edexcel

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2012

Primary and Lower Secondary Curriculum (PLSC) Year 6 Mathematics Achievement Test (JMA01) Paper 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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 for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2012
Publications Code PL032808

General Comments

This was the first sitting of a brand new achievement test for pupils at the end of Year 6; the overall performance was encouraging, the majority of candidates attempted every question. The test allowed candidates to achieve P1, P2 or P3.

The paper was divided into two sections; the first being multiple choice and designed for OMR. The candidates on the whole provided answers correctly identified for the OMR reader. On occasion answers were not clear or more than one offered.

In Section B, for the most part candidates made a good attempt at this paper, with the majority providing an answer for every question. Some candidates made use of the space provided on the question paper to show their working. However, the lack of visible working penalised some students as marks for method could not be awarded and potential transcription errors could not be identified as previous steps were not shown.

Even on low scoring scripts, candidates tended to score well on the basic arithmetic questions (such as 21, 24 and 32)

Report on individual Questions

Question 21

An extremely well answered question with the vast majority of candidates answering correctly.

Question 22

Again, the majority of candidates identified the correct answer.

Question 23

Where this question was tackled correctly, many students gained 1 mark for identifying Sara and Jana while not as many remembered to identify Mariam on the sorting diagram. There were quite a few students who used the information as presented on the table trying to fit '2 brothers', '0 sisters' etc onto the sorting diagram.

Question 24

Most candidates scored full marks on this question.

Question 25

On the whole, students answered this question and gained the mark. Only being a 1 mark question both steps were required for the mark to be gained. There were a number of students who calculated 35% + 25% and left 60% as their answer, rather than calculating 'the rest' for Mohamed.

Question 26

This question provided mixed responses. There did not seem to be a pattern to candidates scoring 1, 2 or 3 marks, however the majority of candidates did manage to score at least one mark. Yellow was regularly given as an incorrect response for part (c).

Question 27

This was one of the questions where lack of working prevented marks being awarded. 24 was a regularly seen incorrect answer but without working no marks could be considered. Where there was working seen candidates tackled this question in many ways. 15+6 = 21 being a common mistake as well as dividing by 4.

Question 28

The majority of students managed to draw a rectangle on the grid provided, although these were not always drawn with a ruler or completely correctly.

Question 29

Another arithmetic question answered very well. The students again rarely showed their working, however, managed to present the correct responses. Where full marks were not gained it appeared that the students mixed up < and >. Occasionally incorrect arithmetic allowed students to gain 1 mark for two correct responses.

Question 30

This question was regularly left or missed out. Many candidates managed to list all factors for 30 and all factors for 45, but did not complete the question by showing which were common to both. Some candidates managed to gain 1 mark on this question for identifying 3 factors, usually omitting 1 or 15.

Question 31

The majority of candidates offered answers for this question, however many did not gain both marks. More candidates recognised right-angled triangles than isosceles.

Question 32

An extremely well answered question. The majority of candidates gained both marks here. Where errors were made there was usually no working shown to look for transcription errors, regularly 611 seen as an incorrect answer for part (a) which could have been worked out correctly and copied down wrong, which would have gained the mark.

Question 33

This was not a well answered question. Part (a) regularly saw 670 as an incorrect response, for ($60+$7)x10. Part (b) saw even less correct responses and more varied approaches, regularly seeing candidates not realising that the $60 room hire cost needed to be subtracted before dividing by 7.

Question 34

This was a poorly answered question with very few candidates explaining that 1/3 was equivalent to 0.33(33...) therefore greater than 0.3 or that 1/3 = 10/30 and 0.3 = 3/10 = 9/30. The majority of candidates chose '1/3 equals 0.3' usually attempting to explain that 1/3 as a decimal rounds to 0.3. Another common incorrect response was to offer '1/3 is greater than 0.3' but explain that '1/3 as a decimal is 1.3; therefore 1/3 is greater than 0.3'

Question 35

Candidates attempted this in a variety of ways with many actually gaining the first mark for Sarah = 100. The follow on was extremely mixed with the majority of candidates not realising that the following step was to subtract their 100 from 250 and work next with 150 sweets.

Occasionally candidates completed their working correctly (not always showing it on their script) but presented the amounts for Fatima and Aya the wrong way round, this gained them one of the two marks. A commonly incorrect response was to have Sarah = 100, Fatima = 150 Aya = 0. This, and other examples of totalling 250, did gain a follow through mark for the candidate realising that the three amounts did need to total 250.

Question 36

In part (a) numerous candidates did not convert the metric units into like units (m → cm / cm → m) and attempted to work with mixed units. Higher level candidates managed to recognise the need for conversion and scored the mark. Part (b) proved to be a very challenging question at this level, very few candidates managed to score the mark here.

Question 37

Most candidates recognised that a the shape was a triangle the angle was a right angle and used this information to add 90° and 53°, working out that the smaller missing angle was 37°. This scored one mark, as many left this as their answer or attempted to work out further but offered incorrect responses. Many candidates did go on to work with the angle of a straight line and work out the correct value for x = 143°.

Question 38

A badly answered question, with many candidates putting 3.7 before 3.37 or 7.373 last rather than 7.7. This was an excellent discriminator for straight forward ordering of decimal numbers.

Question 39

More students gained marks on part (b) of this question. The first part required more work to work out the missing co-ordinates. Part (a) was slightly easier as many recognised that x = 0, as the point was placed on the axis, some confusing the point being on the y-axis as y=0 though. Many candidates left their answers without brackets, which was condoned and gained the mark for the correct values for x and y being given in the correct order.

Question 40

Part (a) saw answers of ¼ or 90 regularly, recognising that running did take up 25% of the pie chart but not knowing how to work with the data and information. In part (b) candidates gained more marks; a large range allowed many more students to score.

Question 41

This question varied in the allocation of marks with no particular patterns shown. Part (a) offered regular answers of 5, which did not fall within the required range therefore not scoring the mark, as students needed to be aware that the dotted line for Yousef did not reach 55. Part (b) saw 15 given as the most common incorrect result, again with students not realising that the two lines did not cross exactly on the line. In part (c) 87 and 88 were regularly offered as incorrect responses, where candidates had misunderstood the question and just read the length at 2 years.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481
Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code PL032808 Summer 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual

Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

Rewarding Learning