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Abstract

This paper advocates use of nonparametric statistics. First, the consequence of using parametric inferential techniques under non-normality is described. Next, the advantages of using nonparametric techniques are presented. The third purpose is to demonstrate empirically how infrequently nonparametric statistics appear in studies, even those published in the most reputable journals. Fourth, a typology of nonparametric statistics is presented for all univariate GLM analyses. Fifth, the nonparametric statistics that are available in the most commonly used statistical software are delineated. Finally, nonparametric effect size indices are outlined.
A Call for Greater Use of Nonparametric Statistics

Whether to choose a parametric or nonparametric statistic can be one of the most difficult steps in analyzing data. Many researchers struggle with this step, or just ignore this step, by proceeding on to use the more common parametric statistic. The process of checking assumptions in order to justify use of the parametric statistic, and being certain that the data fit the assumptions, is paramount and should be undertaken regularly (Kerlinger, 1964, 1973; Nunnally, 1975; Tukey, 1977).

If the data violate the assumptions that justify use of the desired parametric statistic, then transformation of the data could be used that more adequately fits the assumption (Kirk, 1982). Indeed, a member of the family of Box-Cox transformations could be used (Box & Cox, 1964). For example, if the score distribution has moderate positive skew, then the square root transformation might be most appropriate; for severe positive skew a logarithm transformation might be useful; for moderate negative skew, reflecting the variable (i.e., subtracting each score from the largest score plus one) and then taking the square root might suffice; for severe negative skew, reflecting the variable and then taking the logarithm might be effective; finally, for J-shaped distributions, the inverse transformation might be the most adequate (Box & Cox, 1964; Bradley, 1982; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).

Whatever, transformation is used, it is essential that the same assumptions are checked on the transformed data. Providing an appropriate transformation is selected, transforming the data can be an extremely useful method for dealing with outliers, as well as for deviations from the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity (i.e., variability of scores for one continuous variable being approximately the same at
all values of another continuous variable). However, the transformations can be problematic for two major reasons. First and foremost, it is not unusual that several transformations often must be attempted before the most appropriate one is found. This can be extremely time-consuming and frustrating for researchers working under tight deadlines for their research. Second, even when a suitable transformation is found, the subsequent inferential analysis is often more difficult to interpret than would have been the case if the variable had been analyzed in its original form. Thus, although some textbook authors (e.g., Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996) strongly recommend transforming data when assumptions are violated, very few researchers use this technique. In fact, the use of transformations typically is not considered important by instructors of graduate-level statistics and research methodology courses, nor is this topic even covered in these classes taught at the introductory level (Mundfrom, Shaw, Thomas, Young, & Moore, 1998). Such a lack of coverage likely leads to a lack of awareness of the potential usefulness of data transformations.

Because of the lack of awareness of data transformations coupled with the problems described above when they are used, few researchers transform their data. Consistent with this assertion, Keselman et al. (1998), who examined articles published in 17 prominent educational and behavioral science research journals in the 1994 or 1995, reported that data transformations were used in only 7.59% of articles involving between-subjects univariate designs ($n = 79$). Instead of using data transformations, some researchers decide to utilize the other option available for addressing assumption violations, namely, the nonparametric statistic (Gliner & Morgan, 2000; Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1998; Newton & Rudestam, 1999). As stated by Hollander and Wolfe (1973, p.
1), nonparametric statistics represent a class of statistical methods that have specific "desirable properties that hold under relatively mild assumptions regarding the underlying populations(s) from which the data are obtained." Hotelling and Pabst (1936) are credited for developing this field (Savage, 1953).

Since the publication of the first textbook devoted exclusively to nonparametric procedures approximately one-half a century ago (Kendall, 1948), there has been a proliferation of textbooks dedicated to this topic. Yet, use of nonparametric statistics is extremely scant among researchers (Elmore & Woehlke, 1996; Jenkins, Fuqua, & Froehle, 1984). There are many possible reasons for this lack of use (Anderson, 1961; Blair, 1985). One reason stems from the fact that many researchers had graduate-level instruction in statistics that was taught in a rote manner. Another reason is that some researchers do not remember or do not know how to check their data for possible assumption violations (Sawilowsky, 1990). A third explanation for the lack of use of nonparametric statistics might arise from the fact that many graduate-level programs minimize students' exposure to statistical content and methodology. This started during the 1970's when nonparametric statistics were given a secondary role to parametric statistics in many textbooks (Sawilowsky, 1990; Winn & Johnson, 1978). Indeed, Aiken, West, Sechrest, and Reno (1990) reported that statistical and methodological curricula had advanced little in the previous 20 years. Thus, it is likely that many current researchers did not have much exposure to nonparametric statistics in their graduate courses.

A fourth reason for the scarcity of use of nonparametric statistics is that many researchers believe parametric statistics are extremely robust to violations to data
assumptions (Boneau, 1960; Box, 1954; Glass, Peckman, & Sanders, 1972; Lindquist, 1953). Kerlinger (1964, 1973) and Nunnally (1975) discussed the lack of use of nonparametric statistics as stemming from the assumption that nonparametric tests are less powerful than parametric statistics. Finally, the dearth of use of nonparametric methods might have arisen from a failure, fear, or even refusal to recognize that analytical techniques that were once popular no longer reflect best practices, and, moreover, may now be deemed inappropriate, misleading, invalid, or obsolete.

Thus, this paper advocates use of nonparametric statistics. First, the role of statistical assumptions is described. Then, the consequence of using parametric inferential techniques under non-normality is presented. Next, the advantages of utilizing nonparametric techniques are presented. The third purpose is to demonstrate empirically how infrequently nonparametric statistics appear in studies, even those published in the most reputable journals. Fourth, a typology of nonparametric statistics is presented for all univariate GLM analyses. Fifth, the nonparametric statistics that are available in the most commonly used statistical software are delineated. Finally, nonparametric effect size indices are outlined.

**Nonparametric Statistics and the Role of Statistical Assumptions**

Most data in social science research fail to meet the assumptions for parametric statistics (Micceri, 1989). For these cases, if the data are not transformed, then nonparametric techniques should be utilized. To know when to use nonparametric statistics, a basic understanding of the role of statistical assumptions is necessary. Statistical assumptions can be thought of as “rules” or “guidelines” for a given statistic. Before a statistic is to be used, the assumptions for the statistic need to be checked to
see if they have been met. All univariate parametric analyses, including analyses of
bivariate relationships, are subsumed by the general linear model (GLM), and are
therefore bounded by its assumptions. An important assumption that prevails for all
univariate GLM analyses is that the dependent variable is normally distributed.

The more the normality assumption is violated, the less justified it is to rely on
parametric statistics to conduct null hypothesis significance tests. However, many
parametric statistics are assumed to be "robust" against reasonable violations of
assumptions (Boneau, 1960, 1962; Box, 1953; Hinkle et al., 1998; Gardner, 1975;
Minium, 1978; Newton & Rudestam, 1999). A statistical procedure or test is considered
to be robust with respect to the particular underlying assumption, if it is reasonably
insensitive to slight departures from the assumption (Hollander & Wolfe, 1973). If a
parametric statistic is robust, then it can still be used when the assumption is not
adequately met. Yet, Bradley (1978) and Singer (1979) contend that parametric
statistics are not truly robust. Moreover, Bradley (1982) demonstrated that statistical
inference becomes increasingly less robust as distributions depart from normality.
Further, Tabachnick and Fidell (1996, p. 70) noted that “even when the statistics are
used purely descriptively, normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of variables
enhance the analysis.” In fact, according to some methodologists (e.g., Bradley, 1978;
Singer, 1979), assumption violations are only tolerated by the overwhelming majority of
researchers so that the parametric statistics can be used.

Disturbingly, the majority of studies in the social and behavioral sciences do not
utilize random samples (Shaver & Norton, 1980a, 1980b), even though “inferential
statistics is based on the assumption of random sampling from populations” (Glass &
Hopkins, 1984, p. 177). In fact, randomness, in the form of random error, is the basis for sampling distributions against which observed findings are compared (Carver, 1993). Further, use of nonrandom samples increases the chances that scores will be non-normal. Another factor that contributes to violations of normality is that many data sets are generated from small samples. These problems render it likely that the underlying samples yield scores from dependent measures that depart from normality. Thus, it is not surprising that the majority of data in the social and behavioral sciences are not normally distributed (Micceri, 1989).

When the dependent variable deviates from normality, the parametric GLM analysis should not be used. Bradley (1968) defined a nonparametric statistic as being a "distribution-free test …which makes no assumptions about the precise form of the sampled population" (p. 15). Alternatively stated, nonparametric methods are termed distribution-free because they can be employed for variables whose joint distribution represents any specified distribution, including the bivariate normal, or whose joint distribution is not known and therefore is unspecified (Gibbons, 1993). Therefore, when the assumption of normality is not met, a nonparametric statistic is the more appropriate choice.

An important question to be asked is how much should scores deviate from normality before nonparametric statistics become essential. With regard to univariate inferential statistical techniques, Onwuegbuzie and Daniel (2002) have provided objective but simple criteria for determining whether scores deviate from normality. Specifically, these methodologists stated the following:
Additionally, for adequate sample sizes, a formal test of statistical significance can be conducted by utilizing the fact that the ratio of the skewness and kurtosis coefficients to their respective standard errors (i.e., standardized skewness and standardized kurtosis coefficients) are themselves normally distributed. Most other statistical packages print as options skewness and kurtosis coefficients but not their standard errors. However, these standard errors can be approximated manually (the standard error for skewness is approximately equal to the square root of $6/n$, and the standard error for kurtosis is approximately equal to the square root of $24/n$, where $n$ is the sample size). For both small and large sample sizes, rather than conducting a test of statistical significance, criteria can be used for assessing whether the standardized skewness and/or kurtosis coefficients are unacceptably large. One rule of thumb that we offer is that (a) standardized skewness and kurtosis coefficients which lie within $\pm 2$ suggest no serious departures from normality, (b) coefficients outside this range but within the $\pm 3$ boundary signify slight departures from normality, and (c) standardized coefficients outside the $\pm 3$ range indicate important departures from normality. Using such a rule provides an objective method of assessing normality that is based on effect sizes (i.e., standardized coefficients). (pp. 75)

**Consequences of not Meeting the Assumption**

Problems arise when a parametric statistic is used with data that are not normally distributed. Labovitz (1967) points out that "a word of caution is necessary...it frequently turns out that the violation of one assumption does not appreciably alter the
test, [although] the violation of two or more assumptions frequently does have a marked effect” (p.158). Thus, when the assumptions are not met, using a parametric statistic likely will generate invalid results (Field, 2000; Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1998; Newton & Rudestam, 1999).

The use of a parametric statistic when the assumption of normality is grossly violated can have serious consequences (Siegel, 1956). In fact, large skewness and kurtosis coefficients affect Type I and Type II error rates. For instance, a non-normal kurtosis coefficient typically produces an underestimate of the variance of a variable, which, in turn, increases the Type I error rate (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Although the parametric t-test is typically robust with regard to Type I error under the conditions of large and equal samples sizes, this test is not powerful for when data are characterized by skewed distributions. In fact, under skewed conditions, the Wilcoxon Rank Sum test, a nonparametric counterpart of the t-test is three to four times more powerful (Blair & Higgins, 1980; Bridge & Sawilowsky, 1999; Nanna & Sawilowsky, 1998)—a finding of which researchers appear to be unaware.

Advantages of Using Nonparametric Techniques

There are many advantages of using nonparametric techniques. Siegel (1956) outlined six main advantages. The first advantage is that for most nonparametric statistics, the “accuracy of the probability statement does not depend on the shape of the population” (p. 32). Further, the size of the sample is not as important, because small sample sizes will not cause the results to be misleading to the extent that small samples unduly affect parametric tests. The third advantage is that nonparametric statistics can be used when observations come from several different populations.
Next, nonparametric statistics can be used with data that are ordinal, or ranked, as well as with interval- and ratio-scaled data. Nonparametric statistics can be used with nominal data as well. Finally, for many researchers, nonparametric statistics can be easily learned and applied, at least at the univariate level. Most statistical computer software packages, such as the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS; SPSS Inc., 2001) and the Statistical Analysis System (SAS Institute Inc., 2002), include nonparametric statistics.

McSeeney and Katz (1978) summarized the reasons for using nonparametric statistics. These include (a) nonparametric statistics have fewer assumptions, (b) nonparametric statistics can be used with rank-ordered data, (c) nonparametric statistics can be used with small samples, (d) data do not need to be normally distributed, and (e) outliers can be present.

Hollander and Wolfe (1973) provided six reasons for using nonparametric statistics. Specifically, they contended that nonparametric methods (a) require few assumptions about the underlying population from which the data are collected; (b) do not necessitate the assumption of normality; (c) are often easier to apply than are their parametric counterparts; (d) are typically easy to understand; (e) are appropriate when parametric methods cannot be employed; and (f) are only slightly less efficient than parametric methods under normality, while being more efficient under non-normality.

Further, when approximate normality is met, nonparametric tests are still relatively efficient—the asymptotic relative efficiency of nonparametric tests with respect to parametric tests can be as high as 95.5% (Gibbons, 1993; Hollander & Wolfe, 1973). Consequently, in many cases, researchers have relatively little to lose by using
nonparametric tests if the distribution is normal. If the distribution is not normal, tests based on nonparametric tests likely are more efficient than are their parametric counterparts. It is thus surprising that researchers do not utilize nonparametric tests more than they do.

Use of Nonparametric Statistics in Published Journal Articles

Many graduate-level statistics and research methodology courses in the past have not included extensive information regarding nonparametric statistics (Aiken et al., 1990; Sawilowsky, 1990; Winn & Johnson, 1978). In fact, Mundfrom et al. (1998) found that the chi-square statistic was the only nonparametric statistic presented in introductory-level statistics and research methodology classes. Further, of the inferential statistics cited, the statistics and research methodology instructors indicated that the chi-square test was the fourth least most covered technique and was considered the fourth least important topic (Mundfrom, et al., 1998). Thus, nonparametric statistics infrequently appear in published articles, including those in the most reputable journals (Elmore & Woehlke, 1996; Jenkins et al., 1984). Moreover, many researchers do not report whether assumptions were checked, or whether the data fit the assumptions. For example, Keselman et al. (1998) reported that less than one-fifth of articles (i.e., 19.7%) "indicated some concern for distribational assumption violations" (p. 356). Similarly, Onwuegbuzie (in press) found that only 11.1% of researchers discussed the extent to which analysis of variance, analysis of covariance, multivariate analysis of variance, or multivariate analysis of covariance were violated.

To better understand this phenomenon, Royeen (1986) identified five published studies that used parametric statistics. For each study, the data were checked for
whether it met the assumptions for the parametric statistic used. In three of the five studies, the assumptions were not met. Next, the appropriate nonparametric statistic was computed on the data. For each of the three studies that did not meet the assumptions, there were large differences in the results yielded by the nonparametric statistic when compared with the published results from the parametric statistic. Thus, this examination demonstrates that if the assumptions are not met, the results can be very misleading. Furthermore, this examination exemplifies the problem that many studies have: if the assumptions have not been checked and they have not been met for the parametric statistics utilized, then the results are invalid. This is important to note when reading published studies that do not include information about whether or not the assumptions have been checked.

A Typology of Nonparametric Statistics

A myriad of nonparametric statistics exists for conducting distribution-free tests. The vast majority of these tests are readily available from the major statistical software (e.g., SPSS, SAS). A selection of some of the most common tests is provided in Table 1.

Nonparametric Effect Size Indices

When reporting inferential statistics (e.g., t tests, F tests, and chi-square), include information about the obtained magnitude or value of the test statistic, the degrees of freedom, the probability of obtaining a value as extreme as or more extreme than the one obtained, and the direction of the effect.... Neither of the two types of probability value directly reflects the magnitude of an effect or the strength of a relationship. For the reader to fully understand the importance of your findings, it is almost always necessary to include some index of effect size or strength of relationship in your Results section...The general principle to be followed, however, is to provide the reader not only with information about statistical significance but also with enough information to assess the magnitude of the observed effect or relationship. (pp. 22-26)

Reporting effect sizes is no less important for statistically significant nonparametric findings than it is for statistically significant parametric results. However, when the few researchers who use nonparametric methods observe a statistically significant p-value, typically either they do not provide effect sizes, or they compute parametric-based effect sizes. First and foremost, statistically significant nonparametric statistics always should be followed up by some measure of effect size. However, it should be noted that just as parametric tests are adversely affected by departures from GLM assumptions, so too are parametric effect sizes (e.g., $d$, $\omega^2$, $\epsilon^2$). For example, as noted by Onwuegbuzie and Levin (2002), parametric effect sizes are affected by non-normality and heterogeneity of scores. Thus, whatever assumptions were violated that led to the use of nonparametric methods also would distort the parametric effect size. In fact, Hogarty and Kromrey (2001), using Monte Carlo methods, demonstrated that the most frequently used effect-
size estimates (e.g., $d$) are extremely sensitive to departures from normality and homogeneity. Even trimmed effect-size measures (Hedges & Olkin, 1985; Yuen, 1974) exhibit extreme bias when the sample is small.

Therefore, researchers should consider following up statistically significant nonparametric $p$-values with nonparametric effect sizes. Nonparametric effect sizes include Cramer’s $V$, the phi coefficient, and the odds ratio. These effect sizes indices, which are appropriate for chi-square analyses, are readily available on SPSS and SAS. Other nonparametric effect size estimates include (a) $\gamma$ (Kraemer & Andrews, 1982), which is based on the degree of overlap between samples; (b) the Common Language (CL) effect-size statistic (McGraw & Wong, 1992), which indicates the relative frequency with which a score sampled from one distribution is greater than a score sampled from a second distribution; (c) Vargha and Delaney’s (2000) $A$, which is a measure of stochastic superiority that is appropriate for ordinally scaled distributions; (d) Cliff’s (1993) $d$, appropriate for comparing two groups, which assesses the equivalence of probabilities of scores in each group being larger than scores in the other group (i.e., dominance); and (e) Wilcox and Muska’s (1999) $W$, a nonparametric analogue of $\omega^2$, which estimates the degree of certainty with which an observation can be linked to one population rather than the other. Of these five measures, Cliff’s $d$ and Vargha and Delaney’s $A$ appear to be the most robust to violations of normality and heterogeneity of variance (Hogarty & Kromrey, 2001). Unfortunately, none of these five nonparametric measures are computed by the major statistical software programs. Thus, software development companies can play an important role here in motivating researchers to follow up statistically significant nonparametric statistics with nonparametric effect sizes.
Conclusions

For the last 50 years, nonparametric techniques have been underutilized, despite the fact that statistical software routinely allows the computation of an array of nonparametric statistics, and despite the fact that parametric techniques are extremely sensitive to extreme violations to GLM assumptions. Unfortunately, many researchers are not being made adequately aware that nonparametric statistics provide viable alternatives to their parametric counterparts. Clearly, instructors, journal editors, and statistical software developers can play vital roles in promoting the nonparametric movement. In any case, much more work is needed to promote the use of distribution-free statistics. As such, we hope that the present call for the use of nonparametric techniques represents one small step in the right direction.
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Table 1: Typology of Nonparametric Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures of Association:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square Test of Independence</td>
<td>concordance/discordance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau</td>
<td>consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theil test</td>
<td>slope of regression line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran Test</td>
<td>consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's exact test</td>
<td>relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Population Tests:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binomial</td>
<td>proportions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Goodness-of-Fit Test</td>
<td>goodness of fit test for continuous data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Test</td>
<td>paired replicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test</td>
<td>symmetry and equality of location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta test</td>
<td>symmetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges-Lehman One-sample Estimator</td>
<td>median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison of Two Populations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square Test of Homogeneity</td>
<td>differences in proportions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon (Mann-Whitney) Test</td>
<td>differences in location and spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Two-Sample Test</td>
<td>differences between population distributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenbaum's Test</td>
<td>differences in location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukey's Test</td>
<td>differences in spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges-Lehman Two-sample Estimator</td>
<td>difference in medians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage Test</td>
<td>differences in spread when medians equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansari-Bradley Test</td>
<td>differences in dispersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Confidence Interval</td>
<td>differences in location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison of Several Populations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruskal-Wallis Test</td>
<td>symmetry and equality of location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman's Test</td>
<td>symmetry and location (two-way data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terpstra-Jonckheere Test</td>
<td>medians equal vs. changing median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page's Test</td>
<td>ordered alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Match Test for Ordered Alternatives</td>
<td>medians equal vs. medians ordered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller's jackknife Test</td>
<td>unknown squared ratio of scale differs from 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollander Test</td>
<td>X and Y variables are interchangeable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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