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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 Assessment Writer.

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

Principal Examiners have prepared these mark schemes for specimen papers. These mark schemes have not, therefore, been through the normal process of standardising that would take place for live papers.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

## Glossary for Mark Schemes

Examinations are marked in such a way as to award positive achievement wherever possible. Thus, for mathematics papers, marks are awarded under various categories.

If a student uses a method which is not explicitly covered by the mark scheme the same principles of marking should be applied. Credit should be given to any valid methods. Examiners should seek advice from their senior examiner if in any doubt.

| M | mark is for method |
| :---: | :---: |
| 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 marks and is for method and accuracy |
| E | mark is for explanation |
| $f t$ | 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 |
| PI | possibly implied |
| SCA | substantially correct approach |
| c | candidate |
| sf | significant figure(s) |
| dp | decimal place(s) |


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


| 1 | the numbers in column D can be <br> automatically calculated by using a <br> sum formula to add those in columns <br> B and C <br> or <br> cell D3 should be 23 <br> or <br> cell D3 has not been added up <br> correctly <br> or <br> cell B3 or Cell C3 may have the <br> wrong value as they don't add up to <br> 33 | B1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | comments on sampling. eg sample <br> size too small or he has not asked the <br> whole class |  |  |
|  | no time period is given so an average <br> per day cannot be calculated |  | B3 each correct statement |
|  | comments on lack of average, eg.no <br> averages mentioned: texts per person <br> per day or similar is expected or <br> totals cells needed/cell with formula <br> to calculate average | B3 |  |
| collection of texts received is <br> irrelevant |  |  |  |


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


| Alt $\mathbf{1}$ | $3 \times 66000=198000($ not 188000$)$ | B1 | This is the amount the bank will lend him. |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
|  | Pete should divide by 0.9 (instead of <br> multiplying by 0.9) | B1 | This is to find the maximum house price he <br> can afford. There is no purpose to the <br> multiplication done. |
| (£) 220000 | B1 | This is the maximum price he can afford <br> for a house. |  |
|  | $188000 \div 3 \neq 66000$ <br> or | B1 |  |
|  | B1 |  |  |


| 3(a) | says that the complaint was justified and gives any two of the following reasons <br> - column headings needed <br> - the last column should be stated to be percentages <br> - the last but one column should be stated to be votes received <br> - all candidates should be listed <br> - the total electorate should be stated <br> - the percentage turnout is omitted | E2 | or equivalent <br> E1 <br> says that the complaint was justified and gives one correct reason (ignore any incorrect reasons given) <br> or <br> gives two correct reasons but does not say that the complaint was justified |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Q | Answer | Mark | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 (b) | calculates 2010 electorate: <br> $51228 \div 0.714$ or [71740, 71750] | M1 | oe |
|  | uses their 2010 figure to make a sensible estimate of the 2014 figure and makes a valid conclusion based on $50 \%$ of their electorate | A1 | eg <br> assumes the electorate remains stable and compares half of their electorate <br> assumes an increase in electorate and compares half of their increased electorate <br> SC1 says that as we are not told the number of registered voters in 2014 we cannot say if half did not vote |
|  | says that UKIP did make the biggest numerical gain and gives evidence <br> or <br> says that UKIP did make the biggest percentage gain and gives evidence | E1 | relevant figures are: <br> Conservative - 10159 <br> Labour - 4596 <br> Liberal - 9242 <br> UKIP +8074 <br> condone 'UKIP' were the only ones of the four parties from 2010 to increase their vote <br> there is no need for a comment about the parties who did not take part in 2010, but accept any correct comment <br> eg the other parties cannot have increased their vote beyond the 1891 of the independent candidate <br> relevant figures are: <br> condone 'UKIP' were the only ones of the four parties from 2010 to increase their vote <br> there is no need for a comment about the parties who did not take part in 2010, but accept any correct comment <br> eg the other parties cannot have increased their vote beyond the 4.9\% of the independent candidate |


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


| 3(c) | Jenrick (Conservative) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Conservatives did gain a majority, however more people voted against them (47.65) than for them (45\%) | E2 | full well communicated comment putting both sides <br> E1 for partial explanation <br> eg Jenrick was correct as Conservatives gained more votes than any other party <br> or <br> Jenrick is wrong as more people voted against the government (46.7\%) than for the government (45\%) <br> or <br> the government is a coalition so including the Liberal Democrat percentage gives the government an even bigger majority (47.6\%) |
|  | Helmer (UKIP) |  |  |
|  | any comparison of 3.8 and 25.9 | M1 | no credit for result in general election approx factor of 5 as not a justification |
|  | $\frac{25.9}{3.8} \approx 6$ so he is right <br> or $25.9 \div 3.8$ is approx 7 so he is wrong <br> or $6 \times 3.8=22.8$ so it's more than a factor of 6 | A1 | can conclude they agree or disagree with Helmer with correct reasoning |
|  | any comparison of 7403 and 16152 | M1 |  |
|  | $\frac{7403}{16152} \approx \frac{1}{2}$ <br> or $16152 \div 2=8076$ <br> and yes / they more than halved the majority | A1 |  |
|  | Payne (Labour) |  |  |
|  | various sensible numerical arguments are possible, for example <br> - reference to the 45.0 \% being less than half | E1 |  |


|  | $\bullet$only a quarter of the <br> electorate voted against the <br> Conservative candidate |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | clearly communicated answers with <br> links to each candidate's statement <br> and numerical justifications | B1 |  |


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



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


| Alt $\mathbf{5}$ | $0.8 \times 0.5$ or 0.4 | M1 | probability of winning |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
|  | $20 \times$ their 0.4 or 8 | M1 | number of races won |
|  | their $8 \times 500=4000$ | M1 | total winnings |
|  | $20 \times 50$ or 1000 | M1 | total entry fee |
|  | $4000-$ their 1000 | M1 |  |
|  | $(£) 3000$ | A1 |  |


| Alt $\mathbf{2}$ | $0.8 \times 20$ or 16 | M1 | number of races finished |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
|  | their $16 \times 0.5$ or 8 | M1 | number of races won |
|  | their $8 \times(500-50)$ or 3600 | M1 | amount won in races won |
|  | $(20-$ their 8$) \times 50$ or 600 | M1 | amount lost in races lost |
|  | $3600-$ their 600 | M1 |  |
|  | $(£) 3000$ | A1 |  |


| Alt 3 | $0.8 \times 0.5$ or 0.4 | M1 | probability of winning |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
|  | $500-50$ or 450 and -50 | M1 | net winnings and net losses |
|  | $1-0.4=0.6$ <br> or $0.8-0.4=0.4$ <br> and $1-0.8=0.2$ | M1 | probability of losing |
|  | $0.4 \times 450+0.6 \times-50=150$ <br> or <br> $0.4 \times 450+0.4 \times-50+0.2 \times-50$ <br> $=150$ | M1 | expected winning per race |
|  | M1 |  |  |
|  | A1 3000 |  |  |


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


| Alt 4 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 |



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


| 7(a) | 4 and 14 identified <br> or <br> $\frac{1+3}{1+2+3+8}$ | M1 | eg $1+3$ and $1+2+3+8$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
|  | $\frac{4}{14}$ or $\frac{2}{7}$ | A1 |  |
| 7 7(b) | $6+1+2+7=16$ | M1 A1 | or $36+3+8+37=84$ |
|  | 0.16 | A1 | or -0.84 |


| 8(a) | $0.1+0.3-0.03=0.37$ | M1 A1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { or }(0.1 \times 0.7)+(0.3 \times 0.9)+(0.1 \times 0.3)= \\ & 0.37 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | the delays in the two activities are independent | B1 |  |
|  | $0.37 \times 30000=11100$ | M1 A1 |  |
| 8(b) | recommend preventing a delay on $y$ only | E1 | or recommend both |
|  | $y$ costs less than others | E1 | both not much more expensive and may be worth the investment to protect contractor's reputation |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & y=£ 10,000 \\ & \text { none }=£ 11100 \\ & x=£ 13000 \\ & x \text { and } y=£ 11000 \end{aligned}$ | M1 A2 | A1 if three values correct <br> A2 for all correct and seen |
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