Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2021

Pearson Edexcel Awards
In Number and Measure Level 2 (ANM20_2B)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

SECTION B

Question 1.
This was a well-answered question.

Question 2.
Most showed 16 : 31 to gain the mark. Some gave the answer the wrong way around.

Question 3.
Evidence of some understanding was shown by those who added the 2 and the 5 to give 7. Division into 84 usually followed onto the correct answer, though there were some who were unable to divide 84 by 7 correctly. A significant minority of weaker candidates merely attempted to divide 84 by 2, and to divide 84 by 5.

Question 4.
This was not well answered. Some ignored the units and just worked with 60 and 4. Others ignored the instruction to simplify and commonly left their answer as 60/400.

Question 5.
In this question the common errors were related to poor arithmetical processing, but there were fewer examples of poor place value that in previous series, for this type of question.
In part (a) it was disappointing to see a significant number of candidates using operations incorrectly. For example, by just adding all four numbers, by just adding the first three numbers. The weakest candidates confused place value, for example adding 208 to 34.26 to give 34.34
In part (b) there were many different methods shown, including Napier's bones, grid methods and partitioning methods, even though this was multiplication by just a single digit. Place value was again an issue here, particularly with grid or partitioning methods, but so was poor recall of time tables. Those who ignored the decimal point during processing frequently either forgot to put it back, or did so in the incorrect place.

Question 6.
Those who knew how to work out a percentage usually gained some credit. Many found 10% then doubled to give 20%. Some just left their answer as the percentage figure (56) and some spoil their answer by subtracting it from 280. Overall a question that proved to be a good discriminator and provided a good range of marks.

Question 7.
In part (a) there were many who just subtracted across to give the incorrect answer of 6/4, or an equivalent. Those who tried to use a common denominator did so using either 8 or 32. This was not guaranteed to lead to the correct answer, since

not infrequently an error was made in calculating the matching numerators. Any equivalent fraction to 5/8 was acceptable for the final answer.
Part (b) was a well answered question.

Question 8.
Candidates who attempted to work this out accurately gained no marks; the question asked for an estimate, and there must therefore be evidence of estimation before any marks are awarded. Sadly there were far more instances this season of candidates just attempting to work it all out accurately. Those who chose appropriate numbers to use as estimates gained some credit, though this did not include those who just truncated to 0.82 to 1. Few spotted the easy division of 0.8 into 8, and preferred to work out a figure for the numerator first. Some calculations were again spoilt by poor arithmetic.

Question 9.
A well answered question. Most candidates realised that a division by 6 was needed, and most then went on to multiply their answer by 5 (or subtracted from £540), arriving at the correct answer.

Question 10.
Many candidates started by writing 385/700 but were then unable to convert this into a percentage.

Question 11.
In answering part (a) it is important that candidates realise that in these types of question their final answer needs to be supported by working. Credit was sometimes given for an incorrect conclusion linked to their two answers given, as long as a correct method was shown for at least one of these two answers. Whilst many candidates realised that a division of 5 or 6 was needed, this was not always done accurately. Overall this question was better attempted than in previous series.

Question 12.
The key to this question was of course first writing the fractions as top-heavy fractions. Those who merely showed 1 × 2 and 3 × 5 or equivalent gained no marks. But it was encouraging to see many who wrote $\frac{4}{3} \times \frac{12}{5}$ or equivalent. Some decided to use common denominators, usually writing $\frac{20}{15} \times \frac{36}{15}$, which could still lead to the correct answer, but then involved more work and larger numbers to deal with. Some ignored the whole numbers completely. It was disappointing to see a significant minority failing to write their answers as a mixed number as requested, which meant they lost the final mark.

Concluding guidance notes for centres:

1. Basic numeracy such as addition/subtraction needs practice, whilst times tables need to be learned.
2. Candidates need to ensure they arrive to take the examination with all necessary equipment, which includes a calculator for Section A.
3. Figures need to be written clearly, and not over-written.
4. Working needs to be presented legibly and in an organised way on the page, sufficient that the order of the process of solution is clear.
5. Candidates need to spend more time ensuring they read the fine detail of the question to avoid giving answers that do not answer the question, and to give answers in the form required, such as simplified if asked for.