

# A-LEVEL **Statistics**

SS05 Mark scheme

6360 June 2016

Version 1.0: Final Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk.

## Key to mark scheme abbreviations

M	mark is for method
m or dM	mark is dependent on one or more M marks and is for method
Α	mark is dependent on M or m marks and is for accuracy
В	mark is independent of M or m marks and is for method and
	accuracy
E	mark is for explanation
√or ft or F	follow through from previous incorrect result
CAO	correct answer only
CSO	correct solution only
AWFW	anything which falls within
AWRT	anything which rounds to
ACF	any correct form
AG	answer given
SC	special case
OE	or equivalent
A2,1	2 or 1 (or 0) accuracy marks
–x EE	deduct x marks for each error
NMS	no method shown
PI	possibly implied
SCA	substantially correct approach
С	candidate
sf	significant figure(s)
dp	decimal place(s)

### **No Method Shown**

Where the question specifically requires a particular method to be used, we must usually see evidence of use of this method for any marks to be awarded.

Where the answer can be reasonably obtained without showing working and it is very unlikely that the correct answer can be obtained by using an incorrect method, we must award **full marks**. However, the obvious penalty to candidates showing no working is that incorrect answers, however close, earn **no marks**.

Where a question asks the candidate to state or write down a result, no method need be shown for full marks.

Where the permitted calculator has functions which reasonably allow the solution of the question directly, the correct answer without working earns **full marks**, unless it is given to less than the degree of accuracy accepted in the mark scheme, when it gains **no marks**.

Otherwise we require evidence of a correct method for any marks to be awarded.

Q	Solution	Mark	Total	Comment
1(a)(i)	$s = 3.90$ , $s^2 = 15.2$ or $\sum (x - \bar{x})^2 = 197.9$	B1		Stated or used awfw 3.89 ~3.91 (3.90179), awfw 15.1~15.3 9 (15.224) or awfw 197 ~ 199 (197.912)
	98% limits for $\chi_{13}^2 = 4.107$ , 27.688	B1, B1		accept 3sf or better.  If B0, B0 then s.c. B1 for sight of 13 degrees of freedom.
	CI limits for variance:	M1, m1	6	M1: correct form for at least one limit, condone $14 s^2$ , ft on $\chi^2$ values. m1: both expressions completely correct. Both: awfw 7.1 ~ 7.2, 48 ~ 48.3
(ii)	5 ml <sup>2</sup> is less than the lower limit of the CI. Jamal's suspicion is verified	B1ft E1dep	2	B1 ft comment on their CI E1 dep on A1 in (a)
(b)	Lower limit of 95% CI is greater than that of 98% interval, Kajika will come to the same conclusion as Jamal.	E1 E1dep	2	Or 95% CI is narrower than a 98% CI oe E1 dep on first E1 and A1 in (a)
	Total		10	

a(ii) B1 ft accept "below CI" but NOT " not within CI" and cand. must be using 5ml<sup>2</sup> for the comparison.

<sup>(</sup>b) E1 accept" lower limit is increased" or "lower limit is higher .." but NOT "CI is higher" E1 dep – cand. must be using  $5ml^2$  in a(ii).

Q	Solution	Mark	Total	Comment
2(a)(i)	Area = $1 \implies 50k = 1$	M1		M1 for sight of $130 - 80 = 50$ ; may
	so $k = \frac{1}{50}$	A1		be by using integration or may be from a graph.
	30			note: must have sight of " $k =$ " to award
				A1 ALT:
				$k = \frac{1}{b-a} = \frac{1}{130-80} \text{ M1} = \frac{1}{50} \text{ A1}$
(ii)	P(X = 100) = 0	B1		
	<u>Impossible</u> to estimate a <u>1m length</u> exactly	E1	4	o.e.
(b)(i)	Mean = 105	B1		cao
(ii)	S.D. = $\sqrt{\frac{2500}{12}} = \sqrt{208.33} = 14.4$	B1		awrt (14.4337)
	•		2	
(c)(i)	P(score < 5) = P(95 < x < 105)	M1		sc B1 for $\frac{5}{50} = 0.1$
	$=\frac{10}{50}$			
	= 0.2	A1		
(ii)	$X \sim B(25, 0.2)$ P( $X \ge 6$ ) = 1 - P( $X \le 5$ )	M1		Using B( 25, 0.2 or 0.1) PI
	=1-0.6167			
	= 0.3833	A1		awfw 0.38~ 0.39
				note:P( $X \ge 6$ ) when $X \sim B(25, 0.1)$ =1 - 0.9666 = 0.0334
			4	
	Total		10	

Q	Solution	Mark	Total	Comment
3(a)	$\sigma_w$ :s.d. for distances driven with <i>Whizzer</i> balls $\sigma_s$ : s.d. for distances driven with <i>Screamer</i> balls $H_0: \sigma_w^2 = \sigma_s^2$ or $H_0: \sigma_w = \sigma_s$ $H_1: \sigma_w^2 > \sigma_s^2$ or $H_1: \sigma_w = \sigma_s$ $s_w = 23.261$ or $s_w^2 = 541.06$ $s_s = 13.03$ or $s_s^2 = 169.8$	B1		Both hypotheses; other suffices must be clearly identified. Must use $\sigma$ or population s.d./variance  Either; awfw 23.2 ~ 23.3 or 540~ 542;
	$(n_w = 16$ $n_s = 12)$ t.s. $F = \frac{23.26^2}{13.03^2} = 3.19$	M1 A1		13.0 ~ 13.1or 169 ~ 170 awfw 3.135 ~ 3.215 ( 3.18672)
	c.v. $F_{15,11} = 2.719$	B1,B1		B1: df – in order 15,11 PI by correct c.v. B1 c.v. accept 3 sf or better Do not condone $\pm$ Ignore extra value; $\frac{1}{2.507} = 0.399$
	$3.19 > 2.719$ or $p = 0.029 < 0.05$ ; reject $H_0$	A1 dep		Dep A1 for ts and B1 for cv p = $0.031 \sim 0.028 (0.02921)$
	Evidence, at the 5% level, that Lucy's belief is supported.	E1 dep	8	Correct conclusion in context dep previous A1dep. Must indicate some level of uncertainty.
(b)	Samples random and/or independent	E1		Either Do not allow eg "random" or "normal"
	<u>Distances</u> driven with each type of ball must be <u>normally distributed</u>	E1	2	
	Total		10	

Total 10 (a) Alt 1: t.s.  $F = \frac{13.03^2}{23.26^2} = 0.314$  M1 A1 (awfw 0.311~ 0.319); c.v.  $\frac{1}{F_{11,15}} = \frac{1}{2.507} = 0.399$  B1df B1 cv (awfw 0.398~ 0.40);

0.314 < 0.399; reject H0 A1dep; E1 dep as on MS

# Alt 2: Use of p value and if no intermediate evidence seen:

B1 (hypotheses);  $p = 0.031 \sim 0.028$  ( 0.02921....) implies B1 (for variances) M1 A1 for ts (outside this range and they lose all 3 marks) ;comparing 0.029..<0.05 and rejecting  $H_0$  implies B1B1 for cv and A1 dep; E1 conclusion as on MS

(a) alternative conclusion: There is <u>sufficient evidence</u> to suggest that Lucy's driving <u>distances</u> are more <u>variable</u> when she uses a <u>Whizzer</u> ball than when she uses a <u>Screamer</u> ball.

Q	Solution						Mark M1	Total	Comment
4a(i)	$P(X \le 1.5) = P(Z < \frac{1.5 - 12.31}{7.40})$								M1 :attempt at any appropriate
	= P(Z < -1.46) $= 1 - 0.928$								normal probability eg $P(X < 1 \text{ or } 1.5)$ , $P(X > 29 \text{ or }$
	= 0.0728 = 0.072								(29.5) or $P(X < 6.5  or  7)$ or $P(X < 6.5  or  7)$
	P(X > 29.5) = P(Z > 2.32) = 1-0.99 = 0.01								<pre>&lt; 9 or 9.5) [P(X &lt; 1) = 0.0632; P(X &gt; 29) = 0.01205; P( X &lt; 7) = 0.2365; P(X &lt; 9) = 0.32733]</pre>
					•				
	w = 0.07	2 x 20	0 = 14.4	•			M1A1		M1: multiplying an appropriate normal probability by 200 A1: w 14.4 ~14.6 (14.4067)
	P( 6.5 < 1	X < 9.				0)	M1		M1 subtracting:
			= 0.75 = 0.13	85 - 0.6 37	48				Allow for: $P(X < 9 \text{ or } < 9.5) - P(X < 7 \text{ or } 6.5)$ [0.3273 - 0.2365 = 0.0908] or $200 - 156.39 - w - z$ oe or $1 - \text{sum of probabilities}$
	$y = 0.137 \times 200 = 27.4$ $z = 0.01 \times 200 = 2.0$					A1 A1	6	A1: y 26.6 ~ 27.8 ( 27.177) A1: z 1.51 ~ 2.41 (2.018)	
4(a)(ii)	H <sub>0</sub> : Data follows a normal distribution H <sub>1</sub> : Data does not follow a Normal distribution					B1		B1: at least $H_0$ o.e. eg The <u>normal</u> distribution is a suitable model	
		1					M1		No parameters included M1: attempt at (O - E) <sup>2</sup> /E allow for at least 4 values correct to
	classes	0	E	(O - E)	(O-E)^2	(O - E)^2 /E			1dp
	≤1.5	8	14.410	-6.410	41.088	2.851	3.54		
	2 - 3	13	8.980	4.020	16.160	1.800	M1		M1: combining last 2 classes If more than the final 2 classes
	4 - 6 7 - 9	27 37	19.850 27.170	7.150 9.830	51.123 96.629	2.575 3.556			are combined – M0
	10 - 14	39	52.860	-13.860	192.10	3.634	m1		m1: adding, dep on both
	15 - 19	45	43.600	1.400	1.960	0.045	1111		previous M's
	20 - 24	23	23.170	-0.170	0.029	0.001			
	>24.5	8	9.960	-1.960	3.842	0.386			
		200				14.849	A1		awrt 14.2 ~ 15.6 ( 14.8361)
	df = 8 - 1 - 2 = 5 $cv = 11.07$						B1ft B1		Their number of classes - 3 Do not condone ±
	$14.84 > 11.07 \text{ or } p = 0.011 < 0.05 \text{ ; reject } H_0$							$p = 0.009 \sim 0.013 \; (\; 0.011027)$	
	Sufficient evidence to say that the data does not follow a Normal distribution.						Aldep	8	Correct conclusion in context dep A1 for ts and B1 for cv.

4(b)	Large sample ; CLT applies Mike's claim correct	E1 E1dep		E1 : mention of CLT o.e. E1 : dep on previous E1
	Total		16	

(a) (i) NMS each value in range B2

(a) (ii) NMS B1 hypotheses; ts in range M1M1m1A1 ;  $p = 0.011(0.009 \sim 0.012) < 0.05$  ; reject H<sub>0</sub> B1ft B1 ;A1 dep as on MS

Alt: using  $\sum \frac{o^2}{E} - N$ : M1 attempt at O²/E (at least 4 values correct to 1sf); M1 combining last 2 classes; m1 summing and subtracting 200– must be positive answer, A1 answers 14.5 ~ 15.5 (14.849).

# Use of p value and if no intermediate evidence seen:

B1 hypotheses, p = 0.011 (0.009~0.013) implies M1 M1m1A1B1ft; comparing 0.011 < 0.05 B1 and correct conclusion in context E1dep (dependent on previous A1 and B1);

Q	Solution	Mark	Total	Comment
5a	Mean = $\frac{1}{\lambda}$ = 40; variance = $\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^2$ = 1600	B1,B1	2	Cao both
5b(i)	$P(T > 30) = e^{-0.025 \times 30}$ $= 0.4724$	M1 A1	2	or 1 - $(1 - e^{-0.025 \times 30}) = 1 - 0.528$ awfw 0.472 ~ 0.473 (0.472366)
b(ii)	On 2 occasions : prob = $0.4724^2$			
	= 0.2231	B1ft	3	awrt 0.223 ~ 0.224: f.t. on their b (i)
(c)	$P(\bar{T} > 35) = P(Z > \frac{35 - 40}{\sqrt{\frac{1600}{75}}})$	M1		Standardising with 35 and 40; condone $\sqrt{40}$ or $\frac{1600}{75}$ as denominator.
		B1		$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1600}{75}} \text{ or } \sigma^2 = \frac{1600}{75} \text{ seen or implied}$
	= P(Z > -1.08)	A1		by correct probability. [awrt 4.62 ( 4.6188 )]
	= 0.860	A1		awfw -1.08 ~ - 1.09
	- 0.800			0.859 ~ 0.863 ( 0.86049) NMS 4/4 for a probability in correct range.
	Total		9	

Q	Solution	Mark	Total	Comment
6(a)(i)	$H_0: \sigma^2 = 16$	B1		Both hypotheses o.e.
	$H_1$ : $\sigma^2 \neq 16$			
	$s = 1.28 \text{ or } s^2 = 1.63$	B1		over 1 27 1 20 ( 1 277 ) or
	S = 1.28  Of  S = 1.05	DI		awrt 1.27 ~ 1.29 ( 1.277) or 1.61 ~ 1.65 (1.631).
	t.s. $X^2 = \frac{14 \times 1.28^2}{16} = 1.43$	M1 A1		awrt 1.42 ~ 1.43 (1.427)
	$1.5. A - \frac{1}{16} - 1.45$			
	$\text{cv } \chi_{14}^2 = 4.075 \text{ and } 31.319$	B1, B1		B1: df clearly identified, PI by correct cv.
	0 × 14 110 / 2 and 3 1.3 1 3	,		B1: at least the lower value – do not
				condone ±
	$1.43 < 4.075$ reject $H_0$	A1 dep		A1: dep on B1 for CV and A1 for t.s.
	Evidence at the 1% level that the sample	E1 dep		Conclusion in context dep previous
	does not come from a population with a		8	A1 dep.
	standard deviation of 4 kg/m <sup>2</sup>			
6(a)(ii)	The <u>sample</u> is <u>not random</u> because it is	E1		o.e.
σ(α)()	taken from Lian's class.	LI		eg data is taken from Lian's class so may
	<u> </u>		1	be biased or unrepresentative.
6(b)	$H_0$ : $\mu_{car} = \mu_{alt\ means} + 1$	B1		B1: an inequality in μ and "1"
	$H_1$ : $\mu_{car} > \mu_{alt means} + 1$	B1		B1: all correct; other suffices must be
	- 264 - 24225	D1		clearly identified – allow "c" and "a".
	$\bar{x}_{car} = 26.1 \ \bar{x}_{alt. means} = 24.225$	B1 B1		B1; either mean ( cao, 24.2 ~24.3 )
	$S_{car} = 2.09 \ S_{alt means} = 1.74$	M1		B1: either $s$ ( 2.09 ~2.10, 1.73~ 1.74) $s_p^2 = 3.81617$ $s_p = 1.9535$
	$s_p^2 = \frac{10 \times 2.09^2 + 7 \times 1.74^2}{17} = 3.82$	IVII		$S_p = 3.81017$ $S_p = 1.9333$ NMS award M1 for value used in range
	17			3.80 ~ 3.84
	26.1 - 24.225(-1)	M1		M1: numerator
	$t = \frac{1}{1} = 0.964$	M1		M1: denominatorA1: awfw 0.9 ~ 1.0;
	$t = \frac{26.1 - 24.225(-1)}{\sqrt{3.816 \times (\frac{1}{11} + \frac{1}{8})}} = 0.964$	A1		must have gained all M's.
	$cv t_{17} = 1.740$	B1		cao, accept 1.74, condone ±
	0.064 1.740 0.174 0.05	A 1 1		D 416 . 1D16
	0.964 < 1.740  or  p = 0.174 > 0.05;	A1dep		Dep A1 for t.s. and B1 for positive c.v.
	accept H <sub>0</sub>			<i>p</i> : awfw 1.66 ~ 1.90 ( 0.1743)
	No significant evidence at the 5% level that	E1 dep		o.e. conclusion in context dep previous A1
	male students who travel to college by car			r r
	have a BMI which is, on average, more			
	than 1 kg/m <sup>2</sup> greater than those who travel			
	to college by <u>alternative means</u> of			
	transport.			
			11	
	Total		11	
	Total		20	

6(b) Alt 1 for lower tail

ts = 
$$\frac{24.225 - 26.1 (+1)}{\sqrt{3.816 \times (\frac{1}{11} + \frac{1}{8})}} = -0.964$$
 M1 M1 M1A1;  $t_{17} = \pm 1.740$  B1

-0.964 > -1.74; accept H<sub>0</sub> A1 dep (nb signs resolved); E1 dep as on MS

<u>Use of p value and if no intermediate evidence seen</u>: B1 B1 hypotheses as on MS;  $p = 0.166 \sim 0.190$  (0. 1743...) implies B1 B1 M1 M1 M1 A1 (outside this range and they lose all 6 marks); comparing 0.174... > 0.05 B1 and accept H<sub>0</sub> A1 (dependent on previous A1 and B1); E1 dep as on MS.