Jen is using the large data set to investigate the relationship between Daily Maximum. Relative Humidity and Daily Mean Visibility. Using the data for Camborne, Jen takes as her sample the first 8 days of October 2015 Jen's data, without units, is given in the table below. Daily Maximum Relative Humidity 93 92 97 98 100 99 91 96 Daily Mean Visibility 700 700 1100 1000 300 700 2300 1600 The Daily Mean Visibility for 1st October was recorded as 1100 (a) Give an interpretation of this value, including any units. (a) greatest distance at which an object can be seen and recognised in daylight (2) The product moment correlation coefficient for Jen's data, to 3 decimal places, is in this list (a) measured in Decametres (Dm) so 1100 = 1100 x 10 = 11000 m (Imark) -0.256-0.484-0.757One of these values cannot be a product moment correlation coefficient. (b) -1.035 cannot be a correlation coefficient, r, because -1≤r≤1 perfect+ve (Imar. (b) Explain which value. (c) Use your calculator to identify from the list the correct product moment correlation coefficient for Jen's data. (c) fx-991EX: MENU 6 Stats/y = a+bx/kenterdatar then optn/Regression Calc Jen believes that the Daily Maximum Relative Humidity each day can be used to predict (c) fx-CG50: MENU 2 Statistics/Kenterdata7 (&check) then CALC/REG/X/a+bx the Daily Mean Visibility. (d) Carry out a suitable test, at the 5% significance level, to show why the data may support Jen's belief. (c) cotd. => r=-0.7573... State clearly = -0.757 3sf (Imark) your hypotheses your critical value (e) sample in one place and time is not representative

o If Ho was true you would still obtain values in critical region 5% of the time (2 marks) (3) (e) Give two reasons why Jen's belief may still not be correct. (2)(d) Ho: $\rho = 0$ (null hypothesis is always no correlation here)

His $\rho \neq 0$ (two-tailed because Jen does not express belief

(Imark) in any direction) Table "Critical Values for Correlation Coefficients" in Formula Book: under "Product Moment Coefficient" for Sample Size = 8
5% two-tailed test => 2½% each tail => critical values ± 0.7067 (Imark) Observed = = -0.757 < -0.7067 so in critical region => supports Jen's belief (Imark)