Comments Section A

No major problems other than the fact that many students did not recall the internal architecture of the query processor and lost a couple of marks that seemed easy to grab.

Section B

This section was mandatory and mostly required recall of the material that was taught after the reading week. They were simple essay-like questions. Most students did well in this section, with marks over 60%. It is worth noticing, though, that a large number of the students showed difficulty writing precise and clear explanations in their answers.

Section C - Q2

This section was optional, but it was rather popular, having a bit more than 50% of the students solving it. Most of the questions in this section required application of technique and independent thinking. The performance of the students varied from low to quite high. However, most students did less well for the questions that required independent thinking, having difficulty making their answers clear and showing a sensible view of existing database modelling techniques.

Q3

Many students wrongly felt that a join was needed in (a.i).

In (a.ii) most students forgot that in an aggregation query, an attribute can only be projected out if it appears in an aggregation function or if it is mentioned in a GROUP BY clause.

In (a.iv) many students forgot (in spite of the alert in the question) to use products rather than joins.

In (a.v) some swapped projection and selection which causes the attribute selected on not to be available due to having been projected out.

In (b), some students didn't recall EER notation, but those that did did well.

Finally, in © the great majority of students seemed not have read (or else to recall) the Reading Week assignment.

11 February 2014 Page 3 of 10