INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0417/11
Written Paper

Key Messages

Questions requiring simple and straightforward answers were done fairly well, while the answers to more stretching questions needed to contain more explanation or discussion.

Questions inviting the candidate to discuss advantages or disadvantages require comparisons to be made. Candidates need to spend time reading a question thoroughly so that they are quite sure what is required.

General Comments

A perpetuating issue is the use of brand names in answers. It is clearly stated on the front page of the exam paper 'No marks will be awarded for using brand names of software packages or hardware.'

Some questions which required choosing from a list such as **Questions 1**, and **5** were answered very well as were the multi-choice questions. When answering other questions it may be advisable for candidates to list their thoughts in rough before choosing those that would be appropriate to match the phrasing of the question.

Surprisingly, different aspects of social networking sites did not seem to be the strength of a number of candidates.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

A lot of candidates found part **(a)** most difficult.

(a)   A minority of candidates confused storage devices with input devices and types of storage were given in this part.

(b)   Virtually all candidates gained both marks.

(c)   Again, virtually all candidates gained both marks.

Question 2

This was generally very well answered. Any incorrect answers tended to be evenly distributed amongst the options.

Question 3

This was not as well answered as expected, a number of candidates having difficulty with this question. There were quite a few candidates giving answers that indicated that they did not know a great deal about the different types of printers and their properties.

Question 4

Although better answered than **Question 3**, there were a number of candidates who gave at least two incorrect answers.

Question 5

Part **(a)** was not well answered with several candidates giving MICR as their answer.

Part **(b)** There were some answers which suggested candidates did not understand the topic with many giving OCR or Serial for their answer.

Part **(c)** was the best answered part.

Question 6

This question was very well answered with the majority of candidates gaining full marks.

Question 7

This question was not well answered, in general, though candidates gained at least two marks for part **(a)**. Part **(b)** produced some very weak answers.

(a)   Candidates did well on this question with the majority of candidates gaining at least two marks. The most commonly occurring incorrect response was body sensor.

(b)   This was poorly answered in the main, with most candidates failing to gain more than one mark. This continues to be a part of the syllabus that candidates seem ill-prepared for.

Question 8

Candidates did manage to gain some marks for this question. They did well on part **(a)**, less well on part **(b)** and surprisingly not very well on parts **(c)** and **(d)**.

(a)   This was well answered with many candidates gaining at least three marks. The incorrect answers were evenly spread amongst the other answers apart from planning the validation routines which was invariably correctly identified as Design.

(b)   Surprisingly, one in six candidates failed to attempt this question. Of the candidates who made an attempt most gained three marks for naming three different methods of implementation, though only the more able candidates went on to gain marks for good descriptions.

(c)   A similar number to those in part **(b)** made no attempt to answer the question. Of those that did make an attempt not many candidates were able to gain marks other than the most able. This was surprising as questions on this topic are asked regularly and on this occasion candidates were only required to name the items.

(d)   There was a disappointing response from candidates as almost one quarter of candidates failed to make any attempt to answer this question. Of those that made an attempt only the more able gained any marks and this was quite often limited to one mark.

Question 9

This question was not particularly well answered although most candidates managed to gain some marks. Parts **(b)** and **(c)** tended to be answered a little better than **(a)** and **(d)**.

(a)   Many candidates confused this with a question on validation. When candidates gave visual verification for their answer most failed to go on to describe it. Double data entry descriptions were more often described well enough for two marks.

(b)   Although better answered, a number of candidates gave very vague descriptions without mentioning the actual formula. The more able candidates scored highly.

(c) Most candidates were able to gain at least one mark for this question though few candidates gained full marks. A lot of answers gave imprecise descriptions.

(d) Not very well answered. This is a standard question on a topic that is regularly assessed on this paper. Few candidates gained 2 marks. Too many candidates gave one word answers such as easier, faster, more accurate without explaining what they meant.

Question 10

This question was very well answered with virtually all candidates gaining at least three marks. Incorrect answers were evenly distributed amongst the various options.

Question 11

This question was not well answered. Many candidates gained at least one mark for part **(b)** but seemed to struggle with part **(a)**

(a) A lot of candidates appeared confused by what Spam actually is. There were a lot of answers based on Phishing or viruses.

(b) Another area that candidates appeared to be not that well informed. There were a lot of answers which failed to describe phishing or pharming well enough to gain marks.

Question 12

Candidates had mixed fortunes with this question. Most did very well on part **(b)**, quite well on parts **(a)** and **(c)** but not very well at all on part **(d)**

(a) Reasonably well answered with the vast majority of candidates gaining at least one mark, many candidates missed the point that this would only be a network of three computers.

(b) Generally very well answered with the vast majority of candidates gaining at least two marks.

(c) Most candidates gained a mark for describing a form of removable storage medium. Very few were able to gain the second mark by describing the other mark points for this question.

(d) Many candidates failed to score highly as they were not detailed enough in their descriptions. A number mentioned biometrics but then failed to describe any of them. There appears to be a misunderstanding of how a Chip and Pin system works with a transaction.

Question 13

This question was reasonably well answered with many candidates gaining at least half marks. Candidates tended to do substantially better on part **(a)** rather than part **(b)**.

(a) A number of candidates did not mention rent or rental in their field name for costs and so failed to gain credit. Even the weaker candidates managed to gain two marks with the most candidates gaining four or more.

(b) Very few candidates gained full marks. Quite a few managed to suggest creating a query and searching the correct field name for <3. Very few were able to gain other marks failing to detail the design of the report. Brand names were frequently mentioned.

Question 14

A lot of candidates made a reasonable attempt at this question although very few managed more than 3 points in their answer. There were a lot of vague answers with candidates failing to add a single important word to their answer to gain that mark point. Candidates need to ensure that their discussion is balanced covering both positive and negative aspects.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

| Paper 0417/12 |
| Written Paper |

Key Messages

Questions requiring simple and straightforward answers were done well, while the answers to more stretching questions needed to contain more explanation or discussion.

Questions inviting the candidate to discuss advantages or disadvantages require comparisons to be made.

Candidates need to spend time reading a question thoroughly so that they are quite sure what is required.

General Comments

One worrying issue was once again the use of brand names in answers. This was the case particularly on **Questions 12** and **14a**. It is clearly stated on the front page of the exam paper 'No marks will be awarded for using brand names of software packages or hardware.'

Some questions which required choosing from a list such as **Question 5** were answered very well as were the tick box questions of 2, 3, 4, 7a and 13. This approach to answering other questions may be advisable where candidates could list their thoughts in rough before choosing those that would be appropriate to match the phrasing of the question.

There still appeared to be a degree of rote-learned answers from previous years' mark schemes. Rote-learning mark schemes is strongly advised against as, although questions might cover a similar topic, the questions themselves might change considerably. This was particularly the case with **Question 10** where some candidates answered for the advantages and disadvantages of using robots rather than the number of jobs available.

In this paper candidates are required to show a level of understanding as well as knowledge. As has been highlighted in previous reports, this cannot be achieved by simply repeating mark points from previous mark schemes.

Candidates must read questions carefully before answering. This was particularly the case with **Question 12** requiring a description of the process yet many candidates just described the contents. Also that question stated that the results were already stored in a spreadsheet but many wrote about how they could be entered in a spreadsheet.

Question 15 indicated that many candidates not only had not read the question carefully enough, but had also just written down answers that they had rote learnt about the creation of expert systems.

Question 14b asked for data types yet some gave examples of data.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

The vast majority of candidates answered well though part **(b)** was not as well answered as the parts **(a)** and **(c)**.

(a)   Generally well answered though some candidates answered with output or storage devices rather than input devices.

(b)   A significant proportion of candidates failed to secure both marks as USB stick and Pen drive were often cited. Hard disk (drive) was the most popular response. Some candidates failed to give devices, giving media instead.

(c)   The vast majority scored well, referring to a wide range of valid output devices.

Question 2

There was good understanding of methods of implementation and very many candidates achieved full marks. Direct changeover was the most frequently misunderstood method. The minority of candidates who did not gain full marks tended to get the first two ticks correct then the last two incorrect.

Question 3

Another high scoring question and many candidates gained full marks. The final two activities were the most common sources of errors for those candidates who did not achieve full marks.

Question 4

This proved more challenging than the previous 2 two multi-choice questions and a significant number, including strong candidates, dropped one or two of the available marks. The "List of variables" and "The purpose of the system" caused the greatest difficulty to these candidates.

Question 5

Candidates did well on this question though, they found part **(b)** slightly easier than part **(c)** which in turn elicited more correct answers than part **(a)**.

(a)   Most candidates gave the correct answer though, for those who did not, a common error was writing down OMR.

(b)   The vast majority of candidates gave the correct answer though, for those who did not, a common error was writing down keyboard.

(c)   A large majority of candidates gave the correct answer though, for those who did not, a common error was writing down PIN pad.

Question 6

Candidates did very well on this question.

(a)   The vast majority of candidates had a clear understanding and gave the correct answer. The most common omission/ambiguity related to the position of the missing instruction. On a practical level candidates should be encouraged to ensure that their full answer is contained in the answer space rather than relying on putting part of their answer within the question material.

(b)   Generally this question was answered accurately with many candidates commendably achieving full marks. Generally well answered but some candidates entered incorrect numbering and others mixed up the last two instructions.

Question 7

This question was not well answered, with part **(a)** producing better answers than part **(b)**.

(a)   Many candidates were able to identify at least two of the correct sensors. Detergent, wind speed and height sensors were the most frequently incorrect answers.

(b)   Many candidates failed to achieve full marks here as incorrect sensors were cited. It is apparent that washing machines, and how they operate, are not fully understood as wind speed, height and detergent sensors were often described. The errors in **Question 7a** then lead to a loss of marks in

the explanation. Some candidates tended to forget to include the microprocessor and just comment on the heater being turned on or off.

Some common misconceptions were sensors controlling outputs, sensors having pre-set values, sensors making decisions. Marks were also lost by failing to identify the output, candidates would describe water getting 'hotter' instead of the heating element switched ON, or, 'water added' instead of water valve opened.

Question 8

This question was not particularly well answered. The main marks were given for "do not need a pin" in speed of transaction and do not need to remember a pin. Others assumed you could hold the contactless card quite a way from the reader and it would work rather than having to be fairly close.

Many candidates were able to describe the process as easier/faster, but often did not qualify this advantage. Candidates struggled to give specifics and expand their answers. Some talked in a wider sense about safer than cash, rather than comparing the two payment methods. Few referenced the lack of need to contact the bank, or demonstrated an understanding of how most contactless systems work. A significant number compared "chip" cards and "pin" cards.

Candidates need to ensure that their discussion is balanced covering both positive and negative aspects.

Question 9

The majority of candidates managed to gain at least two marks for this question but this was usually on part **(a)**. Very few candidates gained marks on part **(b)**.

(a)   Many candidates experienced problems identifying the component parts of a vertical look up table. Many correctly identified the lookup value and search range – but the remaining marks were not often gained. Some candidates failed to use the example in their answer.

(b)   This question was not that well answered and some candidates showed a lack of understanding. For those that did gain marks, the lack of 'false' was a popular response as was 'exact match'. Sort was not usually covered and few achieved marks for David being returned. Very few candidates identified the need to sort the data for the existing formula to work. Candidates often failed to notice that the first four items were sorted.

Question 10

Many candidates managed to gain at least two marks for this question. The question asked for specific examples but a number of candidates, however, made weak generalised comments about 'computers and machines are making people redundant', 'people to run the website'.

Many candidates described advantages and disadvantages of robots as has been asked in a previous paper.

Many candidates talked about machines and workers, but were not specific as to the job description and the reason. Many answers seemed to apply more to the industrial revolution rather than the information revolution – candidates frequently appeared to think that all machines are computer controlled.

Question 11

The majority of candidates gained at least three marks for this question. However, many failed to read the question properly and gave answers which would not be found in a network of just three computers, giving answers which would be more suitable for a large School network. Where candidates correctly named three or four items they often failed to provide a use in sufficient detail to gain the extra mark.

Question 12

This proved difficult for many candidates as they failed to read the question properly and explained at length what they would put in the newspaper rather than how they would do it. Most candidates did not consider the web authoring package. Technical terms were lacking in some instances – put the images, get the

photos and so on. A lot of candidates lost marks because they missed the fact that it was for a website. The more able candidates were able to gain many marks on this question.

There were some very weak and generalised answers. Many used software brand names instead of software types. The question mentions the results will be stored in a spreadsheet – yet many candidates wrote about how the results would be stored or imported into a database and reports created. A number of wrong answers simply described what the report should look like rather than how it would be produced.

Question 13

This question was well answered with the vast majority gaining at least two of the three marks with many gaining all three. The most popular wrong answer was 'Cost of lighting and electricity will be higher'.

Question 14

This question was quite well answered with the majority of candidates gaining at least half marks. Part **(b)** was the most well answered part with part **(d)** being well answered by most candidates with **(c)** and **(a)** less so.

(a)   A surprising number of candidates did not attempt this question. Many of those who did attempt it failed to identify the correct file extension and many used longhand such as rich text format instead of .rtf. Many candidates gave brand names or spreadsheet/database as incorrect answers.

(b)   The vast majority of candidates gained at least four marks. Some candidates did not give data types but example data.

(c)   Candidates did not do as well as expected. "Student_Id" and "joined_the_school" were provided as correct responses by a number of candidates without describing how the format check would work. A sizeable minority thought the maths test score was correct. The 2nd mark for each was rarely awarded apart from the check that two letters would be followed by six digits.

(d)   Most candidates scored at least three marks. The candidates who lost the most marks were those that designed the Screen input form for several candidates on one form rather than the individual candidate Screen Input Form as requested in the question. Most candidates gained the marks for field names but some put in extra unnecessary fields.

Question 15

Candidates did not do as well as expected, with only the more able achieving more than half marks.
The question is about testing, but a number of candidates focused upon analysis or evaluation. Those who were successful focused on module testing with normal, extreme, abnormal and live data.

Question 16

This question was not very well answered with even part **(b)** producing weak answers.

(a)   Many candidates did not answer the question in that they wrote about creating, not using, an expert system. Most candidates failed to use the question scenario in their answers. Candidates appeared unfamiliar with the topic and where marks were awarded they tended to be for the inference engine searching the knowledge base. Few higher end marks were awarded.

(b)   Part **(b)** was surprisingly not well answered with too many candidates not applying their answers to "diagnosis". "Tax" and "chess games" were frequently seen.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

| Paper 0417/13 |
| Written Paper |

Key Messages

Questions requiring simple and straightforward answers were done well, while the answers to more stretching questions needed to contain more explanation or discussion or more detailed descriptions.

Questions inviting the candidate to discuss advantages and disadvantages require comparisons to be made and both sides of the argument need to be given.

Candidates need to spend time reading a question thoroughly so that they are quite sure what is required.

General Comments

Yet again the issue of brand names used in answers arose. It is clearly stated on the front page of the exam paper 'No marks will be awarded for using brand names of software packages or hardware.' Examples could be found in **Question 3**.

Some questions which required choosing from a list such as **Questions 2, 4** and **5** were answered very well. Most candidates seem to find it easier to choose from a list. In extended text questions candidates could list their thoughts in rough before choosing those that would be appropriate to match the phrasing of the question.

Candidates must read questions carefully before answering. This was particularly the case with **Question 8** where some candidates failed to give both parts of the answer.

With **Question 16a** candidates did not concentrate sufficiently on the processing involved.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

The vast majority of candidates answered well, though parts **(b)** and **(c)** were not as well answered as part **(a)**.

(a) Generally well answered question which enabled the majority of candidates to achieve both marks. Some weaker candidates answered keypad for one of the input devices.

(b) Not as well answered as expected with Pen drive often given as answers as well as answers such as gallery, file apps.

c) Many candidates gained two of the three marks mentioning text messages and email but often suggesting going on the website for the third answer without saying how that would be contacting the bank.

Question 2

This was generally very well answered with most candidates gaining three or four marks. The fourth line produced the most incorrect answers.

Question 3

The vast majority of candidates gained at least two marks, with many gaining three or four. Most could give the examples but where marks were lost, it was for not defining the term properly. Many would write 'things you can touch' but did not indicate that these would be connected or were part of the computer.

The examples of software were frequently brand names and as such could not be given credit.

Question 4

This was not answered very well. Candidates seem to struggle with the concepts of verification and validation. Even the stronger candidates tended to gain three of the four marks, with many of the other candidates tending to get just two correct answers and the weakest just one. The first and third points tended to elicit most incorrect answers.

Question 5

Candidates did well on this question though they found part **(c)** easier than parts **(a)** and **(b)**.

(a) Many candidates gave the correct answer though, for those who did not, a common error was writing down batch.

(b) Many candidates gave the correct answer though, for those who did not, there was no common error with a selection of incorrect answers being given.

(c) A large majority of candidates gave the correct answer though, for those who did not, a common error was the response 'spreadsheet'.

Question 6

This question was not as well answered as expected with even the higher ability candidates tending only to gain one mark. Responses which related to current ICT features or functions lacked depth and understanding. It is recommended that candidates keep up-to-date with developments in ICT. Again many brand names of social network sites, VoIP providers were present.

Question 7

This question, again, did not elicit the responses expected. Many candidates struggled to get half marks. The vast majority of candidates did not answer the main part of the question which was to explain the differences, but instead just listed examples, thereby limiting the number of marks available.

Question 8

This was very well answered with part **(a)** being answered slightly better than part **(b)**.

(a) Candidates did quite well on this question with the vast majority of candidates gaining the mark. Of those that did not, some gave the incorrect instruction without giving the correct instruction or vice versa. A minority of candidates, despite being told the first two instructions were correct insisted on giving LEFT 90 as their answer.

(b) The more able candidates did just as well on this part as part **(a)** but the weaker candidates tended to get the first instruction correct but then seemed to lose their way.

Question 9

This question was fairly well answered with most candidates gaining at least three of the marks available. Part **(a)** produced better answers than part **(b)** particularly with the weaker candidates.

(a) Candidates did reasonably well on this question most gaining at least two marks. However, incorrect answers such as heat sensor and thermometer were often given as a response, as well as sensor on its own. Many candidates lost marks by not describing the use in sufficient detail.

(b)   This part was not so well answered with many candidates failing to give the detail required. A number referred to air conditioning systems rather than central heating systems.

Question 10

This question was not well answered with only the more able candidates gaining more than one mark. Approximately one tenth of candidates did not attempt the question.

Many candidates struggled to describe the role of a proxy server. There appeared to be a lack of technical knowledge and understanding from many candidates. Many candidates were preoccupied with the ability of the proxy server to hide your identity rather than its other functions.

Question 11

This question was reasonably well answered. Most candidates gained a higher proportion of the marks for part **(b)** than part **(a)**

(a)   Many candidates struggled to describe the three features, but were able to give examples. A number of candidates confused the terms and gave reasonable descriptions but in the wrong answer space.

(b)   Most candidates gained at least one mark, usually by referring to unique data.

Question 12

Candidates did quite well on this question. Most did very well on part **(b)** and quite well on part **(a)**.

(a)   This question was answered well by the candidates with many gaining at least half marks. A number of candidates, however, appeared to mix up Format check with Type check.

(b)   The vast majority of candidates gained both marks.

Question 13

This question was not particularly well answered with many candidates failing to gain marks for part **(b)**. A sizeable number did not attempt either part **(a)** or part **(b)**.

(a)   This was better answered than part **(b)** with many candidates gaining at least half marks. A number of candidates did not appear to have any understanding of the function, with many saying that cells in the range A1:A6 would be added.

(b)   This was not well answered with many candidates failing to get even one mark. Worryingly, many failed to see that there was anything wrong with the formula and those that did attempted to give a similarly illogical test instead.

Question 14

Most candidates gained marks on this question though doing better with part **(a)** than part **(b)**

(a)   Most candidates gained at least half marks, usually for using examples and, in addition, giving at least one reason for why biometrics are more secure.

(b)   Candidates struggled to gain even one mark. Those that did gave cost of equipment but few seemed to be able to come up with alternative answers with many just repeating their part **(a)** answers.

Question 15

Candidates did not do as well as expected, with only the more able candidates gaining two or more marks. The most common correct answers related to safety, security and strength of signal but there were few other answers.

Candidates need to ensure that their discussion is balanced covering both positive and negative aspects.

Question 16

This question was not as well answered as others but candidates managed to gain marks, particularly on part **(b)**.

(a)   This was not well answered with most candidates struggling to gain more than one mark. Many candidates did not seem to understand what processing is. Most candidates focused on the inputting of data and the actions of the user, rather than processing and outputs of the system.

(b)   The vast majority of candidates gained at least two marks though some gave online banking and online shopping as answers.

Question 17

This question was well answered with very few candidates failing to gain less than four marks. Where candidates failed to gain more marks it was because they struggled to give a suitable use of the features.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0417/21

Practical Test A

Key messages

Candidates are reminded that printouts will not be marked if their names and details are missing, or if their name and details are written on by hand. However, if a question paper only asks for partial details such as candidate number and Centre number in a header or footer, then candidates should not worry as these details will be sufficient to identify their work as their own. Similarly, documents that extend to more than one page such as a report with name at top or bottom, will be treated as complete if the details only appear on the first or second page (of course, candidates would do well to be encouraged to place their personal details in a page header or footer instead of a report header or footer so that they appear on all pages). Supervisors should leave the decision to mark such materials to the Examiner and not pre-empt the decision by refusing to return such materials to candidates where they clearly form part of a single document. Many marks can be lost because of missing candidate details.

Candidates are advised to check and recheck their text and data entry in the document, report, presentation and email, as many marks were lost because of:

- Incorrect capitalisation
- Character or words missing or extras added
- Omission of spaces
- Omission of the full stop at the end of a sentence.

Marks were lost in all sections of the question paper, because candidates did not show they understood the difference between:

- Serif and sans serif fonts
- Portrait and landscape orientation
- Left and right with alignment to margins.

Candidates should be able to read their own screenshots, as marks may be lost if these are illegible. Many marks were lost because screenshots did not display the required information: document page size and margins must be shown in a screenshot of the relevant page setup window; database field names and types must be show with a screenshot of the database table design and email folders, contacts and messages must be shown from within the email mailbox.

General Comments

The majority of the candidates were able to attempt all the tasks on the paper, although almost every candidate made some errors, some of them very minor. There were two tasks that proved more difficult for many candidates. Firstly, there was the database work, both the report and the extract in the document. Secondly, many candidates were not able to accomplish the creation of a master slide in the presentation. Some candidates did not print, for example, the edited document after producing a clear record of working on it. Perhaps a good strategy would be to advise candidates to read through the paper at an early stage of the examination and highlight points at which saving and printing are required. Overall, the paper is very good at testing the skills of candidates and enabling those with excellent skills to show their ability whilst allowing the less able candidates to score some marks. Overall performance was good, with some candidates scoring very high marks. Marks ranged from candidates who scored in the 70s to some who scored less than 10. Many candidates lost marks for careless mistakes; typing errors, all details not being visible or not doing exactly what was asked on the paper.

Document editing

Steps 3 to 28.   At step 3, the document was to be saved in the format of the software being used. That is, it should no longer be in rich text format.

Steps 4 and 5.

Some candidates did not provide screenshots showing A4 page size and/or margins. On some documents the actual margins were noticeably different from those on the screenshot but this was not marked here.

Step 6.

The logo image was usually resized and placed accurately in the page header.

Step 7.

In the footer, the filename and its full path were expected to be displayed aligned to the left margin. Name and candidate number were required to be displayed at the right margin. It was here that some candidate concerns were raised that the full candidate details including Centre number were not requested. Candidates may be reassured that as this was the requirement of the paper, then no more was needed. However, if candidates did also supply their Centre number to be on the safe side, they were not penalised for the additional information.

Steps 8 to 12.

For the title and subtitle many candidates entered the correct text and applied formatting to it correctly, although a significant number used incorrect capitalisation and/or did not use the specified font, in this instance a serif font.

Steps 13 and 14.

Some candidates used serif, not sans serif font or did not set the correct font to all the body text. Most candidates used single line spacing and justification as specified.

Most candidates changed the page layout correctly into multiple columns from the subheading onwards. Some did not set multiple columns, some did not applied to all subsequent text and some changed the layout after the subheading.

Step 15.

The subheadings were usually all identified and often formatted correctly, but sometimes there would be one or more missed or some would be formatted incorrectly in a sans-serif font or inconsistently.

Steps 16 to 23.

The table was usually created in the correct place and kept within the column margins. The text was entered with relatively few errors. Specified formatting was applied to the text, often with minimal errors. The second row was to be right aligned and with text wrapped. Errors identified included text slit onto two lines on rows 3 to 8 and the printing of gridlines.

Steps 24 to 26.

Bullets were usually applied to all the designated text, but the list was not always sorted or the bullet point indented the correct amount as specified.

Step 27.

Finding and replacing the word was mostly well done. Some, of course did not make the replacement at all.

Database structure and report

Steps 29 and 30.

The database field structure was usually well executed. Some candidates could not set currency with a £ pound sign and used other currency symbols instead. Date format was to be set as day, month year, and imported in this format, with the month displayed as three letters in short format, i.e. dd-mmm-yy. Importing in the format month, day, year sometimes produced import errors or blank field contents. Most candidates set the Yes/No/Boolean field correctly

Steps 31 and 32.

The new records were usually added correctly, but errors often occurred in the format of the telephone numbers, or, if the numerical fields had been set to integer format, the decimal values were not shown.

Step 33.

If the search was successfully made to include Cornwall, the deletion of the specified record could be confirmed.

Steps 36 and 36.

The query on which the report was based was usually well constructed when available. It involved a new field to be calculated at runtime. There were errors in selection criteria, excluding some of the locations, or selecting additional fish species, or not only night fishing locations.

In the report itself, the layout was to be landscape with specified fields in a certain order. The whole report was to be made to appear on a single page (a departure from the usual specification to fit a page wide).

The report was usually given its specified title, and candidate details were usually set to appear at the top of the report.

Steps 37 and 38.

Selection criteria needed wildcards for the search on *London*. A number of candidates only selected *OXON* as a location and some missed one or more of the *London* locations. If only *OXON* was selected then the two key sort could not be verified. The runtime calculation for this report was to calculate the average cost of the season permit. Labels and the heading were usually displayed accurately.

Steps 39 and 41.

A third report extracted from the database records was to be integrated in the document. The selections and sorting was often well done with the specified field displayed in the correct order.

When available, the extract was often well integrated into the document.

Steps 42 and 43.

Candidates had the opportunity to review (proof read) the overall layout and consistency of spacing in their document and many checked for this consistency before printing their document. There were fewer widows/orphans, split lists, etc. than usual. Some documents had large spaces, though sometimes these were necessary to prevent splits. There were some instances where the tops of columns were not level.

Presentation

Steps 44 to 54. The Master slide was not created very well, though some candidates achieved full marks. Although many inserted the various elements, these were not necessarily displayed on every slide (slide 1 was often missing some or all of the elements). In some cases the elements had been inserted manually on different slides, so they were in different positions on the slides. The master slide text was frequently missing or, if present, incorrectly formatted. The formatting of the first level bullets on the master slide with a specific bullet symbol and italicised text was frequently missed.

Most candidates did import the requisite slides, but some omitted the bullets or had not formatted them correctly on the slide master.

Step 46.

Most candidates did change the slide 1 layout to heading and subheading, centred on the slide. Sometimes the subheading retained its bulleted format.

Step 47.

Presenter notes were not well understood and, if present, were sometimes placed on the slide. Printing the slide with its presenter notes visible was an unfamiliar task.

Steps 48 to 50.

The image was often present, but not always placed to the left of the bullets. It was also frequently not flipped horizontally.

Step 51.

The relevant slide was almost always deleted.

Step 52.

There were two spelling errors to be identified and corrected.

Steps 53 and 54.

Printing the slides, four to a page was usually well done. The presenter notes view as noted above was less frequently done well.

Step 55.

The evidence document provided screenshot evidence for page size and margin settings as well as the database structure. The prints from some Centres were very faint again and so poor as to be hardly visible even with the aid of a magnifying glass. Centres must advise candidates to check that screen prints are of a size which is legible, otherwise they risk losing marks.

Administration Issues

Most Centres seem to have understood the message NOT to use staples to keep pages together, however some Centres still persist in using string to tie pages in the Assessment Record Folder – this can potentially obscure text with the punch holes.

They should also encourage the use of suitable plain fonts for what are, in effect, business documents rather than candidates wasting time searching for "fancy" fonts which do very little to enhance the document.

It was noted that the majority of the candidates seem to be taking on board the requirement to produce documents **as requested on the question paper** and not to waste time with embellishments - as such there were many who gained high marks. At the other end of the scale there were some who had marks of 20 or under.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0417/22

Practical Test A

Key messages

Candidates are reminded that printouts will not be marked if their names and details are missing, or if their name and details are written on by hand. However, if a question paper only asks for partial details such as candidate number and Centre number in a header or footer, then candidates should not worry as these details will be sufficient to identify their work as their own. Similarly, documents that extend to more than one page such as a report with name at top or bottom, will be treated as complete if the details only appear on the first or second page (of course, candidates would do well to be encouraged to place their personal details in a page header or footer instead of a report header or footer so that they appear on all pages). Supervisors should leave the decision to mark such materials to the Examiner and not pre-empt the decision by refusing to return such materials to candidates where they clearly form part of a single document. Many marks can be lost because of missing candidate details.

Candidates are advised to check and recheck their text and data entry in the document, report, presentation and email, as many marks were lost because of:

- Incorrect capitalisation
- Character or words missing or extras added
- Omission of spaces
- Omission of the full stop at the end of a sentence.

Marks were lost in all sections of the question paper, because candidates did not show they understood the difference between:

- Serif and sans serif fonts
- Portrait and landscape orientation
- Left and right with alignment to margins.

Candidates should be able to read their own screenshots, as marks may be lost if these are illegible. Many marks were lost because screenshots did not display the required information: document page size and margins must be shown in a screenshot of the relevant page setup window; database field names and types must be show with a screenshot of the database table design and email folders, contacts and messages must be shown from within the email mailbox.

General Comments

The majority of the candidates were able to attempt all the tasks on the paper, although almost every candidate made some errors, some of them very minor. There were two tasks that proved more difficult for many candidates. Firstly, there was the database report. Secondly, many candidates were not able to accomplish the creation of a master slide in the presentation. Some candidates did not print, for example, the edited document after producing a clear record of working on it. Perhaps a good strategy would be to advise candidates to read through the paper at an early stage of the examination and highlight points at which saving and printing are required. Overall, the paper is very good at testing the skills of candidates and enabling those with excellent skills to show their ability whilst allowing the less able candidates to score some marks. Overall performance was good, with some candidates scoring very high marks. Marks ranged from candidates who scored in the 70s to some who scored less than 10. Many candidates lost marks for careless mistakes; typing errors, all details not being visible, or not doing exactly what was asked on the paper.

Document editing

Step 3   The document was to be saved in the format of the software being used; that is, it should no longer be in rich text format.

Steps 4 and 5   A number of candidates who did provide a screenshot provided one that did not show A4 paper size. Some did not give screenshot evidence of margin settings. On some documents the actual margins were different from those on the screenshot. Marking was only concerned with the screenshot evidence.

Step 6   The majority of the candidates showed the header/footer correctly, with most errors being in the lack of right alignment. Many candidates did not give the full path with the filename.

Steps 7 to 11   The text entry (Title and sub-title) was accurate for the majority of scripts, and so was the overall formatting. Most errors were in selection of a sans-serif font, or data entry errors in capitalisation.

Step 12   Most candidates applied the correct column space of 1 cm to three column layout of the body text, but some reverted to one column on page 1 or later in the document. A few did not set columns at all. Occasionally settings were in inches.

Step 13   Body text settings were usually applied as specified, but sometimes a serif font was not chosen, or the font changed within the document. Spacing and alignment were often correct, but sometimes not consistently applied to all of the document.

Step 14   The subheadings were generally all identified and often formatted correctly, but sometimes there would be one or more missed or some would be formatted inconsistently.

Steps 15 and 16 Changing the numbered list to a bulleted list was well done, but aligning the bullets to the margin was less frequently achieved.

Step 17   Applying a border and shading to a nominated paragraph was usually done accurately.

Steps 18 to 22 Data entry to the table was usually accurate. The most common error was not to use the case given for the word RATING. Formatting was usually applied as specified. At step 22, text wrap or gridlines were often in evidence.

Step 23   The paragraph move was generally well executed although the move was occasionally to the wrong place.

Steps 24 to 27 The image was usually correctly placed, then moved to the right margin. It was almost always cropped and resized as required.

Step 28   This was the time to proof read and check the document layout. Spellings errors were usually, but not always, identified and corrected. Layout errors remained such as subheadings left at the foot of a column or page, or inconsistent spacing between paragraphs, etc. and inconsistent alignment of text across columns.

Step 29   Occasionally the document was not printed, despite evidence that it had been worked on.

Database structure

Steps 30 and 31   The database field setup and import was fairly straightforward. The most common error was not to set the numeric data fields to display two decimal place values where specified. Sometimes the data type was set as integer displayed to two decimal places. In this case, some of the data for the added records would not show.

Steps 32 to 34   Two records were added; the first generally producing greater accuracy than the second. If the edited record was completed correctly, the record appeared in the first report.

Report 1

Steps 36 and 37   The majority of candidates succeeded in producing this report. Capitalisation for the title and for the new field *Market_share* was occasionally incorrect. The new field with its calculated value and display formatted as a percentage with no decimal places was generally well done.

All the selection criteria were usually applied and, if sorted correctly it was easy to see that the criterion <=300 was met. This was occasionally incorrectly set to <300.

Displaying all data and fields in the specified order were commonly incorrect. Page orientation and fit to a single page wide were usually correct.

Placing personal details at the top and right of the report was usually achieved. Some candidates did not remove the page numbers when designing their report.

Report 2

Steps 38 and 39   The majority of the candidates created this report successfully with an accurate title. There were some errors in the wildcard search on *Mario*, but selecting Nintendo was usually correct, as was the criterion >=10. Selection of fields to print was generally accurate. The two key sort was frequently applied correctly. The summary calculation was usually correct, but a common error was not to format this number with no decimal places showing.

Presentation

Steps 40 to 50   The most common errors were in not placing all elements on the master slide and ensuring that these all appeared on all slides.

Master slide

The majority of the candidates successfully found a suitable clip art image for the Master Slide, and added a star shape and its text. The text quite often contained capitalisation errors for the second line.

The majority of the candidates set the bullet types to a square shape.

Master slide elements were sometimes not applied to the first slide or to the newly inserted slide.

Most candidates applied the correct layout of Title and Subtitle on the first slide.

The new slide was usually inserted in the right place in the presentation with an appropriate layout chosen. Text added was usually correct, and the table data found and inserted correctly into the table.

Chart data was frequently incorrectly identified and the chart was sometimes seen as a horizontal bar chart instead of a vertical one. Chart title and axis titles frequently displayed capitalisation errors when present. The chart was sometimes

incorrectly inserted to the right of the bulleted text or even below it and sometimes on the new slide beside the table.

Step 50   The two formats for printing were usually selected correctly.

Evidence document

Step 51   The new contact was usually added correctly with correct email address.

Steps 52 to 54   The email was correctly addressed, but many candidates did not demonstrate they had used the cc line for the new contact. (This may be a software issue). The attachment was often a rich text format file. This was used as evidence that the candidates had not saved the revised document in the software being used (see step 3). A common error in the message text is omission of the final full stop.

Administration issues

Most Centres seem to have understood the message NOT to use staples to keep pages together; however, some Centres still persist in using string to tie pages in the Assessment Record Folder – this is a real nuisance (in potentially obscuring text with the punch holes).

The prints from some Centres were again very faint this year and so poor as to be hardly visible even with the aid of a magnifying glass. Centres must advise candidates to check that screen prints are of a size which is legible, otherwise they risk losing marks. They should also encourage the use of suitable plain fonts for what are, in effect, business documents rather than candidates wasting time searching for "fancy" fonts which do nothing to enhance the document.

It was noted that the majority of the candidates seem to be taking on board the requirement to produce documents **as requested on the question paper** and not to use up valuable time with embellishments, which meant they achieved high marks.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0417/31
Practical Test B

General Comments

Overall, there were slightly fewer candidates achieving excellent results on this paper than in previous sessions. The paper gave a good spread of marks. In previous sessions, for a significant number of candidates, the website authoring section of the paper was their strongest element, but in this session, the candidates were required to edit cascading stylesheet. Many candidates appeared well prepared for this examination and the vast majority who submitted their work showed sound knowledge, skills and understanding. Most candidates completed all elements of the paper. Results were very often centre-based. There is evidence that some candidates are rote-learning sets of skills to pass the practical examinations, rather than having the underlying knowledge and understanding to underpin these skills and allow the skills to be applied in any context. This may have been a factor in the reduction in the number of candidates achieving well on the stylesheet question.

There were a significant number of typographical errors in both the website and spreadsheet elements of the paper. Many of these inaccuracies could have been avoided with more careful checking and correction.

Centres **should not** staple the work, hole-punch or tie it together with string. A number of candidates lost marks due to the holes taking out some of the header text being marked. Occasionally, scripts were tied in the middle of the pages, making them difficult to open/turn over for marking. Work should be submitted in the ARF along with the question paper; both the ARF and question paper should have hand written on it, the candidate's name, Centre number and candidate number. It is essential that **ALL** candidates adhere to these instructions. The date on which they undertook the examination must also be recorded in the relevant box on the question paper.

A very small number of candidates did not print their name, Centre number and candidate number on every document submitted for assessment. It is important that candidates do this, as without clear printed evidence of the author of the work, marks cannot be awarded by the Examiner for these pages. It is not acceptable for candidates to hand annotate their printouts with their name, as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work. A number of candidates omitted one or more of the pages from the required printouts. Some candidates submitted multiple printouts for some of the tasks and as instructed crossed out those printouts that were draft copies. If multiple printouts are submitted without draft versions being crossed through, only the first occurrence of that page will be marked. Candidate responses this year included screen shots to show evidence of the work. Many candidates produced screen shots so small that Examiners had to use magnifying devices to try and award candidates' marks. Candidates should check each printout to ensure it is large enough to be read, and if necessary, restyle/reprint accordingly. Where Examiners are unable to read the materials presented, they cannot award candidates the marks. Similarly, some candidates did not achieve marks as a result of presenting screenshots with important elements cropped or where part of the text was obscured by another overlaid window, for example, where part of the stylesheet was overlaid by a window containing a list of files. Candidates are required to highlight elements of the html markup. It is important for them to choose their colours carefully so that the Examiner can read the markup.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

This question was completed well by most candidates.

Question 2

The majority of the candidates downloaded the required images and stored them as instructed.

Question 3

The majority of the candidates opened the evidence document successfully.

Website Authoring – HTML

Question 4

Most candidates created a table structure, many with the correct dimensions. Some candidates produced printouts showing the letters used in the question paper despite the instruction that 'The letters shown in the table must **not** appear on your final web page'. A significant number of candidates created the webpage without adding cell dimensions to the html.

Question 5

This text was frequently entered as specified, but a surprising number of candidates omitted the word 'the' from the text. Some case errors and other typographical errors were also found. Most candidates set the text into style h1.

Question 6

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

Question 7

Many candidates completed this question with little difficulty. Some ignored the list of files to be used and included the image/s j1531fish.jpg and/or j1531bg.jpg in the left column. There were a number of different interpretations of what constituted some of the items, or candidates did not read the question fully; for example the image of the car was sometimes used in place of a boat.

Question 8

Although many candidates completed this question as required, a number did not resize the image of the boat (or some of the other images if they had selected the wrong images in **Question 7**). This led to some interesting browser views, especially when candidates had included the background image in one of the left cells and failed to resize it.

Question 9

Although **Question 9** was completed well by many candidates, there were a significant number of typographical errors in the text, particularly relating to the use of a capital 'I' for 'island', a capital 'L' for 'life' and a capital 'F' for 'found'. Some candidates omitted the punctuation marks in the first and last of these five cells.

Question 10

Almost all of the candidates who submitted a browser view of the webpage completed this correctly.

Question 11

This question was completed well by some candidates. Several candidates created the opening part of the anchor '<a… >', but omitted the '' to close anchor statement. There were a few typographical errors in the entry of the URL. A significant number of candidates used an absolute file path for the hyperlink reference; this would not function correctly in most computers when the webpage was uploaded to a web server. A number of candidates did not set the target window as specified to '_chooseisland'. A small number of candidates set up this hyperlink and the correct target window, but did not create it from the specified text and image, some placing the <a> and tags together so the link could not be accessed.

Question 12

For a webpage to validate all images must have alternate text. Few candidates added appropriate alternate text to **all** of the images in their webpage. Many candidates did add this to the five images in the left column of the table. A number of candidates added alternate text but it was not appropriate; it should contain a description of the image should it not be available for display by the browser.

Question 13

Most candidates attached the correct style to the webpage. Of those candidates who did not complete this successfully, a significant number did not place the markup to attach the stylesheet within the head section.

Question 14

The majority of the candidates completed this step successfully. Many candidates did not enlarge the screenshot sufficiently to enable the Examiner to see the work without some form of magnification. In the worst cases, some potential marks could not be credited as Examiners could not see the evidence of the skills demonstrated.

Question 15

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

Website Authoring – CSS

Question 16

This question gained a very mixed response from the candidates. Some candidates completed it with 100 per cent accuracy and some had little or no understanding of cascading stylesheet syntax so gained few marks. Candidates were asked to define five styles. The style names were given to them yet a surprising number of candidates set up five classes with similar names to the styles specified. The setting of the colour codes into the correct syntax with a # to indicate the hexadecimal followed by six digits for the RGB elements did appear to cause a number of issues for many students. The setting of the font-face also seemed to present some candidates with problems. Many did not set the fonts into the correct order, many attempting to copy and paste similar structures from w3schools or other sites, which gained them no credit. During this session there were a surprising number of candidates who erroneously placed the generic font styles **serif** and **sans-serif** in speech marks. This error was also replicated in the setting of the values for the text-align properties with **center** and **left** erroneously placed in speech marks. A number of candidates incorrectly used **height** as the property rather than **font-size**. The specification for the table was that there should be no visible borders or gridlines. This meant setting two styles rather than just **table**, as setting no border for the **td** style removed the gridlines. Despite a clear instruction that the stylesheet must contain no html tags, a significant number of candidates submitted work with these tags embedded in their CSS.

Question 17

Although many candidates completed this correctly, there were a significant number with syntax errors, especially the use of HTML comments rather than CSS comments.

Question 18

Most candidates completed this question as instructed, although there were a small number who did not use the naming convention specified.

Question 19

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

Question 20

This question tested not only the practical skills required but also the understanding of the concept of, and hierarchy of, cascading stylesheets. It gained mixed responses from the candidates, with some including two stylesheets attached in the correct order, others in the wrong order, and some candidates having replaced the original stylesheet.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

© 2015

Question 21

Almost all of the candidates who attempted this question completed it successfully.

Question 22

Almost all of the candidates who attempted this question completed it successfully.

Data Analysis - Spreadsheets

Question 23

This question was completed well by the majority of candidates who attempted the spreadsheets section of the paper.

Question 24

The majority of candidates inserted a new row as specified.

Question 25

Although many candidates completed this task with accuracy, a significant number introduced typing or case errors.

Question 26

Most candidates set the work into a black 24 point sans-serif font.

Question 27

Many candidates completed the task as specified and had printed the row and column headings (or shown the gridlines) so that the Examiner could award the marks.

Question 28

Candidates who opted to use a VLOOKUP or LOOKUP function for this question generally scored well, but a number of alternative attempts were tried, particularly where candidates had anticipated a question involving nested IF statements.

Question 29

Candidates who opted to use a VLOOKUP or LOOKUP function for this question generally scored well, but a number of alternative attempts were tried, particularly where candidates had anticipated a question involving nested IF statements. A significant number of candidates did not multiply this value by the contents of cell A2.

A large number of candidates used the inefficient (and incorrect) formula =A2*C8 which initially worked, but then required changing each time the spreadsheet was used for modelling.

Question 30

A significant number of candidates used functions like ROUND or INT without considering the need to round up the value. A very small number added 0.5 to the value before rounding (or using INT) to obtain the correct answer (but not the most efficient method). A small number of candidates correctly used the ROUNDUP function with ',0' to obtain whole numbers.

Question 31

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

Question 32

The majority of the candidates who attempted this question and submitted printouts completed this correctly. There were a small number with a portrait orientation or with not all labels and/or formulae fully visible. The most prominent error was the omission of the row and column headings from the printout.

Question 33

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

Question 34

Whilst most candidates entered the correct figure of 1500 rufiyaa, many did not also change the currency to rupees. A number of scripts showed evidence of the data being changed and the resulting values being correct despite the fact that candidates had made an error in the formulae used.

Question 35

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

Question 36

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0417/32
Practical Test B

Key messages

Overall, there were slightly fewer candidates achieving excellent results on this paper than in previous sessions. The paper gave a good spread of marks. In previous sessions, for a significant number of candidates, the website authoring section of the paper was their strongest element, but in this session, the candidates were required to edit a cascading stylesheet, the syntax of this caused some candidates a number of issues. Many candidates appeared well prepared for this examination and the vast majority who submitted their work showed sound knowledge, skills and understanding. Most candidates completed all elements of the paper. Results were very often Centre-based. There is evidence that some candidates are rote-learning sets of skills to pass the practical examinations, rather than having the underlying knowledge and understanding to underpin these skills and allow the skills to be applied in any context. This may have been a factor in the reduction in the number of candidates achieving well on the stylesheet question.

There were a significant number of typographical errors in both the website and spreadsheet elements of the paper. Many of these inaccuracies could have been avoided with more careful checking and correction.

Centres **should not** staple the work, hole-punch or tie it together with string. A number of candidates lost marks due to the holes taking out some of the header text being marked. Occasionally, scripts were tied in the middle of the pages, making them difficult to open/turnover for marking. Work should be submitted in the ARF along with the question paper; both the ARF and question paper should have hand written on it, the candidate's name, Centre number and candidate number. It is essential that **ALL** candidates adhere to these instructions. The date on which they undertook the examination must also be recorded in the relevant box on the question paper.

A small number of candidates did not print their name, Centre number and candidate number on every document submitted for assessment. It is important that candidates do this, as without clear printed evidence of the author of the work, marks cannot be awarded by the Examiner for these pages. It is not acceptable for candidates to hand annotate their printouts with their name, as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work. A number of candidates omitted one or more of the pages from the required printouts. Some candidates submitted multiple printouts for some of the tasks and as instructed crossed out those printouts that were draft copies. If multiple printouts are submitted without draft versions being crossed through, only the first occurrence of that page will be marked. Candidate responses this year included screen shots to show evidence of the work. Many candidates produced screen shots so small that Examiners had to use magnifying devices to try and award candidates' marks. Candidates should check each printout to ensure it is large enough to be read, and if necessary, restyle/reprint accordingly. Where Examiners are unable to read the materials presented, they cannot award candidates the marks. Similarly, some candidates did not achieve marks as a result of presenting screenshots with important elements cropped or where part of the text was obscured by another overlaid window, for example, where part of the stylesheet was overlaid by a window containing a list of files. Candidates are required to highlight elements of the html markup. It is important for them to choose their colours carefully so that the Examiner can read the markup.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

This question was completed well by most candidates.

Question 2

The majority of the candidates downloaded the required images and stored them as instructed.

Question 3

The majority of the candidates opened the evidence document successfully.

Website Authoring – HTML

Question 4

Most candidates created a table structure, many with the correct dimensions. Some candidates produced printouts showing the letters used in the question paper despite the instruction that "The letters shown in the table must **not** appear on your final web page". A significant number of candidates created the webpage without adding cell dimensions to the html. However, there were a large number of candidates, even those who performed superbly on the paper as a whole, who set the table width to 100%.

Question 5

This text was frequently entered as specified, but a surprising number of candidates changed Conservation to Conversation. Some case errors and other typographical errors were also found. Most candidates set the text into style h1

Question 6

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates. Some candidates added Last edited by, which was the text used in some previous question papers. Most candidates set the text into style h3.

Question 7

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates. There were some candidates who erroneously capitalised the initial letter of each word. Most candidates set the text into style h3.

Question 8

Many of the candidates who attempted this question were successful. However a significant number of candidates did not appear to attempt it and a number included extra text with the anchor which was visible in the browser view.

Question 9

Although question 9 was completed well by many candidates, there were a significant number of typographical errors in the text, particularly relating to the use of initial capitals and the omission of the letter 's' from the end of each item. Most candidates set the text into style h2.

Question 10

Almost all of the candidates who submitted a browser view of the webpage completed this correctly.

Question 11

Many candidates completed this question with little difficulty, although a significant number did not place the images in the correct cells.

Question 12

Many of the candidates who submitted a browser view of the webpage completed this correctly, although a number did not resize the image of the gorilla to match the other images.

Question 13

This question was completed well by some candidates. Several candidates created the opening part of the anchor '<a… >', but omitted the '' to close anchor statement. There were a few typographical errors in the entry of the URL. A significant number of candidates used an absolute file path for the hyperlink reference, this would not function correctly in most computers when the webpage was uploaded to a web server. A number of candidates did not set the target window as specified to "_primates". A small number of candidates set up this hyperlink and the correct target window, but did not create it from the specified text and image, some placing the <a> and tags together so the link could not be accessed.

Question 14

For a webpage to validate all images must have alternate text. Few candidates added appropriate alternate text to **all** of the images in their webpage. Many candidates did add this to the 4 images in the right column of the table, but not the alligator image. A number of candidates added alternate text but it was not appropriate, it should contain a description of the image should it not be available for display by the browser.

Question 15

Most candidates attached the correct stylesheet to the webpage. Of those candidates who did not complete this successfully, a significant number did not place the markup to attach the stylesheet within the head section.

Question 16

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

Question 17

The majority of the candidates completed this step successfully. Many candidates did not enlarge the screenshot sufficiently to enable the Examiner to see the work without some form of magnification. In the worst cases, some potential marks could not be credited as Examiners could not see the evidence of the skills demonstrated.

Website Authoring – CSS

Question 18

The stylesheet was answered more successfully than previous years. There were only a few candidates who presented the CSS in a html shell and less use of classes.

This question gained a very mixed response from the candidates. Some candidates completed it with 100% accuracy and some had little or no understanding of cascading stylesheet syntax so gained few marks. Candidates were asked to define 5 styles, the style names for 4 of these styles were given to them yet a surprising number of candidates set up 5 classes with similar names to the styles specified. The setting of the colour codes into the correct syntax with a # to indicate the hexadecimal followed by 6 digits for the RGB elements did appear to cause a number of issues for many candidates. The setting of the font-face also seemed to present some candidates with problems. Many did not set the fonts into the correct order, many attempting to copy and paste similar structures from w3 schools or other sites, which gained them no credit. During this session there were a surprising number of candidates who erroneously placed the generic font styles **serif** and **sans-serif** in speech marks. This error was also replicated in the setting of the values for the text-align properties with **center** and **left** erroneously placed in speech marks. A number of candidates incorrectly used **height** as the property rather than **font-size**. The specification for the table was that there should be no visible borders or gridlines. This meant setting two styles rather than just **table**, as setting no border for the **td** style removed the gridlines. Despite a clear instruction that the stylesheet must contain no html tags, a significant number of candidates submitted work with these tags embedded in their CSS.

Question 19

Most candidates completed this question as instructed, although there were a small number who did not use the naming convention specified.

Question 20

The majority of the candidates completed this step successfully. Many candidates did not enlarge the screenshot sufficiently to enable the Examiner to see the work without some form of magnification. In the worst cases, some potential marks could not be credited as Examiners could not see the evidence of the skills demonstrated.

Question 21

This question tested not only the practical skills required but also the understanding of the concept of; and hierarchy of cascading stylesheets. It gained mixed responses from the candidates; with some including two stylesheets attached in the correct order, others in the wrong order, and some candidates having replaced the original stylesheet.

Question 22

Almost all of the candidates who attempted this question completed it successfully.

Question 23

Almost all of the candidates who attempted this question completed it successfully.

Data Analysis - Spreadsheets

Question 24

This question was completed well by the majority of candidates who attempted the spreadsheets section of the paper.

Question 25

The majority of candidates merged the cells as specified.

Question 26

Although many candidates completed this task with accuracy a significant number introduced typing or case errors.

Question 27

Most candidates set the work into a 24 point right aligned sans-serif font.

Question 28

Although most candidates completed this successfully there were a number who did not use the most efficient method to complete this task, for example: the use of =B3+C3+D3… etc.; instead of =SUM(B3:I3).

Question 29

Although most candidates completed this successfully there were a number who did not use the most efficient method to complete this task.

Questions 28 and **29**

Each required the replication of a single formula within a range of cells. There were a significant number of candidates who replicated one of these functions into cell J15.

Question 30

A significant number of candidates did not use any function to round the total figure. A very small number added 0.5 to the value before rounding (or using INT) to obtain the correct answer (but not the most efficient method). A small number of candidates incorrectly used the ROUNDUP or ROUNDDOWN functions with ',0' to obtain whole numbers.

Question 31

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates, although a number of candidates used the header rather than the footer.

Question 32

The majority of the candidates, who attempted this question and submitted printouts, completed this correctly. There were a small number with not all labels and/or formulae fully visible. The most prominent error was the omission of the row and column headings from the printout.

Question 33

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

Question 34

This question was not completed well by many candidates. Few candidates recognised that an appropriate chart type for percentage values was a pie chart, and fewer fully annotated the completed chart. The chart title infrequently gave sufficient detail to make it easy for a user to understand. The majority of candidates did select the correct data and did provide percentages. Some candidates ignored the requirement to use different patterns or shades for black and white printing.

Question 35

Many candidates entered the correct figure of 50 dollars. A number of scripts showed evidence of the data being changed and the resulting values being correct despite candidates having made an error in the formulae used.

Question 36

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.

Question 37

This question was completed well by the majority of the candidates.