)

"Statistical Concepts in Metrology" was originally written as Chapter 2 for the Handbook of Industrial Metrology published by the American Society of Tool and Manufacturing Engineers, 1967. It was reprinted as one of 40 papers in NBS Special Publication 300, Volume I, Precision Measurement and Calibration; Statistical Concepts and Procedures, 1969. Since then this chapter has been used as basic text in statistics in Bureau-sponsored courses and seminars, including those for Electricity, Electronics, and Analytical Chemistry.

While concepts and techniques introduced in the original chapter remain valid and appropriate, some additions on recent development of graphical methods for the treatment of data would be useful. Graphical methods can be used effectively to "explore" information in data sets prior to the application of classical statistical procedures. For this reason additional sections on statistical graphics are added as a postscript.

12. KEY WORDS (Six to twelve entries; alphabetical order; capitalize only proper names; and separate key words by semicolons)

graphics; measurement; metrology; plots; statistics; uncertainty.

13. AVAILABILITY

☒ Unlimited

☐ For Official Distribution. Do Not Release to NTIS

☒ Order From Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

☒ Order From National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, VA. 22161

14. NO. OF PRINTED PAGES

48

15. Price

USCOMM-DC 6043-P80

☆U.S. Government Printing Office : 1988 - 201-597/92551

NBS Technical Publications

Periodical

Journal of Research—The Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards reports NBS research and development in those disciplines of the physical and engineering sciences in which the Bureau is active. These include physics, chemistry, engineering, mathematics, and computer sciences. Papers cover a broad range of subjects, with major emphasis on measurement methodology and the basic technology underlying standardization. Also included from time to time are survey articles on topics closely related to the Bureau's technical and scientific programs. Issued six times a year.

Nonperiodicals

Monographs—Major contributions to the technical literature on various subjects related to the Bureau's scientific and technical activities.

Handbooks—Recommended codes of engineering and industrial practice (including safety codes) developed in cooperation with interested industries, professional organizations, and regulatory bodies.

Special Publications—Include proceedings of conferences sponsored by NBS, NBS annual reports, and other special publications appropriate to this grouping such as wall charts, pocket cards, and bibliographies.

Applied Mathematics Series—Mathematical tables, manuals, and studies of special interest to physicists, engineers, chemists, biologists, mathematicians, computer programmers, and others engaged in scientific and technical work.

National Standard Reference Data Series—Provides quantitative data on the physical and chemical properties of materials, compiled from the world's literature and critically evaluated. Developed under a worldwide program coordinated by NBS under the authority of the National Standard Data Act (Public Law 90-396).
NOTE: The Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data (JPCRD) is published quarterly for NBS by the American Chemical Society (ACS) and the American Institute of Physics (AIP). Subscriptions, reprints, and supplements are available from ACS, 1155 Sixteenth St., NW, Washington, DC 20056.

Building Science Series—Disseminates technical information developed at the Bureau on building materials, components, systems, and whole structures. The series presents research results, test methods, and performance criteria related to the structural and environmental functions and the durability and safety characteristics of building elements and systems.

Technical Notes—Studies or reports which are complete in themselves but restrictive in their treatment of a subject. Analogous to monographs but not so comprehensive in scope or definitive in treatment of the subject area. Often serve as a vehicle for final reports of work performed at NBS under the sponsorship of other government agencies.

Voluntary Product Standards—Developed under procedures published by the Department of Commerce in Part 10, Title 15, of the Code of Federal Regulations. The standards establish nationally recognized requirements for products, and provide all concerned interests with a basis for common understanding of the characteristics of the products. NBS administers this program as a supplement to the activities of the private sector standardizing organizations.

Consumer Information Series—Practical information, based on NBS research and experience, covering areas of interest to the consumer. Easily understandable language and illustrations provide useful background knowledge for shopping in today's technological marketplace.
Order the **above** *NBS publications from: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.*
Order the **following** *NBS publications—FIPS and NBSIR's—from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161.*

Federal Information Processing Standards Publications (FIPS PUB)—Publications in this series collectively constitute the Federal Information Processing Standards Register. The Register serves as the official source of information in the Federal Government regarding standards issued by NBS pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 as amended, Public Law 89-306 (79 Stat. 1127), and as implemented by Executive Order 11717 (38 FR 12315, dated May 11, 1973) and Part 6 of Title 15 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations).

NBS Interagency Reports (NBSIR)—A special series of interim or final reports on work performed by NBS for outside sponsors (both government and non-government). In general, initial distribution is handled by the sponsor; public distribution is by the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161, in paper copy or microfiche form.

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Bureau of Standards
Gaithersburg, MD 20899

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300



75 Years Stimulating America's Progress
1913 1988