



General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mathematics (Modular) 4307 *Specification B*

Module 1 Foundation Tier 43051F

Report on the Examination *2008 examination - June series*

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX
Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.

General

The paper was accessible to its target group, and there was little evidence of candidates being short of time. Presentation was generally good although candidates should be reminded of the importance of bringing the correct equipment to the examination. Some candidates had drawn in pen and then had problems trying to correct their mistakes. Other candidates drew radii on the pie chart using freehand, leading to accuracy errors.

It was pleasing to see that a large number of candidates had shown their methods clearly and some topics were done better than in previous examinations. However, all candidates need to be reminded of the importance of showing clear working. Candidates should ensure that their written answers explain clearly what they mean.

Topics that were well done included:

- pictograms
- describing probabilities
- interpreting a dual bar chart.

Topics which candidates found difficult included:

- interpreting a pie chart
- calculation of a mean from a grouped frequency table
- criticising a response section.

Question 1

This question was very well done by the majority of candidates.

Question 2

A large number of candidates added the three given figures correctly and then tried “trial and improvement” to find an answer. Some candidates embedded the answer 6 but it was apparent that others became lost in the process and many gave an answer of 5.

Question 3

In part (a) many candidates gave 90° or 90% as their answer. In part (b), those candidates who knew how to draw a pie chart scored well - often obtaining full marks. However, a significant proportion were unable to work out the angles correctly and tended to only score for labelling four sectors in order of size. In many cases there was a complete lack of working. There was a significant number of candidates with sector angles outside the acceptable tolerance.

Question 4

Part (a) was answered well by many candidates. However, some candidates gave $\frac{12}{50}$ and others did calculations involving the total amount spent. In part (b) common errors included reference to midpoints and a fairly common incorrect statement was that no-one spent less than £10. In part (c) only a few candidates realised the correct class interval was $10 < x \leq 20$. Errors in part (d) included $\frac{50}{4}$, the sum of the midpoints, $\frac{80}{4}$ and $\frac{80}{50}$. Other errors included using incorrect values for midpoints (for example, the upper class boundaries), dividing the correct sum by 4 and giving an answer of £16.6 rather than £16.60.

Question 5

This question was well attempted.

Question 6

Parts (a) and (b) were generally correct. In part (c) some candidates did not make their working clear. There were a few errors when reading the graph, a few addition errors and some candidates simply wrote an answer of 21, making the women on Friday the same as the men on Friday.

Question 7

Many candidates made errors in calculating the range in part (b) and also when locating the median in part (c). Significant numbers of candidates appeared to guess which boxes to tick in part (d).

Question 8

Part (a)(i) was well done. A few candidates listed the relevant numbers in part (a)(ii) but did not add them. Part (a)(iii) was well done. All the acceptable criticisms were seen in part (b) though most candidates gave either 'might have watched no TV' or 'no box for less than an hour'. Some commented incorrectly that the 'more than 8 hours' category had no upper limit. Many candidates ticked a box as if responding to the questionnaire and a few either commented that, "watching too much TV was bad for you", or wrote down what they did last Sunday.