

General Certificate of Education

Mathematics and Statistics 6320 Specification B

MBS3 Statistics 3

Mark Scheme

2005 examination - June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Key to Mark Scheme

| Mmark is formethodmmark is dependent on one or more M marks and is formethodAmark is dependent on M or m marks and is foraccuracyBmark is independent of M or m marks and is foraccuracyEmark is forexplanation $\sqrt{or ft or F}$ follow through from p incorrect result | previous |
|---|----------|
| Amark is dependent on M or m marks and is for mark is independent of M or m marks and is for mark is foraccuracy accuracyBmark is independent of M or m marks and is for mark is foraccuracy explanation \checkmark or ft or Ffollow through from p | previous |
| Bmark is independent of M or m marks and is for mark is foraccuracy explanation \mathbf{F} mark is forexplanation follow through from p | revious |
| Emark is forexplanation $\sqrt{\mathbf{or} \mathbf{ft} \mathbf{or} \mathbf{F}}$ follow through from p | revious |
| $\sqrt{\mathbf{or} \mathbf{ft} \mathbf{or} \mathbf{F}}$ follow through from p | previous |
| | previous |
| incorrect result | |
| | |
| cao correct answer only | |
| cso correct solution only | |
| awfw anything which falls w | within |
| awrt anything which round | ls to |
| acf any correct form | |
| ag answer given | |
| sc special case | |
| oe or equivalent | |
| sf significant figure(s) | |
| dp decimal place(s) | |
| A2,1 2 or 1 (or 0) accuracy | marks |
| -x ee deduct x marks for each | ch error |
| pi possibly implied | |
| sca substantially correct a | nnroach |

Abbreviations used in Marking

| MC - x | deducted x marks for mis-copy |
|--------|-------------------------------|
| MR - x | deducted x marks for mis-read |
| isw | ignored subsequent working |
| bod | given benefit of doubt |
| wr | work replaced by candidate |
| fb | formulae book |

Application of Mark Scheme

| No method shown: | |
|--|--|
| Correct answer without working | mark as in scheme |
| Incorrect answer without working | zero marks unless specified otherwise |
| More than one method / choice of solution: | |
| 2 or more complete attempts, neither/none crossed out | mark both/all fully and award the mean mark rounded down |
| 1 complete and 1 partial attempt, neither crossed out | award credit for the complete solution only |
| Crossed out work | do not mark unless it has not been replaced |
| Alternative solution using a correct or partially correct method | award method and accuracy marks as appropriate |

| Q | Solution | Marks | Total | Comments |
|----------|---|----------|-------|---|
| 1 (a)(i) | $\frac{87}{170}$ or 0.512 or 51.2% | B1 | 1 | |
| (ii) | $\frac{170}{170}$ or $\frac{9}{85}$ or 0.106 or 10.6% | B1 | 1 | |
| (iii) | $\frac{96}{170}$ or $\frac{43}{85}$ or 0.565 or 56.5% | M1 A1 | 2 | For attempt at 18+46+23+9 |
| (iv) | $\frac{9}{83}$ or 0.108 or 10.8% | M1 | 2 | For numerator |
| | 83 | M1 A1 | 3 | For denominator |
| (b) | Resident occupies a two-bedroomed apartment and replies excessive | E1 E1 | 2 | Correct description No negatives, description clear If "given" used E1 only |
| | Total | | 9 | |
| 2 (a) | $H_0 \eta_d = 0$ | B1 | | or |
| | $H_1 \eta_d \neq 0$ | | | H ₀ Population median price same for both |
| | 2 tail test 10 % level | | | supermarkets |
| | | | | H ₁ Population median price not the same for both supermarkets |
| | | | | lor both supermarkets |
| | Signs + + + + + + + | M1 A1 | | Or differences |
| | test stat $7^+/3^-$ | IVII AI | | of unreferees |
| | B (10, 0.5) model | M1 | | M1 if model seen to be used |
| | $P(\ge 7^+) = P(\le 3^-) = 0.172$ | | | |
| | 0.172 > 0.05 | M1 | | Comparison with 0.05 or use of identified |
| | Hence, no significant evidence to reject | | | critical region |
| | H ₀ There is no significant evidence to suggest | A1 | 6 | |
| | a difference in median prices between the | | - | |
| | two supermarkets | | | |
| (b) | Conclude that there is a difference in | | | |
| (~) | Conclude that there is a difference in prices between the supermarkets when, in | E1 | | Explanation of Type I error |
| | fact, there is no difference. | E1 | 2 | Explanation in context |
| | | D1 | | |
| (c) | Wilcoxon signed-rank | B1 | 1 | |
| | Total | | 9 | |

Mathematics and Statistics B Statistics 3 MBS3 June 2005

MBS3 (cont)

| Q | Solution | Marks | Total | Comments |
|-----------|---|-------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Q 3(a) | Solution Ranks for x and y x 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 y 2, 4, 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 7, 9, 8, 13, 12, 11, 16, 16, 14, 16 r_s (from calculator) = 0.9484 (0.948) | Marks M1 M1 A1 B3 | <u>Total</u> | for ranks, can be reversed for ties (y only) Alternatively differences, d 1, 2, 2, 1, 0, 0, 3, 1, 0, 2, 2, 0, 2, 2, 1, 2, 1 $\sum d^2 = 42$ B1 |
| (b)(i) | H ₀ $\rho_s = 0$ H ₁ $\rho_s > 0$ 1 tail 5% test stat $r_s = 0.9484$ (or 0.9485) | B1 | | $r_{\rm s} = 1 - \frac{6 \times 42}{17 \times 288} = 0.9485 \ (0.949)$ M1, A1 For hypotheses |
| | critical value = 0.4124 test stat > 0.4124 so significant evidence to reject H ₀ Sig evidence of an association | B1 M1 A1 | 4 | for cv If 2 tail H ₁ , allow cv=.4821 M1A1 For comparison relevant ts/cv; ft Conclusion |
| (ii) | Crime rate has a significant positive association with the number of males aged 16-24 who are unemployed. The more males aged 16-24 who are unemployed, the higher the crime rate | B1√ | 1 | Conclusion in context ft if <i>r</i> sensible |
| | Total | | 11 | |

MBS3 (cont)

| Q | Solution | Marks | Total | Comments |
|------|---|----------|---------|--|
| 4(a) | H ₀ $\eta = 250$ H ₁ $\eta > 250$ 1 tail test 5% sig level | B1 B1 | | or H_0 Population median(average) = 250 H_1 Population median(average) > 250 |
| | Differences -5, +33, +25, -8, -2, -28, +9, +10, +8, +31, -15, +42 | M1 A1 | | Differences |
| | Ranks -2, 11, 8, -3 ¹ / ₂ , -1, -9, +5, +6, +3 ¹ / ₂ , +10, -7, +12 | ml Al | | Rank orders m1 A0 if rank 1 = biggest |
| | $T_{+} = 11 + 8 + 5 + 6 + 3\frac{1}{2} + 10 + 12 = 55\frac{1}{2}$ $T_{-} = 2 + 3\frac{1}{2} + 1 + 9 + 7 = 22\frac{1}{2}$ | A1 | | total of ranks (+ or –) |
| | Test stat $T = 22\frac{1}{2}$ Critical value, $n = 12$ 1 tail, 5% cv = 17 T > 17 Accept H ₀ There is no significant evidence to support | B1 M1 | | For cv Comparison of <i>T</i> with cv |
| | There is no significant evidence to suggest that the median lifetime of the new batteries is more than 250 hours. | A1 | 10 | In context |
| (b) | Battery lifetimes are symmetrically distributed | B1 | | |
| | Batteries in trial are selected at random Total | B1 | 2 12 | Other sensible comments possible |

MBS3 (cont)

| Q | Solution | Marks | Total | Comments |
|------|---|-------|-------|---|
| 5(a) | H ₀ Samples are from identical | B1 | | |
| | populations | D1 | | |
| | H ₁ Samples are not from identical | B1 | | |
| | populations – average starting salary for | | | |
| | students who went to 'Top League' universities is higher | | | |
| | 1 tail test 5% sig level | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Ranks | | | |
| | 'Top League' | | | |
| | 8 4 11 10 13 15 | M1 | | for ranks as one group (can be reversed) |
| | Other | M1 | | |
| | 1 3 5 6 7 9 14 12 2 | A1 A1 | | |
| | $T_{\text{Top League}} = 61$ | 1.1.1 | | |
| | $T_{\text{Other}} = 59$ | m1 A1 | | for totals, either correct |
| | $U_{\text{Top League}} = 61 - \frac{1}{2}(6 \times 7) = 40$ | m1 | | for U values, either |
| | $U_{\text{Other}} = 59 - \frac{1}{2}(9 \times 10) = 14$ | | | note: various other alternative methods |
| | | | | accepted |
| | test stat $U = 14$ | A1 | | |
| | critical value = 12 | M1 B1 | | for use of correct cv consistent with U |
| | test stat > 12 Accept H_0 | ml | | for comparison ts/cv |
| | No significant evidence (just) to suggest | | | 1 |
| | that the samples are from different | | | |
| | populations (or no evidence to suggest | | | |
| | that there is a difference in average | A1 | 14 | |
| | starting salary for the two university | | | |
| | groups) | | | |
| (b) | Result might be influenced by such | | | |
| | factors as gender or subject studied so a | | | |
| | matched pairs design would reduce risk of | E1 | | For concept of likelihood of experimental |
| | experimental error as a consequence. | | | error – with reason – and matched pairs |
| | People might have lied about their salaries | | | preferred |
| | as they were asked to state, not provide | E1 | 2 | Other sensible reason |
| | verification. Obtaining verification would | | | |
| | eliminate this problem. | | | Other methods possible |
| | Sample sizes should be more evenly | | | |
| | balanced. | | | |
| (c) | $(10+11+12+13+14+15) - \frac{1}{2}(6 \times 7)$ | | | |
| | or | M1 | | For 75 or 99 |
| | $(7+8+9+10+\ldots+15) - \frac{1}{2}(9 \times 10)$ | M1 | | |
| | Max $U = 54$ | A1 | 3 | |
| | | | | |
| | Total | | 19 | |
| | TOTAL | | 60 | |