



## **Free-Standing Mathematics Qualification**

# **Making Sense of Data 6983**

## **Report on the Examination**

*2007 examination - January series*

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 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.

---

## Making Sense of Data (6983) Examination

### General

Many candidates entered for this paper were well prepared, achieving creditable marks. However, a significant proportion of candidates achieved less than ten marks out of a maximum of forty.

Overall, many candidates showed enough working to obtain method marks where appropriate and a number of very pleasing papers were seen. However, the weaker candidates rarely showed adequate working and thus gained either full marks or zero marks in, for example, question 2 (pie chart) and question 6 (ratio).

Questions 1 and 3, in particular, were found to be accessible by the candidates.

Questions found difficult were:

- Fractions, question 4, part (a)
- Use of one decimal place, question 5, part (a)
- Ratio, question 6

### Question 1

This question was usually well done. A few candidates interchanged the mode, mean and median. Others wrote the respective countries in parts (a) and (b), rather than the amounts as required.

### Question 2

A significant proportion of candidates showed evidence that they did not possess a protractor. Some used percentage protractors, but all too often only one or two angles were drawn accurately. With no working shown, unless the whole pie chart was correct, no credit was given. Those who did obtain the correct pie chart often forgot to label it appropriately.

### Question 3

A significant number of correct graphs were seen. However, many candidates made life difficult for themselves in part (a) as they did not choose simple scales. Many started at 4000, which was penalised, and then used a scale of 4cm representing £1000. This created major problems as they were unable to find where, for example, 6741 was on their scale.

### Question 4

Relatively few candidates obtained the fraction  $\frac{5}{100}$ , and of those who did it was rare to see this fraction simplified from  $\frac{5}{100}$  to  $\frac{1}{20}$ . In part (b), it was common to see 5% turned into the decimal 0.5 instead of 0.05.

### Question 5

Column D was usually found correctly. Although Column E proved more challenging, most candidates obtained some answers correctly; the 600% for wood pigeons was most likely to be incorrect.

Part (b) was rarely answered correctly. There were a few candidates who appreciated that the reason that their answer was not 595% was because the data were given to one decimal place.

### Question 6

It was relatively rare to see  $2 + 3$  found to be 5. Thus few gave the working  $20 \div 5$ . Often the correct answer, 12, appeared by magic but so did many other numbers, for example 0.3, 0.7, 0 and 25.

### Question 7

This question was badly answered. Many candidates were convinced that the year was required and drew two separate graphs, one plotting saloon cars and years, and the other,  $4 \times 4$ s and years.

The explanation by candidates for part (b) frequently referred to "it" and occasionally the origin. Few explained that the points did not lie on a **straight line** (which passed through the **origin**).

### Question 8

This question was answered very well.

## **Portfolio**

### **FSMQ Foundation Level – January 2007**

There were many pleasing entries under the specification **Managing Money**, with bills, order forms and best buys being particularly well done. Many centres prefixed their portfolios with tables showing the tasks attempted and the various components required. These tables allowed candidates, teachers and moderators to gain an overall impression and pinpoint any missing elements.

Centres are reminded that to achieve a grade A portfolio for Managing Money, significant fractional work should be attempted in task 5, e.g. an investigation into the increase in wages if these increases are fractional. The specification for all the foundation units now includes a detailed scaling scheme for incomplete portfolios and centres should ensure that these scaling schemes are adhered to and indicated on the candidate record forms.

If work is attempted for all elements (even though one element may be very slight) then the portfolio is complete.

Again many excellent portfolios were submitted for **Making Sense of Data**. Tables were produced by centres which helped candidates to track the 12 elements required. The scaling scheme for incomplete portfolios needs to be examined carefully for this unit. Several centres did not complete all elements, especially the writing of a report on raw data and two diagrams and the descriptions of two line graphs. Other centres did not include work on direct proportion.

Some centres are still submitting more than one centre declaration form when candidates enter for more than one unit. Only one form is required for each level.

Overall, it was very pleasing to see independent work carried out by candidates and encouraged by their teachers.

#### **Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.