

# Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test — Exam Reference Card

n = 5 to 50 · All Alpha Levels · Formulas · Decision Rules · Worked Example

Statistics Fundamentals | statisticsfundamentals.com

**REJECT  $H_0$**   
 $W \leq W_{\text{critical}}$

$W = \min(W^+, W^-)$   
 $W_{\text{critical}}$  from table below

**FAIL TO REJECT  $H_0$**   
 $W > W_{\text{critical}}$

## 6-Step Procedure

<b>1</b>	<b>Calculate differences</b>	$D_i = X_i - Y_i$ for each pair. Drop pairs where $D_i = 0$ . Remaining count is effective n.
<b>2</b>	<b>Rank absolute differences</b>	Rank $ D_i $ from 1 (smallest) to n (largest). Assign midranks to ties: e.g., tied 3rd and 4th both receive rank 3.5.
<b>3</b>	<b>Compute <math>W^+</math> and <math>W^-</math></b>	$W^+$ = sum of ranks for all $D_i > 0$ . $W^-$ = sum of ranks for all $D_i < 0$ .
<b>4</b>	<b>Compute W and verify</b>	$W = \min(W^+, W^-)$ . Check: $W^+ + W^-$ must equal $n(n+1)/2$ .
<b>5</b>	<b>Choose <math>\alpha</math> and tail direction</b>	Default: two-tailed $\alpha = 0.05$ . One-tailed only when direction was pre-specified before data collection.
<b>6</b>	<b>Look up and decide</b>	Find row n in table below. Read $W_{\text{critical}}$ . If $W \leq W_{\text{critical}} \rightarrow$ reject $H_0$ (significant). If $W > W_{\text{critical}} \rightarrow$ fail to reject $H_0$ .

## Key Formulas & Symbols

$D_i = X_i - Y_i$	Paired difference (drop if $D_i = 0$ )
$W^+ + W^- = n(n+1)/2$	Verification check — always confirm this before looking up the table
$W = \min(W^+, W^-)$	Test statistic — the smaller of the two rank sums
$\mu_W = n(n+1) / 4$	Mean of W under $H_0$ — used in normal approximation ( $n > 20$ )
$\sigma_W = \sqrt{[n(n+1)(2n+1) / 24]}$	Standard error of W — denominator of Z approximation
$Z = (W - \mu_W) / \sigma_W$	Z-score for $n > 20$ : compare $ Z $ to 1.960 ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) or 2.576 ( $\alpha=0.01$ ) two-tailed
$\sigma_{W,\text{corr}} = \sqrt{[n(n+1)(2n+1)/24 - \sum(t_j^3 - t_j)/48]}$	Tie-corrected standard error: $t_j$ = count of ties in tie group j

## Worked Example (n = 8, Two-Tailed $\alpha = 0.05$ )

**Scenario:** 8 patients have anxiety scores measured before and after CBT therapy. Data cannot be assumed normal (small sample). Using Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

Patient	Before (X)	After (Y)	D = X-Y	D	Rank	Signed Rank
1	14	13	+1	1	1	+1
2	12	10	+2	2	2	+2
3	16	13	+3	3	3	+3
4	11	15	-4	4	4	-4 ■
5	15	10	+5	5	5	+5
6	17	11	+6	6	6	+6
7	13	6	+7	7	7	+7
8	18	10	+8	8	8	+8

$$W^+ = 1+2+3+5+6+7+8 = 32$$

$$W^- = 4 = 4$$

$$W = \min(32, 4) = 4$$

$$W_{\text{critical}} (n=8, \alpha=0.05, 2T) = 3$$

**4 > 3 → Fail to reject  $H_0$**

Verify:  $W^+ + W^- = 32 + 4 = 36 = 8 \times 9 / 2 = 36$  ✓ ■ Patient 4's score worsened after therapy — one negative rank is not enough to flip the result when 7 out of 8 patients improved.

# Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test — Complete Critical Value Table

Both Two-Tailed and One-Tailed Headers Shown · Reject  $H_0$  if  $W \leq W_{critical}$  ·  $n = 5$  to  $50$

statisticsfundamentals.com/tables/wilcoxon-signed-rank-table/

## Complete Reference Table — All Alpha Levels (n = 5 to 50)

The highlighted column (Two-Tailed  $\alpha = 0.05$  / One-Tailed  $\alpha = 0.025$ ) is the standard significance level for most academic research. Milestone rows at  $n = 10, 20, 30, 40, 50$  are marked with a bold rule.

n	2T $\alpha=0.10$ 1T $\alpha=0.05$	2T $\alpha=0.05$ ★ 1T $\alpha=0.025$	2T $\alpha=0.02$ 1T $\alpha=0.01$	n	2T $\alpha=0.10$ 1T $\alpha=0.05$	2T $\alpha=0.05$ ★ 1T $\alpha=0.025$	2T $\alpha=0.02$ 1T $\alpha=0.01$
5	0	—	—	<b>28</b>	— 130	116	101
6	2	0	—	<b>29</b>	140	126	110
7	3	2	0	<b>30</b>	— 151	137	120
8	5	3	1	<b>31</b>	163	147	130
9	8	5	3	<b>32</b>	1 175	159	140
10	10	8	5	<b>33</b>	187	170	151
11	13	10	7	<b>34</b>	5 200	182	162
12	17	13	9	<b>35</b>	213	195	173
13	21	17	12	<b>36</b>	9 227	208	185
14	25	21	15	<b>37</b>	241	221	198
15	30	25	19	<b>38</b>	15 256	235	211
16	35	29	23	<b>39</b>	271	249	224
17	41	34	27	<b>40</b>	23 286	264	238
18	47	40	32	<b>41</b>	302	279	252
19	53	46	37	<b>42</b>	32 319	294	266
20	60	52	43	<b>43</b>	336	310	281
21	67	58	49	<b>44</b>	42 353	327	296
22	75	65	55	<b>45</b>	371	343	312
23	83	73	62	<b>46</b>	54 389	361	328
24	91	81	69	<b>47</b>	407	378	345
25	100	89	76	<b>48</b>	68 426	396	362
26	110	98	84	<b>49</b>	446	415	379
27	119	107	92	<b>50</b>	83 466	434	397

★ Two-tailed  $\alpha = 0.05$  is identical to one-tailed  $\alpha = 0.025$ . These columns share the same critical values.

### Alpha Level Summary & Use Cases

Two-Tailed $\alpha$	One-Tailed $\alpha$	Stringency	Minimum n	Typical Use Case
0.10	0.05	Liberal	n = 5	Pilot / exploratory studies; high power priority
<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.025</b>	<b>Standard</b>	<b>n = 6</b>	Most academic, clinical & behavioural research (default)
0.02	0.01	Moderate	n = 7	Medical studies, safety-critical decisions
0.01	0.005	Stringent	n = 8	Regulatory submissions, pre-registered replication studies

## Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test vs Paired t-Test — Quick Comparison

Feature	Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test	Paired Student's t-Test
Data type	Ordinal, interval, or ratio	Continuous interval or ratio
Distribution	Distribution-free (non-parametric)	Differences must be ~Normal
Outlier sensitivity	Robust — ranks limit extreme impact	Sensitive — outliers distort mean
Comparison basis	Median of paired differences	Mean of paired differences
Best for	Small n, non-normal, ordinal data	Large n, verified normality
Relative power	~95.5% of t-test on normal data	100% on normal data

### Primary References

1. Wilcoxon, F. (1945). Individual comparisons by ranking methods. *Biometrics Bulletin*, 1(6), 80–83. doi:10.2307/3001968
2. Conover, W. J. (1999). *Practical Nonparametric Statistics* (3rd ed.). Wiley. [Table A.1, critical values of the Wilcoxon signed-rank statistic]
3. NIST/SEMATECH (2012). e-Handbook of Statistical Methods — Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test. [itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/prc/section2/prc262.htm](http://itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/prc/section2/prc262.htm)
4. Penn State STAT 415. Non-parametric Tests — Wilcoxon Signed-Rank. [online.stat.psu.edu/stat415/lesson/20/20.2](http://online.stat.psu.edu/stat415/lesson/20/20.2)
5. Lehmann, E. L. & D'Abbrera, H. J. M. (2006). *Nonparametrics: Statistical Methods Based on Ranks*. Springer. [ARE =  $3/\pi \approx 0.955$  relative efficiency result]
6. Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health — Biostatistics Dept. (2021). Nonparametric Methods course notes. [hsph.harvard.edu](http://hsph.harvard.edu)