INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0983/12 **Theory**

Key messages

A wide variety of questions were offered to the candidates covering many aspects of ICT theory from simple hardware identification to the more challenging applications of ICT such as the policing of social network sites and digital certificates. There were questions which related to some of the practical tasks in other papers such as questions on creating a table in a word processing software and then inserting a row and a picture into it.

As in recent series it is important that candidates need to be clearer in their answers in order to achieve higher marks. It is important that in the examination candidates take some time to read the question thoroughly before writing an answer. For example, writing that a device is faster achieves no marks but faster to read the data for example does achieve the mark. Better candidates use specific and detailed language when replying to 'describe' and 'write down the steps' type questions as well as giving a justification of the statements and discussing the arguments for and against.

Occasionally candidates may need to expand their answers on to other parts of the examination paper or onto extra sheets. It is important that if this occurs the candidate clearly writes where the extra part is written.

General comments

Most candidates were able to attempt most of the questions and produced a large range of marks. There was a good correlation between the individual answers and the overall score of the paper. The paper gave all candidates an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of ICT using a wide variety of topics. The vast majority of candidates were able to complete the paper in the allotted time, and most were able to make an attempt at all of the questions. Some parts of the examination paper contained new topics or topics that had not been set for some time.

When a question indicates a specific number of answers, candidates should only write one answer in each allocated space. Candidates writing extra answers will achieve no credit for these. Any question inviting the candidate to describe, discuss, explain advantages or disadvantages requires specific points relevant to the questions asked as well as a detailed answer.

On the examination paper it clearly states that brand names should not be used in answers but as in recent sessions there continues to be candidates that use these names. The Examiners cannot give credit for brand names.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

This question was fairly well answered by most of the candidates. Most candidates were able to pick up at least three marks. The most common correct answer was burglar alarms. Personal finance, weather forecasting were frequently ticked as measurement. Candidates can improve on the layout of their answers by making sure that if ticks are crossed out the crossing out is very clear.

Question 2

This question was well answered by many of the candidates.

(a)   This was a very well answered question with many of the candidates achieving full marks.

(b)   This question appealed to most candidates and therefore was a well answered question with most candidates achieving as least three of the four marks. Some candidates needed to develop more detailed answers to the question, for example rather than writing using the internet a more detailed answer could be searching the internet for information about a school project.

Candidates need to improve their layout of the answers by using generic software names in their answers rather than brand names. They should also develop the technique of placing one answer per point on numbered answered questions like this. The first answer achieves the mark then other answers written on the marking point are ignored. Writing extra numbered points under the answer area are also ignored.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to achieve at least three of the four marks. Some candidates had issues with the answers to store the current instructions in use by a computer and to back up data from a school network server.

Question 4

This question was well answered by most candidates with many achieving at least two of the three marks.

(a)   The majority of candidates were able to achieve full marks on this question.

(b)   Most candidates were able to achieve the mark on this question. Some candidates gave the answer as cookies rather than spyware.

(c)   This part of the question was less well answered than the first two parts, however some of the candidates were able to achieve the mark. Some candidates mixed up phishing for the correct answer smishing.

Question 5

This question was well answered by many of the candidates. Some candidates needed to develop more detailed answers to the question.

(a)   This part of the question was answered well. Candidates needed to read the question thoroughly before starting to answer it. Numeric as an answer on its own was not accepted but adding the correct type of number achieved the mark. The question stated that the field Rings used Y or N as an answer therefore candidates needed to write Boolean or logical otherwise they would repeat the question.

(b)   This part of the question was well answered with the majority of candidates producing perfect answers. Some candidates needed to develop more accurate answers to the question, so that the field names matched those in the table. This question involved candidates reading the question and using the rules and field names given in the table.

(c)   This question was well answered with most candidates able to achieve both marks.

(d)   Most candidates managed to achieve a mark in this part of the question which was fairly well answered. Some candidates needed to develop more detailed answers to the question for example referring back to the references in the formula.

Question 6

Many candidates needed to develop more detailed answers to the question rather than giving general statements.

Although most candidates were able to pick up at least two marks. Most common marks awarded were for the discussion of flight crew safety and it being quicker to receive the data. Advantages more commonly received marks than disadvantages which were on the whole limited or weak.

Question 7

(a)   This was a question where the topic had not been examined for some time. It was important that candidates carefully read the question and then answered it about the user requirements. Some candidates misread the question answering about analysis whilst others wrote about booking rooms in general, mixing up client with the customer.

(b)   This was a well answered question, with most candidates achieving at least three marks. Where incorrect ticks were places Evaluation points were mixed up with Analysis.

(c)   Many candidates managed to achieve marks for naming the implementation.

A small number of candidates did not attempt this question. Answering of questions like this where an example is given can be improved by reading the question carefully before answering. The question included an example of pilot running; however, some candidates gave this as an answer. Many candidates needed to develop more detailed answers to the question.

Question 8

The question relates to the candidates use of IT equipment and safety aspects. Some candidates mixed up health with safety answering the question about health issues with the use of ergonomic devices whilst others wrote about both. Some candidates tended to give vague strategies even though they were able to correctly identify the consequence.

Question 9

(a)   Many candidates could not explain what an intranet was used for. Some candidates tended to write about the features of an intranet rather than the use of it. In order to improve answers in this type of question more detail is needed.

(b)   Many candidates achieved two out of the four marks on this question, but many candidates mixed up the internet with the web. This meant that many of the answers given were repeated. One or two candidates gave answers relating to social media which was a repeat of the question.

(c)   This question is a discuss question therefore in order to improve the marks in this type of question the benefits and drawbacks must be clearly explained. Most marks were achieved from the benefits section, as well as freedom of speech. There is a tendency recently for candidates to write about 'stuff' and 'things'; rather than specifying exactly what they mean.

Question 10

The question related to work patterns rather than the introduction of computers as some candidates thought. Some candidates thought it was about improving the way workers worked when employees use computers. Some candidates understood the type of work would change but their answers were not detailed enough. Those candidates that did identify a working pattern then had issues with identifying any benefits for employees or employers.

Question 11

Most candidates wrote about digital certificates but there was little awareness beyond that the certificate adds a level of security/authentication. Some candidates wrote about digitised certificates that had been awarded for work. In order to improve the answering of this question more information is needed in the answer.

Question 12

Most candidates were able to achieve at least five marks on this question mostly from **parts (c)** and **(d)**.

(a)   Many candidates referred to the amount of data and the fact that it takes time to find information compared to typing in a website address. As with previous questions in order to improve the answering of the question more detail is needed.

(b)   Most candidates manage to achieve at least a couple of marks. A number of answers referred to things like spelling and grammar mistakes without specifying the amount. Date published was also mentioned frequently but without referring to last update. Candidates that explained about comparison with other sites and books, checking authors credentials/reviews produced some good answers.

(c)   This question was well answered by many of the candidates with most candidates achieving at least a mark. With questions of this type, detailed answers like writing down the number of rows and columns ensure that good marks are achieved.

(d)   This question was well answered by many of the candidates with most candidates achieving at least two marks. A lot of full mark answers showing really good understanding of the topic. In order to improve the answering this type of question candidates must give detailed answers.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

> **Paper 0983/21**
> **Practical Test**

Key messages

- Candidates need to be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types and select a font style for the type specified.
- Candidates must enter accurately text in bold on the question paper.
- Candidates must use proofing techniques to identify errors and ensure consistency of presentation.
- Candidates must be able to create, modify and apply styles in different software packages.
- Candidates must be able to distinguish between the database page header/footer area and the report header/footer area and understand which is appropriate to use.
- Candidates must be able to insert merge fields into a master document whilst maintaining the punctuation, layout and spacing of the original text.
- Printouts must be produced as instructed on the question paper.
- Candidates must ensure they include their identification details in tasks before printing as instructed on the question paper.
- Candidates must produce legible screenshots which show the outcome of an action rather than the skill process.
- Candidates must printout the Evidence Document as this contains supporting evidence that could substantially improve their grade.
- Candidates need to know the importance of following the instructions on the question paper.

General comments

Most candidates appeared well prepared for the examination. The majority of candidates completed or attempted all elements of the paper and most showed a good level of skill. The mail merge task was particularly well done with many candidates achieving full marks for this task.

Candidates must be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types. These are not the actual names of font styles but categories of font type with specific attributes. Candidates must be able to select an appropriate font for the font type specified.

When creating or editing paragraph styles candidates must base the style on the 'normal' (Microsoft Office) or 'default' (Open Office) paragraph style.

Text to be entered by the candidate as part of a task is displayed in bold on the question paper. Marks are available for accurate data entry of this text which must be keyed exactly as shown including punctuation and capitalisation. Candidates are advised to carefully check their data entry to ensure it matches the text on the question paper. Common errors on this paper included incorrect capitalisation, incorrect or missing characters, omission of spaces, truncated headings and additional punctuation.

In the database task it was noted that some candidates had incorrectly deleted duplicate records in both reports. It was not clear why these records had been deleted but it may be connected to the instruction not to group the data. Grouped data refers to records that are grouped together under one field or heading instead of every record showing all the fields. Records should not be deleted from the source file unless there is a specific instruction to do so.

Candidates are instructed to produce screenshots to evidence the ICT skills that cannot be assessed through the printed product alone. These screenshots must display the outcome of an action and not the

process so for example, the saved word processing document must be seen in the file list within the folder – the '*Save As*' dialogue box is insufficient as the save process is incomplete. Screenshot evidence is often too small and/or faint to be read even using magnification devices. Candidates must ensure that all screenshots can be easily read with the naked eye. Care should be taken when cropping and resizing screenshots to ensure important elements are still shown such as primary keys in the table structure. Evidence in the style modification and database formula screenshots was often cropped or truncated so the marks could not be awarded.

The question paper prompts candidates to include their name, centre number and candidate number on all tasks prior to printing. Without clear printed evidence of the author of the work marks cannot be awarded. It is not acceptable for candidates to annotate their printouts by hand as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work.

Some centres are still submitting stapled work which is not permitted. Hole-punching work and securing it with treasury tags or string is permitted but care should be taken not to obscure text with the punch holes. Centres should return the Supervisor's Report Folder with the candidates' work. This identifies the software used and can be helpful if issues were experienced during the practical test. The candidates' work must be submitted in the original hard-copy printed Assessment Record Folders that are provided to centres. Printed or photocopied Assessment Record Folders must not be used.

Comments on specific questions

Task 1 – Evidence Document

The evidence document was opened and identification details entered by the majority of candidates. This document is used to store supporting screenshot evidence for skills which cannot be assessed by the printed tasks alone. Occasionally the screenshots were too small or faint to be read, or essential evidence had been cropped from the image. Candidates must ensure that all text can be easily read with the naked eye. A small number of candidates did not present the evidence document for marking, and others omitted identification details so marks could not be awarded for these pages.

Task 2 – Document

Question 1

All candidates opened the correct file and most saved it with the file name specified. Occasionally it was saved in the original .rtf format rather than the format of the word processing software being used and a few candidates did not enter the file name in capitals as given on the question paper. Screenshot evidence of the save was often inconclusive, showing the save in process rather than capturing the outcome of the file saved in the work area. A screenshot of the folder contents after saving provides the evidence required. The majority of candidates retained the page setup settings as instructed.

Question 2

The two page breaks in the recall text were usually deleted however the spacing between the paragraphs was not always retained. Some candidates ran the paragraphs together instead of retaining the paragraph breaks or inserted additional hard returns thereby creating inconsistent spacing between the paragraphs.

Question 3

Headers and footers were generally inserted and aligned as instructed. A few candidates omitted their centre number and/or candidate number from the header details or incorrectly split their identification details in the header area so their name was left aligned, the centre number centred and the candidate number right aligned. An automated field was not always used for the page numbers in the footer with the keyed number 1 appearing on all pages. Occasionally the header items did not align with the page margins on all pages and candidates who used the built-in content control to align the items did not always remove superfluous text or placeholders in the header and/or footer areas.

Question 4

The title text was usually entered accurately at the start of the document. The word '*Triathlon'* occasionally contained keying errors and '*Pack'* was occasionally entered as '*Park'*.

Question 5

The creation and storage of the *TN-title* style with the correct attributes was done well by most candidates. Screenshot evidence of the style settings provided details of the attributes applied to this style and the formatting of the title entered in step 4 needed to match these settings. Occasionally there were errors in the capitalisation of the style name. A common error was this new style not being based on the normal or default paragraph style for the document. The *TN-title* style was frequently based on the *TN-body* style which was already applied to the recall text, or candidates based their style on 'plain text' or 'no style'. When the style is based on an existing style it inherits the attributes of that style resulting in additional formatting being applied to the style. A few candidates continue to enter 'serif' or 'sans-serif' as the font name in the font dialogue box which, as that font name does not exist, will revert to the default font style. A named font style with attributes of the specified typeface category must be selected and applied. It is not necessary to capture the paragraph formatting box separately as attributes applied here will be listed in the style description. If the paragraph formatting box is captured as evidence this must be shown alongside the style dialogue box so the style name can be seen. When presented as a separate screenshot no marks can be awarded as there is no evidence of which style the formatting is applied to.

Question 6

Most candidates changed the page layout to two equally spaced columns with the correct spacing between the columns. Some candidates inserted the initial column break below rather than above the subheading and occasionally a page break was inserted instead of a section break. A small number of candidates displayed the entire document in two columns. The most frequent error was not ending the column section in the correct position so the last paragraph displayed as one column. There were a few instances where the column formatting had been applied in separate sections resulting in the loss of paragraph order and flow.

Question 7

The application of bullets to the specified text was done well. Any consistent bullet style was accepted. The list was not always presented in single line spacing with a 6 point space after the last item in the list. The bullet indent was not always set accurately and occasionally the text rather than the bullet was indented 1.5 centimetres from the left margin.

Question 8

Modification of the stored *TN-subhead* style was assessed from the screenshot in the Evidence Document and was generally completed well. A small number of candidates created a new style instead of modifying the existing style. The attributes applied were usually correct although some candidates did not set the font format to display all capitals. Occasionally a separate screenshot was provided to evidence the spacing set after each paragraph but this was inconclusive as it did not evidence the name of the style the paragraph formatting was applied to.

Question 9

Most candidates indented the correct paragraph 1 centimetre from both margins and applied an external border. Occasionally the paragraph was not indented from both margins and, more commonly, the weight of the displayed black border was 1 point instead of 3 to 4 points.

Question 10

Most candidates located the table and deleted the entire column and its contents as instructed. A few candidates deleted the contents but left a blank column in the table.

Question 11

Many candidates made a good attempt at formatting the table to match the image displayed on the question paper. Most merged the cells in the first column, rotated the text and applied a black background with white text. The most common error was not centring the text both vertically and horizontally within the cell.

Question 12

The stored *TN-table* style was usually applied correctly to columns 2, 3 and 4 although a few candidates applied this style to the first column as well. The text in row 1 was not always displayed on one line. The table style had 0 point paragraph spacing set but this was often not retained. Most candidates applied 1 point borders and gridlines although the table borders were not always within the column width. A number of candidates did not set a 6 point space below the table. This could be set by applying a 6 point space above the paragraph following the table.

Question 13

Almost all candidates imported the correct image and positioned this in the correct paragraph. The image was usually aligned to the top of the paragraph but a number of candidates aligned this to the left column margin instead of the right. The image was usually resized accurately with text wrap applied. The image was not always reflected so the hand was displayed on the left.

Question 14

In most cases there was evidence of good proofreading and document presentation skills. By default the presentation of the document should have been consistent as the *TN-body* paragraph style had already been applied to the recall text. A few candidates inserted unnecessary hard returns between paragraphs resulting in large gaps between paragraphs for no apparent reason. The columns were not always aligned at the top of the page. Most candidates kept the table and bulleted list together so they were not split over columns or pages. Occasionally there was a widow or orphan, more commonly where a single line of text had been left at the bottom of a column.

Task 3 – Database

Question 15

The importing of the csv files, creation of primary keys and relationships between the tables were well done by those who attempted the database task. Candidates coped well with importing three tables for this database. The field names and data types were mostly set correctly although the Boolean/logical field was occasionally set as a numeric field and/or displayed 0 and –1 in Report 2 instead of Yes/No. Importing the Date/Time field as DMY did not cause any problems, nor did importing the time display as hh:mm:ss. Screenshot evidence of the tables were occasionally truncated so not all the fields were visible and it was therefore not possible to award the field names and data types for those tables. Candidates should ensure all the fields are displayed in their screenshot or produce additional screenshots to ensure all the evidence is captured. Similarly, the athlete table was often cropped so the primary key was not visible, however this mark could be awarded if this field was seen in the relationship evidence.

Question 16

Most candidates created relationships between the tables, but the screenshot evidence did not always confirm that one-to-many relationships had been created. The screenshot was often captured during the process of creating the relationship rather than showing the outcome. Screenshots of the relationship dialogue boxes will evidence the relationship type. The relationship diagram can only be credited if it shows the single and one-to-many infinity symbols confirming the relationship type. Some candidates showed the single and one-to-many infinity symbols, but the table field lists were not expanded so it was not possible to assess which fields were linked. To achieve the relationship marks the original tables must be joined so the database is operational. Importing separate tables just to screenshot the relationships is not acceptable.

Question 17

Evidence of the new record was assessed in Report 1 and most candidates had entered this data accurately. Some candidates did not enter this as a new record but incorrectly overwrote the first record in the athlete table (*Corey Buist*).

Question 18

Locating and amending a record in the results table was not done well. A number of candidates added this as a new record to the results table instead of locating and amending the existing record. This amendment

was assessed in Report 2 and where the correct record had been amended and the correct fields were displayed, the amendments were generally accurate.

Question 19

The first tabular report used fields from all three tables and was generally well done by candidates who attempted this question. The report title occasionally contained data entry or capitalisation errors or displayed additional text such as '*Query 1*' in the title area. The search was based on three criteria with the most common errors being the wildcard search on '*ham*' and searching for those with an outcome of complete. Most candidates displayed the correct fields in the report although these were not always in the correct order as, without manual intervention, the software placed the sort field *Position* as the first field in the report. This can be avoided by setting the sort order in the report design rather than during the step-by-step creation of the report. The *Position* field was not always included. Occasionally data in the *Location* and/or *Last_Name* fields was truncated. Most candidates presented the report in portrait orientation with identification details in the header or footer, but the report did not always fit on a single page.

Question 20

The second report used fields from all three tables. The report title was usually entered as instructed in a larger font size at the top of the report. Occasionally this title contained data entry or capitalisation errors or displayed additional text such as '*Query 1*' in the title area. Most candidates completed the search successfully but where errors did occur these were usually on the criteria set for the *Position* field with some including 0 records and/or only those records less than 5. The new field heading was usually entered accurately with only a few candidates omitting the underscore or making data entry or capitalisation errors. Those that created the new calculated field usually used the correct calculation to add the T1 and T2 fields and by default this value inherited the correct hh:mm:ss formatting from the existing T1 and T2 fields. The report required some manipulation to ensure the data in all fields was fully visible. Most fitted the report to a single page wide and presented this in landscape, but the fields were not always in the correct order or displayed the data in full. Some candidates displayed the wrong fields, most commonly *Swim(M)* in place of *Swim*. The two field sort was completed well. The calculation used to count the number of records was assessed in the Evidence Document and required a screenshot of the database formula used. The screenshot did not always evidence that a database formula had been used and frequently the control box was truncated so the formula was not fully visible. Where the formula was correct in the Evidence Document the result displayed in the report did not always give the correct result for the records displayed. Some candidates incorrectly deleted duplicate records from the report, but the count formula still gave the result of 39 which was not correct for the records displayed. The label for this calculation was usually positioned to the left of the value but occasionally contained capitalisation errors or additional punctuation. Identification details were often entered in the report footer so they printed at the end of the report instead of the page footer so they print in the same position at the bottom of every page as instructed. A few candidates omitted their identification details from all pages of the report which could not then be assessed. A common error was not removing the automated data in the page footer to ensure only the identification details were displayed.

Task 4 – Mail Merge

Question 21

The mail merge task was well done with many candidates producing error-free work. The correct files were located and the data source attached to the master document. Candidates inserted their identification details which ensured the task could be marked, but a number inserted these in the header instead of the footer.

Question 22

Most candidates correctly replaced the text and chevrons in the master document with the correct fields from the data source file. The most common errors were not removing all the chevrons, deleting punctuation and spacing between the fields, and modifying the spacing between lines as the merge fields were inserted. Most candidates replaced <DATE> with a date field although some incorrectly used a *CreateDate* or *SaveDate* field instead of a field code for today's date. The formatting of this field was assessed from a screenshot in the Evidence Document. This did not always show a field had been used and the formatting of the field rarely match the question paper with different separators, spacing and the weekday not displayed (dddd). Some candidates did not print the original master document as instructed, instead taking a screenshot of the full master document.

Question 23

The merge selection was based on two search criteria and was generally completed well. Most candidates set the correct criteria on the *Male_Female* field but not all set the correct criteria on the *Gender_Pos* field and a number used OR instead of AND to set both criteria. Screenshot evidence of a tick box selection method did not provide evidence that an automated filter had been used.

Question 24

Most candidates merged and printed the certificates as specified. A few candidates printed additional letters which did not match the search criteria. A small number of candidates provided no evidence of the master document and it was therefore not possible to assess whether mail merge had been used to complete this task. The merge result must match the master document for this merge mark to be credited. On occasions the merge result did not match the layout, spacing and formatting of the master document so, for example, the fields were inserted in the master certificate without spaces but in the resulting merged certificates the fields had spaces so did not match the master letter. If candidates identify an error after merging they should correct the master document, reprint the master document and complete the merge again.

Task 5 – Presentation

Question 25

Most candidates successfully imported the eight slides into presentation software and presented each as a title and bulleted list. Most candidates entered their name after the text on slide 1 as instructed.

Question 26

Most candidates entered their identification details and slide numbers on the master slide so they displayed in the same position on all slides in the presentation. The slide numbers were not always positioned in the top right of the slide. Occasionally the master items were not in the same position on all slides, most often seen with slide items in a different position on slide 1.

Question 27

The correct two slides were usually deleted but a few candidates deleted only one of the slides.

Question 28

Most candidates created a pie chart. The data selection was not always accurate with candidates selecting more data than *Triathlon* only.

Question 29

Most inserted a chart title as instructed. Occasionally this contained capitalisation or data entry errors.

Question 30

Controlling the sector label display proved challenging for some candidates. Often values, percentages and labels were all displayed and others displayed values instead of percentages. These labels were not always positioned outside each chart sector. Candidates who selected the wrong data often incorrectly displayed a legend.

Question 31

Not all candidates attempted this but those that did were usually successful in emphasising the largest percentage by pulling that sector away from the chart. Some candidates used an exploded pie chart and therefore did not control which sector was pulled away.

Question 32

This was completed well with most candidates placing the chart on the correct slide to the left of the bullets. A small number placed this below or to the right of the bulleted text.

Question 33

Candidates performed well in this task with most achieving one or two marks. Most managed to evidence that the sound file was set to play automatically as the slide appeared. A mark was also awarded for evidence of the correct sound file or that the sound file was applied to the correct slide.

Question 34

Most candidates printed the presentation with two slides to the page. Controlling the printing to only slides 1, 2, 3 and 4 was not so well done with many printing the full presentation.

Task 6 – Printing the Evidence Document

Question 35

Most candidates provided a printout of the Evidence Document. It is essential that candidates print their Evidence Document towards the end of the examination time, regardless of whether they have finished all the questions. They should make sure that their screenshots are large enough for the evidence to be legible and that cropping/resizing has not removed essential evidence.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

> **Paper 0983/22**
> **Practical Test**

Key messages

- Candidates must be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types and select a font style for the type specified.
- Candidates must enter accurately text in bold on the question paper.
- Candidates must use proofing techniques to identify errors and ensure consistency of presentation.
- Candidates must be able to create, modify and apply styles in different software packages.
- Candidates must be able to distinguish between the database page header/footer area and the report header/footer area and understand which is appropriate to use.
- Candidates must be able to select contiguous and non-contiguous data to chart data.
- Candidates must produce legible screenshots which show the outcome of an action rather than the skill process.
- Candidates must printout the Evidence Document as this contains supporting evidence that could substantially improve their grade.
- Candidates need to know the importance of following the instructions on the question paper.
- Candidates must ensure they use appropriate software for the task.

General comments

Candidates appeared well prepared for this examination. Candidate errors were spread evenly over the sections of the paper. Most candidates completed or attempted all elements of the paper and the majority who submitted work showed sound knowledge, skills and understanding. The mail merge task was particularly well done with many candidates achieving full marks for this task.

Candidates must use the most appropriate software to complete each task. Marks cannot be awarded where word processing software has been used to complete the presentation task as different skills are being tested and assessed.

Candidates must be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types. These are not the actual names of font styles but categories of font type with specific attributes. Candidates must be able to select an appropriate font for the font type specified.

Text to be entered by the candidate as part of a task is displayed in bold on the question paper. Marks are available for accurate data entry of this text which must be keyed exactly as shown including punctuation and capitalisation. Candidates are advised to carefully check their data entry to ensure it matches the text on the question paper.

Candidates are instructed to produce screenshots to evidence the ICT skills that cannot be assessed through the printed product alone. These screenshots must display the outcome of an action and not the process so for example, the saved word processing document must be seen in the file list within the folder – the '*Save As*' dialogue box is insufficient as the save process is incomplete. Screenshot evidence is often too small and/or faint to be read even using magnification devices. Candidates must ensure that all screenshots can be easily read with the naked eye. Care should be taken when cropping and resizing screenshots to ensure important elements are still shown such as primary keys in the table structure. Evidence in the style modification and database formula screenshots was often cropped or truncated so the marks could not be awarded.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

The question paper prompts candidates to include their name, centre number and candidate number on all tasks prior to printing. Without clear printed evidence of the author of the work marks cannot be awarded. It is not acceptable for candidates to annotate their printouts by hand as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work.

Some centres are still submitting stapled work which is not permitted. Hole-punching work and securing it with treasury tags or string is permitted but care should be taken not to obscure text with the punch holes. Centres should return the Supervisor's Report Folder with the candidates' work. This identifies the software used and can be helpful if issues were experienced during the practical test. The candidates' work must be submitted in the original hard-copy printed Assessment Record Folders that are provided to centres. Printed or photocopied Assessment Record Folders must not be used.

Comments on specific questions

Task 1 – Evidence Document

The evidence document was opened and identification details entered by the majority of candidates. This document is used to store supporting screenshot evidence for skills which cannot be assessed by the printed tasks alone. Occasionally the screenshots were too small or faint to be read, or essential evidence had been cropped from the image. Candidates must ensure that all text can be easily read with the naked eye. A small number of candidates did not present the evidence document for marking, and others omitted identification details so marks could not be awarded for these pages.

Task 2 – Document

Question 1

Candidates opened the correct source file and retained the page setup settings as instructed. The majority of candidates set the margins as instructed and provided screenshot evidence of this. A small number of candidates applied inches to the measurements instead of centimetres but most completed this task successfully.

Question 2

Most saved the file with correct file name. Occasionally the file was saved in the original .rtf format rather than the format of the word processing software being used and a few candidates did not enter the file name in capitals as given on the question paper. Screenshot evidence of the save was often inconclusive, showing the save in process rather than capturing the outcome of the file saved in the work area. A screenshot of the folder contents after saving provides the evidence required.

Question 3

Most candidates entered the text in the header accurately followed by their name, centre number and candidate number. A few candidates omitted their centre number and/or candidate number from these details. Page numbers were correctly inserted in the footer area although an automated field was not always used with the keyed number 1 appearing on all pages. Occasionally the header and footer items did not align with the page margins on all pages and candidates who used the built-in content control to align the items did not always remove superfluous text or placeholders in the header and/or footer areas.

Question 4

The creation and storage of the *MS-subhead* style with the correct attributes was done well by most candidates. Screenshot evidence of the style settings provided details of the attributes applied to this style. Occasionally there were errors in the capitalisation of the style name. A common error was not basing this new style on the 'normal' or 'default' paragraph style for the document. The *MS-subhead* style was often based on the *MS-body* style which was already applied to the recall text, or candidates based their style on 'plain text' or 'no style'. When the style is based on an existing style it inherits the attributes of that style resulting in additional formatting being applied to the style. A few candidates continue to enter 'serif' or 'sans-serif' as the font name in the font dialogue box which, as that font name does not exist, will revert to the default font style. A named font style with attributes of the specified typeface category must be selected and applied. It is not necessary to capture the paragraph formatting box separately as attributes applied here will be listed in the style description. If the paragraph formatting box is captured as evidence this must be shown

alongside the style dialogue box so the style name can be seen. When presented as a separate screenshot no marks can be awarded as there is no evidence of which style the formatting is applied to.

Question 5

Most candidates entered the title text accurately at the start of the document.

Question 6

The *MS-title* style was supplied in the recall file and candidates were required to modify the settings of this style and provide screenshot evidence of these changes. A small number of candidates created a new style instead of modifying the existing style and some typed 'serif' in the font dialogue box instead of selecting a named font from the serif category such as Times New Roman. As there is no font named 'serif' the font displayed will be the default font style for the system. Bold and italic were usually set correctly but the underline from the original style was not always removed. Changes in the spacing before and after the paragraph were occasionally evidenced from a separate screenshot of the paragraph formatting box which cannot be awarded as there is no evidence of which style name this formatting is applied to.

Question 7

The amended *MS-title* style was usually applied correctly to the title text. Application of the style was only awarded if there was evidence that the style had been modified in **Question 6** and all the formatting was correct.

Question 8

Locating and moving the paragraph was not always completed successfully. Some candidates copied the paragraph instead of moving it and frequently the spacing above and below the paragraph was not retained either from where the paragraph was originally placed, or in the new location. A small number of candidates entered the subheading *Triathlon* above the original paragraph rather than moving the text so the document then contained two *Triathlon* subheadings.

Question 9

Most candidates changed the page layout to two equally spaced columns with the correct spacing between the columns. Some candidates inserted the initial column break below rather than above the subheading and occasionally a page break was inserted instead of a section break. A small number of candidates displayed the entire document in two columns. There were a few instances where the column formatting had been applied in separate sections resulting in the loss of paragraph order and flow.

Question 10

The application of bullets to the specified text was done well and the majority of candidates used square shaped bullets as instructed. The bullets were often not aligned with the left margin or displayed in single line spacing although most managed to leave a six point space after the last item in the list. A few candidates had changed the text so the start of each line in the list had a capital letter and a few had changed only the last item to start with an initial capital (*More extreme events…*).

Question 11

Applying the MS-subhead style to the five subheadings was well done. The mark was awarded if there was evidence that the MS-subhead style had been created and saved, and the formatting of all five subheadings matched the formatting seen in the screenshot evidence for **Question 4**.

Question 12

Most candidates created a vertical bar chart but the correct selection of only duathlon and triathlon data was not always well done. A number of candidates also incorrectly charted the *Total* column with the data and a number of horizontal bar charts were seen.

Question 13

The chart title was usually entered correctly. The data entry was not always accurate with typographical errors in '*Participation'* and capitalisation of the text not always as shown on the question paper.

Question 14

Candidates who charted the correct data had little difficulty displaying the correct legend. Displaying percentage numbers as data labels along the top of each bar was not always done.

Question 15

Most candidates successfully controlled the value axis scale with a minimum value of 0 per cent and a maximum of 100 per cent. Increments were not assessed on this paper.

Question 16

The chart was usually placed in the correct position within the column width.

Question 17

Almost all candidates imported the correct image and positioned this in the correct paragraph. The image was usually aligned to the left column margin and top of the paragraph. Most candidates correctly resized the image and applied text wrap. Most cropped the bottom of the image correctly with only a few not attempting this.

Question 18

In most cases there was evidence of good proofreading and document presentation skills. The *MS-body* paragraph style had already been applied to the recall text so by default the presentation of the document should have been consistent. A few candidates inserted unnecessary hard returns between paragraphs for no apparent reason resulting in large gaps and inconsistent spacing between paragraphs. The 6 point space after the body style text was not always retained, particularly above the chart and bulleted list. Text in the columns was not always not aligned at the top of the page. Most candidates kept the chart and bulleted list together so they were not split over columns or pages. Occasionally a widow or orphan was seen.

Task 3 – Database

Question 19

The importing of the csv files, creation of primary keys and relationships between the tables were well done by those who attempted the database task. Candidates coped well with importing three tables for this database. The field names and data types were mostly set correctly although the Boolean/logical field was occasionally set as a numeric field and/or displayed 0 and –1 in Report 1 instead of Yes/No. Importing the times to display as hh:mm:ss did not cause any issues. Screenshot evidence of the duathlon table was occasionally truncated so not all the field names and data types were visible. Candidates should ensure all the fields are displayed in their screenshot or produce additional screenshots to ensure all the evidence is captured.

Question 20

The one-to-many relationships between the tables were usually well done but the screenshot evidence did not always confirm the type of relationship created. Some candidates captured the screenshot during the process of creating the relationship rather than showing the outcome. Screenshots of the relationship dialogue boxes will evidence the relationship type. The relationship diagram can only be credited if it shows the single and one-to-many infinity symbols confirming the relationship type. To achieve the relationship marks the original tables must be joined so the database is operational. Importing separate tables just to screenshot the relationships is not acceptable.

Question 21

Most candidates entered the new record details accurately in the duathlon table. These details were assessed in Report 2. Some candidates overwrote the first record in the duathlon table (*Graham Boardman*) instead of entering the data as a new record.

Question 22

The first tabular report used fields from all three tables and was generally well done by candidates who attempted this question. The report title occasionally contained data entry or capitalisation errors or displayed additional text such as '*Query 1*' in the title area. The search was based on two criteria – most candidates located the *Elite-Pro* records but found the operators to exclude records (NOT or <>) more challenging. Most candidates displayed the correct fields in the report although these were not always in the correct order as, without manual intervention, the software placed the sort field *Status* as the first field in the report. This can be avoided by setting the sort order in the report design rather than during the step-by-step creation of the report. Occasionally data in the *Status* and/or *Last_Name* fields was truncated. Most candidates presented the report in portrait orientation with identification details in the header or footer, but the report did not always fit on a single page.

Question 23

The second report used fields from two tables. The report title was usually entered as instructed in a larger font size at the top of the report. Some candidates found the search demanding with most finding *Male* in *GBR* or *IRL* but had difficulty locating the records between specific years. A few candidates found records in 1982 and 2001 only and some did not attempt to set this search criteria. The new field heading was usually entered accurately with only a few candidates omitting the underscore or making data entry or capitalisation errors. Those that created the new calculated field usually used the correct calculation to calculate the age of the athlete. The report required some manipulation to fit a single page wide with all the data was fully visible. The field order was usually correct except where the sort fields were positioned first in the report. The two field sort was completed well. The calculation used to count the number of records was assessed in the Evidence Document and required a screenshot of the database formula used. The screenshot did not always evidence that a database formula had been used and the control box was often truncated so the formula was not fully visible. Some candidates placed this calculation in the page footer so it appeared at the end of every page in the report, rather than the report footer so it appeared at the end of report as instructed on the question paper. The label for this calculation was usually positioned correctly to the left of the value but occasionally contained capitalisation errors or additional punctuation. Identification details should be entered in the page footer so they appear in the footer of every page but several candidates entered these in the report footer so they appeared only at the end of the report, or in the report header. A few candidates omitted their identification details from all pages of the report which could not then be assessed. A common error was not removing the automated data in the page footer to ensure only the identification details were displayed.

Question 24

Exporting report 2 a in pdf format was well done and the vast majority of candidates named this file correctly. A few candidates did not use uppercase for the file name.

Task 4 – Mail Merge

Question 25

The mail merge task was well done with many candidates producing error-free work. The correct files were located and the data source attached to the master document. Candidates inserted their identification details which ensured the task could be marked, but a number inserted these in the footer instead of the header.

Question 26

Most candidates correctly replaced the text and chevrons in the master document with the correct fields from the data source file. The most common errors were not removing all the chevrons, deleting punctuation and spacing between the fields, and modifying the spacing between lines as the merge fields were inserted. Most candidates replaced <DATE> with a date field although some incorrectly used a *CreateDate* or *SaveDate* field instead of a field code for today's date. The formatting of this field was assessed from a screenshot in the Evidence Document. This did not always show a field had been used and the formatting of the field rarely

matched the question paper with different separators, spacing and the weekday not displayed (dddd). Some candidates did not print the original master document as instructed and instead submitted a screenshot of the master document.

Question 27

The merge selection was based on two search criteria and was generally completed well. Most candidates set the correct criteria on the *Discipline* field but not all set the correct criteria on the *Duration* field. Screenshot evidence of a tick box selection method did not provide evidence that an automated filter had been used.

Question 28

Most candidates merged and printed the vouchers as specified. A small number of candidates provided no evidence of the master document and it was therefore not possible to assess whether mail merge had been used to complete this task. The content, layout and formatting of the vouchers produced must match the master document exactly. If candidates identify an error after merging they should correct the master document, reprint the master document and complete the merge again.

Task 5 – Printing the Evidence Document

Most candidates provided a printout of the Evidence Document. It is essential that candidates print their Evidence Document towards the end of the examination time, regardless of whether they have finished all the questions. They should make sure that their screenshots are large enough for the evidence to be legible and that cropping/resizing has not removed essential evidence.

Task 6 – Presentation

Question 29

Most candidates successfully imported the six slides into presentation software and presented each slide as a title and bulleted list. Most candidates inserted their name, centre number and candidate number as a slide footer. Marks were not awarded where incorrect software had been used such as the .rft file opened, manipulated and printed in word processing software.

Question 30

Very few candidates applied all the formatting features required to display the bullets exactly as shown on the question paper. Most candidates applied a dashed bullet style to the correct three lines of text but few indented these lines or displayed them in a smaller font size with italic enhancement. The bullets were often not aligned consistently to the left and had no space between the bullet and the text. A few candidates re-typed the text rather than formatting the three lines of imported text and in doing so introduced new data entry errors.

Question 31

Most candidates changed the slide to a title and table layout. Candidates who followed the instructions to create the table structure and copy the data into this structure presented the table well and found manipulation of the table easier. Some candidates opened the .csv file and copied and pasted the table onto the slide without creating the table structure first. Either method is acceptable but without the table structure more manipulation is required to resize and position the table and text.

Question 32

Few candidates applied a plain style to the table. In many cases a themed background with shading and colour was used. Those candidates that applied a plain table style were also successful in displaying internal and external gridlines.

Question 33

If a themed table design had been used to create the table, it required more editing from the candidate to achieve the required formatting. Two rows were inserted at the top of the table with varying success. Occasionally these new rows were separated from the table, or text boxes had been used. Entering the text

and formatting the rows so they looked the same as the example on the question paper produced a mixed response. The text entered in the new rows often contained typographical or capitalisation errors. The text was not always displayed in bold and few candidates applied shading to the first two rows. Few candidates managed to centre both horizontally and vertically the text in the first cell, or merge and centre the heading over the three columns. A small number of candidates used separate text boxes for the headings and tried to position these above the columns.

Question 34

Few candidates adjusted the width of the first column so the data displayed on one line. Generally, adjustments were made so the table fitted on the slide with data fully visible.

Question 35

Most candidates printed the presentation with two slides to the page. A few printed the complete presentation as individual slides.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

<div style="border: 1px solid black">

Paper 0983/31

Practical Test

</div>

Key messages

For this examination, the main issues to note are as follows:

- Candidates need a better understanding of the syntax of CSS in a stylesheet.
- Candidates need to understand the importance of following the instructions on the question paper.
- Candidates must ensure that they include their candidate details in the correct place on all printouts.
- Candidates need to take greater care with the accuracy of data entry.
- Candidates need to take greater care with the formatting of the spreadsheet, particularly the setting of row heights and column widths to match both the question and the data or labels contained within the cells.
- Candidates need a better understanding of HTML syntax, particularly in the use of head and body tags.
- Candidates need to be able to use HLOOKUP functions as well as VLOOKUP functions and be able to identify which is the most appropriate function for a task.

General comments

There were significant differences in the range of output from centre to centre and from candidate to candidate within centres. Candidate errors were spread evenly over the sections of the paper.

Candidates must ensure that the text within the markup and spreadsheet printouts is large enough to enable examiners to read the work, without the use of magnification devices.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Most candidates placed the specified files in the correct folder, although not all displayed the folder name in their screenshot evidence. Fewer candidates included all the specified file details, image dimensions were not always added to the folder specifications before the screenshot was taken.

Question 2

Most candidates produced a table with the correct number of rows and columns. A number of candidates set dimensions in pixels instead of percentage values, despite clear instructions to the contrary. A small number of candidates erroneously produced a new table for each row. A significant number of candidates did not hide the table borders.

Question 3

Candidates who included the page title often did so correctly, although a few candidates had text that contained data entry errors.

Question 4

Please note that due to an issue with **Question 4**, for all candidates who sat the practical test, full marks have been awarded for this question to make sure that candidates were not disadvantaged.

Question 5

Most candidates placed the correct images in the correct cells.

Question 6

Please note that due to an issue with **Question 6**, for all candidates who sat the practical test, full marks have been awarded for this question to make sure that candidates were not disadvantaged.

Question 7

Few candidates completed this step as instructed. Most modern web authoring packages insert **alt=""** by default but many candidates left this unchanged or used alt text that did not describe to the user details of the image that was omitted.

Question 8

This was well completed by most candidates but some errors in spelling and capitalisation were seen. Where visible the h2 style was usually correct.

Question 9

The text was usually pasted as specified into cell K but in some cases part of the text was missing. Not all candidates who attempted this set it in paragraph style.

Question 10

The given text, including the candidate details, needed to be exactly as shown in the question and this was not always achieved. The required line breaks and h3 style were usually correctly added.

Question 11

Most candidates created the hyperlink as specified but fewer included the target window attribute in their solution.

Question 12

Most candidates attached the stylesheet as specified. A number of candidates included file paths in their attached stylesheets which would enable them to work on the candidates' computer but not on others with a different file/folder structure. Some, having added the stylesheet correctly, then added extra styles (in the head section or inline) which overrode the stylesheet

Question 13

Some candidates created a new stylesheet rather than updating the supplied stylesheet. Few candidates placed the background elements in the body section of their stylesheet, of those who did, a number did not set the correct background colour as they did not rearrange the colour elements into their RGB components. Some candidates did not use the # symbol to denote a hexadecimal number. Candidates often did not use a single selector thereby increasing the chances of making mistakes when repeating the contents of styles h1, h2 and h3. A significant number of candidates omitted the speech marks around **"San Francisco"**. Few candidates set the CSS to right align their tables within the browser window. Font sizes were frequently set in pixels rather than in points. Most candidates included the stylesheet, browser view of the page (although there were still some submissions in an editor rather than a browser) and HTML. Some screen prints were cropped so that the address bar was not visible. The CSS comment was not always set using/* */.

Question 14

Many candidates completed this as specified, although errors in typing, spacing and alignment were seen in a number of scripts

Question 15

Most candidates formatted the spreadsheet as specified, although the most common error was not centre aligning the contents of all cells. Not all candidates reduced the height of row 2 as shown in the question.

Question 16

This question was performed well by most candidates, although some candidates did not use the csv file (as specified in the question paper) or incorrectly specifying the lookup range.

Question 17

This question was performed well by most candidates, although some candidates did not use the csv file (as specified in the question paper) or incorrectly specifying the lookup range.

Question 18

Many candidates attempted this question using a VLOOKUP rather than a HLOOKUP function. This incorrect selection of the function led to errors in the resulting returns. A significant number of candidates found solutions that worked for all eventualities, but few of these were replicable formulae. Not many candidates managed to generate a blank cell if the HLOOKUP generated no data.

Question 19

This was completed well by almost all candidates, but row and column headings were often omitted and formulae were sometimes not fully visible.

Question 20

This question was completed well by almost all candidates and often fully correct. The reduction in the height of row 2 was not always clearly visible.

Question 21

Most candidates completed this modelling task as specified.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

> **Paper 0983/32**
> **Practical Test**

Key messages

For this examination, the main issues to note are as follows:

- Candidates need a better understanding of the syntax of CSS in a stylesheet.
- Candidates need to understand the importance of following the instructions on the question paper.
- Candidates need to understand the difference between cropping and resizing an image.
- Candidates must ensure that they include their candidate details in the correct place on all printouts.
- Candidates need to take greater care with the accuracy of data entry.
- Candidates need to take greater care with the formatting of the spreadsheet, particularly the setting of row heights and column widths to match both the question and the data or labels contained within the cells.
- Candidates need a better understanding of HTML syntax, particularly in the use of head and body tags.
- Candidates need to be able to use HLOOKUP functions as well as VLOOKUP functions and be able to identify which is the most appropriate function for a task.

General comments

There were significant differences in the range of output from centre to centre and from candidate to candidate within centres. Candidate errors were spread evenly over the sections of the paper.

Candidates must ensure that the text within the markup and spreadsheet printouts is large enough to enable Examiners to read the work, without the use of magnification devices.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Most candidates placed the specified files in the correct folder, although not all displayed the folder name in their screenshot evidence. Fewer candidates included all the specified file details, image dimensions were not always added to the folder specifications before the screenshot was taken. A significant number of candidates resized the image of the diver rather than cropping it, most completing this to the specified sizes, although not all as an image with portrait orientation (as specified by the 1600 pixels wide by 3000 pixels high. Several candidates did not save the image in the specified file format.

Question 2

Most candidates produced a table with the correct number of rows and columns. A number of candidates set dimensions in pixels instead of percentage values, despite clear instructions to the contrary. A small number of candidates erroneously produced a new table for each row. A small number of candidates collapsed the cell borders, presumably in their attempt to hide them. A significant number of candidates did not hide the table borders.

Question 3

Most candidates placed the correct images in the correct cells.

Question 4

Please note that due to an issue with **Question 4**, for all candidates who sat the practical test, full marks have been awarded for this question to make sure that candidates were not disadvantaged.

Question 5

This was completed by most candidates but some errors in spelling and capitalisation were seen. Where visible the h1 style was usually correct.

Question 6

This was completed by most candidates but some errors in spelling and capitalisation were seen. A significant number of candidates did not display the text from the source file as three paragraphs using either <h2>and </h2> tags or using <br> tags. A small number of candidates repeated wording from previous papers rather than the wording given in the question paper. Where visible the h2 style was usually correct although a number of candidates overwrote style h2 with style p.

Question 7

Most candidates attached the stylesheet as specified. A number of candidates included file paths in their attached stylesheets which would enable them to work on the candidates' computer but not on others with a different file/folder structure. Some, having added the stylesheet correctly, then added extra styles (in the head section or inline) which overrode the stylesheet.

Question 8

Some candidates created a new stylesheet rather than updating the supplied stylesheet. Few candidates placed the background elements in the body section of their stylesheet, of those who did, a number did not set the correct background colour as they did not rearrange the colour elements into their RGB components. Some candidates did not use the # symbol to denote a hexadecimal number. Candidates often did not use a single selector thereby increasing the chances of making mistakes when repeating the contents of styles h1 and h2. Some candidates added the text colour as black rather than using the hexadecimal codes required by the question paper. A significant number of candidates omitted the speech marks around "Domino Regular", several candidates had case errors in this text. The CSS comment was not always set using /* */. This comment was not always placed at the start of the stylesheet. Margins were seldom completed as specified in the question paper, with some candidates setting text alignment rather than table alignment. Most candidates included the stylesheet, browser view of the page (although there were still some submissions in an editor rather than a browser) and HTML. Some screen prints were cropped so that the address bar was not visible.

Question 9

Most candidates added the correct text, placed on the right in the header.

Question 10

Most candidates formatted the spreadsheet as specified, although the most common error was not centre aligning the contents of all light blue cells both vertically and horizontally. Not all candidates reduced the height of rows 2, 7 and 12 as shown in the question. A significant number of candidates left the cells in column A (that were not part of a merged cell) left aligned rather than right aligning them as shown in the diagram. Almost all candidates formatted the merged cells as specified.

Question 11

This question was performed well by many candidates, although some candidates did not use the csv file for the camera (as specified in the question paper) or incorrectly specified the lookup range (to include labels as well as the data).

Question 12

This question was performed well by many candidates, although some candidates did not use the csv file for the camera (as specified in the question paper) or incorrectly specified the lookup range (to include labels as well as the data).

Question 13

This question was performed well by many candidates, although some candidates did not use the csv file for the housing (as specified in the question paper) or incorrectly specified the lookup range (to include labels as well as the data).

Question 14

This question was performed well by many candidates, although some candidates did not use the csv file for the housing (as specified in the question paper) or incorrectly specified the lookup range (to include labels as well as the data).

Question 15

This question was performed well by most candidates, although some candidates, rather than using the sum function as =SUM(B6,B11) erroneously set this as a range of cells, for example: =SUM(B6:B11). A number of candidates incorrectly used the sum function with =SUM(B6+B11)

Question 16

Many candidates entered numeric values into their formulae rather than referencing cells in the discount table. Of the candidates attempting this with nested IF functions, many attained the correct outcomes, but some did not apply these functions logically, either working lowest to highest or vice-versa, and started in the middle meaning that their solution only worked for some data but not all.

Question 17

This was completed well by almost all candidates.

Question 18

Many candidates reversed the two data items subtracting the package price from the discount amount, hence attaining a negative cost for both camera and housing. A significant number of candidates did complete this as specified.

Question 19

Many candidates incorrectly tested the codes for the camera and housing matched each other, rather than looking up the camera code in the housing table. Many candidates attempted an error message, but this did not inform the user what the error/issue was with their selection. Many of the stronger candidates completed this question well.

Question 20

This question was completed well by most all candidates and often fully correct. There were cases where the specified currency was not used (£ sterling) for the numeric values and other candidates had not set the percentage value to display as specified, often setting this as currency as well.

Question 21

Most candidates completed this task as specified although not all cells were fully visible in some candidates' submissions. Where candidates did not display the formulae in full, Examiners were unable to award a number of marks for the elements of the formulae that were not visible.

Question 22

Most candidates completed this task as specified, although some candidates omitted some of the required cells from their printouts (often columns C onwards) or printed this on two pages.

Question 21

Most candidates completed this modelling task as specified.