

1)	$f(x) = \frac{1}{\theta} \quad 0 \leq x \leq \theta$			
(i)	$E[X] = \frac{\theta}{2}$ $E[2\bar{X}] = 2E[\bar{X}] = 2E[X]$ $= \theta$ \therefore unbiased	B1 M1 A1 E1	Write-down, or by symmetry, or by integration.	4
(ii)	$\sum x = 2.3 \quad \therefore \bar{x} = \frac{2.3}{5} = 0.46 \quad \therefore 2\bar{x} = 0.92$ But we know $\theta \geq 1$ \therefore estimator can give nonsense answers, i.e. essentially useless	B1 E1 E2	(E1, E1)	4
(iii)	$Y = \max\{X_i\}, g(y) = \frac{ny^{n-1}}{\theta^n} \quad 0 \leq y \leq \theta$ $MSE(kY) = E[(kY - \theta)^2] =$ $E[k^2Y^2 - 2k\theta Y + \theta^2] =$ $k^2E[Y^2] - 2k\theta E[Y] + \theta^2$ $\frac{dMSE}{dk} =$ $2kE[Y^2] - 2\theta E[Y] = 0$ for $k = \frac{\theta E[Y]}{E[Y^2]}$ $\frac{d^2MSE}{dk^2} = 2E[Y^2] > 0 \quad \therefore$ this is a minimum $E[Y] = \int_0^\theta \frac{ny^n}{\theta^n} dy = \frac{n}{\theta^n} \frac{\theta^{n+1}}{n+1} = \frac{n\theta}{n+1}$ $E[Y^2] = \int_0^\theta \frac{ny^{n+1}}{\theta^n} dy = \frac{n}{\theta^n} \frac{\theta^{n+2}}{n+2} = \frac{n\theta^2}{n+2}$ \therefore minimising $k = \theta \frac{n\theta}{n+1} \frac{n+2}{n\theta^2} = \frac{n+2}{n+1}$	M1 1 M1 M1 A1 M1 A1 M1 A1	BEWARE PRINTED ANSWER	12
(iv)	With this k , kY is always greater than the sample maximum So it does not suffer from the disadvantage in part (ii)	E2 E2	(E1 E1) (E1 E1)	4

<p>2(i)</p>	$G(t) = E[t^X] = \sum_{x=0}^n \binom{n}{x} (pt)^x (1-p)^{n-x}$ $= [(1-p) + pt]^n$ $= (q + pt)^n$	<p>M1 2 1</p>	<p>Available as B2 for write-down or as 1+1 for algebra</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>(ii)</p>	$\mu = G'(1) \quad G'(t) = np(q + pt)^{n-1}$ $G'(1) = np \times 1 = np$ $\sigma^2 = G''(1) + \mu - \mu^2$ $G''(t) = n(n-1)p^2(q + pt)^{n-2}$ $G''(1) = n(n-1)p^2$ $\therefore \sigma^2 = n^2 p^2 - np^2 + np - n^2 p^2$ $= -np^2 + np = npq$	<p>1 1 1 1 M1 1</p>		<p>6</p>
<p>(iii)</p>	$Z = \frac{X - \mu}{\sigma} \quad \text{Mean 0, Variance 1}$	<p>B1</p>	<p>For <u>BOTH</u></p>	<p>1</p>
<p>(iv)</p>	$M(\theta) = G(e^\theta) = (q + pe^\theta)^n$ <p>$Z = aX + b$ with:</p> $a = \frac{1}{\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{npq}} \quad \text{and} \quad b = -\frac{\mu}{\sigma} = -\sqrt{\frac{np}{q}}$ $M_Z(\theta) = e^{b\theta} M_X(a\theta)$ $\therefore M_Z(\theta) = e^{-\sqrt{\frac{np}{q}}\theta} \left(q + pe^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{npq}}\theta} \right)^n =$ $\left(qe^{-\frac{p\theta}{\sqrt{npq}}} + pe^{\frac{1-p}{\sqrt{npq}}\theta} \right)^n$	<p>1 M1 1 ----- 1 ----- 1</p>	<p>BEWARE PRINTED ANSWER</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>(v)</p>	$M_Z(\theta) = \left(q - \frac{qp\theta}{\sqrt{npq}} + \frac{qp^2\theta^2}{2npq} + \right.$ <p>terms in $n^{-3/2}, n^{-2}, \dots +$</p> $\left. p + \frac{pq\theta}{\sqrt{npq}} + \frac{pq^2\theta^2}{2npq} + \dots \right)^n =$ $\left(1 + \frac{\theta^2}{2n} + \dots \right)^n \rightarrow$ $e^{\theta^2/2}$	<p>M1 M1 1 1</p>	<p>For expansion of exponential terms</p> <p>For indication that these can be neglected as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Use of result given in question</p>	<p>4</p>

4769

Mark Scheme

June 2007

(vi)	<p>N(0,1)</p> <p>Because $e^{\theta^2/2}$ is the mgf of N(0,1)</p> <p>and the relationship between distributions and their mgfs is unique</p>	<p>1</p> <p>E1</p> <p>E1</p>		<p>3</p>
(vii)	<p>“Unstandardising”, $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ ie $N(np, npq)$</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Parameters need to be given.</p>	<p>1</p>

3(i)	$H_0 : \mu_A = \mu_B$ $H_1 : \mu_A \neq \mu_B$ <p>Where μ_A, μ_B are the population means</p> <p>Test statistic</p> $\frac{26.4 - 25.38}{\sqrt{\frac{2.45}{7} + \frac{1.40}{5}}} =$ $\frac{1.02}{\sqrt{0.63}} = 1.285$ <p>Refer to N(0,1) Double-tailed 5% point is 1.96 Not significant No evidence that the population means differ</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>M1</p> <p>M1</p> <p>M1</p> <p>A1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Do NOT allow $\bar{X} = \bar{Y}$ or similar</p> <p>Accept absence of “population” if correct notation μ is used. Hypotheses stated verbally <u>must</u> include the word “population”.</p> <p>Numerator</p> <p>Denominator two separate terms correct</p> <p>No FT if wrong</p> <p>No FT if wrong</p>	10
(ii)	<p>CI (for $\mu_A - \mu_B$) is</p> $1.02 \pm$ $1.645 \times$ $0.7937 =$ $1.02 \pm 1.3056 =$ $(-0.2856, 2.3256)$	<p>M1</p> <p>B1</p> <p>M1</p> <p>A1</p> <p>cao</p>	<p>Zero out of 4 if not N(0,1)</p>	4
(iii)	<p>H_0 is accepted if $-1.96 < \text{test statistic} < 1.96$</p> <p>i.e. if $-1.96 < \frac{\bar{x} - \bar{y}}{0.7937} < 1.96$</p> <p>i.e. if $-1.556 < \bar{x} - \bar{y} < 1.556$</p> <p>In fact, $\bar{X} - \bar{Y} \sim N(2, 0.7937^2)$</p> <p>So we want</p> $P(-1.556 < N(2, 0.7937^2) < 1.556) =$ $P\left(\frac{-1.556 - 2}{0.7937} < N(0,1) < \frac{1.556 - 2}{0.7937}\right) =$ $P(-4.48 < N(0,1) < -0.5594) = 0.2879$	<p>M1</p> <p>M1</p> <p>A1</p> <p>M1</p> <p>M1</p> <p>M1</p> <p>A1</p> <p>cao</p>	<p>SC1 Same wrong test can get M1,M1,A0.</p> <p>SC2 Use of 1.645 gets 2 out of 3.</p> <p>BEWARE PRINTED ANSWER</p> <p>Standardising</p>	7
(iv)	<p>Wilcoxon would give protection if assumption of Normality is wrong.</p> <p>Wilcoxon could not really be applied if underlying variances are indeed different.</p> <p>Wilcoxon would be less powerful (worse Type II error behaviour) with such small samples if Normality is correct.</p>	<p>E1</p> <p>E1</p> <p>E1</p>		3

4 (i)	There might be some consistent source of plot-to-plot variation that has inflated the residual and which the design has failed to cater for.	E2	E1 – Some reference to extra variation. E1 – Some indication of a reason.	2																				
(ii)	Variation between the fertilisers should be compared with experimental error. If the residual is inflated so that it measures more than experimental error, the comparison of between - fertilisers variation with it is less likely to reach significance.	E1 E2	 (E1, E1)	3																				
(iii)	Randomised blocks <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tbody> <tr><td>C</td><td>.</td><td>.</td></tr> <tr><td>B</td><td>.</td><td>.</td></tr> <tr><td>A</td><td>.</td><td>.</td></tr> <tr><td>D</td><td>.</td><td>.</td></tr> <tr><td>E</td><td>.</td><td>.</td></tr> </tbody> </table> SPECIAL CASE: Latin Square $\frac{2}{4}$ (1, E1)	C	.	.	B	.	.	A	.	.	D	.	.	E	.	.	1 E1 E1 E1	Blocks (strips) clearly correctly oriented w.r.t. fertiliser gradient. All fertilisers appear in a block. Different (random) arrangements in the blocks.	4					
C	.	.																						
B	.	.																						
A	.	.																						
D	.	.																						
E	.	.																						
(iv)	Totals are: 95.0 123.2 86.8 130.2 67.4 (each from sample of size 4) Grand total 502.6 “Correction factor” $CF = \frac{502.6^2}{20} = 12630.338$ Total SS = $13610.22 - CF = 979.882$ Between fertilisers SS = $\frac{95.0^2}{4} + \dots + \frac{67.4^2}{4} - CF =$ $13308.07 - CF = 677.732$ Residual SS (by subtraction) = $979.882 - 677.732 = 302.15$ <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Source of variation</th> <th>SS</th> <th>df</th> <th>MS</th> <th>MS Ratio</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Between fertiliser</td> <td>677.732</td> <td>4</td> <td>169.433</td> <td>8.41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Residual</td> <td>302.15</td> <td>15</td> <td>20.143</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>979.882</td> <td>19</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Refer to $F_{4, 15}$ -upper 5% point is 3.06 Significant - seems effects of fertilisers are not all the same	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	MS Ratio	Between fertiliser	677.732	4	169.433	8.41	Residual	302.15	15	20.143		Total	979.882	19			M1 M1 A1 M1 M1 1, A1 1 1 1 1 1	For correct method for any two If each calculated SS is correct No FT if wrong No FT if wrong	12
Source of variation	SS	df	MS	MS Ratio																				
Between fertiliser	677.732	4	169.433	8.41																				
Residual	302.15	15	20.143																					
Total	979.882	19																						
(vii)	<u>Independent</u> $N(0, \sigma^2)$ [constant]	1 1 1		3																				