

QUESTION 1		Marks	Remark
<p>i) Sample proportion / p</p> <p>ii) $H_0 : \pi = 0.75$ (claim) $H_1 : \pi \neq 0.75$</p> <p>A 92% confidence interval for $\pi = (0.538, 0.722)$</p> <p>Since $\pi_0 = 0.75$ do not lies within the confidence interval $(0.538, 0.722)$, reject H_0</p> <p>At $\alpha = 0.08$, there is enough evidence to reject the claim that true proportion of Malaysian drivers who do not trust the self-parking technology is 0.75.</p>			
TOTAL		6 Marks	
QUESTION 2		Marks	Remark
<p>i) $H_0 : \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$ (claim) $H_1 : \sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$</p> $f_{test} = \frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} = \frac{33.7794}{46.5199} = 0.7261$ $f_{0.05, 16, 23} = 2.1086$ $f_{0.95, 16, 23} = \frac{1}{f_{0.05, 23, 16}} = \frac{1}{2.2443} = 0.4456$ <p>Since $(f_{0.95, 16, 23} = 0.4456) < f_{test} = 0.7261 < (f_{0.05, 16, 23} = 2.1086)$, do not reject H_0</p> <p>At $\alpha = 0.1$, there is enough evidence to support the claim that $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$.</p>			

<div>ii) $H_0 : \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$ $H_1 : \mu_1 - \mu_2 \neq 0$ (claim) $P - value = (0.3399)$ Since $(P - value = 0.3399) > (\alpha = 0.03)$, do not reject H_0 At $\alpha = 0.03$, there is enough evidence to reject the claim that the true mean of CO level for nicotine patch group is different from control group.</div>									
<div>iii) No</div>									
TOTAL		14 Marks							
QUESTION 3		Marks	Remark						
<div><div> i) Factors : Gender of children and type of pineapple pulp supplement</div><div> ii) No. of treatment = 2 x 3 =6 List of treatments:<table><tr><td>Boys, Placebo</td><td>Girls, Placebo</td></tr><tr><td>Boys, Low dose</td><td>Girls, Low dose</td></tr><tr><td>Boys. High dose</td><td>Girls. High dose</td></tr></table></div><div> iii)</div></div>		Boys, Placebo	Girls, Placebo	Boys, Low dose	Girls, Low dose	Boys. High dose	Girls. High dose		
Boys, Placebo	Girls, Placebo								
Boys, Low dose	Girls, Low dose								
Boys. High dose	Girls. High dose								

$X = 2(3)(5 - 1) = 24$ $Y = \frac{28}{24} = 1.1667$ $Z = \frac{0.4334}{1.1667} = 0.3715$ <p>iv)</p> <p>H_0 : There is no interaction effect between gender and type of pineapple pulp supplements</p> <p>H_1 : There is an interaction effect between gender and type of pineapple pulp supplements</p> <p>Since ($f_{test} = 0.3715 < f_{crit} = 3.4028$) OR ($P - value = 0.6936 > \alpha = 0.05$)</p> <p>Do not reject H_0</p> <p>At , $\alpha = 0.05$, there is no interaction effect between gender and type of pineapple pulp supplements</p> <p>v)</p> <p>The marginal effect should be tested since there is no interaction effect between gender and type of pineapple pulp supplements.</p>		
TOTAL	15 Marks	
QUESTION 4	Marks	Remark
<p>i)</p> <p>Dependent variable : sales number of air filter</p> <p>Independent variable : air quality index (AQI)</p> <p>ii)</p>		

$$S_{xy} = 1963.6 - \frac{798(23.2)}{10} = 112.24$$

$$S_{xx} = 69026 - \frac{(798)^2}{10} = 5345.6$$

$$S_{yy} = 57.06 - \frac{(23.2)^2}{10} = 3.236$$

$$r = \frac{112.24}{\sqrt{(3.236)(5345.6)}} = 0.8534$$

iii)

As the reading of AQI increases, so as the sales number of air filter.

iv)

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{y} &= 0.6442 + 0.021x \\ &= 06442 + 0.021(78) \\ &= 2.2822 \text{ (in thousand unit) @ 2282.2 units}\end{aligned}$$

v)

H_0 : There is no linear relationship between the reading of AQI and the sales numbers of air filter.

H_1 : There is a linear relationship between the reading of AQI and the sales numbers of air filter.

$se(\beta) = \left[\frac{3.236 - 0.0210(112.24)}{8} \right] \left(\frac{1}{5345.6} \right)$ $= 0.0045$ $t_{test} = \frac{0.021 - 0}{0.0045} = 4.6667$ $t_{0.0025, 8} = 3.8325$ <p>Since $(t_{test} = 4.6667 > t_{crit} = 3.8325)$ Reject H_0 At $\alpha = 0.005$, there is a linear relationship between the reading of AQI and the sales numbers of air filter.</p>		
TOTAL	20 Marks	
QUESTION 5	Marks	Remark
<p>i) 0.7382 73.82% variation in the risk of lake eutrophication can be predicted by average lake depth, external phosphorus loading rate and flushing rate.</p> <p>ii) When the average lake depth and external phosphorus loading rate are held constants, the risk of eutrophication decreases by 2.1661% for an increase of $1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ d}^{-1}$ in flushing rate.</p> <p>iii) $H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$ $H_1: \beta_j \neq 0$ for at least one $j = 1, 2, 3$ $P\text{-value} = 0.0064$ Since $(P\text{-value} = 0.0064) < (\alpha = 0.01)$, we reject H_0</p>		

At $\alpha = 0.01$, at least one independent variable is related to the dependent variable.

iv)

Predictor	P -value	r^2	Adjusted r^2	Regression model
D, L, F	0.0064	0.8287	0.7382	$\hat{R} = -7.9239 + 3.5368D + 3.7345L - 2.1661F$

v)

Best model: $\hat{R} = 41.3200 + 38.9761L$

vi)

Best model $\hat{R} = -4.1900 + 4.1846D + 2.3189L$

Because it has the lowest significant P -value and the highest adjusted $r^2 = 0.9250$.

vii)

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{R} &= -4.19 + 4.1846D + 2.3189L \\ &= -4.19 + 4.1846(19) + 2.3189(0.125) \\ &= 75.6073\%\end{aligned}$$

TOTAL

19 Marks

QUESTION 6

Marks

Remark

a) i) to compare observed value and expected value

- ii) the data are obtained from a random sample OR
the data is observed frequency OR
the expected frequency for each category must be at least five

b) i) $240 - (73+40+41+33+9) = 44$

- ii) H_0 : The recent study does not differ from previous study
 H_1 : The recent study does differ from previous study

O_i	P_i	E_i	Combine >>	O_i	E_i	$\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
73	0.35	84		73	84	1.4405
41	0.15	36		41	36	0.6944
40	0.14	33.6		40	33.6	1.2190
44	0.23	55.2		44	55.2	2.2725
33	0.11	26.4		42	31.2	3.7385
9	0.02	4.8				
						$\chi^2_{test} = 9.3649$

$$\chi^2_{0.1,4} = 7.7794$$

Since $(\chi^2_{test} = 9.3649) > (\chi^2_{0.1,4} = 7.7794)$, reject H_0

At $\alpha = 0.1$, there is enough evidence to support the claim that the recent study differs from previous study.

OR

H_0 : The recent study does not differ from previous study

H_1 : The recent study does differ from previous study

O_i	P_i	E_i	$\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
73	0.35	84	1.4405
41	0.15	36	0.6944
40	0.14	33.6	1.2190
44	0.23	55.2	2.2725
33	0.11	26.4	1.6500
9	0.02	4.8	3.6750
$\chi^2_{test} = 10.9514$			

$$\chi^2_{0.1,5} = 9.2364$$

Since $(\chi^2_{test} = 10.9514) > (\chi^2_{0.1,4} = 9.2364)$, reject H_0

At $\alpha = 0.1$, there is enough evidence to support the claim that the recent study differs from previous study.

TOTAL

13 Marks

QUESTION 7

Marks

Remark

a) No

b)

i) $30 + P + Q = 110$

$P + Q = 80$

$P = 40, Q = 40$

ii)

H_0 : The occurrence of these types of crime is independent on the city area

H_1 : The occurrence of these types of crime is dependent on the city area

O_{ij}	$E_{ij} = \frac{n_i \times n_j}{n_{..}}$	$\frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$		
O_{11}	37.8947	0.1170		
O_{12}	53.6842	0.7430		
O_{13}	28.4211	2.4951		
O_{21}	47.3684	0.1462		
O_{22}	67.1053	0.1249		
O_{23}	35.5263	0.8596		
O_{31}	34.7368	0.6459		
O_{32}	49.2105	1.7239		
O_{33}	26.0526	7.4668		
		$\chi^2_{test} = 14.3224$		
<p>Since $(\chi^2_{test} = 14.3224) > (\chi^2_{0.025, 2(2)} = 11.1433)$, then we reject H_0</p> <p>At $\alpha = 0.025$, we can conclude that the occurrence of these types of crime is dependent on the city area.</p>				
TOTAL			13 Marks	