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## (Specification 6380)

## Statistics 2

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process 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 standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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.

## Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from: aqa.org.uk
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## 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 |
| A | mark is dependent on M or m marks and is for accuracy |
| B | mark is independent of M or m marks and is for method and accuracy |
| E | mark is for explanation |
| $\checkmark$ 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 |
| $-x \mathrm{EE}$ | deduct $x$ marks for each error |
| NMS | no method shown |
| PI | possibly implied |
| SCA | substantially correct approach |
| c | 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 | Marks | Total | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1(a) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E}(X)=99 \times 0.5+125 \times 0.3+144 \times 0.2 \\ & =115.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { M1 } \\ \text { A1 } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B2 } 115.8(115.5 \sim 116) \\ & \quad \text { or M1 A1 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E}\left(X^{2}\right)=99^{2} \times 0.5+125^{2} \times 0.3+144^{2} \times 0.2= \\ & 13735.2 \end{aligned}$ | M1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B2 } 18.04(18 \sim 18.1) \\ & \quad \text { or M1A1 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{V}(X)=13735.2-115.8^{2}=325.56 \\ & \text { s.d. }=\sqrt{ } 325.56=18.04 \end{aligned}$ | A1 | 4 |  |
| (b)(i) | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{E}(Y)=79 \times 0.25+99 \times 0.375+ \\ 125 \times 0.225+144 \times 0.15= \end{array}$ | M1 |  | M1 method A1 107 ag |
|  | 106.6 | A1 | 2 |  |
| (ii) |  | M1 |  | M1 Any calculation which could be helpful in answering the question |
|  | $106.6 \times 1.2=127.92>115.8 \text { hence }$ increase in customers will mean increase in the total takings on tea bags despite the lower mean. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m1 } \\ & \text { A1 } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | ml attempt at a valid comparison <br> A1 correct conclusion based on correct calculations - allow use of 107 for $\mathrm{E}(Y)$ |
| (c) | Extra customers in shop for cheap teabags may make additional purchases. | E1 | 1 | E1 Any sensible point |
|  | Total |  | 10 |  |
| 2(a)(i) | $\mathrm{P}(2$ or fewer $)=0.5184$ | B1 | 1 | B1 0.518 ( $0.518 \sim 0.519)$ |
| (ii) | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}(>3) & =1-\mathrm{P}(3 \text { or fewer }) \\ & =1-0.7360 \end{aligned}$ | M1 |  | M1 method |
|  | $=0.264$ | A1 | 2 | A1 0.264 ( $0.2635 \sim 0.2645$ ) |
| (iii) | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}(4) & =\mathrm{P}(4 \text { or fewer })-\mathrm{P}(3 \text { or fewer }) \\ & =0.8774-0.7360 \end{aligned}$ | M1 |  | M1 method |
|  | $=0.1414$ | A1 | 2 | A1 0.1414 ( $0.141 \sim 0.142$ ) |
| (b) | Poisson mean 13 | B1 |  | B1 poisson mean $5 \times 2.6$ |
|  | $\mathrm{P}(15$ or fewer ) - P ( 9 or fewer $)$ | M1 |  | M1 method - generous |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & =0.7636-0.1658 \\ & =0.598 \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{m} 1$ | 4 | m 1 correct method <br> A1 $0.598(0.597 \sim 0.6)$ |
|  | Total |  | 9 |  |

## SS02(cont)

| Q | Solution | Marks | Total | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3(a) | $1574.25 \quad 1578.5$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { M1 } \\ \text { A1 } \end{gathered}$ |  | M1 4-point m.a. attempted A1 1574 (1570 ~ 1575 ) and 1578.5 ( $1578 \sim 1580$ ) |
|  | graph | A1 | 3 | A1 both points plotted accurately |
| (b) | on graph | B1 | 1 | B1 trend line - generous |
| (c) | on graph | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M1 } \\ & \text { A1 } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | M1 method <br> A1 reasonably accurate plot by eye |
| (d) | Estimate of seasonal effect for Q1 $(-295-275) / 2=-285$ | M1 m1 |  | M1 attempt to find deviations from trend line or centred m.a. <br> m 1 mean of 2 or 3 deviations - ignore sign |
|  |  | A1 | 3 | A1 $-285(-265 \sim-295)$ |
| (e) | $1700-285=1415$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B1 } \\ & \text { M1 } \end{aligned}$ |  | B1 1700 ( 1675 ~ 1725 ) <br> M1 method - their figures ( must be below trend line ) |
|  |  | A1 | 3 | A1 1415 ( 1390~1440) |
| (f) | Method appears to be effective | E1 | 1 | E1 method effective |
| (g) | The further ahead the forecast the less accurate/effective the forecast is likely to be. | E1 |  | E1 the further ahead the forecast the less accurate it is likely to be |
|  | The worldwide recession in 2009 means that projecting an upward trend in expenditure into the future is unlikely to provide a good forecast | E1 | 2 | E1 expenditure on shoes cannot continue to increase indefinitely/effect of recession/any sensible comment |
|  | Total |  | 15 |  |

SS02 (cont)

| Q | Solution | Marks | Total | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4(a) |  |  |  | B1 one correct hypothesis |
|  | $\mathrm{H}_{0}: \mu=25 \quad \mathrm{H}_{1}: \mu<25$ | B1B1 |  | B1 both hypotheses correct |
|  | $\bar{x}=23.4875$ | B1 |  | B1 23.4875 ( $23.48 \sim 23.5)$ |
|  | $z=(23.4875-25) /(2.3 / \sqrt{ } 8)=$ | M1m1 |  | M1 Use of $2.3 / \sqrt{ } 8$ |
|  | -1.86 | A1 |  | A1 -1.86 ( $-1.85 \sim-1.87$ ) |
|  | c.v. -1.6449 | B1 |  | B1 -1.6449 - ignore sign |
|  | Reject $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ | A1 $\checkmark$ |  | A1 $\checkmark$ conclusion - must be compared with correct tail of normal |
|  | Conclude that there is significant evidence that the mean $\%$ by which the contents exceed the nominal quantity is less than 25. | A1 $\checkmark$ | 9 | A1 $\checkmark$ in context |
| (b) | A Type 1 error would be to conclude the mean increase in contents was less than | E1 |  | E1 idea of Type 1 error |
|  | $25 \%$ when in fact it was equal to $25 \%$ | E1 | 2 | E1 in context |
| (c) | Risk of Type 1 error is set at any required level and is not affected by the sample size. | E1 E1 | 2 | E1 claim incorrect <br> E1 risk of Type 1 error unaffected by sample size |
|  | Total |  | 13 |  |

## SS02 (cont)

| Q | Solution | Marks | Total | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5(a) | Number medical staff from 000 to 389. | E1 |  | E1 valid numbering of one strata |
|  | Choose 3-digit random numbers. | E1 |  | E1 3-digit random numbers |
|  | Ignore repeats and > 389 | E1 |  | E1 ignore repeats |
|  | Continue until 39 obtained. | E1 |  | E1 ignore > 389 |
|  | Choose corresponding medical staff. <br> In the same way select 22 ancillary staff, | E1 |  | or equivalent for |
|  | 14 administrative staff and 7 managers. | E1 | 6 | E1 39,22,14,7 |
| (b)(i) | Number medical staff 000 to 389 , ancillary staff 390 to 609 , administrative staff 610 to 749 and managers 750 to 819 | E1 |  | E1 valid numbering |
|  | Select a random number between 000 and 027. | E1 |  | E1 choose random starting point (not necessarily in range 000 to 027) |
|  |  | E1 |  | E1 idea of systematic sampling |
|  | Choose this number and every 8th number thereafter until 100 have been selected. Choose corresponding staff. | E1 |  | E1 choose every 8th |
| (ii) | Because 820 is not exactly divisible by 100. (In the sample described above numbers 000 to 027 have different chances of being selected the rest have a 1 in 8 chance.) | E1 | 5 | E1 820 not exactly divisible by 100 or equivalent |
| (c) | Other survey suggests that there is no point in stratifying by employment category as all categories have similar views. <br> A sample stratified by sex would be the best. | E1 |  | E1 stratifying by category pointless <br> E1 representative proportion of each sex desirable |
|  | Neither the stratified sample above nor the systematic sample necessarily contain a representative proportion of each sex. | E1 |  | E1 stratified by category not necessarily representative of sexes |
|  |  | E1 | 3 | E1 systematic not necessarily representative of sexes maximum 3 |
|  | Total |  | 14 |  |

## SS02 (cont)

| Q | Solution | Marks | Total | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6(a) | 9000 | B1B1 | 2 | B1 9 <br> B1 thousand |
| (b) | The population of England is about 10 times as large as that of Scotland. <br> However there are about 20 times as many full-time students in England as in Scotland | E1 E1 |  | E1 There are more part-time than fulltime students in each country. <br> E1 Scotland has a smaller proportion of population in full-time education |
|  | The proportion of part-time students to the population is similar in both countries. | E1 | 3 | E1 Scotland has a similar proportion of the population in part-time education. |
| (c)(i) | $22.5+1.5 \times(22.5-16.8)=31.05$ older than 31.05 years | B1 | 1 | B1 31.05 ( $31 \sim 31.1$ ) allow 32 |
| (ii) | The ages of individual students are not known. <br> There are so many outliers that all the *s would be superimposed on one another | E1 | 1 | E1 exact ages not known E1 too many outliers maximum 1 mark |
| (d)(i) | Total, thousands, full-time students in Scotland 45.1. $\begin{aligned} & 45.1 \div 2=22.55 \\ & 1.5+8.7+9.7=19.9 \text { aged } 17 \text { or less } \\ & (\text { ie }<18.0) \end{aligned}$ | M1 |  | M1 attempt to compare cumulative frequency with 45.1/2 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 19.9<22.55 \\ & 19.9+6.9=26.8 \text { aged } 18 \text { or less } \\ & (\text { ie }<19.0) \end{aligned}$ | M1 |  | M1 a correct method |
|  | $26.8>22.55 .$ <br> Hence median lies between 18.0 and 19.0 | A1 | 3 | A1 Correct conclusion based on correct calculations. ag |
| (ii) | on figure 2 | M1A1 | 2 | M1 method for box and whisker generous <br> A1 reasonably accurate plot |
| (iii) | Similar <br> Both positive skew | E1 |  | E1 any valid comment |
|  | Scotland slightly lower variability as measured by interquartile range. Scotland slightly higher median | E1 | 2 | E1 any further valid comment |
|  | Total |  | 14 |  |
|  | TOTAL |  | 75 |  |

