



## General Certificate of Education

# Mathematics and Statistics 6320 *Specification B*

*MBS6 Statistics 6*

## 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

<b>M</b>	mark is for	method
<b>m</b>	mark is dependent on one or more M marks and is for	method
<b>A</b>	mark is dependent on M or m marks and is for	accuracy
<b>B</b>	mark is independent of M or m marks and is for	accuracy
<b>E</b>	mark is for	explanation
<b>✓ or ft or F</b>		follow through from previous incorrect result
<b>cao</b>		correct answer only
<b>cso</b>		correct solution only
<b>awfw</b>		anything which falls within
<b>awrt</b>		anything which rounds to
<b>acf</b>		any correct form
<b>ag</b>		answer given
<b>sc</b>		special case
<b>oe</b>		or equivalent
<b>sf</b>		significant figure(s)
<b>dp</b>		decimal place(s)
<b>A2,1</b>		2 or 1 (or 0) accuracy marks
<b>-x ee</b>		deduct x marks for each error
<b>pi</b>		possibly implied
<b>sca</b>		substantially correct approach

## Abbreviations used in Marking

<b>MC – x</b>	deducted x marks for mis-copy
<b>MR – x</b>	deducted x marks for mis-read
<b>isw</b>	ignored subsequent working
<b>bod</b>	given benefit of doubt
<b>wr</b>	work replaced by candidate
<b>fb</b>	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

## Mathematics and Statistics B Statistics 6 MBS6 June 2005

Q	Solution	Marks	Total	Comments
1 (a)	$H_0 \eta_d = 0$	B1		or
	$H_1 \eta_d \neq 0$			$H_0$ Population median price same for both supermarkets
	2 tail test 10 % level			$H_1$ Population median price not the same for both supermarkets
	Signs or differences + + - . + + - - + + + test stat $7^+ / 3^-$	M1		
	B ( 10, 0.5 ) model	M1		M1 if model seen to be used
1 (a)	$P(\geq 7^+) = P(\leq 3^-) = 0.172$	M1		Comparison with 0.05 or use of identified critical region
	$0.172 > 0.05$			
	Hence, no significant evidence to reject $H_0$			
	There is no significant evidence to suggest a difference in median prices between the two supermarkets	A1	5	
(b)	$P(\text{Type II error}) = 0$	B1	1	
<b>Total</b>			<b>6</b>	
2 (a)	$\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{1}{3} \times \frac{1}{5} = \frac{1}{60}$ or 0.167 or 16.7%	M1 A1	2	For product
(b)	$1 - \frac{1}{60} = \frac{59}{60}$ or 0.983 or 98.3%	B1	1	
(c)	$[\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{2}{3} \times \frac{4}{5}] + [\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{1}{3} \times \frac{4}{5}] + [\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{2}{3} \times \frac{1}{5}]$	M1 M1		For 3 products attempted For sum
	$= \frac{8}{60} + \frac{12}{60} + \frac{6}{60} = \frac{26}{60}$ or $\frac{13}{30}$ or 0.433 or 43.3%	A1	3	
(d)	$\frac{6}{26}$ or $\frac{3}{13}$ or 0.231 or 23.1%	M1 A1	2	M1 for use of 26 as denominator
<b>Total</b>			<b>8</b>	

**MBS6 (cont)**

Q	Solution	Marks	Total	Comments	
<b>3(a)(i)</b>	The 'highest' negative difference from 250 is 28 ( 222 – 250 = –28) and, if the remaining 6 batteries had lifetimes in excess of 280 hours, their positive differences from 250 will all be greater than 30. This means that the ranks assigned will be 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15	E1	2	Evidence of consideration of differences	
		E1		Understanding that 'missing' 6 will take the top 6 rank values.	
<b>(ii)</b>	$H_0 \eta = 250$ $H_1 \eta > 250$ 1 tail test                      5% sig level	B1		or $H_0$ Population median(average) = 250 $H_1$ Population median(average) > 250 sc B1 here for no 'pop' if B0 for no pop in Q1	
	Differences -28, -22, -15, -8, -2, +1, +9, +10, +25 and 6 in excess of 250	M1		Differences seen	
	Ranks -9, -7, -6, -3, -2, +1, +4, +5, +8 and then +10,+11,+12,+13,+14,+15	m1		Rank orders	
	$T_+ = 1+4+5+8+10+\dots+15 = 93$ $T_- = 9+7+6+3+2 = 27$	m1		Attempt at total of ranks ( + or - )	
	Test stat $T = 27$ Critical value, $n = 15$ 1 tail, 5% $cv = 30$ $T < 30$	A1 B1 M1		Both totals OK or sight of $cv = 30$ For $cv$ Comparison of $T$ with $cv$ Do not allow $cv = 8$	
	Significant evidence to reject $H_0$ There is significant evidence to suggest that the median lifetime of the new batteries is more than 250 hours.	A1	8		
	Battery lifetimes are symmetrically distributed	B1			
	Batteries in trial were selected at random	B1	2		
		<b>Total</b>		<b>12</b>	

## MBS6 (cont)

Q	Solution	Marks	Total	Comments
4(a)	Ranks for $x$ , $y$ and $z$  $x$ 11, 3, 15, 1, 5, 13, 6, 4, 8, 12, 2, 9, 17, 14, 10, 7, 16  $y$ 3, 4½, 6½, 10, 8, 17, 15, 13, , 1, 9, 16, 12, 14, 11, 2, 6½, 4½  $z$ 13, 1, 16, 2, 5, 11, 6, 3, 7, 12, 4, 9, 16, 16, 8, 10, 14	M1  M1  A1	3	for ranks  for ties
(b)(i)	$r_s$ (from calculator) = -0.0847  can fit on incorrect ranks	B3✓	3	<b>Alternatively</b> differences, $d$ 8, 1½, 8½, 9, 3, 4, 9, 9, 7, 3, 14, 3, 3, 3, 8, ½, 11½ $\sum d^2 = 884$ B1 $r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \times 884}{17 \times 288} = -0.0833$ M1, A1
(ii)	$r_s$ (from calculator) = 0.9484  can fit on incorrect ranks	B3✓	3	<b>Alternatively</b> differences, $d$ 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 2, 0, 1, 2, 2, 3, 2 $\sum d^2 = 42$ B1 $r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \times 42}{17 \times 288} = 0.9485$ M1, A1
(c)(i)	The calculated value indicates virtually no association in rank order between the number of offences reported per million population and the number males aged 16-24 per thousand pop .	E1✓	1	In context; ft
(ii)	$H_0 \rho_s = 0$ $H_1 \rho_s \neq 0$ 2 tail 5% test stat $r_s = 0.9484$ (or 0.9485) critical value = 0.4821 test stat > 0.4821 so significant evidence to reject $H_0$ Sig evidence of an association	B1  B1 M1  A1✓	4	For hypotheses  for cv For comparison relevant ts/cv  Conclusion; ft
(d)	Crime rate has no sig association with the actual number of males aged 16 – 24 but has clear association (positive) with the number of males aged 16-24 who are unemployed	E2,1	2	Interpretation in context
<b>Total</b>			<b>16</b>	

**MBS6 (cont)**

Q	Solution	Marks	Total	Comments
<b>5(a)</b>	H <sub>0</sub> Samples are from identical populations	B1		B1 if wording not exact but 1 tail idea
	H <sub>1</sub> Samples are not from identical populations – average starting salary for students who went to ‘Top League’ universities is higher	B1		
	1 tail test                    5% sig level			
	Ranks			
	‘Top League’	M1		for ranks as one group
	8 4 14 12 18 17 20 11	A1		
	Other			
	1 3 5 6 7 10 13 15 16 9 19 2	A1		
	$T_{\text{Top League}} = 104$	m1		for totals, either correct
	$T_{\text{Other}} = 106$	A1		
$U_{\text{Top League}} = 104 - \frac{1}{2}(8 \times 9) = 68$	m1		for $U$ values, either	
$U_{\text{Other}} = 106 - \frac{1}{2}(12 \times 13) = 28$	A1		note: various other alternative methods accepted	
test stat $U = 28$				
critical value = 26	B1		for use of correct cv consistent with $U$	
test stat > 26 Accept H <sub>0</sub>	M1			
No significant evidence (just) to suggest that the samples are from different populations ( or no evidence to suggest that there is a difference in average starting salary for the two university groups)	A1	12		
<b>(b)</b> Max value				
$(13+14+15+\dots+19+20) - \frac{1}{2}(8 \times 9)$				
or				
$(9+10+11+\dots+19+20) - \frac{1}{2}(12 \times 13)$	M1		For 174/132	
Max $U = 96$	A1	2	Other methods possible	
<b>(c)(i)</b> Students in the trial should be matched according to subject area studied and gender so that a range of identical subjects are covered at each type of university. One pair of students, matched for gender, in each of a range of subject areas, at each type of university, would then be involved in the trial.	E1		Concept of ‘matched pairs’ explained.	
	E1, E1	3	Full explanation with some detail of subject relevance and gender	
<b>(ii)</b> Wilcoxon signed-rank test or sign test	B1	1		
	<b>Total</b>		<b>18</b>	
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>60</b>	