

Exercise walk-through

3.3.2

Uncertainty, evaluation and statistics

Pearson Edexcel · International A-Level · Biology

1

The method

Method — Errors and what repeats can and cannot fix

Random error makes readings scatter either side of the true value; repeating and averaging reduces its effect on the mean. A **systematic error** shifts every reading the same way (a zero offset on the colorimeter, a mis-calibrated graticule); averaging does not remove it – zero the instrument on a blank, calibrate against a standard.

Method — Uncertainty in arithmetic

Percentage uncertainty of one reading = (absolute uncertainty $\div$ value) $\times$ 100 %.

For a product or quotient of independent measurements, add the percentage uncertainties; for a difference, add the absolute uncertainties first. Quote results to the significant figures the inputs support.

$$\frac{1.0 \text{ mm}}{50.0 \text{ mm}} \times 100\% = 2.0\%$$

Exercises 2.1·2.3

2.1 State one thing repeat readings improve, and one kind of error they cannot remove, naming a fix for that kind. [3]

2.2 A length of 50.0 mm is measured with an absolute uncertainty of 1.0 mm, and a time of 20 s with 1 s. Calculate each percentage uncertainty and the maximum percentage uncertainty in a rate found by dividing length by time. [3]

2.3 Five replicate absorbance readings are 0.42, 0.44, 0.43, 0.41 and 0.62. Identify the anomaly and state what to do about it. [3]

Exercises 2.1·2.3

2.1 State one thing repeat readings improve, and one kind of error they cannot remove, naming a fix for that kind. [3]

2.1 Repeats improve reliability and give a mean with an estimate of spread. They cannot remove a systematic error; fix it at the source – zero the colorimeter on plain solvent / calibrate the graticule against a stage micrometer.

2.2 A length of 50.0 mm is measured with an absolute uncertainty of 1.0 mm, and a time of 20 s with 1 s. Calculate each percentage uncertainty and the maximum percentage uncertainty in a rate found by dividing length by time. [3]

2.2 Length: $1.0/50.0 \times 100 = 2.0\%$. Time: $1/20 \times 100 = 5\%$. Quotient maximum: $2 + 5 = 7\%$.

2.3 Five replicate absorbance readings are 0.42, 0.44, 0.43, 0.41 and 0.62. Identify the anomaly and state what to do about it. [3]

2.3 0.62 is inconsistent with the tight 0.41–0.44 group. Repeat that treatment; if confirmed, treat it separately – never delete silently, and report its cause if identifiable (e.g. an unshaken sample).

Exercises 2.4·3.1

2.4 A student compares pigment loss at two temperatures with three repeats each. State two statistics that would make the comparison convincing, and what overlap between them would mean. [3]

3.1 Describe how an investigation of starch content in one cassava root could be extended to determine the variability of starch concentration between different cassava roots, naming the conditions, the summary statistic and one measure of variability you would report. [3]

Exercises 2.4·3.1

2.4 A student compares pigment loss at two temperatures with three repeats each. State two statistics that would make the comparison convincing, and what overlap between them would mean. [3]

2.4 Mean absorbance per temperature with SD (or standard error, or range/error bars) per temperature. Overlap of the spreads means the two temperatures' difference is not secure – the means alone cannot support a conclusion.

3.1 Describe how an investigation of starch content in one cassava root could be extended to determine the variability of starch concentration between different cassava roots, naming the conditions, the summary statistic and one measure of variability you would report. [3]

3.1 Take roots grown under the same conditions and use the same equipment and measurement method throughout; repeat the measurement on several different roots and calculate each root's concentration, then the mean of the roots; report a named variability measure – SD, standard error, range or error bars.

Exercises 3.2-3.3

3.2 A gradient is determined from a best-fit line, with a steepest plausible gradient of 1.10 and a shallowest of 0.86 a.u. per hour. Explain how these lines were chosen, what they tell you about the gradient's uncertainty, and why the triangle used should span at least half the line. [4]

3.3 A membrane-permeability method reports “colour was judged by eye against a printed scale; one reading per treatment”. Give three improvements, each with the weakness it removes, and state which one changes the method from semi-quantitative to quantitative. [5]

Exercises 3.2-3.3

3.2 A gradient is determined from a best-fit line, with a steepest plausible gradient of 1.10 and a shallowest of 0.86 a.u. per hour. Explain how these lines were chosen, what they tell you about the gradient's uncertainty, and why the triangle used should span at least half the line. [4]

3.2 The steepest and shallowest lines are the extreme plausible lines that still pass acceptably through the error bars; their gradients bound the best-fit gradient – the true gradient lies between 0.86 and 1.10, so the uncertainty is about ± 0.12 around the best-fit value. A small triangle magnifies reading error in Δy and Δx ; a triangle spanning at least half the line keeps the read-off error small relative to the values.

3.3 A membrane-permeability method reports “colour was judged by eye against a printed scale; one reading per treatment”. Give three improvements, each with the weakness it removes, and state which one changes the method from semi-quantitative to quantitative. [5]

3.3 Improvements, each with its weakness: a colorimeter instead of the eye – removes subjective judgement and gives an objective value, this is the change from semi-quantitative to quantitative; zero on plain solvent – removes the systematic offset; repeat each treatment and take the mean – reduces random error / shows reliability; shake before sampling – uneven pigment distribution biases single readings.