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Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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

[^0]
## Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

## Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

## Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

| $\mathbf{1}$ | bivariate | B1 |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |


| $\mathbf{2}$ | 1.5 | B 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 3(a) | 0.4 | B 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 3(b) | 0.14 | B 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 4(a) | $20-39$ years | B1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Cannot tell with explanation, eg <br> The diagram does not show the oldest ages in <br> each region <br> The diagram (only) shows the modal ages <br> Region J has oldest modal age but that does <br> not mean the oldest house is in region J | B1 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |


|  | Buildings in the village are generally/tend to be older than buildings in the town | B1 | the buildings in the on average <br> the modal age of village is older th | in the town |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4(c) | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Cannot score B1 with one correct statement and one incorrect statement |  |  |  |
|  | The village has more regions which have a modal age of 60+ years |  |  | B1 |
|  | The town has a bigger variety of different aged buildings |  |  | B0 |
|  | The village has fewer new houses |  |  | B0 |
|  | The town has a smaller proportion of old houses |  |  | B0 |
|  | The town has less old(er) houses [may not be true as the town is likely to have more buildings in total] |  |  | B0 |
|  | The ages of buildings in the village are older than in the town |  |  | B0 |
|  | The village has no areas where there are lots of new houses |  |  | B0 |
|  | The majority of the houses in the village are over 40 years old whereas in the town it is lower |  |  | B0 |
|  | The village has more older buildings |  |  | B0 |
|  | Reference to people rather than buildings |  |  | B0 |
|  | Reference to both places as villages or both places as towns |  |  | B0 |


| 5(a)(i) | Quota (sampling) | B1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 5(a)(ii) | Two different reasons, eg <br> Reason type 1: Problems connected with location of data collection <br> eg The people using the supermarket may not all live in the town <br> eg The people using this supermarket may not be representative of all people in the town <br> Reason type 2: Problems connected with interviewer selection bias <br> eg The interviewer may approach people who are more likely to answer <br> eg The interviewer is not choosing randomly <br> Reason type 3: Problems connected with whether the proportions of males/females and/or different age groups is representative of population <br> eg There may not be equal numbers of males and females in the town | B2 | oe reasons should categories <br> B1 for one reaso |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | 2 marks can be awarded for a single sentence if it contains 2 valid reasons. <br> Accept 'the age profile of supermarket shoppers may not be the same as the age profile of library users' as an alternative Type 3 reason. |  |  |  |
|  | The age categories are very big so the sample may not be representative |  |  | B1 |
|  | The results will be biased towards people who visit that one supermarket |  |  | B1 |
|  | Asking people outside of a supermarket are likely to be older people, so younger people may not be represented |  |  | B1 |
|  | She only sampled one week |  |  | B0 |
|  | Some people may have never been to the library |  |  | B0 |
|  | The sample selected does not represent the population/ sample too small |  |  | B0 |


| 5(b) | Assign a number to every house in the town | B1 | accept reference to obtaining/using a | ling frame |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Select 120 numbers (from the list of random numbers) ignoring repeats (and numbers greater than 8000). | B1 | must include refer repeats for this ma | to ignoring |
|  | Select the houses matching the numbers chosen. | B1 |  |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | each of the 120 (random) numbers should correspond to a house on the list |  |  | $3^{\text {rd }} \mathrm{B} 1$ |
|  | He can allocate each house a number. Then he can use a random number generator to select each house to put in the sample |  |  | B1B0B0 |
|  | He can number all the houses differently, then randomly select 120 numbers and question the houses chosen |  |  | B1B0B1 |



| 5(c)(ii) | Any suitable suggestion of overcoming the difficulty the student raised in (c)(i), eg <br> Ways linked to 'people not in': <br> - Ask someone else from the same house <br> - Call back at a different time <br> - Select another house at random <br> - He could leave his contact details <br> Ways linked to 'people don't want to take part' <br> - Give an incentive to take part <br> - Choose someone from a neighbouring property <br> - Select another house at random |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |
|  | This mark can only be scored if a credit worthy problem has been identified in 5(c)(i). |  |
|  | To overcome the difficulty, it must not change from face-to-face interviewing: <br> Select more than 120 houses randomly, but only visit 120 Phone them to arrange when to see them Phone them instead | B1 <br> B1 <br> B0 |


| 6(a)(i) | Females (aged 14-15) eat more (fruit and vegetables) on average (than males) (aged 14-15) | B1 | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Females eat on average 0.3 more (portions of fruit and vegetables) Females eat on average 0.2 more (portions of fruit and vegetables) |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B} 1 \\ & \mathrm{~B} 0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Males eat less portions than females |  |  | B0 |
|  | The mean amount of fruit and vegetables eaten by females is larger The mean for females is larger |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B1 } \\ & \text { B0 } \end{aligned}$ |


| 6(a)(ii) | Award B2 for two correct comparisons of the number of portions of fruit and vegetables eaten by adults, eg <br> Adults aged 65-74 eat the most fruit and veg (for both females and males) <br> Males aged 16-24 years eat the least fruit and vegetables <br> Males aged 45-54 eat less than males aged 35-44 | B2 | oe <br> award B1 for one correct comparison of the number of portions of fruit and vegetables eaten by adults |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Ignore any reference to the Children's table |  |  |  |
|  | Allow any comparison statement in context to score B1 unless their other comparison contradicts it. <br> eg Adults aged 65-74 eat the most fruit and veg. Adults aged 35-44 eat the most fruit and veg. |  |  | B0 |
|  | Adults aged 16-24 years eat the least fruit and vegetables |  |  | B1 |
|  | Young adults and the very old eat less (fruit and vegetables) |  |  | B1 |
|  | Adults aged 16-24 eat a lower amount of fruit and vegetables than the average amount eaten by adults of all ages |  |  | B1 |
|  | Females (tend to) eat more vegetables than males (except in the 65+ age group) |  |  | B1 |
|  | Females eat more fruit and vegetables than males (not true for 75+ age group) |  |  | B0 |
|  | Adults aged 25+ stay close to the mean of 3.5 (too vague) |  |  | B0 |
|  | More females eat fruit than males |  |  | B0 |


|  | To make sure that the proportions of males and females in the sample match the proportions in the population. | B1 | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6(b) | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | The health survey suggests there is a difference between genders |  |  | B1 |
|  | To ensure that males and females are fairly represented |  |  | B1 |
|  | Males and females differ in the amount of fruit and vegetables they eat |  |  | B1 |
|  | The numbers of males and females are not close to being equal |  |  | B1 |
|  | There are more females than males |  |  | B1 |
|  | Her sample will be (more) representative of the year group |  |  | B1 |
|  | Her sample will be (more) representative of the population |  |  | B1 |
|  | So that there is an even/equal amount of males and females |  |  | B0 |
|  | To get more accurate results |  |  | B0 |


| 6(c) | $\frac{99}{99+121}\left(=\frac{99}{220}\right) \text { or } 0.45$ <br> or $\frac{40}{99+121}\left(=\frac{40}{220}\right) \text { or } \frac{2}{11}$ <br> or $\frac{99+121}{40}\left(=\frac{220}{40}\right) \text { or } \frac{11}{2}$ | M1 | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{99}{99+121} \times 40 \text { and } 18$ <br> or $\frac{40}{99+121} \times 99 \text { and } 18$ <br> or $99 \div \frac{99+121}{40} \text { and } 18$ | A1 |  |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | May also calculate how many number of males selected is eg $\begin{aligned} & \frac{121}{99+121}(\times 40) \\ & 40-\frac{121}{99+121} \times 40 \text { and } 18 \end{aligned}$ | and us | this to show the | M1 A1 |
|  | May also work from 18 to show that there are 99 males in the year group |  |  |  |


| 6(d) | People who eat school dinners may eat more vegetables/fruit/more healthily than people who do not eat school dinners | B1 | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Reasons relating to fruit and vegetables being controlled rather than chosen: <br> You may be restricted as to how much fruit and vegetables you can have if you eat school dinners <br> School dinners may contain more/less fruit and vegetables (than a packed lunch) <br> There will be different things on the menu |  |  | B1 B1 B0 |
|  | Reasons relating to the sample not being rep <br> (She does not have a representative sample people who have packed lunch <br> They may not all eat (school) dinners <br> She is only asking people from her year grou <br> Her sample is not representative (reason req | ause <br> d) | he does not ask | B1 B1 B1 B0 |


| 6(e) | $5+2 \text { or } 7$ <br> or $\frac{5}{40} \times 100 \text { or } 12.5(\%)$ <br> or $\frac{2}{40} \times 100 \text { or } 5$ | M1 | implied by 0.175 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 17.5(\%) | A1 | oe SC1 82.5(\%) |


| 6(f) | $\begin{aligned} & (0 \times 6)+(1 \times 4)+(2 \times 10)+(3 \times 9)+(4 \\ & \times 4)+(5 \times 5)+(6 \times 2) \end{aligned}$ <br> or $0+4+20+27+16+25+12$ <br> or $104$ | M1 | the first term in the seen. <br> Allow an error in on or one omission. <br> if the frequencies the 40 values are then 104 should be | ay no <br> e term <br> red and epara |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { their } 104}{40}$ | M1dep |  |  |
|  | 2.6 | A1 |  |  |
|  | (the mean for England is) 3(.0) | B1 |  |  |
|  | Students in Natalie's year group eat less fruit and vegetables (on average) than students (of the same age) in England | B1ft | ft their average (wh 40) | nnot be |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Condone use of UK to mean England |  |  |  |
|  | Special cases: <br> A correct comparison of the median (2.5) with 3(.0) with a suitable conclusion can earn B3 as a special case. <br> A comparison of the mode (2) with 3(.0) with a suitable conclusion can earn the final two B marks. <br> If the mean is calculated, ignore any reference to the median and mode (and range). |  |  |  |
|  | Award B1 if they refer to amount eaten/number eaten/fruit and vegetables: <br> Students in England (of the same age) eat more fruit and vegetables than in her year group <br> The (average) amount eaten (by students of the same age) in England is higher than in her year group <br> The figures for England are higher than for her year group |  |  | B1 <br> B1 B1 |


| 6(g) | Two suitable suggestions, eg <br> - Ask more students <br> - Compare boys and girls separately <br> - Give students advice about what a portion is <br> - Ask students for the number of portions they have eaten for more than one day/ keep a food diary | B2 | oe <br> award B1 for one suggestion |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Separate her graph into male and female |  |  | B1 |
|  | Use a census instead |  |  | B1 |
|  | Collect the data over a number of days |  |  | B1 |
|  | Take a bigger sample |  |  | B1 |
|  | Make the sample of her class bigger (condone use of class) |  |  | B1 |
|  | Ask the questions over a period of time to see what the long-term mean is |  |  | B1 |
|  | She could have taken a bigger sample so that the whole school was represented (it was only 14-15 years the comparison was for) |  |  | B0 |
|  | Sample different age groups |  |  | B0 |
|  | Ask the same amount of boys and girls |  |  | B0 |


| 7(a) | 325 and 250 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 7(b) | Alternative 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 360-208-86 or $66\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | M1 | condone measuring $\pm 2^{\circ}$ |  |
|  | $\frac{\text { their } 66}{208} \times 312$ | M1dep |  |  |
|  | 99 and <br> William made more teapots in 2019 | A1 | oe |  |
|  | Alternative 2 |  |  |  |
|  | $\frac{86}{208} \times 312 \text { or } 129$ <br> or $\frac{360}{208} \times 312 \text { or } 540$ | M1 | oe |  |
|  | $\frac{360}{208} \times 312-\frac{86}{208} \times 312-312$ <br> or $540-312-129$ | M1dep | oe |  |
|  | 99 and William made more teapots in 2019 | A1 | oe |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | If the angle for teapots is measured, allow [96, 102] for the calculated number of teapots in 2019. |  |  |  |


| Comparison of life expectancy in the two <br> countries |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| The life expectancy in the UK is higher than in <br> Brazil (in each year and for both males and <br> females) | B1 | oe |
| Comparing gender differences in life <br> expectancy |  |  |
| The life expectancy for females is higher than <br> for males (in both countries) | B1 | oe |
| The difference in life expectancy between <br> males and females is smaller in the UK (in <br> 2010) than in Brazil <br> or <br> The difference in life expectancies between <br> males and females in the UK has narrowed <br> or <br> The difference in life expectancies between <br> males and females in Brazil has widened | B1 | oe |
| Comparing trends |  |  |
| Fife expectancies have increased (in both <br> countries) <br> eg Life expectancy for UK males in 2010 is greater than the life expectancy of <br> Brazilian males (in 2010) | B1 | oe |
| Life expectancies in Brazil have increased at a <br> faster rate (than in the UK) | B1 | oe |
| Reference to figures from the graph must be correct |  |  |


|  | Life expectancy for UK females in 2010 is greater than the life expectancy of <br> males in Brazil in $2010 \quad$ (inconsistent comparison) | B0 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Do not allow statements that just quote figures without comparing <br> eg In the UK in 1960 the life expectancy for a male was 68 and for a female it <br> was 74 whereas in Brazil in 1960 the life expectancy was 52 and for a female <br> it was 56. | B0 |  |
| For 3 $3^{\text {rd }}$ B1 <br> Life expectancies have increased for both males and females (in both <br> countries) | B1 |  |


| 9(a) | England has more houses (than other parts of the UK) <br> or <br> The population of England is greater (than other parts of the UK) | B1 | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | More houses are sold in England (than other parts of the UK) |  |  | B1 |
|  | England is bigger (than other parts of the UK) |  |  | B1 |
|  | There is a greater proportion of houses in England (than other parts of the UK) |  |  | B1 |
|  | The house index for England went up the most (than other parts of the UK) |  |  | B0 |


| 9(b) | $\begin{aligned} & 177000 \times \frac{100}{101.7} \text { or } 174041(.29 \ldots) \\ & \text { or } \\ & 177000 \times \frac{105.2}{100} \text { or } 186204 \\ & \text { or } \\ & \frac{177000}{101.7} \text { or } 1740.41(29 \ldots) \\ & \text { or } \\ & 177000 \times 105.2 \text { or } 18620400 \end{aligned}$ | M1 | oe <br> allow 174 041(.29...) or 1740.41(29...) or 186204 or 18620400 to be rounded to 3 or more significant figures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | their $174041(.29 \ldots) \times \frac{105.2}{100}$ or their $186204 \times \frac{100}{101.7}$ or $177000 \times \frac{105.2}{101.7}$ <br> or <br> their $1740.41(29 \ldots) \times 105.2$ <br> or <br> their $\frac{18620400}{101.7}$ | M1dep | oe |
|  | 183000 or [183 048, 183 100] | A1 |  |


| 9(c) | $105.7 \times 84$ or $105.7 \times 0.84$ or $105.2 \times 4$ or $105.2 \times 0.04$ or $100.6 \times 10$ or $100.6 \times 0.1$ or $103.4 \times 2$ or $103.4 \times 0.02$ | M1 | oe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & (105.7 \times 84)+(105.2 \times 4)+(100.6 \times 10) \\ & +(103.4 \times 2) \end{aligned}$ <br> or $\begin{aligned} & (105.7 \times 0.84)+(105.2 \times 0.04)+ \\ & (100.6 \times 0.1)+(103.4 \times 0.02) \end{aligned}$ | M1dep | oe implied by 1051 |
|  | 105.1(24) | A1 |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |
|  | May work with 1.057, 1.052, 1.006 and 1.034 instead which is acceptable |  |  |

## Alternative 1

| $\frac{543000}{499000} \times 100$ or $108.8(17 \ldots)$ | M1 | accept $£ 177000$ with working |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $108.8(17 \ldots)$ and <br> a suitable conclusion, eg <br> - the newspaper is correct <br> - prices in London have grown at a faster <br> rate/by a greater percentage. | A1ft | follow through from 9(c) |

## Alternative 2

| $\frac{543000-499000}{499000} \times 100$ or $8.8(17 \ldots)(\%)$ | M1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $8.8(17 \ldots)(\%)$ and <br> a suitable conclusion, eg <br> - the newspaper is correct <br> - prices in London have grown at a faster <br> rate/by a greater percentage. | A1ft | follow through from 9(c) as long <br> as their answer in 9(c) is greater <br> than 100. |

## Alternative 3

| $\begin{aligned} & 499000 \times \frac{\text { their } 105.1}{100} \text { or }[524000,525 \\ & 000] \end{aligned}$ | M1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [524 000, 525000$]$ and <br> a suitable conclusion, eg <br> - the newspaper is correct <br> - prices in London have grown at a faster rate/by a greater percentage. | A1ft | follow through from 9(c) as long as their answer in 9(c) is greater than 100. |

## Additional Guidance

Do not allow wrong interpretation of the index numbers or percentage increase

|  | House prices have grown by a greater amount in London |  | B0 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| 10(a) | Plaque score | B1 | oe |


| 10(b) | To ensure the data are as accurate as possible <br> or <br> To ensure the experiment is as reliable as possible | B1 | oe <br> Other guess their | just aned |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | To help people to remember (how long they cleaned their teeth) |  |  | B1 |
|  | So they have somewhere to write their results (too vague) |  |  | B0 |
|  | So they can store their recordings |  |  | B0 |


| 10(c) | The line does not pass through the (double) mean point | B1 | oe <br> eg more points lie below the line than above it. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The line of best fit does not cover the horizontal extent of the data | B1 | oe |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | The line of best fit does not pass through the middle of the data |  |  | B1 |
|  | The line is too short |  |  | B1 |
|  | The line of best fit is not centred around his mean |  |  | B1 |
|  | The line does not go far enough |  |  | B1 |
|  | The line does not go past/beyond two of the data values |  |  | B1 |
|  | It does not have an equal amount of points on either side of the line |  |  | B1 |
|  | It does not go beyond the full set of points |  |  | B1 |
|  | Doesn't go through the whole/entire graph |  |  | B0 |
|  | It's too high up |  |  | B0 |
|  | It should intersect the axes |  |  | B0 |
|  | Doesn't represent all of the data |  |  | B0 |
|  | Doesn't go through all of the points |  |  | B0 |


| 10(d)(i) | $2.7-0.43 \times 4$ | M1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.98 | A1 | accept 1 if working seen |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |
|  | SC1 1.84 |  |  |


| 10(d)(ii) | $(1-) \frac{6 \times 520}{12 \times\left(12^{2}-1\right)}$ | M1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $-0.818(1 \ldots)$ or -0.82 or $-\frac{9}{11}$ or $-0.8 \ddot{1}$ | A1 | oe |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |
|  | Ignore any subsequent attempts to round if the correct answer is seen |  |  |


| 10(e) | Ticks No, with a correct reason, eg <br> - If two variables are correlated, it does not mean that increasing one will cause the other to change <br> - Correlation does not imply a causation | B1 | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Ticks No and 'He should have said that people who spend more time in the shower tend to have lower plaque scores'. |  |  | B1 |
|  | Both variables could be related through a third variable eg levels of hygiene |  |  | B1 |
|  | There is no proof of causation, only correlation |  |  | B1 |
|  | Spending more time in the shower is not related to plaque score |  |  | B0 |
|  | Showering is not cleaning their teeth |  |  | B0 |
|  | There is no causal relationship between time in the shower and plaque score |  |  | B0 |


| 11(a) | 600 seen as Flu vaccination rate for Greater Manchester | B1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{171800}{\text { their } 600} \times 1000$ | M1 |  |  |
|  | (Number of children offered vaccine in SE =) $\text { [286 000, } 286 \text { 334] }$ <br> and <br> (Flu vaccination rate in $\mathrm{SE}=$ ) 600 | A1ft | ft from their 600 |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Beware of attempts to $\times 100$ instead of $\times 1000$ leading to: <br> eg Greater Manchester flu vaccination rate $=60$ <br> Number of children offered vaccine in SE $=$ [286 000, 286 334] <br> SE flu vaccination rate $=60$ |  |  | B0M1A1ft |


| 11(b)(i) | The children receive the vaccine independently of one another <br> or <br> these children are representative of children across the country | B1 ft | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | The child minder does not require all children to have been vaccinated. |  |  | B1 |
|  | These children all have the same probability of being vaccinated (as children in the country) |  |  | B1 |
|  | The children are not siblings |  |  | B1 |
|  | There were no specific reasons why a child could not have the vaccine (eg medical) |  |  | B1 |
|  | One of the children has been vaccinated already |  |  | B0 |
|  | The child receives the vaccine or does not receive the vaccine (there are only two outcomes in this scenario) |  |  | B0 |


| 11(b)(ii) | $k \times 0.91^{3} \times(1-0.91)^{1}$ for any $k>0$ | M1 | oe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \times 0.91^{3} \times(1-0.91) \\ & \text { or }[0.27,0.2713] \end{aligned}$ | M1dep |  |
|  | their $\mathrm{P}(3)+0.91^{4}$ | M1 | provided $0<$ their $\mathrm{P}(3)<1$ |
|  | [0.957, 0.95704] or 0.96 | A1 |  |


| 11(c) | $\begin{aligned} & (230 \div 250=) 0.92 \text { or } 92 \% \\ & \text { or } \\ & (0.91 \times 250=) 227.5 \text { or } 227 \text { or } 228 \end{aligned}$ | B1 | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A suitable comment that implies that Lara might be incorrect, eg <br> The difference between the proportions in the city and the whole of England could be due to natural variation/ sampling variability <br> (The proportion is so close to $91 \%$ that) a different sample could have given a proportion less than $91 \%$ <br> The children attending nursery schools may be more likely to have had the MMR vaccine than other children in the city | B1 | oe <br> the difference bet observed and exp frequencies could variation |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Lara's sample is not representative of the population because she has not sampled children who don't attend nursery school |  |  | B1 |
|  | The difference between the sample proportion and the figure for England is small (given the size of the sample) |  |  | B1 |
|  | Some of the children attending the nursery may not live in the city |  |  | B1 |
|  | The 250 children may not be representative of all young children in the city (needs an explanation why it may not be representative) |  |  | B0 |
|  | The sample is biased (lacks a reason why there is bias) |  |  | B0 |
|  | Lara's sample is not representative of the population (lacks reason) |  |  | B0 |
|  | The sample size is too small |  |  | B0 |


| 12(a)(i) | $\frac{23}{95}$ or $\frac{95}{23}$ | M1 | accept ratios, eg 23 : 95 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{23}{95}=\frac{138}{N} \text { or }(N=) \frac{138 \times 95}{23}$ | M1 | oe <br> correct equation involving, or correct expression for, population size |
|  | 570 | A1 |  |


| 12(a)(ii) | To enable the marked fish to mix with the remainder of the population. | B1 | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | To allow the marked fish time to recover. |  |  | B1 |


| 12(b)(i) | She has not plotted frequency density (on the vertical axis) | B1 | oe |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | She should have adjusted the frequencies to take into account the different class widths |  |  | B1 |
|  | She has plotted frequency on the vertical axis |  |  | B1 |
|  | She should have used frequency density (instead of frequency) |  |  | B1 |



|  | Suitable linear scales on horizontal and vertical axes and horizontal axis labelled 'length' and vertical axis labelled 'frequency density'. | B1 | oe <br> accept abbreviations. <br> condone lack of title. <br> units not needed on labels. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fully correct histogram | A1 | condone lack of labels on axes for this mark, but axes must be numbered. <br> condone lack of title. |
|  | Alternative 2 - use of a standard bar width |  |  |
|  | One class width used as standard width and the height of one bar with a different width correctly calculated <br> eg standard width $=10$ <br> height of $0<x \leqslant 20$ bar calculated as 9 <br> or height of $40<x \leqslant 60$ bar calculated as 15 <br> or height of $60<x \leqslant 80$ bar calculated as 7 <br> or height of $80<x \leqslant 120$ bar calculated as 2 | M1 | the standard width may not be explicitly stated but could be inferred from histogram from bars with unchanged heights. <br> height calculations can be implied by histogram. |
|  | One class width used as standard width and the heights of all other bars correctly calculated <br> eg standard width $=10$ <br> height of $20<x \leqslant 30$ and $30<x \leqslant 40$ bars given as 30 and 38 respectively <br> and height of $0<x \leqslant 20$ bar calculated as 9 and height of $40<x \leqslant 60$ bar calculated as 15 and height of $60<x \leqslant 80$ bar calculated as 7 and height of $80<x \leqslant 120$ bar calculated as 2 | M1 | the standard width may not be explicitly stated but could be inferred from histogram from bars with unchanged heights. <br> height calculations can be implied by histogram. |
|  | Suitable linear scales on horizontal and vertical axes and horizontal axis labelled 'length' and vertical axis suitably labelled (eg standard frequency or frequency per 'standard width') | B1 | oe <br> accept abbreviations. <br> condone lack of title. <br> units not needed on labels. <br> allow frequency density as vertical axis label. |



|  | 2nd $M$ mark is awarded for calculating the adjusted heights of all bars |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $\mathbf{1 2 ( b ) ( \text { (iii) }}$ | Positive (skew) | B1ft | oe |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |
|  | Follow through (if possible) from their histogram |  |  |
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