

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	