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Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

## Key to mark scheme abbreviations

| M | mark is for method |
| :---: | :---: |
| m or dM | mark is dependent on one or more M marks and is for method |
| A | mark is dependent on M or m marks and is for accuracy |
| B | mark is independent of M or m marks and is for method and accuracy |
| E | mark is for explanation |
| $\checkmark$ orft or F | follow through from previous incorrect result |
| CAO | correct answer only |
| CSO | correct solution only |
| AWFW | anything which falls within |
| AWRT | anything which rounds to |
| ACF | any correct form |
| AG | answer given |
| SC | special case |
| OE | or equivalent |
| A2,1 | 2 or 1 (or 0) accuracy marks |
| -x EE | deduct $x$ marks for each error |
| NMS | no method shown |
| PI | possibly implied |
| SCA | substantially correct approach |
| c | candidate |
| sf | significant figure(s) |
| dp | decimal place(s) |

## No Method Shown

Where the question specifically requires a particular method to be used, we must usually see evidence of use of this method for any marks to be awarded.

Where the answer can be reasonably obtained without showing working and it is very unlikely that the correct answer can be obtained by using an incorrect method, we must award full marks. However, the obvious penalty to candidates showing no working is that incorrect answers, however close, earn no marks.

Where a question asks the candidate to state or write down a result, no method need be shown for full marks.

Where the permitted calculator has functions which reasonably allow the solution of the question directly, the correct answer without working earns full marks, unless it is given to less than the degree of accuracy accepted in the mark scheme, when it gains no marks.

Otherwise we require evidence of a correct method for any marks to be awarded.


## Alternative method 1

| Median or mean $=30$ | B1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| In general the students in this <br> class/they performed better than the <br> national average | E1ft | OE <br> correct comment for their median or mean |

1(b)
Alternative method 2
15 out of $24 /$ more than half the
OE eg $62.5 \%$ scored more than the students scored more than the national average
national average
or
9 out of 24 / less than half the students scored below the national average

In general the students in this class/they performed better than the

E1ft

OE
correct comment for their proportion/values national average

## Additional Guidance

Do not accept 'The median was higher' for the E mark
However 'they got higher marks than the national average/ on average they got higher marks' would score E1

In general students were above the national average

| $\mathbf{Q}$ | Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $£ 83$ | B1 |  |
| $\mathbf{Q}$ Answer Mark Comments |  |  |  | 


| Alternative method 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Package $744 \times 3 \times 0.9 \text { or }(£) 2008.8(0)$ | M1 | OE | Award M2 for $744 \times 3 \times 0.9 \times 1.03 \text { in any }$ <br> order <br> Award M1 for any 3 of these values multiplied in any order |
| their ( $£$ )2008.(..) $\times 1.03$ or ( $£$ )2069.(..) | M1 | OE |  |
| Independent <br> Hotel $\quad 480 \div 1.33 \times 3$ <br> or $360.9(0) \times 3$ <br> or (£)1082.(..) | M1 | or $480 \div 1.33+312$ or ( $£$ ) 672.90 |  |
| ```Total cost Their (£)1082.(..) \(+312 \times 3\) or (£)2018.(..)``` | M1 | their (£)672.90 $\times 3$ |  |
| (£)2069.(..) and (£)2018.(...) and independent is cheaper <br> or <br> independent is 50.35 cheaper/over $£ 50$ cheaper | A2 | A1 for two values with one correct and correct ft conclusion <br> or <br> A1 for both values correct but incorrect or no conclusion |  |

## Additional Guidance

If there is evidence of multiplying by 3 people at some point then use alt 1 (in pounds) or alt 3 (in euros)
If there is no evidence of multiplying by 3 then use alt 2 (in pounds) or alt 4 (in euros)
Do not swap between alts for a response
Example (using alt 1)
$744 \times 3 \times 0.9 \times 1.03=2069.06$
M2
$480 \div 1.33=360.90$
$360.90+312=672.90$
independent is cheaper
M1 (in comment box)
A1 (one correct value - 2069- and correct ft conclusion)

| So although both values are correct on different alts they should have multiplied 672.9 by 3 or divided 2069 by 3 to be consistent so treat as incorrect method <br> (marking on alt 2 would give the same total of 4 marks -M1M0M1M1A1) |
| :---: |
| Accept alternative ways of subtracting 10\% and/or adding 3\% |
| Multiplying by an incorrect percentage can still score one of the first 2 method marks Examples <br> $744 \times 3 \times 0.1 \times 1.03$ or $229 .(\ldots) \quad$ scores M0M1 ( 3 correct values multiplied) <br> $744 \times 3 \times 1.1 \times 1.03$ or 2528 . (...) scores MOM1 (3 correct values multiplied) <br> $744 \times 3 \times 0.9 \times 0.97$ or 1948.(..) scores MOM1 (3 correct values multiplied) <br> $744 \times 3 \times 0.1 \times 0.97$ scores MOMO <br> These are only examples. |
| They must compare using consistent units example <br> $£ 2069$ and $€ 2685$ and packages $4 u$ are cheaper does not gain the A1 for one value correct and correct ft conclusion. This would gain maximum M2 for either 2069 or 2685 |


| 3 | Alternative method 2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Package per person$\begin{aligned} & 744 \times 0.9 \text { or }(£) 669 .(. .) \\ & \text { their }(£) 669 .(. .) \times 1.03 \text { or }(£) 689 .(. .) \end{aligned}$ | M1 <br> M1 | OE <br> OE | Award M2 for $744 \times 0.9 \times 1.03$ <br> in any order <br> Award M1 for any 2 of these values multiplied in any order |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Independent per person <br> Hotel $480 \div 1.33$ or ( $£$ )360.(9..) | M1 |  |  |
|  | Their (£)360.(9..) + 312 or 672.(..) | M1 |  |  |
|  | (£)689.(...) and (£)672.(...) and independent is cheaper per person or independent is $(£) 17$ cheaper per person <br> or <br> total cost is ( $£$ ) 51 cheaper for independent | A2 | A1 for two values with one correct and correct ft conclusion <br> or <br> A1 for both values correct but incorrect or no conclusion |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |


|  | Accept alternative ways of subtracting 10\% and/or adding 3\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Multiplying by an incorrect percentage can still score one of the first 2 method marks <br> Examples <br> $744 \times 0.1 \times 1.03$ or 76 .(...) scores M0M1 ( 2 correct values multiplied) <br> $744 \times 1.1 \times 1.03$ or 842 .(...) scores M0M1 ( 2 correct values multiplied) <br> $744 \times 0.9 \times 0.97$ or 649 .(..) scores MOM1 (2 correct values multiplied) <br> $744 \times 0.1 \times 0.97$ scores MOMO <br> These are only examples. |  |
|  | They must compare using consistent units |  |


| Q Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 3 | Alternative method 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Package$\begin{aligned} & 744 \times 1.33 \times 0.9 \text { or }(€) 890.5(. .) \\ & \hline \text { their }(€) 890.56 \times 1.03 \times 3 \text { or }(€) 2751 .(. .) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M1 } \\ & \text { M1 } \end{aligned}$ | OE <br> OE | Award M2 for $744 \times 1.33 \times 0.9 \times 1.03 \times 3$ <br> in any order <br> Award M1 for any 3 of these values multiplied in any order |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Independent <br> Hotel $312 \times 1.33 \times 3$ or $(€) 1244.88$ |  | M1 | or $312 \times 1.33+480$ or ( $€$ ) 894.96 |  |  |
|  | Total cost <br> Their $(€) 1244.88+480 \times 3$ <br> or ( $€$ )2684.(88) |  | M1 | their ( $€$ ) $894.96 \times 3$ |  |  |
|  | (€)2751.(...) and €2684.(88) and independent is cheaper |  | A2 | Deduct one mark if $€$ signs are missing from their answer <br> A1 for two values with one correct and correct ft conclusion or <br> A1 for both values correct but incorrect or no conclusion |  |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Accept alternative ways of subtracting 10\% and/or adding 3\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Multiplying by an incorrect percentage can still score one of the first 2 method |  |  |  |  |  |

marks
Examples
$744 \times 1.33 \times 0.1 \times 1.03 \times 3$ or 305 .(..) scores M0M1 (at least 3 correct values multiplied)
$744 \times 1.33 \times 0.1 \times 1.03$ or 101.(...) scores MOM1 (3 correct values multiplied)
These are only examples.

| 3 | Alternative method 4 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Package $744 \times 1.33 \times 0.9 \text { or }(€) 890.5(. .)$ | M1 | OE | Award M2 for $744 \times 1.33 \times 0.9 \times 1.03$ <br> in any order <br> Award M1 for any 3 of these values multiplied in any order |  |
|  | their $(€) 890.56 \times 1.03$ or ( $€$ )917.(..) | M1 | OE |  |  |
|  | Independent <br> Flight $312 \times 1.33$ or $(€) 414$.(..) or 415 | M1 |  |  |  |
|  | Total cost <br> Their (€)414.(..) +480 <br> or ( $€$ )894.(..) or ( $($ ) 895 | M1 |  |  |  |
|  | ( $€$ ) 917.(...) and ( $€$ )894.(..) and independent is cheaper | A2 | A1 for two values with one correct and correct ft conclusion or <br> A1 for both values correct but incorrect or no conclusion |  |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |  |
|  | Accept alternative ways of subtracting 10\% and/or adding 3\% |  |  |  |  |
|  | Multiplying by an incorrect percentage can still score one of the first 2 method marks <br> Examples <br> $744 \times 1.33 \times 0.1 \times 1.03$ or $98 .(\ldots) \quad$ scores M0M1 (at least 3 correct values multiplied) <br> $744 \times 1.33 \times 0.9 \times 0.97$ or 863 .(...) scores MOM1 (3 correct values multiplied) <br> These are only examples. |  |  |  |  |

$\square$

| Q | Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



|  | they could use households to estimate population eg small town 2000 houses <br> $\times 4$ people $=8000$ population |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | If working in ml they can still gain the method mark but they must convert to <br> litres for the accuracy mark | The three values may be multiplied in 2 steps <br> eg litres per day $\times$ days in month at one point in their working, <br> then this answer $\times$ number of people |
| If they just state a number of litres per month eg 65 litres per month they do not <br> score the marks for assumptions but can score M1 and A1 for multiplying this <br> correctly by their population |  |  |
| Allow rounding at any point <br> eg <br> uses 7 litres and 31 days in a month, $7 \times 31=217$ and rounds to 200 or 220 |  |  |
|  | Final answer must be an integer |  |


| Q Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\mathbf{5 ( a )}$ | Collect prices from estate <br> agents/websites for house prices/ <br> recent house sales/newspapers <br> and <br> across different areas of London | E2 | E1 Partial explanation (only one of the <br> comments) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |
|  | For different area allow different suburbs/estates/streets |  |  |


| 5(b) | (No,) London prices may not be representative of the whole country or <br> London prices are likely to be higher/different than some other parts of the country | B1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |
|  | No may be implied eg It would not be sensible |  |  |
|  | Ignore other non-contradictory comments eg sample size too small |  |  |
|  | Its London/it's the capital |  | B0 |


| 5(c) | Alternative method 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | B1 | condone 000's added eg 158000 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 180000 \div \text { their }[157,165] \\ & \text { or } \\ & {[1090,1147]} \end{aligned}$ | M1 | $180000 \times \frac{\text { their }[188,192]}{\text { their }[157,165]} \text { implies M2 }$ |
|  | their [1090,1147] $\times$ their [188,192] | M1 |  |
|  | (£) [204 900,220 200] | A1ft | ft their values for 2009 and 2014 Answer must be to nearest $£ 100$ |
|  | Alternative method 2 |  |  |
|  | 2009 157 to 165 <br> and  <br> 2014 188 to 192 | B1 | condone 000's added eg 158000 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { their }[188,192]-\text { their }[157,165]}{\text { their }[157,165]} \\ & \times 100) \\ & \text { or }[13.9,22.3] \\ & \text { or }[0.139,0223] \end{aligned}$ | M1 |  |
|  | their [0.139,0223] $\times 180000$ | M1 |  |
|  | (£) [204900,220 200] | A1ft | ft their values for 2009 and 2014 Answer must be to nearest $£ 100$ |


| Q | Answer | Mark | Comments |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6(a) | $=\mathrm{B} 2^{*}(1.14 / 100)$ | B 1 |  |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Fully correct |  |  | B1 for one error with correct ft calculations |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6(b) | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | B | C | D |
|  | 1 |  | Starting amount (£) | Interest (£) | Final amount $(£)$ |
|  | 2 | First 3 months | 2800.00 | 31.92 | 2831.92 |
|  | 3 | Second 3 months | 2831.92 | 32.28 | 2864.20 |
|  | 4 | Third 3 months | 2864.20 | 32.65 | 2896.85 |
|  | 5 | Fourth 3 months | 2896.85 | 33.02 | 2929.87 |

Note these figures are worked out on rounding to 2 dp each year
If more dp are used in calculations then D4 may be 2896.86 and D5 would be 2929.88 so 2929.87 or 2929.88 in cell D5 scores B2

| Q | Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 6(c) | Alternative method 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $4 \times 1.14$ or 4.56 (\%) or 0.0456 | M1 | $(1+0.0114)^{4}-1$ gains M2 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \left(1+\frac{\text { their } 0.0456}{4}\right)^{4}-1 \\ & \text { or } 0.04638(\ldots) \end{aligned}$ | M1 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 4.638(\ldots) \\ & 4.64 \end{aligned}$ | A1 |  |
|  | Alternative method 2 |  |  |
|  | their 2929.87-2800 or 129.87 | M1 | ft their 2929.87 from part (b) |
|  | $\frac{\text { their } 129.87}{2800} \times 100$ | M1 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 4.638(\ldots) \\ & 4.64 \end{aligned}$ | A1ft | ft their total interest from part (b) |
|  | Alternative method 3 |  |  |
|  | $\frac{\text { their } 2929.87}{2800} \times 100$ or 104.64 | M1 | ft their 2929.87 from part (b) |
|  | their 104.64.. - 100 | M1 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 4.63(\ldots) \\ & 4.64 \end{aligned}$ | A1 | ft their total interest from part (b) |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |
|  | Alt 1 uses the AER formula from the formula sheet |  |  |
|  | Note $\left(1+\frac{0.0114}{4}\right)^{4}-1 \quad$ is a common incorrect substitution. Scores MOM1A0 |  |  |
|  | For Alt 2 and Alt 3 If their 2929.87 is a different value the check to see it matches their final value in the spreadsheet (use full screen view) |  |  |
|  | Beware the use of 3 instead of 4 for the months <br> This leads to $\left(1+\frac{0.0456}{3}\right)^{3}-1=0.04629$ or 4.63 <br> scores M1M0 |  |  |


| Q | Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 7(a) | Alternative method 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Histogram chosen | B1 | vertical scale labelled frequency density implies density <br> unequal bar widths implies histogram unless values are cumulative |
|  | Both axes scales appropriate with correct labelling | B1 | Vertical scale must be labelled frequency density (or fd) not just frequency <br> Horizontal scale minimum label is sugar, $g$ |
|  | Fully correct histogram <br> $0-40$ height 0.3 <br> 40-60 height 0.9 <br> 60-70 height 2.3 <br> 70-80 height 2.7 <br> 80-120 height 0.5 | B2 | B1 At least 3 bars correct or at least 3 correct frequency densities seen Heights $\pm 1 / 2$ square <br> Check table for frequency densities |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |
|  | if a bar goes above the graph paper (eg used 5 cm to 1 ) penalise B 1 for an inappropriate scale but allow heights for final B marks |  |  |


| 7(a) | Alternative method 2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cumulative frequency graph chosen |  | B1 | cf scale or heights plotted at cf values implies cf graph |
|  | Both axes scales appropriate with correct labelling |  | B1 | Vertical axis must be cumulative frequency (or cf) not just frequency <br> Horizontal scale minimum label is sugar, g horizontal axis must start from 0 (no broken axis) |
|  | Fully correct cumulative frequency graph joined with lines or smooth curve |  | B2 | $\pm 1 / 2$ square <br> B1 All heights correct and joined with line/curve but plotted at incorrect horizontal position <br> or <br> Plotted at upper class values and joined with line or curve with at least 3 heights correct <br> or <br> All points correct but no line/ curve or poor line/curve |
|  | less than 40 | 12 |  |  |
|  | less than 60 | 30 |  |  |
|  | less than 70 | 53 |  |  |
|  | less than 80 | 80 |  |  |
|  | less than 120 | 100 |  |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Can be joined to (0,0) |  |  |  |
|  | If heights are incorrect check if they have shown their cf values and follow through 1 error eg they show their cf values as $12,20,43,70,90$ and then plot these values accurately award B1 of the final B2 <br> Just seeing the cf values does not gain the first B1 -they must attempt the graph! <br> Some are working out cf values and plotting at these heights but as cf 'bars' not single points eg a sort of 'cumulative frequency histogram' <br> Award B1 for choosing cf graph and B1 if scales are appropriate and labelled correctly |  |  |  |
|  | Deduct 1 mark if end of curve drops down. |  |  |  |
|  | The tolerance of $1 / 2 \mathrm{sq}$ applies to horizontal position, heights and the curve/line going through the points. |  |  |  |
|  | A 'poor' curve is 'feathered' and/or misses the points by more than $1 / 2$ square |  |  |  |


| 7(a) <br> cont | Alternative method 3 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency polygon chosen | B1 |  |  |
|  | Both axes scales appropriate with correct labelling | B1 | vertical scale must be frequency <br> Horizontal scale minimum label is sugar, g |  |
|  | Fully correct frequency polygon plotted at mid class intervals, with all heights correct and joined with straight lines | B2 | $\pm 1 / 2$ square <br> B1 All heights correct and joined with straight lines but plotted at incorrect horizontal position or <br> Plotted at mid-class values with 3 or 4 heights correct, and joined <br> Ignore lines before first point and after last point <br> or <br> All points correct but no line or poor line |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | In Alt 2, the points can be joined by straight lines or a smooth curve Lines must be 'straight' not curved or 'wiggly'. |  |  |  |
|  | Non-linear scale on the horizontal axis loses the 2nd B1 but can access the last two B marks for plotting at their correct positions |  |  |  |
|  | The tolerance of $1 / 2 \mathrm{sq}$ applies to horizontal position, heights and the line going through the points. |  |  |  |


| $\mathbf{Q}$ | Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Alternative method 1 - working out number above 30 g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Before =) 91 | B1 |  |
| $10 \times 1.6 \text { or } 16$ <br> or $20 \times 2.8 \text { or } 56$ <br> or $40 \times 0.1 \text { or } 4$ <br> or $20 \times 0.4 \text { or } 8$ | M1 | These can be written on the bars of the histogram <br> Ignore any units |
| (After =) 76 | A1 |  |
| Yes, the number/percentage of children consuming more than the recommended amount had decreased (by 15(\%)) <br> or <br> Yes it was 91(\%) before and now it's only 76(\%) | B1ft | ft their values if M 1 awarded and a value seen for both before and after |

Alternative method 2 - working out number below 30 g

| (Before $=$ ) 9 | B1 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $20 \times 0.4$ or 8 <br> or <br> $10 \times 1.6$ or 16 | M1 | Ignore any units |  |
| (After $=$ ) 24 | A1 |  |  |
| Yes, the number/percentage of <br> children consuming below the <br> recommended amount had increased <br> (by 15(\%)) | B1ft | ft their values if M1 awarded and a value <br> seen for both before and after |  |
| Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
| check histogram for values |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| $\mathbf{Q}$ | Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Alternative method 1

| $40 \times 50$ p <br> or $40 \times 0.5$ <br> or $40 \times 7.2(0)-40 \times 6.7(0)$ <br> or $288-268$ <br> or $(£) 20$ | M1 | extra gross pay per week |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| their $20 \times 0.2$ or $(£) 4$ | M1 | OE extra tax paid per week |
| their $20 \times 0.12$ or $(£) 2.40$ | M1 | OE extra N.I paid per week |
| their $20-($ their $4+$ their 2.40$)$ or <br> $13.6(0)$ | M1 |  |
| their $13.6(0) \div 40$ <br> or 0.34 | M1 | or $35 \times 40$ or $1400(p)$ or $(£) 14$ |
| $£ 0.34$ or $34(p)$ and Yes <br> or <br> 13.60 and 14 and Yes | A1 | If leave 34 p in pounds must show $£$ sign |

## Alternative method 2

| $7.2(0)-6.7(0)$ or $50(\mathrm{p})$ | M 1 | extra gross pay per hour |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| their $50 \times 0.2$ or $10(\mathrm{p})$ | M 1 | OE extra tax paid per hour |
| their $50 \times 0.12$ or $6(\mathrm{p})$ | M1 | OE extra NI paid per hour |
| their $10+$ their 6 or 16 | M1 |  |
| $50-$ their 16 | M1 |  |
| 34 p and Yes | A1 |  |




| Q | Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\mathbf{y y y}$ | 15.8(4) |  | B1 for $\sum f x=792$ seen <br> SC1 15.59 or 15.6 or 16.09 or 16.1 (using <br> lower or upper class boundaries) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |


| 9(b) | The answer is within the range of the data/ close to the intervals with the highest frequencies/in/near the modal class <br> or <br> work out the median and check its similar/compare with the mean | B1 | OE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |


| 9(c) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6759(\ldots) \text { or } 0.676 \\ & \text { or } 0.6828(\ldots) \text { or } 0.683 \\ & \text { or } 0.68 \end{aligned}$ | B2 | B1 for $\sum f x^{2}=12568.125$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | If correct sd is seen then ignore any attempt to change to minutes and seconds But penalise by one mark any invalid further working after correct sd seen example$\begin{aligned} & s d=0.68 \\ & 0.68 \times 50=34 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | B1 |


| 9(d) | Correct evaluation of difference between the mean before and after training | B1ft | ft their (a) and (c) <br> 1.6(4) if their 9a is correct |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Correct comparison in context about the means <br> eg after training he was faster/ he's swimming quicker/his times have decreased | B1 ft | ft their (a) and (c) |  |
|  | Correct comparison of sd's in context eg he is now more consistent/ his times are less varied | B1ft | ft their (a) and (c) |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | If there are no values for their part a and/or $c$ then they must state the mean and/sd they are using |  |  |  |
|  | eg He decreased his average time by 1.6(4) minutes and his times were minutes more consistent |  |  | B3 |
|  | eg He decreased his average time by 1.6(4) minutes |  |  | B2 |
|  | eg After coaching he was faster and more consistent |  |  | B2 |
|  | He was faster after training |  |  | B1 |
|  | After training he had a lower mean time |  |  | B0 |
|  | After training his mean was lower by about 1.6 seconds and he was more consistent |  |  | B1B0B1 |


| Q Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




| 10(a) <br> cont | Alternative method 2 -works on full occupancy first |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Room with double bed costs ( $£$ ) 5.40 or ( $£$ ) 6.40 | B1 | 2 pillowcases or 4 pillowcases used implied by totals of a particular number of rooms <br> eg ( $£$ ) 135 is 25 rooms at ( $£$ )5.40 |  |
|  | Room with 2 single beds costs ( $£$ ) 7.60 or ( $£$ ) 8.60 <br> or room with one single bed used costs <br> ( $£$ ) 3.8(0) or ( $£$ )4.3(0) | B1 | 2 pillowcases or 4 pillowcases used implied by totals of a particular number of rooms <br> eg ( $£$ ) 134.40 is 8 rooms at $(£) 4.30$ |  |
|  | $25 \times$ their $5.40+10 \times$ their 7.60 | M1 | finds total cost of laundry for one change |  |
|  | Makes assumption about average number of sheet changes per room eg 4 times a week 20 times per month guests stay on average 4 days so about 7 times per month | B1 | Accept $2-6$ changes per week <br> or <br> 6 - 26 changes per month <br> Must be changes -not number of nights stayed |  |
|  | Works out total cost of sheet changes per month for all rooms eg their total cost per change $\times$ their 4 per week $\times 4$ weeks <br> eg their total cost per change $\times$ their 20 times | M1 | Answers may be rounded eg to nearest 10 |  |
|  | Occupancy rate of $70 \%$ to $85 \%$ used | B1 |  |  |
|  | Their cost per month $\times$ their occupancy rate | M1 | their cost per month must include multiplication by the number of sheet changes |  |
|  | Correct answer for their calculations (may be rounded) | A1 | Answers must be rounded to the nearest pound |  |
|  | Additional Guidance |  |  |  |
|  | Accept sensible rounding for any stage of their calculations eg estimates on average bed linen for double room is $£ 6$ per set |  |  |  |
|  | Answers may follow part of each alt eg works out occupancy rate first then finds cost of laundry for all rooms per night |  |  |  |


| Q | Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



