



THE CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF BANKERS, GHANA

FORMAT FOR EXAMINER'S REPORT

QUANTITATIVE METHODS FOR DECISION-MAKING

(OLD SYLLABUS)

General Observations

Only six candidates sat for the examination. Although the questions were drawn from the approved syllabus and candidates were required to answer any four out of six, it was expected that well-prepared students would meet the pass mark. Unfortunately, all six candidates failed to attain the minimum requirement for a pass.

Comments on Candidates' Performance

Candidate performance was generally unsatisfactory. Most candidates were unable to show sufficient understanding or effectively apply the core concepts evaluated. Although the questions were clearly structured and set within practical scenarios, none of the candidates managed to pass the examination.

Summary Statistics of the Performance per the format in the table below.

Total No. of Candidates	Question No.	No of the Candidates Attempted each Question	% of candidates attempted each question	NO. Passed	NO. Failed	% Passed	% Failed	
6	1	6	100%	0	6	0%	100%	
	2	6	83%	1	5	20%	80%	
	3	3	17%	0	3	0%	100%	
	4	5	100%	0	5	0%	100%	
	5	2	-	-	0	2	0%	100%
	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

General Problems Identified

Responses provided by candidates demonstrated a lack of understanding of what the questions required, often missing the core demand. This contributes to inadequate comprehension of key syllabus concepts and their application. Basic arithmetic errors, especially in summation and substitution, were also widespread and affected final answers. Furthermore, several responses were incomplete, with candidates starting questions but failing to finish them, resulting in lost marks.

MAIN ISSUES/CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED

QUESTION 1

Difficulty in identifying the appropriate scale of measurement for the variable of interest.

Use of an incorrect scale when constructing the histogram.

Interchanging of axes, leading to misrepresentation of data.

Use of wrong frequency values in computations.

Challenges in describing the distribution accurately.

Incorrect formulas quoted and applied in calculating the median and standard deviation.

Inability to compute the coefficient of skewness correctly.

QUESTION 2

Interchanging dependent and independent variables, leading to incorrect analysis.

Inaccurate plotting of graphs, resulting in poor representation of data relationships.

Errors in summing values used for calculating the intercept and slope.

Incorrect interpretation of the computed slope and intercept.

Misinterpretation of the coefficient of determination (R^2)

QUESTION 3

Inaccurate calculation and interpretation of confidence intervals, leading to incorrect conclusions based on the estimated interval.

QUESTION 4

No candidate attempted part (a), indicating a lack of understanding or familiarity with the question.

QUESTION 5

Incorrect formulation of the hypothesis, which led to the use of an inappropriate approach and an incorrect conclusion.

QUESTION 6

No candidate attempted this question, suggesting a lack of preparedness or understanding of the topic area.

Conclusion

Candidate performance was well below expectations, as none of the candidates met the required standard. Despite some of the questions being drawn from previous examination diets, overall performance remained unsatisfactory, with a 100% failure rate and the highest score recorded at only 30%.

Jacob Amediku

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'jka', positioned below the printed name 'Jacob Amediku'.