

# Final Exam Review

BIOL 305

2025-12-12

## Introduction

These are questions that are posed as they would be on a final. Please complete each part of each question; we will review the answers. The following data are either imaginary or pulled from publicly available sources like Wikipedia.

For each question:

- Determine which test should be used
- Write your null and alternative hypotheses
- Perform the appropriate test
- Evaluate the results using an  $\alpha = 0.05$
- Write a conclusion that relates back to the biological hypothesis
- If needed, plot the data - Don't forget a title and/or detailed caption and appropriate axes names

```
library(tidyverse)
```

```
## -- Attaching core tidyverse packages ----- tidyverse 2.0.0 --
## v dplyr     1.1.4    v readr     2.1.6
## vforcats   1.0.1    v stringr   1.6.0
## v ggplot2   4.0.1    v tibble    3.3.0
## v lubridate 1.9.4    v tidyv     1.3.1
## v purrr    1.2.0
## -- Conflicts ----- tidyverse_conflicts() --
## x dplyr::filter() masks stats::filter()
## x dplyr::lag()   masks stats::lag()
## i Use the conflicted package (<http://conflicted.r-lib.org/>) to force all conflicts to become errors
library(UNKstats)
```

## Happiness

You decide to ask your friends to rate their happiness on a scale of 0-100 before and after you bother them to ask how happy they are, thereby inciting an existential crises within each of them. You predict that asking this question will decrease the happiness they are feeling at that moment. These data are ranked data, but assume they are parametric given the size of the scale being used.

```
before.asking <- c(96, 80, 86, 92, 100, 92, 95, 91, 87)
after.asking <- c(72, 53, 90, 85, 90, 86, 83, 79, 62)

happiness <- cbind(before.asking, after.asking) |>
  as.data.frame()

happiness

## before.asking after.asking
```

```

## 1      96      72
## 2      80      53
## 3      86      90
## 4      92      85
## 5     100      90
## 6      92      86
## 7      95      83
## 8      91      79
## 9      87      62

```

statistic = 3.86, p = 0.002

## Running and grades

You hear that going running is good for your grades. You decide to look and see if the amount of time people spend running is related to their grades. You obtain the following data:

```

run_time <- c(20,25,22,50,30,10,6)
grade <- c(94,84,95,72,88,90,85)

run_grades <- cbind(run_time, grade) |>
  as.data.frame()

run_grades

```

```

##   run_time grade
## 1      20    94
## 2      25    84
## 3      22    95
## 4      50    72
## 5      30    88
## 6      10    90
## 7       6    85

```

Test statistic = -1.92, p = 0.11, other value = -0.65

## Fosbury Flop

High-jumpers use the “Fosbury Flop” because it improves their performance by allowing their center of mass to pass *under* the high-jump bar while their bodies pass *over* the bar. Below are jump heights (in meters) for world records from before the Fosbury Flop was widely used and after the Fosbury Flop was widely used. Does the flop significantly improve athlete performance?

```

pre_flop <- c(2.09,2.12,2.15,2.18,2.17,2.28,2.29)
post_flop <- c(2.30,2.33,2.39,2.34,2.42,2.45,2.44)

jump_heights <- cbind(pre_flop, post_flop) |>
  as.data.frame()

jump_heights

```

```

##   pre_flop post_flop
## 1      2.09      2.30
## 2      2.12      2.33
## 3      2.15      2.39
## 4      2.18      2.34
## 5      2.17      2.42

```

```
## 6      2.28      2.45
## 7      2.29      2.44
```

Stat = -5.47, p < 0.0001

## Sandhills, Stonehills

You decide to look at concentrations of Greater Prairie-Chickens *Tympanuchus cupido* in fields a set amount of years after control burns. The following table shows the count of prairie-chickens in each field from the year of the burn until 5 years after the burn. Conditions are lettered to ensure sorting is performed correctly.

Assume these data are normally distributed. For the purposes of this study, it does *not* count as a “repeated measures / paired” survey, since we do not know if surveys were the same across all years, we only know that they were performed in the same regions with approximately the same amount of effort.

```
Location <- c(rep("Sandhills", 4), rep("Stonehills", 4))
a_burn_year <- c(1,0,3,2,1,0,0,2)
b_one_year_post_burn <- c(3,5,7,6,5,3,2,5)
c_five_years_post_burn <- c(20,21,15,8,8,7,10,8)

burn_counts <- c(a_burn_year, b_one_year_post_burn, c_five_years_post_burn)

# prairie_chickens <- cbind(Location, a_burn_year, b_one_year_post_burn, c_five_years_post_burn) |>
#   # as.data.frame()

time <- c(rep("a_burn_year", 8),
          rep("b_one_year_post_burn", 8),
          rep("c_five_years_post_burn", 8))

prairie_chickens <- cbind(Location, time, burn_counts) |>
  as.data.frame() |>
  mutate(Location = as.factor(Location)) |>
  mutate(time = as.factor(time)) |>
  mutate(burn_counts = as.numeric(burn_counts))

prairie_chickens

##      Location        time burn_counts
## 1    Sandhills  a_burn_year         1
## 2    Sandhills  a_burn_year         0
## 3    Sandhills  a_burn_year         3
## 4    Sandhills  a_burn_year         2
## 5  Stonehills  a_burn_year         1
## 6  Stonehills  a_burn_year         0
## 7  Stonehills  a_burn_year         0
## 8  Stonehills  a_burn_year         2
## 9    Sandhills b_one_year_post_burn  3
## 10   Sandhills b_one_year_post_burn  5
## 11   Sandhills b_one_year_post_burn  7
## 12   Sandhills b_one_year_post_burn  6
## 13  Stonehills b_one_year_post_burn  5
## 14  Stonehills b_one_year_post_burn  3
## 15  Stonehills b_one_year_post_burn  2
## 16  Stonehills b_one_year_post_burn  5
## 17  Sandhills c_five_years_post_burn 20
```

```

## 18 Sandhills c_five_years_post_burn      21
## 19 Sandhills c_five_years_post_burn      15
## 20 Sandhills c_five_years_post_burn       8
## 21 Stonehills c_five_years_post_burn      8
## 22 Stonehills c_five_years_post_burn      7
## 23 Stonehills c_five_years_post_burn     10
## 24 Stonehills c_five_years_post_burn      8

```

Statistic = 26.31, p < 0.0001.

## Range vs. Body Size

Multiple studies have shown there is a correlation between range and body size. These studies have been so correlated, in fact, that researchers hypothesize that you can predict an organisms' range size based on its body size. Use the data below to assess this hypothesis.

The URL is: [https://github.com/jacobccoooper/biol305\\_unk/blob/main/assignments/final\\_exam\\_bodysize.csv](https://github.com/jacobccoooper/biol305_unk/blob/main/assignments/final_exam_bodysize.csv)

Round your answers to *two* decimal places, even though the datasheet shows more precision.

```

# download data from github
body_range <- read_csv("https://raw.githubusercontent.com/jacobccoooper/biol305_unk/main/assignments/final_exam_bodysize.csv")

## Rows: 100 Columns: 2
## -- Column specification -----
## Delimiter: ","
## dbl (2): body_size, range_size
##
## i Use `spec()` to retrieve the full column specification for this data.
## i Specify the column types or set `show_col_types = FALSE` to quiet this message.

```

*NOTE:* Can only do correlation and regression on things with a *linear* relationship.

stat = 70.44, p < 0.0001, other val = 1.89

## Applying what you know

How many square kilometers would the range of an animal weighing 4500 kg be?

HINT: use the following to define your new range size:

```
newdat = data.frame(explanatory_variable = 123)
```

You can then use `predict` to get your value:

```
predict(model, newdat)
```

The range would be 11.01  $km^2$ .