

**GCE**

**Statistics (MEI)**

Unit **G242**: Statistics 2 (Z2)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2015**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2015

## 1. Annotations and abbreviations

<b>Annotation in scoris</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
✓ and ✖	
BOD	Benefit of doubt
FT	Follow through
ISW	Ignore subsequent working
M0, M1	Method mark awarded 0, 1
A0, A1	Accuracy mark awarded 0, 1
B0, B1	Independent mark awarded 0, 1
SC	Special case
^	Omission sign
MR	Misread
Highlighting	
<b>Other abbreviations in mark scheme</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
E1	Mark for explaining
U1	Mark for correct units
G1	Mark for a correct feature on a graph
M1 dep*	Method mark dependent on a previous mark, indicated by *
cao	Correct answer only
oe	Or equivalent
rot	Rounded or truncated
soi	Seen or implied
www	Without wrong working

**2. Subject-specific Marking Instructions for GCE Mathematics (MEI) Statistics strand**

- a Annotations should be used whenever appropriate during your marking.

**The A, M and B annotations must be used on your standardisation scripts for responses that are not awarded either 0 or full marks.** It is vital that you annotate standardisation scripts fully to show how the marks have been awarded.

For subsequent marking you must make it clear how you have arrived at the mark you have awarded.

- b An element of professional judgement is required in the marking of any written paper. Remember that the mark scheme is designed to assist in marking incorrect solutions. Correct *solutions* leading to correct answers are awarded full marks but work must not be judged on the answer alone, and answers that are given in the question, especially, must be validly obtained; key steps in the working must always be looked at and anything unfamiliar must be investigated thoroughly.

Correct but unfamiliar or unexpected methods are often signalled by a correct result following an *apparently* incorrect method. Such work must be carefully assessed. When a candidate adopts a method which does not correspond to the mark scheme, award marks according to the spirit of the basic scheme; if you are in any doubt whatsoever (especially if several marks or candidates are involved) you should contact your Team Leader.

- c The following types of marks are available.

**M**

A suitable method has been selected and *applied* in a manner which shows that the method is essentially understood. Method marks are not usually lost for numerical errors, algebraic slips or errors in units. However, it is not usually sufficient for a candidate just to indicate an intention of using some method or just to quote a formula; the formula or idea must be applied to the specific problem in hand, eg by substituting the relevant quantities into the formula. In some cases the nature of the errors allowed for the award of an M mark may be specified.

**A**

Accuracy mark, awarded for a correct answer or intermediate step correctly obtained. Accuracy marks cannot be given unless the associated Method mark is earned (or implied). Therefore M0 A1 cannot ever be awarded.

**B**

Mark for a correct result or statement independent of Method marks.

**E**

A given result is to be established or a result has to be explained. This usually requires more working or explanation than the establishment of an unknown result.

Unless otherwise indicated, marks once gained cannot subsequently be lost, eg wrong working following a correct form of answer is ignored. Sometimes this is reinforced in the mark scheme by the abbreviation isw. However, this would not apply to a case where a candidate passes through the correct answer as part of a wrong argument.

- d When a part of a question has two or more 'method' steps, the M marks are in principle independent unless the scheme specifically says otherwise; and similarly where there are several B marks allocated. (The notation 'dep \*' is used to indicate that a particular mark is dependent on an earlier, asterisked, mark in the scheme.) Of course, in practice it may happen that when a candidate has once gone wrong in a part of a question, the work from there on is worthless so that no more marks can sensibly be given. On the other hand, when two or more steps are successfully run together by the candidate, the earlier marks are implied and full credit must be given.
- e The abbreviation ft implies that the A or B mark indicated is allowed for work correctly following on from previously incorrect results. Otherwise, A and B marks are given for correct work only — differences in notation are of course permitted. A (accuracy) marks are not given for answers obtained from incorrect working. When A or B marks are awarded for work at an intermediate stage of a solution, there may be various alternatives that are equally acceptable. In such cases, exactly what is acceptable will be detailed in the mark scheme rationale. If this is not the case please consult your Team Leader.

Sometimes the answer to one part of a question is used in a later part of the same question. In this case, A marks will often be 'follow through'. In such cases you must ensure that you refer back to the answer of the previous part question even if this is not shown within the image zone. You may find it easier to mark follow through questions candidate-by-candidate rather than question-by-question.

- f Wrong or missing units in an answer should not lead to the loss of a mark unless the scheme specifically indicates otherwise.

Candidates are expected to give numerical answers to an appropriate degree of accuracy. 3 significant figures may often be the norm for this, but this always needs to be considered in the context of the problem in hand. For example, in quoting probabilities from Normal tables, we generally expect *some* evidence of interpolation and so quotation to 4 decimal places will often be appropriate. But even this does not always apply – quotations of the standard critical points for significance tests such as 1.96, 1.645, 2.576 (maybe even 2.58 – but not 2.57) will commonly suffice, especially if the calculated value of a test statistic is nowhere near any of these values. Sensible discretion *must* be exercised in such cases.

Discretion must also be exercised in the case of small variations in the degree of accuracy to which an answer is given. For example, if 3 significant figures are expected (either because of an explicit instruction or because the general context of a

problem demands it) but only 2 are given, loss of an accuracy ("A") mark is likely to be appropriate; but if 4 significant figures are given, this should not normally be penalised. Likewise, answers which are slightly deviant from what is expected in a very minor manner (for example a Normal probability given, after an attempt at interpolation, as 0.6418 whereas 0.6417 was expected) should not be penalised. However, answers which are *grossly* over- or under-specified should normally result in the loss of a mark. This includes cases such as, for example, insistence that the value of a test statistic is (say) 2.128888446667 merely because that is the value that happened to come off the candidate's calculator. Note that this applies to answers that are given as final stages of calculations; intermediate working should usually be carried out, and quoted, to a greater degree of accuracy to avoid the danger of premature approximation.

The situation regarding any particular cases where the accuracy of the answer may be a marking issue should be detailed in the mark scheme rationale. If in doubt, contact your Team Leader.

g Rules for replaced work

If a candidate attempts a question more than once, and indicates which attempt he/she wishes to be marked, then examiners should do as the candidate requests.

If there are two or more attempts at a question which have not been crossed out, examiners should mark what appears to be the last (complete) attempt and ignore the others.

NB Follow these maths-specific instructions rather than those in the assessor handbook.

h Genuine misreading (of numbers or symbols, occasionally even of text) occurs. If this results in the object and/or difficulty of the question being considerably changed, it is likely that all the marks for that question, or section of the question, will be lost. However, misreads are often such that the object and/or difficulty remain substantially unaltered; these cases are considered below.

The simple rule is that *all* method ("M") marks [and of course all independent ("B") marks] remain accessible but at least some accuracy ("A") marks do not. It is difficult to legislate in an overall sense beyond this global statement because misreads, even when the object and/or difficulty remains unchanged, can vary greatly in their effects. For example, a misread of 1.02 as 10.2 (perhaps as a quoted value of a sample mean) may well be catastrophic; whereas a misread of 1.6748 as 1.6746 may have so slight an effect as to be almost unnoticeable in the candidate's work.

A misread should normally attract *some* penalty, though this would often be only 1 mark and should rarely if ever be more than 2. Commonly in sections of questions where there is a numerical answer either at the end of the section or to be obtained and commented on (eg the value of a test statistic), this answer will have an "A" mark that may actually be designated as "cao" [correct answer only]. This should be interpreted *strictly* – if the misread has led to failure to obtain this value, then this "A" mark

must be withheld even if all method marks have been earned. It will also often be the case that such a mark is implicitly "cao" even if not explicitly designated as such.

On the other hand, we commonly allow "fresh starts" within a question or part of question. For example, a follow-through of the candidate's value of a test statistic is generally allowed (and often explicitly stated as such within the marking scheme), so that the candidate may exhibit knowledge of how to compare it with a critical value and draw conclusions. Such "fresh starts" are not affected by any earlier misreads.

A misread may be of a symbol rather than a number – for example, an algebraic symbol in a mathematical expression. Such misreads are more likely to bring about a considerable change in the object and/or difficulty of the question; but, if they do not, they should be treated as far as possible in the same way as numerical misreads, *mutatis mutandis*. This also applied to misreads of text, which are fairly rare but can cause major problems in fair marking.

The situation regarding any particular cases that arise while you are marking for which you feel you need detailed guidance should be discussed with your Team Leader.

Note that a miscopy of the candidate's own working is not a misread but an accuracy error.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (i)	<p>Assume that the underlying <b>population</b> of units of electricity produced per day is distributed symmetrically...</p> <p>... and the <b>sample</b> is random</p> <p><math>H_0</math>: population median = 8000  <math>H_1</math>: population median &gt; 8000</p> <p>Actual differences            970 -170 303 45 641 -58 701 670 -160 532</p> <p>Associated ranks            10 4 5 1 7 2 9 8 3 6</p> <p><math>T = 4 + 2 + 3 = 9</math>  <math>\therefore T = 9</math></p> <p>From <math>n = 10</math> tables – at the 5% level of significance in a one-tailed Wilcoxon single sample test, the critical value of <math>T</math> is 10</p> <p><math>9 &lt; 10 \therefore</math> the result is significant</p> <p>The evidence suggests that the median amount of electricity produced per day exceeds 8000 units.</p>	<p><b>B1</b></p> <p><b>B1</b></p> <p><b>B1</b> <b>B1</b></p> <p><b>B1</b></p> <p><b>M1</b> <b>A1</b></p> <p><b>B1</b> <b>B1</b> <b>M1</b></p> <p><b>A1</b></p> <p><b>M1</b></p> <p><b>A1</b></p> <p>[13]</p>	<p>Do not accept “not necessarily Normal” or reference to data in place of population</p> <p>Do not accept “the data is random”</p> <p>If population not stated then SC1 for <math>H_0</math>: median = 8000, <math>H_1</math>: median &gt; 8000. Allow “m” for “median”.  <math>T^+ = 46</math>            Use of <math>n = 10</math></p> <p>No further A marks from here if incorrect</p> <p>For a sensible comparison leading to a conclusion.            For non-assertive conclusion in context. Conclusion must refer to “median” or “average”</p>
1 (ii)	<p>A test based on the <math>t</math> distribution should be used,</p> <p>the sample is small and the <b>population</b> variance unknown.</p>	<p><b>B1</b></p> <p><b>B1</b> [2]</p>	<p>Allow “<math>n</math> is small” for “the sample is small”.</p>



Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(i)	Sample mean = $34.7/200 = 0.1735$ & variance = $(6.737 - 200 \times 0.1735^2)/199$ = 0.003600.. = 0.00360 to 3 s.f. AG	<b>B1</b> <b>M1</b> <b>A1</b> <b>[3]</b>	M1 for attempt to use sample variance, A1 correct use leading to given answer Correct structure with their sample mean
2	(ii)	$H_0: \mu = 0.16$ & $H_1: \mu > 0.16$ Where $\mu$ represents the population mean amount of salt per biscuit $z = \frac{0.1735 - 0.16}{\sqrt{0.00360} / \sqrt{200}} = 3.182$ At the 10% level, the critical value = 1.282 3.182 > 1.282 so significant The evidence <b>suggests</b> that the (population) mean amount of salt exceeds 0.16 g per biscuit.	<b>B1 B1</b> <b>B1</b> <b>M1</b> <b>A1</b>  <b>B1</b> <b>M1</b> <b>A1</b>  <b>[8]</b>	Allow 3.18 No further A marks if incorrect. Allow B1 for 0.00073 or 0.00074 if a probability method is used. Condone 0.9993 only if later compared with 0.90. For a sensible comparison leading to a conclusion. For non-assertive conclusion in context. Allow “average” for “mean”.
2	(iii)	The sample size is large	<b>B1</b>  <b>[1]</b>	Allow “ $n$ is large”
2	(iv)	This is too assertive. There is a 10% probability that a significant result is obtained when in fact the null hypothesis is true.	<b>B1</b> <b>B1</b>  <b>[2]</b>	For commenting on assertiveness, or “doesn’t prove”. For commenting that there is a chance that the conclusion is incorrect. Or for stating “the officer should have said population mean”. Or for comments which recognise that a different conclusion might have been reached with a lower significance level.



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance																																																		
4 (i)	<p><math>H_0</math>: No association between bicycle performance and type of road surface  <math>H_1</math>: There is an association between bicycle performance and type of road surface</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="495 448 1140 804"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="495 448 752 517">Expected frequencies</th> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="752 448 1140 485">Bicycle performance</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th data-bbox="752 485 875 517">Worse</th> <th data-bbox="875 485 987 517">Same</th> <th data-bbox="987 485 1140 517">Improved</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="495 517 618 553">Type of road surface</td> <td data-bbox="618 517 752 553">Smooth</td> <td data-bbox="752 517 875 553">11.088</td> <td data-bbox="875 517 987 553">15.456</td> <td data-bbox="987 517 1140 553">15.456</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="618 553 752 590">Rough</td> <td data-bbox="752 553 875 590">9.240</td> <td data-bbox="875 553 987 590"><b>12.88</b></td> <td data-bbox="987 553 1140 590"><b>12.88</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="618 590 752 627">VRough</td> <td data-bbox="752 590 875 627">12.672</td> <td data-bbox="875 590 987 627"><b>17.664</b></td> <td data-bbox="987 590 1140 627"><b>17.664</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="495 627 1140 804"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="495 627 752 663">Contributions</th> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="752 627 1140 663">Bicycle performance</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th data-bbox="752 663 875 700">Worse</th> <th data-bbox="875 663 987 700">Same</th> <th data-bbox="987 663 1140 700">Improved</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="495 700 618 737">Type of road surface</td> <td data-bbox="618 700 752 737">Smooth</td> <td data-bbox="752 700 875 737">5.8997</td> <td data-bbox="875 700 987 737">0.1372</td> <td data-bbox="987 700 1140 737">5.8934</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="618 737 752 774">Rough</td> <td data-bbox="752 737 875 774">0.3352</td> <td data-bbox="875 737 987 774">0.0974</td> <td data-bbox="987 737 1140 774">0.6440</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="618 774 752 804">VRough</td> <td data-bbox="752 774 875 804">3.1600</td> <td data-bbox="875 774 987 804"><b>0.0064</b></td> <td data-bbox="987 774 1140 804"><b>2.5141</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><math>X^2 = 18.687</math>  4 degrees of freedom  Critical value for 5% significance level is 9.488  As <math>18.687 &gt; 9.488</math> the result is significant</p> <p>There is evidence to suggest an association between bicycle performance and type of road surface</p>	Expected frequencies		Bicycle performance					Worse	Same	Improved	Type of road surface	Smooth	11.088	15.456	15.456		Rough	9.240	<b>12.88</b>	<b>12.88</b>		VRough	12.672	<b>17.664</b>	<b>17.664</b>	Contributions		Bicycle performance					Worse	Same	Improved	Type of road surface	Smooth	5.8997	0.1372	5.8934		Rough	0.3352	0.0974	0.6440		VRough	3.1600	<b>0.0064</b>	<b>2.5141</b>	<p><b>B1</b></p> <p><b>M1</b>  <b>A1</b></p> <p><b>M1</b>  <b>A1</b>  <b>A1</b>  <b>B1</b>  <b>B1</b>  <b>M1</b>  <b>A1</b>  <b>A1</b></p> <p><b>[11]</b></p>	<p>Any suitable method</p> <p>Allow 2.514  Allow awrt 18.7 www  No further A marks from here if incorrect.  FT their TS</p>
Expected frequencies		Bicycle performance																																																			
		Worse	Same	Improved																																																	
Type of road surface	Smooth	11.088	15.456	15.456																																																	
	Rough	9.240	<b>12.88</b>	<b>12.88</b>																																																	
	VRough	12.672	<b>17.664</b>	<b>17.664</b>																																																	
Contributions		Bicycle performance																																																			
		Worse	Same	Improved																																																	
Type of road surface	Smooth	5.8997	0.1372	5.8934																																																	
	Rough	0.3352	0.0974	0.6440																																																	
	VRough	3.1600	<b>0.0064</b>	<b>2.5141</b>																																																	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (ii)	<p>Smooth surfaces – high contributions show that many more test runs than expected showed improved performance and far fewer showed worse performance.</p> <p>Rough – low contributions indicate that performances were as expected.</p> <p>Very rough – contribution for “worse” indicates that more performed worse than expected on this surface. Also, fewer showed improved performance than expected.</p>	<p><b>B1</b> <b>B2,1,0</b></p> <p>[3]</p>	<p>For reference to size of contribution</p> <p>B1 For at least one suitable comment, B2 for a suitable, concise comment relating to each surface – no errors.</p>
5 (i)	<p>The sample is too small to obtain a reliable estimate for the population variance.</p> <p>Population variance is unknown</p>	<p><b>B1</b></p> <p><b>B1</b> <b>[2]</b></p>	<p>For small sample.</p> <p>For further sensible comment</p>
5 (ii)	<p>C.I. based on the <math>t</math> distribution</p> <p>Sample mean = 0.99775</p> <p>Sample standard deviation = 0.00542 (3 s.f.)</p> <p>7 degrees of freedom</p> $0.99775 \pm 2.365 \times \frac{0.00542}{\sqrt{8}}$ <p>(0.9932, 1.0023) correct to 4 d.p.</p>	<p><b>M1</b></p> <p><b>B1</b> <b>B1</b> <b>B1</b> <b>M1</b> <b>B1</b> <b>M1</b> <b>A1A1</b></p> <p>[9]</p>	<p>SOI</p> <p>M1 centred on their sample mean</p> <p>B1 for 2.365</p> <p>M1 for structure with their sample mean, SSD &amp; 2.365</p> <p>Allow (0.993, 1.002) from <math>t</math> dist<sup>n</sup></p>
5 (iii)	<p>As this interval contains 1 kg it does not provide evidence to suggest that the population mean weight of sugar is not 1 kg</p> <p>However, as this is based on only one small sample, further investigation may be needed.</p>	<p><b>B1</b> <b>B1</b></p> <p><b>B1</b></p> <p>[3]</p>	<p>Allow other suitable, statistically based comments.</p> <p>e.g. suitable comment referring to level of confidence.</p>

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2015

