# How to Easily Determine a Good Confidence Interval

Authored by
**stats writer**

December 2, 2025

A **confidence interval** (CI) represents a crucial concept in inferential statistics, providing a range of values that is likely to contain the true, unknown **population parameter**. This interval is constructed by integrating a sample statistic--such as the sample mean--with a calculated margin of error, which is directly influenced by the specified level of confidence. Ultimately, the quality and utility of a CI often hinge on its width, representing a delicate trade-off between the precision of the estimate and the certainty (confidence level) with which we make that claim.

The primary goal of statistical estimation is to accurately pinpoint where the true **population parameter** lies. A **confidence interval** serves as a probabilistic statement about this location, defining a range of values that is expected to encompass the population value with a specified probability, such as 95% or 99%. Understanding what constitutes a "good" confidence interval requires moving beyond mere definition and evaluating the interval's practical utility in real-world research and decision-making.

## What Defines a "Good" Confidence Interval?

The fundamental question statisticians and researchers frequently ask is: **What is considered a good confidence interval?** The consensus within the statistical community is that, generally, narrower confidence intervals are highly desirable. A narrow interval signifies a higher degree of precision in our estimation. When the range of plausible values for a **population parameter** is small, the estimate is more informative and useful for drawing conclusions or formulating policies.

Consider a hypothetical scenario where we are estimating the mean weight of a newly developed pharmaceutical compound. If our 95% confidence interval spans from 5.0 grams to 50.0 grams, this wide range offers very little actionable insight. Conversely, a 95% **confidence interval** spanning from 27.0 grams to 28.0 grams provides a much clearer, more precise estimate of the true mean weight, greatly enhancing the utility of the statistical analysis. Thus, precision--achieved through a narrow interval--is a key metric for evaluating the quality of a CI.

## The Interplay of Precision, Confidence, and Sample Size

While narrow intervals offer precision, they are inherently tied to other critical factors: the chosen confidence level and the size of the sample used in the study. Achieving a narrower interval typically requires sacrifices or adjustments in one of these areas. Specifically, for a fixed **sample size**, increasing the confidence level (e.g., moving from 90% to 99%) will inevitably widen the interval, as we must cast a wider net to be more certain of capturing the true parameter.

However, the variable that researchers often leverage to control the interval width without sacrificing the desired confidence level is the **sample size** (denoted as $n$). As the **sample size** increases, the standard error of the mean decreases. This reduction in variability directly translates into a smaller margin of error, resulting in a significantly narrower confidence interval. This relationship highlights why increasing the number of observations is often the most effective pathway to generating a high-quality, precise estimate.

## Illustrative Example: Estimating Plant Height

To demonstrate the impact of **sample size** on interval width, let us consider an example involving the estimation of the mean height of a specific plant species. We will calculate the 95% **confidence interval** under two different sampling conditions, keeping all other factors constant. This comparison clearly illustrates how increased data collection contributes to enhanced statistical precision.

Suppose a researcher is trying to estimate the true population mean height, μ, using the standard formula for a CI for a population mean when the population standard deviation is unknown or estimated by the **sample standard deviation**. The critical factor in determining the width of the final interval is the margin of error component, which is inversely proportional to the square root of the **sample size**.

## The Formula for Confidence Intervals

To calculate a **confidence interval** for a population mean (μ) when the sample size is sufficiently large or the population standard deviation is known (using a z-distribution), we employ the following structure. This formula integrates the point estimate with the critical value and the standard error:

**Confidence Interval = $x \pm z^*(s/\sqrt{n})$**

The components of this formula are defined as follows, each playing a vital role in determining the center and width of the interval:

**x:** The **sample mean**, which serves as the best point estimate for the true population mean.
**z:** The chosen z-value (or critical value), determined by the desired level of confidence.
**s:** The **sample standard deviation**, which quantifies the variability observed within the sample data.
**n:** The **sample size**, which is the number of observations collected.

The critical z-value is entirely dependent on the confidence level selected by the researcher. Common confidence levels correlate to specific z-scores derived from the standard normal distribution, as summarized in the table below:

| Confidence Level | z-value (Critical Value) |
| --- | --- |

| | |
|---|---|
| 0.90 (90%) | 1.645 |
| 0.95 (95%) | 1.96 |
| 0.99 (99%) | 2.58 |

## Scenario 1: Small Sample Size (n = 25)

We begin by analyzing the results from a relatively small random sample of 25 plants. The collected data yielded the following descriptive statistics, which serve as the foundation for our estimation:

Sample size **n = 25**
Sample mean height (**x**) **= 36.5 inches**
**Sample standard deviation** (**s**) **= 18.5 inches**

We now calculate the 95% **confidence interval** for the true population mean height using the z-value of 1.96 corresponding to the 95% confidence level:

**95% Confidence Interval:** $36.5 \pm 1.96 * (18.5 / \sqrt{25}) = 36.5 \pm 7.252 =$

The interpretation of this interval is that we are 95% confident that the true population mean height for this species of plant falls somewhere between 29.248 inches and 43.752 inches. The interval width is approximately 14.5 inches, indicating a relatively low level of precision due to the small **sample size**.

## Scenario 2: Increased Sample Size (n = 100)

Next, let us observe the effect of increasing the data collection effort. Suppose a second researcher collects a much larger random sample of 100 plants. For the purpose of this comparison, we will assume the descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) remain identical, isolating the effect of *n*:

Sample size **n = 100**
**Sample mean** height (**x**) **= 36.5 inches**
Sample **standard deviation** (**s**) **= 18.5 inches**

We now proceed to calculate the 95% **confidence interval** for the true population mean height using the increased sample size:

**95% Confidence Interval:** $36.5 \pm 1.96 * (18.5 / \sqrt{100}) = 36.5 \pm 3.626 =$

The interpretation remains the same--we are 95% confident that the true population mean height falls within this calculated range. However, notice the dramatic difference in the interval width. The range now spans approximately 7.25 inches, which is half the width of the previous interval.

## The Critical Role of Sample Size and Variability

This comparison clearly demonstrates that by simply quadrupling the **sample size** (from n=25 to n=100), we significantly narrowed the confidence interval, thereby producing a more precise and statistically "better" estimate for the population mean. In any practical research setting, a researcher would strongly prefer the second interval because it offers a much tighter range of values, providing superior insight into the population characteristics.

It is important to acknowledge, however, that while increasing the sample size is the most reliable way to achieve a narrow CI, it is not always feasible. Gathering larger samples often involves substantial increases in time, cost, and logistical complexity, making it impractical for certain types of studies. Furthermore, researchers are limited by the inherent variability of the underlying dataset, quantified by the **sample standard deviation** (s).

Datasets with naturally high variability will produce high values for the **sample standard deviation**, which in turn results in a larger margin of error and naturally wider confidence intervals, regardless of the sample size chosen. Therefore, when attempting to maximize precision, the sample size remains the only factor truly under the direct control of the researcher, assuming the confidence level is fixed.

## Contextualizing "Narrowness" Across Disciplines

The definition of what constitutes a sufficiently "narrow" or "good" confidence interval is not universal; it varies significantly across different fields of study. In areas like particle physics, where measurements are exceptionally precise, a very narrow interval might be expected. Conversely, in social sciences or complex biological studies dealing with high human or environmental variability, a wider interval might be deemed acceptable due to the inherent noise in the data.

Researchers must always contextualize their results within their specific discipline and research goals. A CI that is considered excessively wide in financial modeling might be considered quite precise in ecological surveys. The ultimate goal is to achieve an interval that is sufficiently narrow to be meaningful and actionable within the context of the study's established parameters, while maintaining the required level of confidence.

## Summary of Key Insights

Here is a concise overview summarizing the main conclusions regarding the characteristics of an optimal confidence interval:

Researchers universally regard a "good" **confidence interval** as one that is narrow, as narrowness signifies greater precision in estimating the true population parameter.
The most effective way for researchers to produce narrower confidence intervals, without compromising the confidence level, is by substantially increasing the **sample size** used in the data collection process.
The acceptable degree of "narrowness" is relative and depends heavily on the field of study, reflecting the natural variability (standard deviation) present in the specific type of data being analyzed.

For additional detailed methodologies and practical applications related to confidence intervals, please refer to the following related resources: