

# A Comprehensive Guide to Reading and Interpreting the Chi-Square Distribution Table

Authored by  
**Mohammed loot**

November 9, 2025

## RECOMMENDED CITATION

Mohammed loot (2025). *A Comprehensive Guide to Reading and Interpreting the Chi-Square Distribution Table*. PSYCHOLOGICAL STATISTICS. Retrieved from <https://statistics.arabpsychology.com/?p=14000>

The ability to accurately read and interpret statistical tables is a cornerstone of effective data analysis. This comprehensive tutorial provides an in-depth explanation of how to navigate the **Chi-Square Distribution Table**, a fundamental resource used across numerous disciplines for performing rigorous statistical hypothesis testing. Mastery of this table ensures that researchers can correctly determine the critical boundaries necessary to draw robust conclusions from their data.

## Understanding the Chi-Square Distribution Table

The [Chi-Square Distribution](#) table is a vital reference tool in inferential statistics, serving as the source for the corresponding [critical values](#) required for Chi-Square tests. These critical values establish the rejection region--the threshold used to decide whether the calculated test statistic provides sufficient evidence to reject the [null hypothesis](#). To utilize this table successfully, analysts must first determine two specific parameters derived from their statistical analysis:

The [degrees of freedom](#) (df), which is a value calculated based on the specific type of Chi-Square test being conducted and the dimensions of the data set.

The designated [alpha level](#) (or significance level, denoted as  $\alpha$ ), which quantifies the researcher's acceptable risk of committing a Type I error. Common alpha levels used in research include 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10.

The structure of the table is designed for immediate utility. The vertical dimension (the leftmost column) typically lists the possible values for the [degrees of freedom](#). Conversely, the horizontal dimension (the top row) displays the various [alpha levels](#). The essential critical value required for the test is found at the intersection of the appropriate row (df) and column ( $\alpha$ ).

## Locating Critical Values and Decision Making

Once the critical value is identified, the decision-making process in hypothesis testing becomes straightforward. This value acts as the boundary between the acceptance region and the rejection region. The calculated test statistic from the Chi-Square procedure is directly compared against the table's [critical value](#). If the calculated test statistic is larger than the [critical value](#) extracted from the table, the result falls into the rejection area. This outcome signifies that the observed findings are statistically significant, providing strong evidence to reject the [null hypothesis](#).

The image below illustrates the typical layout and structure of the Chi-Square distribution table. Note that while this excerpt displays the initial rows, a complete table often extends to cover a much wider range of degrees of freedom, which may be necessary for analyses involving larger datasets or more complex designs.

DF	P										
	0.995	0.975	0.2	0.1	0.05	0.025	0.02	0.01	0.005	0.002	0.001
1	.0004	.00016	1.642	2.706	3.841	5.024	5.412	6.635	7.879	9.55	10.828
2	0.01	0.0506	3.219	4.605	5.991	7.378	7.824	9.21	10.597	12.429	13.816
3	0.0717	0.216	4.642	6.251	7.815	9.348	9.837	11.345	12.838	14.796	16.266
4	0.207	0.484	5.989	7.779	9.488	11.143	11.668	13.277	14.86	16.924	18.467
5	0.412	0.831	7.289	9.236	11.07	12.833	13.388	15.086	16.75	18.907	20.515
6	0.676	1.237	8.558	10.645	12.592	14.449	15.033	16.812	18.548	20.791	22.458
7	0.989	1.69	9.803	12.017	14.067	16.013	16.622	18.475	20.278	22.601	24.322
8	1.344	2.18	11.03	13.362	15.507	17.535	18.168	20.09	21.955	24.352	26.124
9	1.735	2.7	12.242	14.684	16.919	19.023	19.679	21.666	23.589	26.056	27.877
10	2.156	3.247	13.442	15.987	18.307	20.483	21.161	23.209	25.188	27.722	29.588
11	2.603	3.816	14.631	17.275	19.675	21.92	22.618	24.725	26.757	29.354	31.264
12	3.074	4.404	15.812	18.549	21.026	23.337	24.054	26.217	28.3	30.957	32.909
13	3.565	5.009	16.985	19.812	22.362	24.736	25.472	27.688	29.819	32.535	34.528
14	4.075	5.629	18.151	21.064	23.685	26.119	26.873	29.141	31.319	34.091	36.123
15	4.601	6.262	19.311	22.307	24.996	27.488	28.259	30.578	32.801	35.628	37.697
16	5.142	6.908	20.465	23.542	26.296	28.845	29.633	32	34.267	37.146	39.252
17	5.697	7.564	21.615	24.769	27.587	30.191	30.995	33.409	35.718	38.648	40.79
18	6.265	8.231	22.76	25.989	28.869	31.526	32.346	34.805	37.156	40.136	42.312
19	6.844	8.907	23.9	27.204	30.144	32.852	33.687	36.191	38.582	41.61	43.82
20	7.434	9.591	25.038	28.412	31.41	34.17	35.02	37.566	39.997	43.072	45.315

## Practical Applications: Overview of Chi-Square Tests

The methodology for applying the **Chi-Square Distribution Table** remains consistent across various forms of the [Chi-Square test](#), yet the prerequisite step--calculating the degrees of freedom--changes depending on the test being performed. Understanding these subtle differences is essential, as the calculation of degrees of freedom dictates which specific row of the distribution table must be consulted. We will explore three primary applications of this statistical framework:

The **Chi-Square Test for Independence**, which is used to assess whether a relationship exists between two or more categorical variables within a single population.

The **Chi-Square Test for Goodness of Fit**, which determines if an observed distribution of data significantly aligns with a hypothesized or theoretical distribution.

The **Chi-Square Test for Homogeneity**, which tests whether the distribution of a categorical variable is the same across two or more independent populations.

By examining these distinct scenarios, we demonstrate how the initial steps of setting up the hypothesis and calculating the degrees of freedom directly translate into finding the correct critical boundary using the distribution table.

## Case Study 1: The Chi-Square Test for Independence

The **Chi-Square test for independence** is a fundamental tool used when the objective is to determine if two distinct [categorical variables](#) are statistically related or associated. This test operates by comparing the observed frequencies collected from a sample against the expected frequencies that would occur if the variables were, in fact, entirely independent.

### Example Scenario: Voter Preferences and Gender

Consider a research study designed to explore if a voter's gender has any significant association with their political party preference (Democrat, Republican, or Independent). A random sample comprising 500 eligible voters is surveyed. The researchers establish the significance threshold, or [alpha level](#) ( $\alpha$ ), at 0.05. The data gathered from the survey is summarized in the contingency table below, which forms the basis for performing the Chi-Square test for independence.

	Republican	Democrat	Independent	Total
Male	120	90	40	250
Female	110	95	45	250
Total	230	185	85	500

After performing the necessary statistical calculations on the data, the resulting test statistic ( $\chi^2_{\text{calc}}$ ) is found to be 0.864. The subsequent crucial step involves calculating the degrees of freedom (df) and locating the corresponding critical value in the table. For a test of independence, the formula for df is:  $df = (\text{Number of Rows} - 1) \times (\text{Number of Columns} - 1)$ . Given 2 rows (Male, Female) and 3 columns (Parties), the calculation is  $df = (2 - 1) \times (3 - 1) = 2$ .

Consulting the Chi-Square distribution table with 2 degrees of freedom and an alpha level of 0.05, we trace the intersection point. The corresponding critical value ( $\chi^2_{\text{crit}}$ ) for this specific test is determined to be **5.991**. Since the calculated test statistic (0.864) is substantially smaller than the critical value (5.991), the result falls outside the rejection region. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, concluding that there is no statistically significant association between gender and political party preference based on this sample.

DF	P										
	0.995	0.975	0.2	0.1	0.05	0.025	0.02	0.01	0.005	0.002	0.001
1	.0004	.00016	1.642	2.706	3.841	5.024	5.412	6.635	7.879	9.55	10.828
2	0.01	0.0506	3.219	4.605	5.991	7.378	7.824	9.21	10.597	12.429	13.816
3	0.0717	0.216	4.642	6.251	7.815	9.348	9.837	11.345	12.838	14.796	16.266
4	0.207	0.484	5.989	7.779	9.488	11.143	11.668	13.277	14.86	16.924	18.467
5	0.412	0.831	7.289	9.236	11.07	12.833	13.388	15.086	16.75	18.907	20.515
6	0.676	1.237	8.558	10.645	12.592	14.449	15.033	16.812	18.548	20.791	22.458
7	0.989	1.69	9.803	12.017	14.067	16.013	16.622	18.475	20.278	22.601	24.322
8	1.344	2.18	11.03	13.362	15.507	17.535	18.168	20.09	21.955	24.352	26.124
9	1.735	2.7	12.242	14.684	16.919	19.023	19.679	21.666	23.589	26.056	27.877
10	2.156	3.247	13.442	15.987	18.307	20.483	21.161	23.209	25.188	27.722	29.588

## Case Study 2: The Chi-Square Test for Goodness of Fit

The **Chi-Square Goodness of Fit test** is applied when a researcher needs to verify whether the observed frequency distribution of a single categorical variable deviates significantly from a pre-established or hypothesized theoretical distribution. This test essentially measures the "fit" between the sample data and the expected population model. It is particularly useful for verifying claims about population proportions.

### Example Scenario: Retail Customer Traffic Distribution

A retail shop owner claims that their weekend customer traffic is distributed as follows: 30% on Friday, 50% on Saturday, and 20% on Sunday. To test the validity of this assertion, a researcher collects observational data over a random period, noting 91 customers on Friday, 104 on Saturday, and 65 on Sunday. The analysis aims to use the goodness of fit test with a significance level ( $\alpha$ ) of 0.10 to determine if the actual customer distribution is consistent with the owner's stated proportions.

After calculating the expected counts based on the 30/50/20 proportions and comparing them to the observed counts, the resulting test statistic ( $\chi^2_{\text{calc}}$ ) for this analysis is found to be 10.616. To pinpoint the appropriate critical boundary in the [Chi-Square Distribution](#) table, the degrees of freedom (df) must be calculated. For the Goodness of Fit test, df is calculated as the number of categories (or possible outcomes) minus one. With three categories (Friday, Saturday, Sunday), the calculation is  $df = 3 - 1 = 2$ . Using  $df = 2$  and the specified alpha level ( $\alpha = 0.10$ ), we consult the table, identifying the critical value ( $\chi^2_{\text{crit}}$ ) as **4.605**.

DF	P										
	0.995	0.975	0.2	0.1	0.05	0.025	0.02	0.01	0.005	0.002	0.001
1	.0004	.00016	1.642	2.706	3.841	5.024	5.412	6.635	7.879	9.55	10.828
2	0.01	0.0506	3.219	4.605	5.991	7.378	7.824	9.21	10.597	12.429	13.816
3	0.0717	0.216	4.642	6.251	7.815	9.348	9.837	11.345	12.838	14.796	16.266
4	0.207	0.484	5.989	7.779	9.488	11.143	11.668	13.277	14.86	16.924	18.467
5	0.412	0.831	7.289	9.236	11.07	12.833	13.388	15.086	16.75	18.907	20.515
6	0.676	1.237	8.558	10.645	12.592	14.449	15.033	16.812	18.548	20.791	22.458
7	0.989	1.69	9.803	12.017	14.067	16.013	16.622	18.475	20.278	22.601	24.322
8	1.344	2.18	11.03	13.362	15.507	17.535	18.168	20.09	21.955	24.352	26.124
9	1.735	2.7	12.242	14.684	16.919	19.023	19.679	21.666	23.589	26.056	27.877
10	2.156	3.247	13.442	15.987	18.307	20.483	21.161	23.209	25.188	27.722	29.588

Given that the calculated test statistic (10.616) is significantly larger than the critical value (4.605), the result clearly falls within the statistical rejection region. Therefore, we reject the [null hypothesis](#). This compelling statistical evidence suggests that the true distribution of weekend customers in the shop does not align with the owner's claim of 30%, 50%, and 20% across the three days.

### Case Study 3: The Chi-Square Test for Homogeneity

The **Chi-Square Test for Homogeneity** is specifically designed to formally test whether the distribution of a particular categorical variable is uniform (homogeneous) across two or more distinct populations or groups. This test is essential for comparing proportional outcomes across different samples, such as comparing the success rates of new treatments versus a control group.

#### Example Scenario: Comparing Basketball Training Programs

A sports training facility introduces two new basketball programs (Program 1 and Program 2) intended to boost player performance beyond that achieved by the current standard program. Players are randomly assigned to one of the three groups: 172 players to Program 1, 173 to Program 2, and 215 to the current program. After a one-month training period, all players participate in a standardized shooting test, yielding the pass/fail results summarized in the contingency table below. The goal is to use a significance level of 0.05 to ascertain if the passing rate is truly homogeneous (the same) across all three training programs.

	Program 1	Program 2	Current Program	Total
# Passed	112	94	130	336
# Failed	60	79	85	224
Total	172	173	215	560

After performing the foundational calculations, including determining the expected frequencies, the resulting calculated Chi-Square test statistic ( $\chi^2_{\text{calc}}$ ) is found to be 4.208. To conclude the hypothesis test, we must locate the critical boundary value in the [Chi-Square Distribution](#) table. Importantly, the homogeneity test uses the identical structural calculation for the degrees of freedom as the test for independence:  $df = (\text{Number of Rows} - 1) \times (\text{Number of Columns} - 1)$ . With 2 rows (Pass/Fail) and 3 columns (Program 1, Program 2, Current Program), the calculation is  $df = (2 - 1) \times (3 - 1) = 2$ .

Using  $df = 2$  and the specified alpha level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ), we consult the table, finding the critical value ( $\chi^2_{\text{crit}}$ ) to be **5.991**. Since the calculated test statistic (4.208) is smaller than the critical value (5.991), the result does not enter the rejection region. Consequently, we fail to reject the [null hypothesis](#). The conclusion drawn is that there is insufficient statistical evidence to assert that the three training programs yield significantly different passing rates among the participating players.

DF	P										
	0.995	0.975	0.2	0.1	0.05	0.025	0.02	0.01	0.005	0.002	0.001
1	.0004	.00016	1.642	2.706	3.841	5.024	5.412	6.635	7.879	9.55	10.828
2	0.01	0.0506	3.219	4.605	5.991	7.378	7.824	9.21	10.597	12.429	13.816
3	0.0717	0.216	4.642	6.251	7.815	9.348	9.837	11.345	12.838	14.796	16.266
4	0.207	0.484	5.989	7.779	9.488	11.143	11.668	13.277	14.86	16.924	18.467
5	0.412	0.831	7.289	9.236	11.07	12.833	13.388	15.086	16.75	18.907	20.515
6	0.676	1.237	8.558	10.645	12.592	14.449	15.033	16.812	18.548	20.791	22.458
7	0.989	1.69	9.803	12.017	14.067	16.013	16.622	18.475	20.278	22.601	24.322
8	1.344	2.18	11.03	13.362	15.507	17.535	18.168	20.09	21.955	24.352	26.124
9	1.735	2.7	12.242	14.684	16.919	19.023	19.679	21.666	23.589	26.056	27.877
10	2.156	3.247	13.442	15.987	18.307	20.483	21.161	23.209	25.188	27.722	29.588