## 4767 Statistics 2

| 1 (i) |  | G1 For values of $a$ <br> G1 for values of $t$ <br> G1 for axes | [3] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (ii) | $a$ is independent, $t$ is dependent since the values of $a$ are not subject to random variation, but are determined by the runways which the pilot chooses, whereas the values of $t$ are subject to random variation. | B1 <br> E1dep <br> E1dep | [3] |
| (iii) | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{a}=900, \bar{t}=855.2 \\ & b=\frac{\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{at}}}{\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{a}}}=\frac{6037800-5987 \times 6300 / 7}{8190000-6300^{2} / 7}=\frac{649500}{2520000}=0.258 \\ & \text { OR } \quad b=\frac{6037800 / 7-855.29 \times 900}{8190000 / 7-900^{2}}=\frac{92785}{360000}=0.258 \end{aligned}$ <br> hence least squares regression line is: $\begin{aligned} & t-\bar{t}=b(a-\bar{a}) \\ \Rightarrow & t-855.29=0.258(a-900) \\ \Rightarrow & t=0.258 a+623 \end{aligned}$ | B1 for $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{t}$ used (SOI) <br> M1 for attempt at gradient (b) <br> A1 for 0.258 cao <br> M1 for equation of line <br> A1 FT for complete equation | [5] |
| (iv) | (A) For $a=800$, predicted take-off distance $=0.258 \times 800+623=829$ <br> (B) For $a=2500$, predicted take-off distance $=0.258 \times 2500+623=1268$ <br> Valid relevant comments relating to the predictions such as: First prediction is interpolation so should be reasonable Second prediction is extrapolation and may not be reliable | M1 for at least one prediction attempted <br> A1 for both answers (FT their equation if $b>0$ ) <br> E1 (first comment) <br> E1 (second comment) | [4] |
| (v) | $\begin{aligned} & a=1200 \Rightarrow \\ & \quad \text { predicted } t=0.258 \times 1200+623=933 \\ & \text { Residual }=923-933=-10 \end{aligned}$ <br> The residual is negative because the observed value is less than the predicted value. | M1 for prediction <br> M1 for subtraction <br> A1 FT <br> E1 <br> Total | [4] |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2 (i) \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \mathrm{P}(1 \text { of } 10 \text { is faulty }) \\
\& =\binom{10}{1} \times 0.02^{1} \times 0.98^{9}=0.1667
\end{aligned}
\] \& M1 for coefficient M1 for probabilities A1 \& [3] \\
\hline (ii) \& \(n\) is large and \(p\) is small \& \begin{tabular}{l}
B1, B1 \\
Allow appropriate numerical ranges
\end{tabular} \& [2] \\
\hline (iii) \& \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
\lambda=150 \times 0.02=3
\] \\
(A) \(\mathrm{P}(X=0)=\tilde{\mathrm{e}}^{-3} \frac{3^{0}}{0!}=0.0498\) (3 s.f.) \\
or from tables \(=0.0498\) \\
(B) Expected number \(=3\) \\
Using tables: \(\mathrm{P}(X>3)=1-\mathrm{P}(X \leq 3)\) \(=1-0.6472=0.3528\)
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
B1 for mean (soi) \\
M1 for calculation or use of tables \\
A1 \\
B1 expected no \(=3\) (soi) \\
M1 \\
A1
\end{tabular} \& [3]
[3] \\
\hline (iv) \& \begin{tabular}{l}
(A) Binomial \((2000,0.02)\) \\
(B) Use Normal approx with
\[
\begin{aligned}
\& \mu=n p=2000 \times 0.02=40 \\
\& \sigma^{2}=n p q=2000 \times 0.02 \times 0.98=39.2
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\begin{aligned}
\& \mathrm{P}(X \leq 50)=\mathrm{P}\left(Z \leq \frac{50.5-40}{\sqrt{39.2}}\right) \\
\& =\mathrm{P}(Z \leq 1.677)=\Phi(1.677)=0.9532
\end{aligned}
\] \\
NB Poisson approximation also acceptable for full marks
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
B1 for binomial B1 for parameters \\
B1 \\
B1 \\
B1 for continuity corr. \\
M1 for probability using correct tail \\
A1 CAO
\end{tabular} \& [2]

[5]
[18] <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 3 \& (i) \& \begin{tabular}{l}
(A)
\[
\begin{aligned}
\& \mathrm{P}(X<50) \\
\& =\mathrm{P}\left(Z<\frac{50-45.3}{11.5}\right) \\
\& =\mathrm{P}(Z<0.4087) \\
\& =\Phi(0.4087) \\
\& =0.6585
\end{aligned}
\] \\
(B)
\[
\begin{aligned}
\& \mathrm{P}(45.3<X<50) \\
\& =0.6585-0.5 \\
\& =0.1585
\end{aligned}
\]
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
M1 for standardising \\
M1 for correct structure of probability calc' \\
A1 CAO inc use of diff tables \\
NB When a candidate's answers suggest that (s)he appears to have neglected to use the difference column of the Normal distribution tables penalise the first occurrence only \\
M1 \\
A1
\end{tabular} \& [3]

[2] <br>

\hline \& (ii) \& \[
$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { From tables } \Phi^{-1}(0.9)=1.282 \\
& \frac{k-45.3}{11.5}=1.282 \\
& k=45.3+1.282 \times 11.5=60.0
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& | B1 for 1.282 seen |
| :--- |
| M1 for equation in $k$ |
| A1 CAO | \& [3] <br>

\hline \& (iii) \& \[
$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{P} \text { (score }=111) \\
& =\mathrm{P}(110.5<Y<111.5) \\
& =\mathrm{P}\left(\frac{110.5-100}{15}<Z<\frac{111.5-100}{15}\right) \\
& =\mathrm{P}(0.7<Z<0.7667) \\
& =\Phi(0.7667)-\Phi(0.7) \\
& =0.7784-0.7580 \\
& =0.0204
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& | B1 for both continuity corrections |
| :--- |
| M1 for standardising |
| M1 for correct structure of probability calc’ |
| A1 CAO | \& [4] <br>

\hline \& (iv) \& From tables,

\[
$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi^{-1}(0.3)=-0.5244, \Phi^{-1}(0.8)=0.8416 \\
& 22=\mu+0.8416 \sigma \\
& 15=\mu-0.5244 \sigma \\
& 7=1.3660 \sigma \\
& \sigma=5.124, \mu=17.69
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& | B1 for 0.5244 or 0.8416 seen |
| :--- |
| M1 for at least one equation in $\mathrm{z}, \mu \& \sigma$ |
| A1 for both correct |
| M1 for attempt to solve two appropriate equations |
| A1 CAO for both | \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
{[5]} \\
{[17]}
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

| 4 | (i) | $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : no association between size of business and recycling service used. <br> $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ : some association between size of business and recycling service used. | B1 for both | [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ii) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Expected frequency }=78 / 285 \times 180=49.2632 \\ & \begin{aligned} \text { Contribution } & =(52-49.2632)^{2} / 49.2632 \\ & =0.1520 \end{aligned} \end{aligned}$ | M1 A1 <br> M1 for valid attempt at $(O-E)^{2} / E$ <br> A1 NB Answer given Allow 0.152 | [4] |
|  | (iii) | Test statistic $X^{2}=0.6041$ <br> Refer to $\mathcal{X}_{2}{ }^{2}$ <br> Critical value at $5 \%$ level $=5.991$ <br> Result is not significant <br> There is no evidence to suggest any association between size of business and recycling service used. <br> NB if $\mathrm{H}_{0} \mathrm{H}_{1}$ reversed, or 'correlation' mentioned in part (i), do not award B1in part (i) or E1 in part (iii). | B1 <br> B1 for 2 deg of f(seen) <br> B1 CAO for cv <br> B1 for not significant <br> E1 | [5] |
|  | (iv) | $\mathrm{H}_{0}: \mu=32.8 ; \quad \mathrm{H}_{1}: \mu<32.8$ <br> Where $\mu$ denotes the population mean weight of rubbish in the bins. <br> Test statistic $=\frac{30.9-32.8}{3.4 / \sqrt{50}}=-\frac{1.9}{0.4808}=-3.951$ <br> $5 \%$ level 1 tailed critical value of $z=-1.645$ <br> $-3.951<-1.645$ so significant. <br> There is sufficient evidence to reject $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ <br> There is evidence to suggest that the weight of rubbish in dustbins has been reduced. | B1 for use of 32.8 <br> B1 for both correct <br> B1 for definition of $\mu$ <br> M1 must include $\sqrt{ } 50$ <br> A1 <br> B1 for $\pm 1.645$ <br> M1 for sensible comparison leading to a conclusion <br> A1 for conclusion in words in context | $\begin{array}{r} {[8]} \\ {[18]} \end{array}$ |

