INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0417/11 **Written Paper**

Key messages

To achieve high marks in the level of response question (last question) candidates must give more than a statement in their answer by expanding on the points made. Justification and discussion of the points is also essential.

The use of brand names rather than the generic names are still causing issues in the paper. It is clearly stated on the front page of the examination paper 'No marks will be awarded for using brand names of software packages or hardware.'

There is still a tendency to answer the question that the candidate thinks is being set rather than the one that is being set. In order to gain the marks expansion is needed on the answers given rather than just statements.

General comments

All candidates appeared to have enough time to finish the paper.

Once again, some candidates gave extra answers that were not asked for. There is also a worrying number of candidates who write on extra sheets and the blank pages of the question paper, without indicating in the original answer space that they have done so. Candidates should indicate in the original answer space where to locate the replacement answer, so that the examiner can easily locate it and award appropriate marks. Some candidates do not write on the first line of the answer space and then have to cram their writing at the bottom on the answer space.

More than in previous years candidates are tending leave the answer space blank, rather than making an attempt and possibly gaining a mark.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

This question as a whole was well answered.

(a)   This part of the question was well answered.

(b)   The answer should have been interpreter, but many candidates wrote compiler.

(c)   Few candidates got this question wrong.

(d)   This answer was mostly correct although some candidates wrote microphone.

Question 2

Candidates placing ticks in two or even three columns was more common tis series than in previous years. The first tick, 'does not require a laser to read the data' tended to be the one that was most incorrectly answered.

Question 3

Overall this question was fairly well answered although the second part tended to gain the mark more often than part **(a)**.

(a)   Incorrect answers included WLAN with some candidates writing it as 'wide local area network'.

(b)   More candidates answer this part of the question correctly. Popular incorrect answers included WLAN, hub and switch.

Question 4

This question was well answered with many of the candidates gaining at least 2 marks.

Question 5

(a)   Most candidates were able to explain that the data had to be changed before the microprocessor could read it but some were vague in their answers.

(b)   This was slightly better answered than part **(a)**; but stock answers appeared not relating to the question.

Question 6

This question was well answered by most candidates. Some scored one mark. The most common incorrect answer was the first answer.

Question 7

Most candidates managed to gain two marks with some scoring three marks; few scored six marks. There were many incorrect answers relating to the use of lower case in hex codes and incorrect command words. Popular correct answers included the missing hyphen in border-width and the incorrect use of square brackets. The question asked for the incorrect part and the corrected element; some candidates failed to give the incorrect part.

Question 8

This question was not well answered by many candidates. Some managed to gain good marks in the contrast of the two forms of implementation but many mixed up pilot implementation with prototyping and even direct implementation. Many candidates gave answers along the lines that two new different systems were being implemented, rather than comparing one new system being implemented using two different methods.

Question 9

(a)   The question stated that numeric fields had to be expanded up on but many candidates simply wrote numeric. The Animal_passport_number was incorrectly expressed as a number even though the example data had a '/'. Some candidates thought this was a date field. The first two field data types tended to be correctly answered but the numeric ones, less so with some candidates writing integer.

(b)   Many wrote breed_of_cow as the answer and other incorrect fields. As candidates were writing the field from the stem of the question it had to be written exactly as it was in the stem. Some candidates did not gain the mark due to capitalising letters or missing out the underscores.

(c)   This question was not well answered with some candidates gaining marks for naming the validation check but then failing to expand upon it. Some candidates named a range check which was incorrect, but then explained a length check. Some candidates even wrote about verification rather than validation.

(d)   This was a fairly well answered question with many candidates gaining three marks or more. Many candidates gave an appropriate name for the sheet. The main cause of concern was the range

selected as it included a row that could not be included, some candidates removed the row others selected a more appropriate range. In some cases, the descriptions given were not full and therefore marks were not gained.

Question 10

(a)   This question was fairly well answered with most candidates gaining at least 2 marks. Some candidates gave more ticks than was necessary so did not gain the marks.

(b)   This question was not well answered with many candidates guessing as to what live data was. Some related it to real time systems, or used when testing with few stating it was existing data where the results were known.

(c)   This was not well answered, with a lot of candidates only managing one mark. There were many totally incorrect answers like keyboard and mouse.

Question 11

(a)   The topic for this question has been asked many times. Only a very few candidates understand the operation of an expert system. Some candidates can name the components but not explain how they interact or operate. Some candidates explained how an expert system was created which had been set previously. Many however did make an attempt rather than just leaving the answer space blank.

(b)   Candidates did not do well on this part of the question. There were vague answers like car problems and some answers related to library systems.

Question 12

(a)   This question was well answered with most candidates gaining at least two marks.

(b)   This question was a description but some candidates did not give enough expansion in their answer and therefore did not achieve the mark. The popular correct answer was time zones although some candidates simply wrote time zone and therefore with no expansion did not gain the mark. Some answers referred to hacking but again were not expanded upon.

(c)   As with the previous question some candidates did not expand on their answers and therefore did not gain the marks. The explanation of the scrambling of data and the protection of data were well answered though.

Question 13

Candidates mixed up health with safety and even security, therefore candidates did not answer the question. Those that understood safety gained very good marks.

Question 14

(a)   Only a few good answers were seen. Many answers referred directly to the operation of a particular game and were not in actually about virtual reality. Candidates appeared to know what it is but could not explain it.

(b)   This was better answered than part **(a)** proving that candidates understand VR but cannot explain it. Many candidates gained at least a mark in this question.

Question 15

(a)   This was fairly well answered with candidates giving a correct example of test data, however they did not point out that whole numbers were needed in the explanation of the range therefore not gaining full marks.

(b)   This part of the question answered better than part **(a)**.

(c)   Most candidates gained at least a mark.

Question 16

(a)   This part of the question was well answered with candidates gaining at least a mark.

(b)   This part was not as well answered as part **(a)**.

Question 17

Candidates did better on this type of question than in previous series. However few managed to gain Level 3, 7 – 8 marks. This requires the candidate writing a good conclusion and a justification of the points raised.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0417/12
Written Paper

Key messages

To achieve high marks in the level of response question (last question) candidates must give more than a statement in their answer by expanding on the points made. Justification and discussion of the points is also essential.

The use of brand names rather than the generic names are still causing issues in the paper. It is clearly stated on the front page of the examination paper 'No marks will be awarded for using brand names of software packages or hardware.'

There is still a tendency to answer the question that the candidate thinks is being set rather than the one that is being set. It is important that candidates read the question closely before answering it.

General comments

All candidates appeared to have enough time to finish the paper.

Once again, some candidates gave extra answers that were not asked for. There is also a worrying number of candidates who write on extra sheets and the blank pages of the question paper, without indicating in the original answer space that they have done so. Candidates should indicate in the original answer space where to locate the replacement answer, so that the examiner can easily locate it and award appropriate marks. Some candidates do not write on the first line of the answer space and then have to cram their writing at the bottom on the answer space.

There has been an improvement from previous years with less candidates tending to leave the answer space blank, rather than making an attempt and possibly gaining a mark.

There is a large number of instances in recent sessions of candidates using mathematical operators such as x and ⩽ instead of standard ICT operators such as * and <=.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Answered well.

(b) Answered very well with few incorrect answers.

(c) Not as well answered as other parts, microphone being the most common incorrect answer closely followed by cables.

(d) Generally, well answered but with a significant number of candidates confusing RAM and ROM.

Question 2

Most candidates gained at least three marks on this question. Some candidates did confuse laser and dot matrix printers. Generally, candidates were able to identify the 3D printer statements to be correct.

Question 3

Very well answered question and candidates were able to identify the most appropriate network. However, some candidates did confuse WAN and WLAN stating that WLAN would use satellites and connected countries.

Question 4

Most candidates managed to gain three marks on this question.

(a)   Well answered, the most common incorrect answer was iris scan or chip reader.

(b)   The vast majority of candidates answered this correctly. The most common incorrect answer was coding and occasionally quantum cryptography.

(c)   Generally, well answered. Iris scan and anti-spyware were the most common incorrect answers.

(d)   Very few incorrect answers. The only reasonably common alternative answer was chip reader.

Question 5

Virtually all candidates answered this correctly. Very rarely candidates gave RAM and ROM as answers. However, a small number of candidates circled more than two answers, some correcting their mistakes but not making it easy for examiners to see what was correct and what was not to be marked.

Question 6

(a)   Only a very small number of candidates included <td rowspan="3"> but many wrote <td> and </td>. Some candidates mixed up src and scr therefore not gaining marks as scr would not work in HTML. Often, img tags were written incorrectly. Some candidates wrote Alternative Text and Image Source. Some candidates included written responses with no HTML, but where HTML was written and correct then examiners awarded marks for this type of answer.

(b)   Generally, this was not well answered with only a small number of candidates answering the question correctly and candidates on the whole demonstrated little knowledge of HTML structure.

Question 7

Overall in this question some candidates mixed the responses between part **(a)** and part **(b)**.

(a)   Candidates demonstrated little understanding of the principles of RFID communication. Many candidates demonstrated a lack of knowledge of passive RFID tags and confused passive with active. Some candidates demonstrated an awareness of passive tags but demonstrated little knowledge of how they communicate with the reader. Radio waves or signals were rarely mentioned. Some responses stated the use of an antenna and the signal but did not describe clearly how these are used.

(b)   This part was better answered than part **(a)**. Most candidates answered the tag stored ALL the information about the animal, and once read by the reader, the feed was dispensed. Database was mentioned in a few instances, but again general answers like "information about the goat is stored in the system" were not uncommon. Very few candidates discussed how the feed was selected. Once again answers were vague.

Question 8

(a)   This question was generally answered well. The most common errors were putting the calculation in a function such as COUNT(), and using x or instead of *.

(b)   Most candidates managed to gain two marks on this part of the question. Candidates that used the VLOOKUP function gained better marks than those candidates that used the alternative IF function. Those candidates that responded with IF Statements and used the values rather than cell

references and did not gain marks. The logic on these statements were also incorrect resulting in incorrect values being returned.

(c) Most candidates gained at least a mark on this question. However, many were vague in their responses and missed out on full marks. Some wrote about absolute referencing rather than replicating the formula. The common mistakes were not being clear about clicking on the drag handle. They often missed out on marks due to a lack being precise about dragging to F13. As with previous sessions candidates can give a statement about the method but cannot expand upon this for subsequent marks.

(d) This question was not answered well. Even though the paper states clearly the use of trade names are not allowed, many candidates missed marks by giving named propriety software. Some candidates managed to answer the question well and understand the requirements. Weaker responses did not use correct ICT wording for the actions.

Question 9

(a) Most candidates gave at least one response that gained credit. Lack of precision was a problem.

(b) The most common misconception was that the SATNAV sent signals to the satellite and the satellite did the calculations and sent the results back to the SATNAV. Entering current position as an input was a common error, GPS was only rarely mentioned. Candidates clearly understood that a driver would need to input the destination and the route would be displayed but their technical understanding of the principles of operation was limited.

Question 10

(a) Generally, this question was answered well but some candidates provided answers learned by rote, mentioning things which were not relevant to this question. It is important that candidates read the question and then give answers relating to the question. There was a noticeable improvement from previous years in the number of candidates making comparisons rather than observations. Candidates seemed to prefer the advantages to the disadvantages.

This question referred to the building of a lens therefore general answers referring to consistency were irrelevant. There were a number of one-word answers given like "Expensive" and these were not given credit. Some candidates failed to understand this was a comparison and simply listed advantages/disadvantages. Many candidates did discuss hazardous conditions and how the use of robots would lead to unemployment as a general response, rather than the use of robots to build the lens.

(b) This question was not answered well. Candidates generally appeared to understand that modules were to be tested individually and included test data. However, responses lacked an understanding of how the system would be tested as a whole under controlled conditions or that data had to be transferred between modules. Many candidates misunderstood the question and described methods of implementation.

(c) This part of the question was also not well answered with few candidates managing to gain full marks and many no marks.

Question 11

(a) Most candidates mentioned deleting files or corrupting files. Many candidates mentioned a virus replicating and the access to the hard disc slowing without mentioning that the storage on the hard disc was becoming full. Poor terminology for delete was common e.g. "get rid of", "exterminate". Some candidates referred to the hard drive being corrupted or physically damaged. Again there was a lack of depth in answers.

(b) Most candidates gained one mark, only a few gaining full marks. In the question candidates were asked to explain "another way" computers could be infected with a virus, but many candidates gave two or more, but only the first was marked.

(c) This answered better than the other two parts. It was clear that some candidates knew the use of quarantine and went on to gain full marks for this question. Often responses repeated the question

by stating the computer is scanned. Better responses described the use of a database of virus codes, and the use of heuristic testing. However, some candidates offered responses which were vague and lacked key terminology, many of these responses failed to understand the processes involved and how anti-virus software works.

Question 12

This question was not answered well. The only marks most candidates managed to score were for less hardware needed and clearer voice. The majority of candidates mentioned less internet/bandwidth/Wi-Fi needed than video-conferencing, rather than no internet. A great deal of candidates mentioned "no need to dress up" which was not an ICT answer.

Question 13

This was a well answered by nearly all candidates. There were a few candidates who did not tick RSI and opted for electrocution, demonstrating a lack of understanding of key terms.

Question 14

It was clear that many candidates understood the context but could not express themselves fully producing vague answers therefore missing marks. Some candidates mixed up augmented reality with virtual reality. Candidates that did well in this question gave answers referring to positioning of furniture or supermarket products, but again the supermarket answers were vague stating that information was shown as opposed to searched then displayed. Barcodes and QR codes were mentioned in a few responses.

Question 15

(a)   This question was answered fairly well by many of the candidates who clearly understood the use of biometrics and applied their understanding to the question. Many candidates identified that biometrics were unique and that passwords could be stolen or forgotten. Very few candidates mentioned that the person needed to be present.

(b)   This part was not as well answered as the first part of the question. The majority of the candidates did not appear to be aware of contactless transactions and so mentioned entering a PIN. They also did not understand the role of computers in the process (many referred to the card deducting money rather than banks computer). Some candidates are still writing that the money is stored on the card. Good answers included cards need to be checked for validity and the clear understanding of transferring data from account to account.

Question 16

The question was very poorly answered. Almost all answers were basically describing Primary/Foreign key relationships, storage capacity, or ease of using/creating Forms/Reports etc. A few mentioned repetition of data with relational databases, and "easy to understand/use" with flat files and therefore managed to gain a Level 2. There were a number of candidates who confused flat files and relational databases and there were a number of candidates who clearly knew very little about both. There were a few candidates who gave good answers and understood the differences between relational and flat file databases whilst others thought that flat files were one database whilst relational were two.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

| Paper 0417/13 |
| Written Paper |

Key messages

To achieve high marks in the level of response question (last question) candidates must give more than a statement in their answer by expanding on the points made. Justification and discussion of the points is also essential.

The use of brand names rather than the generic names are still causing issues in the paper. It is clearly stated on the front page of the examination paper 'No marks will be awarded for using brand names of software packages or hardware.'

There is still a tendency to answer the question that the candidate thinks is being set rather than the one that is being set. In order to gain the marks expansion is needed on the answers given rather than just statements.

General comments

All candidates appeared to have enough time to finish the paper. However to help the examiners, good handwriting is essential as important words can be missed if the hand writing is bad. This year the quality of handwriting has diminished.

Once again, some candidates gave extra answers that were not asked for. There is also a worrying number of candidates who write on extra sheets and the blank pages of the question paper, without indicating in the original answer space that they have done so. Candidates should indicate in the original answer space where to locate the replacement answer, so that the examiner can easily locate it and award appropriate marks. Some candidates do not write on the first line of the answer space and then have to cram their writing at the bottom on the answer space.

There has been an improvement from previous years with less candidates tending to leave the answer space blank, rather than making an attempt and possibly gaining a mark.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Overall this question answered well with most candidates managing to gain marks.

(a)   Most got this question right, but common errors were RAM or the internal hard disk.

(b)   As with **part (a)** most candidates managed to gain a mark on this part although CD Rom was a common error. This part was not answered as well as **parts (a)** and **(d)**.

(c)   Most got this question right, but common errors were ROM.

(d)   Most got this right, but some put wide format printer. Touch screen was also a popular incorrect answer.

Question 2

Most candidates managed to gain four marks on this question, but common errors were in rows 2 and 3.

Question 3

This was a straightforward question with most candidates gaining three marks or more. However, OMR and OCR were common errors.

Question 4

Most candidates managed to gain marks on this question, web cam was sometimes chosen instead of monitor. Some candidates thought that microphones and web cams were output devices.

Question 5

(a) Many candidates provided correct answers for this section. However, some candidates gave answers which related to features like water depth, pollution or clarity and even moisture.

(b) Mostly well answered with some writing ADC out in full, wrong answers included modem and DAC.

(c) Despite this being a straight forward question, candidates still could not explain the process. Candidates mixed up control and monitoring explaining at the end of the process the use of actuators to correct out-of-limit readings in the pond. Most candidates gained at least a mark on this question the main marks being for sending the data from the sensors or comparing with a pre-set value.

Question 6

Not well answered the majority of candidates only gaining two marks across the three parts. Many candidates understood what was required but did not give enough detail whereas others mixed up their answers for all three parts up.

(a) This was the best answered question of the three parts. Most managed to gain at least one mark by explain what phishing was but had difficulty expanding on this.

(b) This part of the question not well answered. Many candidates understood that software was downloaded onto the user's computer but could not explain how it re-directed user's to the fake website; some candidates stated that this was automatic.

(c) Not well answered with some candidates writing that this was similar to phishing but not stating the process. Some stated a text message was send but could not expand to state it was a link or telephone number that was sent. Smishing is on the syllabus but has not been covered as much as phishing or pharming.

Question 7

Most candidates managed to gain two marks for explaining how the colour was changed and that the elements had to be copied. Candidates appeared have a poor use of terminology – e.g. paint not fill, etc. A few candidates described the LOGO instructions of how to draw shapes and missed out copy when referring to copy and paste.

Question 8

Many candidates seemed to think that the robots were humanoid and cold, unfeeling hands that could harm the cows or frighten the cows. Few described advantages or disadvantages that related to the context of the question; opting for generic answers.

Question 9

(a)   Many candidates managed to gain at least a mark if not two on the question. Most incorrect answers were errors of omission of quotes around Comic sans, misspellings, or a lack of delimiters.

(b)   Many good answers but errors in the delimiters or command words did not gain marks.

(c)   Many correct answers. Errors were incorrect characters or omission of ;

(d)   This part was not well answered with the common error being font-weight putting font-type.

Question 10

Most candidates could only list one valid reason. Again, there was a lack of detail in the answers given. There was a lack of comparison between the devices. Lots of 'more storage space' but no reference to which device had the more storage space. Popular correct answers were pen drive more portable than magnetic tapes and pen drive more robust than magnetic tapes.

Question 11

(a)   Some good answers but very few scored a second mark. Some candidates thought user documentation related to personal data.

(b)   Some good answers but again only a few candidates gaining the second mark. This is a similar problem to other questions where candidates give a statement and then do not expand upon it.

(c)   This question relied on candidates understanding both user and technical documentation and therefore it threw one or two of them. There were some good answers with full marks but many did not seem to know the topic. There were a few that listed the components of an expert system. Many managed to gain a least a mark with FAQ and how to… being popular correct answers

(d)   Most candidates did well on this question with many achieving full marks. Common incorrect choices were 'test the system...' and 'observe…'

Question 12

Common errors here were to omit the check against the original source and the fact that the computer does the checking in double entry. As a result, many answers were re-words of the question with no added information from the candidate.

Question 13

(a)   This question was not well answered with many candidates not knowing what a web-conference was most scored only the 'online' mark.

(b)   Following on from **13(a)**, most found this difficult with mixed up answers. There were many contradictory answers ...'video uses internet, web doesn't' then further into the response the converse. Some candidates still think that video-conferencing involves the use of making and sending a video.

Question 14

Most candidates managed to gain at least three marks but there were still some vague answers like 'pains' and 'hurts'. Common errors were to repeat 'back and neck' for row 2 and 4.

Question 15

Many candidates did not provide answers that would gain marks. Popular incorrect answers were that drones could measure that depth of the water or that they could work 24/7. Many gave descriptions of the drones and how they can fly but did not relate their answers to helping monitor the situation again, as in previous answers in the paper, giving generic answers.

Question 16

This question was not well answered, and features were in short supply. Most candidates did not write about features but described the benefits and drawbacks of the use of WLANs.

Question 17

(a) Quite a few chose the correct method, but few gave satisfactory reasons, often just repeating the question, i.e. office workers are too busy to be disturbed.

(b) Quite a few just described how direct implementation worked without giving any reasons for its use in this scenario. Other common errors were to state that it's faster or cheaper without much, if any, expansion on this, to describe the other methods but not give any reason for not using them, or to repeat the question e.g. state that there is 'no space for...'.

Question 18

This question was not well answered with candidates able to give statements but failing to expand upon them, therefore only gaining a level 1. Some candidates wrote long answers but there was little substance. There were lots of discussions about staying safe on line but this was not relevant to the question. Some candidates however did well on the question and gained six marks but few managed to give a good conclusion or a justification of the points.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0417/21
Practical Test A

Key messages

To improve performance in this examination candidates must be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types. These are categories of font type with specific attributes and not the actual names of font styles. Candidates must be able to select an appropriate font style for the font type specified. Some centres have reported that they do not have a font style called 'serif' installed on the computers. As typeface categories the font style names 'serif' and 'sans-serif' will not appear as an installed font.

Text to be entered by the candidate as part of a task is displayed in bold on the examination 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 this data entry as common errors on this paper included incorrect capitalisation, incorrect or missing characters, omission of spaces, truncated headings and additional punctuation.

Candidates are required to produce screenshots to evidence the ICT skills that cannot be assessed through the printed product alone. The screenshot evidence needs to show the outcome rather than the process so, for example, save evidence needs to show the folder contents with the saved file listed. Many candidates screenshot the 'Save as…' dialogue box which shows the save in process but does not provide sufficient evidence that the file has been saved. Candidates should check each printed screenshot to ensure it is clear and large enough to be read. Where examiners are unable to read the materials presented, they cannot award the marks. Similarly, some candidates did not achieve marks as a result of presenting screenshots with important elements cropped.

Each task instructs candidates to enter their name, centre number and candidate number. A small number of candidates are not following these instructions and submitting work for assessment without identification details. Without clear printed evidence of the author of the work, examiners were unable to award any marks for these pages. It is not acceptable for candidates to annotate their printouts by hand with their name as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work.

Candidates are required to create and apply paragraph styles. When selecting a font type for a paragraph style this should be a font that contains no other formatting. Applying additional formatting that has not been specified in the House style specification will mean that candidates do not gain marks, for example, the font style *Algerian* is a serif font style that displays all capital letters and if this did not match the enhancement specified on the House style specification candidates would not gain marks.

Candidates should be encouraged to print evidence as it is completed rather than waiting until the end of the examination time. They should print all pages of a document or report and not just the first page. It is essential that candidates print their Evidence Document towards the end of the examination time, regardless of whether they have finished the examination. The document will contain supporting evidence which can substantially improve the candidate's mark and they should be taught to print this before the examination ends.

General comments

The paper gave a good spread of marks and most candidates appeared well prepared for the examination. Most candidates completed or attempted all elements of the paper and the majority who submitted work showed sound knowledge, skills and understanding. Candidates are now more familiar and confident with

the skills assessed in the syllabus. There has been a marked improvement in the creation and application of styles and, as a result, documents are well presented with consistent presentation. The mail merge task is also completed well with many candidates achieving full marks for this section.

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. Several candidates lost marks due to punch holes taking out characters in the database report headings resulting in missing letters in data entry which could not then be assessed for accuracy.

In this session too many candidates printed evidence that was too small to read even using magnification devices. Candidates MUST ensure that all screenshots can be easily read with the naked eye.

Candidates should submit all printouts and cross through any draft versions which are not to be marked. If multiple printouts are submitted without draft versions being crossed through, only the first occurrence of each page will be marked.

Comments on specific questions

Task 1 – The Evidence Document

This question was completed well by most candidates. Occasionally the screenshots were too small or faint to be read. A small number of candidates did not present the evidence document for marking.

Task 2 – Document

Question 1

All candidates opened the correct source file and most saved it with the correct filename in the format of the word processing software being used. Some candidates resaved the file in RTF format and occasionally the filename contained typographical errors or was not capitalised as shown on the exam paper. Screenshot evidence of the save was often inconclusive showing the save in process rather than capturing the outcome of the file saved. A screenshot of the folder contents after saving provides the evidence required. A number of candidates increased the left and right hand margin settings despite a specific instruction not to make to make any changes to the page setup.

Question 2

Headers and footers were well done by most candidates although automated page numbers were not always used with the typed number 1 appearing on all pages. A few candidates entered only their name in the footer area without the centre and candidate numbers. Candidates who used the built in content control to align the text did not always remove superfluous text or placeholders in the header and/or footer area. Occasionally the header and/or footer text did not align with the page margins on all pages.

Question 3

The creation, storage and application of styles is being done well by the vast majority of candidates. Each style must be named accurately and candidates should make sure that each new style is based on the default or 'normal' paragraph style as this avoids the new style inheriting additional formatting. Styles containing additional formatting not listed in the House style specification do not gain marks. Common errors in creating the styles continue to be capitalisation errors in the style names, serif or sans-serif font styles set incorrectly, additional formatting applied and incorrect spacing applied before and/or after the style. Screenshot evidence of the GR-Subhead style provided details of the settings created for this style and the formatting of all subheadings in the document needed to match these settings. A few candidates continue to format the relevant text without providing evidence of creating styles and do not gain these marks.

Question 4

Candidates were required to show a list of the new styles as evidence that the styles had been created. Any screenshot that showed a list of these style names was acceptable including the style ribbon toolbar or a list from a style manager/organiser. The application of the relevant styles in the document was only awarded if there was evidence in the style list that the style had been created.

Question 5

The title text was generally correctly entered at the start of the document with the correct style applied. The text occasionally contained spelling and/or capitalisation errors. Application of the GR-Title style was awarded if the formatting met the House style specification and there was evidence that the style had been created and saved in the style list.

Question 6

The subtitle text was provided from the source file and most candidates correctly entered their name after this text and applied the GR-Subtitle style to this text. Application of the GR-Subtitle style was awarded if the formatting met the House style specification and there was evidence that the style had been created and saved in the style list.

Question 7

Most candidates correctly applied the GR-Body style to the text in the document. Application of the GR-Body style was awarded if the formatting met the House style specification and there was evidence that the style had been created and saved in the style list. Occasionally inconsistencies in the formatting of the body style were seen such as a mixture of serif and sans-serif font styles used, full justification not applied to all paragraphs and, more commonly, inconsistent spacing after body text paragraphs. No space between the chart and preceding paragraph indicated that the 6 point spacing after each paragraph had not been set as part of the GR-Body style. Had this been set and applied correctly the spacing below the paragraphs would have been set automatically. As part of proofreading candidates should make sure that all styles have been applied correctly to the text and spacing is consistent.

Question 8

Most candidates changed the required text into two equally spaced columns with the correct spacing between the columns. A few candidates displayed the entire document in two columns and a smaller number inserted the column break below rather than above the subheading. Occasionally a page break was inserted instead of a section break.

Question 9

Most candidates applied bullets of some sort to the list but did not evidence creating and storing the GR-Bullet style to meet the House Style specification requirements. Without evidence of this style saved the marks were not awarded. Capitalisation, single line spacing and a left indent of 3 cm were not applied to the style. Some candidates only formatted 5 of the 7 lines in the list and many used a square or round bullet.

Question 10

This question tested the application of the GR-Subhead style to each of the eight subheadings within the document and was performed well by most candidates. Some candidates had formatting errors in the style creation but achieved this application mark if all the subheadings matched the GR-Subhead style evidenced in **Question 3**. A number of candidates inserted extra space after the subheading *'Volunteering Projects'* so it did not match the spacing defined in the GR-Subhead style. Without evidence that the GR-Subhead style had been created and saved this application mark was not awarded.

Questions 11 to 15

Most candidates created a vertical bar chart and inserted this in the correct position within the column width. Some candidates were not able to select non-contiguous ranges and therefore charted all the data, or selected the adjacent column *Vacancies* instead of the *Percent* data. The chart title was correctly entered although this occasionally contained data entry or capitalisation errors - common errors were '*Type'* instead of '*Types'* and '*skill'* instead of '*skills'*. Where the correct data had been selected most set the maximum value axis to 48% (or 0.48). Increments of 0.06 were not always set with some setting the y-axis minimum to 6% instead. A few candidates incorrectly displayed a legend and some of the labels were truncated on the x-axis. Displaying the values as data labels above each bar was not always done. A number of horizontal bar charts were seen.

Questions 16 and 17

Most candidates imported the correct image in the correct position. Some candidates unnecessarily inserted extra space below the subheading, presumably to make room for the image, and this resulted in inconsistent spacing after this subheading. Resizing the image was well done with the aspect ratio maintained. Most applied text wrapping to the image but a few candidates failed to align the image to the left of the column and/or to the top of the text in the paragraph. Occasionally the image was placed in the wrong paragraph or text wrap not applied. Most candidates achieved full marks for manipulating the image.

Questions 18 and 19

Most candidates indented the paragraph although some included additional text, indented from only the left margin, or indented more or less than the required measurement. Those that attempted the indent applied a border to this text although this was not always a thick, 3 to 4 point black border. Shading was occasionally applied to the text rather than filling the box and a few changed the colour of the words to grey instead.

Questions 20

The document was usually well presented, particularly where the styles had been created and applied correctly. Spacing between items was generally consistent and the bulleted list and bordered paragraph were rarely split across columns/pages. Occasionally there was a widow or orphan, particularly where a subheading had been left at the bottom of a column, or the columns were not aligned at the top of the page.

Task 3 – Database

Question 21 and 224

The importing of the csv files and creation of primary keys and relationships between the tables were well done. Most field names and data types were accurate although a few candidates set the telephone number as numeric instead of text. Formatting was not always as instructed with the Boolean field not displaying as Yes/No and the dates and times not formatted as instructed. The screenshot evidence did not always confirm a one-to-many relationship had been created. This can be evidenced through a relationship dialogue box or diagram showing the relationship type. It must show the outcome after the relationship has been created and not the creation in process.

Question 23

The creation of a columnar data entry form using all the fields from the test data table was well done by most. Some candidates had modified their form so the field headings were not always aligned to the left or displayed under each other.

Question 24

Most candidates used their data entry form to enter the new record and provided screenshot evidence of this. The new record sometimes contained data entry errors and some screenshots were so small it was not possible to read the contents. A few candidates did not evidence the new record in the form and some screenshots were cropped so not all the fields were displayed. Candidates were not awarded marks if they overwrote the first record in the database (*CIE1300520*) instead of entering this data as a new record.

Question 25

The first report used fields from the both tables and was completed well by a number of candidates. Those that created the new calculated field generally did so well using the correct calculation. There were some data entry and capitalisation errors in the field heading and some did not displayed the data as a percentage with 0 decimal places. The search was based on three criterion with the most common error being the search between two dates with many candidates confusing the greater than (>) and less than (<) operators. The wildcard search on 'Internet' was generally well done. Most displayed the correct fields although these were often in the wrong order as without manual intervention the software placed the sort fields first in the report. This can be avoided by setting the sort order in the report structure rather than during the creation of the report. Data in one or more of the fields was often truncated and required manipulation to ensure it was all fully visible. The multiple criteria sort was generally well done. Candidates were instructed not to group the data, so to avoid this several candidates deleted records with a *Student_ID* that appeared more than once. This is not the correct way to prevent grouping and resulted in the report data being incorrect. Formatting

instructions for the report title were not always followed. Many candidates accepted the default font type but this should have been changed to a serif font and centred. The larger title was not always fully visible with the descenders on the letters in the title truncated. The report title occasionally contained data entry or capitalisation errors. The average calculation was done well but this was often not positioned under the *Score* field or formatted to display as integer. Some candidates positioned this calculation in the page footer rather than at the end of the report which caused an error in the calculation. The label for the calculation was not always to the left of the value and was occasionally entered as '*Average score*' or contained capitalisation errors and/or a superfluous colon.

Question 26

The second report used fields from both tables. This was well done by those that attempted it with many error-free reports produced. A few candidates incorrectly based this report on the result of the search in **Question 25** rather than creating a new search. The search was generally well done although a few candidates searched on >18:00 instead of >=18:00. Most displayed the correct fields although *Start_Time* was occasionally missing. The field order was not always correct with the sort field being positioned first, and the data was occasionally truncated. The sort on a single criterion was not always done. The report was required to fit on a single page which most did. A few contained data entry errors in the report title and the 's' on '*Sessions'* was often missing or truncated.

Question 27

Candidates did not perform well on the theory question despite a common topic that has been covered in the theory paper on many previous occasions. A few candidates gave good clear answers to some or all parts of the question, but others were unable to provide an accurate definition of data validation and confused validation and verification. In part c) many candidates gave a description of the validation criteria required for the *Score* field (often incorrect) rather than the giving the actual validation criteria to be used. Many were unable to apply their knowledge of data validation to this database.

Task 4 – Mail Merge

Question 28 and 29

The mail merge task was very well done with some candidates producing error-free work. Most candidates evidenced using a field to display today's date although some incorrectly used the *CreateDate* or *SaveDate* field codes. A number of candidates did not use the correct dd/MM/yy formatting and screenshot evidence did not show the formatting of the date field code at all. Most candidates correctly replaced the text and chevrons in the master document with the correct fields. The most common errors continue to be failure to retain a space between the fields, deleting line spaces and punctuation as the fields are inserted, and not removing the chevrons in the text. Most entered their name in the footer but this did not always include the centre number and candidate number. There were two spelling errors in the first paragraph which were not corrected by some candidates suggesting that the spell check had not been run as instructed.

Question 30 and 31

The merge selection was based on two search criterion and was usually completed well. The search to match *Monday* caused no problems but some had difficulty also finding records greater than (>) *13:00* and a few candidates incorrectly changed the criteria to OR instead of AND. Screenshot evidence of a tick box selection method does not evidence that an automated filter has been used. A few candidates continue to use '*find'* or '*find in field*' to select recipients at the printing stage which did not merge the letters.

Question 32

Candidates were required to discuss the advantages and disadvantages to applicants of using an online form for the skills checklist, rather than completing this form manually, with the data then entered onto the database by university staff. Many candidates focused on the benefits to the university or gave generic answers with vague descriptions of why it was good to use an online form rather than relating their answer to the scenario. Answers seen included the consideration of the need for IT skills, internet access and a device and/or software to enable applicants to complete the form online. Many candidates did not attempt an answer to this question.

Task 5 – Presentation

Question 33

Most candidates successfully imported the 5 slides and presented each as a title and bulleted list. A few candidates did not format slide 1 with a centred title and some left a bullet on the subtitle. A small number of candidates did not enter their name after the text as instructed. The layout required the title and subtitle to be centred on the slide. Whilst built-in slide designs can be used candidates should ensure the design chosen meets the requirements. Some applied a built-in slide design that positioned the master items differently on slide 1, did not centre the title and subtitle on the first slide.

Question 34

The master items were entered although these were not always positioned consistently suggesting a slide master may not have been used. Marks were not gained where one or more of the master items moved or appeared in a different position on the second and subsequent slides. The most common error was the omission or inconsistent position of the slide numbers.

Question 35

Most candidates moved the slide to the correct position.

Question 36 and 37

The majority of candidates copied the diagram to the correct slide and most attempted to draw the missing boxes with varying degrees of success. Only a small minority of candidates gained full marks. Few candidates managed to match the design of the existing boxes with the newly created boxes. Differences included the box shading and thickness of joining lines, differing font sizes and styles of the text within the boxes, data entry and capitalisation errors in the text, and joining lines overlapping the shapes. A better approach to this task would have been to open the file, ungroup the diagram, copy and paste one of the existing boxes and then format and edit this box to create the new boxes. This would have provided a consistency in design with the other shapes. The joining lines should be positioned behind the boxes so the overlap was not visible. It was evident from the number of data entry errors that some candidates had attempted to redraw the complete diagram.

Question 38

The majority of candidates printed only slides 1 to 4 as instructed with 2 slides to the page. A few printed only slides 1 and 4. Some candidates printed all 5 slides with 2 slides to the page, or printed all slides as full-page slides.

Question 39

Some candidates submitted no printout of the Evidence Document. It is essential that candidates print their Evidence Document as failure to do so can result in a number of lost marks. Candidates should be encouraged to print this towards the end of the exam, regardless of whether they have finished the paper.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

```
Paper 0417/22
Practical Test A
```

Key messages

To improve performance in this examination candidates must be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types. These are categories of font type with specific attributes and not the actual names of font styles. Candidates must be able to select an appropriate font style for the font type specified. Some centres have reported that they do not have a font style called 'serif' installed on the computers. As typeface categories the font style names 'serif' and 'sans-serif' will not appear as an installed font.

Text to be entered by the candidate as part of a task is displayed in bold on the examination 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 this data entry as common errors on this paper included incorrect capitalisation, incorrect or missing characters, omission of spaces, truncated headings and additional punctuation.

Candidates are required to produce screenshots to evidence the ICT skills that cannot be assessed through the printed product alone. The screenshot evidence needs to show the outcome rather than the process so, for example, save evidence needs to show the folder contents with the saved file listed. Many candidates screenshot the '*Save as…*' dialogue box which shows the save in process but does not provide sufficient evidence that the file has been saved. Candidates should check each printed screenshot to ensure it is clear and large enough to be read. Where examiners are unable to read the materials presented, they cannot award the marks. Similarly, some candidates did not achieve marks as a result of presenting screenshots with important elements cropped.

Each task instructs candidates to enter their name, centre number and candidate number. A small number of candidates are not following these instructions and submitting work for assessment without identification details. Without clear printed evidence of the author of the work, examiners were unable to award any marks for these pages. It is not acceptable for candidates to annotate their printouts by hand with their name as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work.

Candidates are required to create and apply paragraph styles. When selecting a font type for a paragraph style this should be a font that contains no other formatting. Applying additional formatting that has not been specified in the House style specification will mean that candidates do not gain marks, for example, the font style *Algerian* is a serif font style that displays all capital letters and if this did not match the enhancement specified on the House style specification candidates would not gain marks.

Candidates should be encouraged to print evidence as it is completed rather than waiting until the end of the examination time. They should print all pages of a document or report and not just the first page. It is essential that candidates print their Evidence Document towards the end of the examination time, regardless of whether they have finished the examination. The document will contain supporting evidence which can substantially improve the candidate's mark and they should be taught to print this before the examination ends.

General comments

Candidates appeared well prepared for this examination and the paper gave a good spread of marks. Most candidates completed or attempted all elements of the paper and the majority who submitted work showed

sound knowledge, skills and understanding. Candidates are now more confident and perform well with the skills in the syllabus, particularly the creation and use of styles and mail merge.

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. Several candidates lost marks due to punch holes taking out characters in the database report headings resulting in missing letters in data entry which could not then be assessed for accuracy.

Screenshots in the Evidence Document are often too small to read even using magnification devices. Candidates MUST ensure that all screenshots can be easily read with the naked eye.

A small number of candidates did not print their name, centre number and candidate number on some of the documents submitted for assessment. Without clear printed evidence of the author of the work, examiners were unable to award any marks for these pages. It is not acceptable for candidates to annotate their printouts by hand with their name as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work.

Some candidates omitted one or more of the pages from the required printouts. A small number of candidates submitted multiple printouts for some of the tasks and did not to cross out those printouts that were draft copies. Candidates should submit all printouts and cross through any draft versions which are not to be marked. If multiple printouts are submitted without draft versions being crossed through, only the first occurrence of each page will be marked.

Comments on specific questions

Task 1 – The Evidence Document

An evidence document was created and used by candidates to store screenshot evidence as required by the paper. Occasionally the screenshots were too small or faint to be read. A small number did not print identification details on the document so marks could not be awarded for these pages. A few did not present the evidence document for marking.

Task 2 – Document

Question 1

All candidates opened the correct source file and most saved it with the correct filename in the format of the word processing software being used. Some candidates resaved the file in rtf format and occasionally the filename contained typographical errors or was not capitalised as shown on the exam paper. Screenshot evidence of the save was often inconclusive showing the save in process rather than capturing the outcome of the file saved. A screenshot of the folder contents after saving provides the evidence required. Some candidates increased the left and right hand margin settings despite a specific instruction not to make to make any changes to the page setup.

Question 2

Headers and footers were generally inserted as instructed. Automated page numbers were not always used, with the number 1 typed and appearing on all pages and a few candidates omitted their centre number and candidate number from the header details. Where the file detail and path wrapped to a second line in the footer this often did not align to the right margin. Candidates who used the built in content control to align the text did not always remove superfluous text or placeholders in the header and/or footer areas and a few candidates displayed the field codes.

Question 3

Candidates are required to create paragraph styles according to a House style specification. This is being well done by the vast majority of candidates. The styles must be correctly named and the correct attributes applied. Styles containing extra formatting not listed in the House style specification are penalised. To avoid a new style inheriting additional formatting candidates should make sure that each new style is based on the default or 'normal' paragraph style. Common errors in creating the styles continue to be capitalisation errors in the style names, serif or sans-serif font styles set incorrectly, additional formatting applied and incorrect spacing applied before and/or after the style. Screenshot evidence of the TA-Subhead style provided details of the settings created for this style and the formatting of all subheadings needed to match these settings. A

few candidates continue to apply the individual attributes to the relevant text rather than creating styles and do not gain these marks.

Question 4

Candidates were required to show a list of the new styles as evidence that the styles had been created and saved. It was not necessary to show all the attributes set for every style. Any screenshot that showed a list of these style names was acceptable including the style ribbon toolbar or a list from a style manager/organiser. The application of the relevant styles in the document was only awarded if there was evidence in the style list that the style had been created and saved.

Question 5

Candidates entered the title text at the start of the document and applied the style. Occasionally this was entered below the subtitle text. Text in bold on the examination paper must be entered exactly as shown. The title text occasionally contained spelling and/or capitalisation errors. Application of the TA-Title style was awarded if the formatting met the House style specification and there was evidence that the style had been created and saved in the style list seen in **Question 4**.

Question 6

The subtitle text was provided in the recall document and most candidates correctly entered their name after this text and applied the TA-Subtitle style. Application of the TA-Subtitle style was awarded if the formatting met the House style specification and there was evidence that the style had been created and saved in the style list seen in **Question 4**. Some candidates inserted a line space after the subtitle and as a result the spacing after did not match the House style specification.

Question 7

Most attempted to apply the TA-Body style to the rest of the text in the document. Application of the TA-Body style was awarded if the formatting met the House style specification and there was evidence that the style had been created and saved in the style list seen in **Question 4**. Occasionally inconsistencies were found in the TA-Body text style such as the serif font style and size not applied consistently, full justification not applied to all the body text and, more commonly, some inconsistent spacing after paragraphs of body text. No spacing above the extract and chart indicated that the 6 point spacing after each paragraph had not been set as part of the TA-Body style. Had this been set and applied correctly the spacing below the paragraphs would have been set automatically. As part of proofreading candidates should make sure that all styles have been applied correctly to the text and spacing is consistent.

Question 8

Most candidates changed the required text into two equally spaced columns with the correct spacing between the columns. A few candidates displayed the entire document in two columns and a smaller number inserted the column break below rather than above the subheading. Occasionally a page break was inserted instead of a section break.

Question 9

Most candidates applied the software's default bullets to the list. Few created the TA-Bullet style with the attributes listed in the House style specification. Without evidence of this style saved the marks were not awarded.

Question 10

This question tested the application of the TA-Subhead style to each of the five subheadings within the document and was performed well by most candidates. Screenshot evidence of the TA-Subhead style settings was provided in the Evidence Document and if all five subheadings matched these settings this application mark was awarded.

Questions 11 to 15

Most candidates selected the correct data and created a vertical bar chart. This was inserted in the correct position within the column width. The chart title occasionally contained data entry or capitalisation errors. Formatting the maximum value on the value axis and setting increments was well done on this paper. Occasionally the year axis labels and title were omitted from the category axis. A number of horizontal bar charts were seen.

Questions 16 and 17

Most candidates achieved full marks for manipulating the image. The image was imported and inserted in the correct position. It was aligned and resized correctly with the aspect ratio maintained and text wrapped around the image.

Task 3 – Database

Question 18 and 19

Importing the csv files, setting primary keys and creating a relationship between the tables was well done although a few incorrectly included ID fields. Most field names and data types were accurate although a few candidates set the *Subject_Ref* as a numeric field instead of text. The *Day_Release* field was occasionally set at a text field rather than Boolean and this often displayed on the report with True/False or a checkbox rather than Yes/No. The date field was not always displayed in the format dd-MMM-yy. The relationship screenshot was often captured during the process of creating the relationship which did not evidence the type of relationship between the tables.

Question 20

The creation of a columnar data entry form using all the fields from the apprentices data table was usually well done. Some candidates modified their form so the field headings were not always aligned to the left or displayed under each other in columnar format. Radio buttons were not well understood and very few candidates managed to create these. It was expected that candidates would use one control box containing both radio buttons although this was rarely seen. A variety of evidence was seen including separate radio buttons, list boxes, drop down menus and check boxes. A few candidates evidenced how and where the values would be stored although this was not required to achieve the mark. Very few candidates included an appropriate heading for the form with most not changing the filename inserted by default.

Question 21

Most candidates used their data entry form to enter the new record and provided screenshot evidence of this. The new record sometimes contained data entry errors and some screenshots were so small it was not possible to read the contents. Candidates were did not achieve the mark, if they overwrote the first record in the database (*Apprentice Butcher*) instead of entering this data as a new record.

Question 22

The first report used fields from the both tables and was generally done well. Most created a new calculated field although the calculation was not always correct and the new field heading occasionally contained capitalisation or data entry errors. The new field was usually formatted to 2 decimal places but did not always use the same currency symbol as the *Wage* field. The search was based on three criterion with most successfully finding *Advanced* or *Higher* but very few managing to exclude *Accounting* from the search, or set criteria to find records on or before *31-Aug-18*. Most sorted the data correctly and displayed the correct fields but these were often presented in the wrong order with the sort fields positioned first in the report. This can be avoided by setting the sort order after the structure of the report has been created. The report was to fit the width of a landscape page and tested the candidate's ability to manipulate the data and adjust the field widths to present the report as requested. The data in one or more of the fields was often truncated. Most displayed the report title in a larger font so it stood out as the title. The number of vacancies was calculated correctly although not positioned under the *Level* field. Screenshot evidence was provided of the formula used which showed that some had used SUM instead of COUNT and a surprising number had counted on a field called *Vacancies* which did not exist in the database and was the reason an error appeared. The label *Number of jobs* was not always to the left of the value and often contained an error including capitalisation of 'Jobs', superfluous punctuation at the end and/or the final letter was missing.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

Question 23

The database extract used fields from both tables and searched on three fields using a wildcard and search operators. The most common errors were the wildcard search on *Engineer* and searching for those >=150 with candidates confusing the greater than (>) and less than (<) operators, or not including records that were equal to 150. The field order was often incorrect and/or contained additional fields. The single criterion sort was occasionally in descending rather than ascending order. A number of candidates showed no evidence of attempting this task.

Question 24

Most candidates who completed **Question 23** provided evidence of exporting the extract although this was not always in rtf format. The extract was often saved as a spreadsheet or as a .txt file. Screenshot evidence occasionally showed the save in process rather than the outcome of the file saved in the work area.

Question 25

Candidates did not perform well on this theory question with many confusing verification and validation. Candidates were unable to provide an accurate definition of data verification or to name two methods with many believing that proofreading is a type of verification. Very few candidates mentioned comparing data with the original source or were able to explain how one of these methods could be used with this database.

Task 4 – Document 2

Question 26

The number of candidates who managed to import the rtf extract into the document was relatively low. Some candidates inserted a screenshot of the extract rather than importing the saved rtf file. Candidates were required to manipulate the data so it displayed on one line but many did not do this accepting the default presentation. Other errors included incorrect field order, additional fields displayed and the TA-Table style not applied to the extract. Rarely was a 6 point space applied below the extract. In a few cases the extract was printed as a separate document or database report.

Question 27

The overall layout and presentation of the document was generally good. Spacing between items was consistent and the extract and bulleted list were rarely split across columns/pages. Generally the widow/orphan control was good. Occasionally the columns were not aligned at the top of the page and a few candidates had changed the left and right hand margin settings despite a specific instruction not to make to make any changes to the page setup. Spacing below the chart and extract was not always consistent with the rest of the document. A few candidates had broken paragraphs by inserting hard returns and occasionally the last paragraph of the document was not in two columns suggesting not all the text had been selected when the columns were created.

Question 28

This question was not well answered with very few candidates evaluating the effects of IT on employment. Few related their answers to the scenario and answered in general terms. Many candidates focused on the benefits to the company of using robots such as higher productivity, working 24/7 without needing breaks and not needing to be paid which were not relevant to the question. Better answers identified a reduction of employment in offices and manual workers, an increase in job opportunities in areas such as network managers, website designers, computer programmers and a change in working patterns and hours.

Task 5 – Mail Merge

Question 29 to 31

The mail merge task was well done with some candidates producing error-free work. Most candidates evidenced using a date field to display today's date although this was often not presented in the long date format of dd MMMM yyyy. Some candidates incorrectly used the *CreateDate* or *SaveDate* field codes. Occasionally the screenshot did not show the formatting of the field. Most candidates correctly replaced the text and chevrons in the master document with the correct fields. The most common errors continue to be failure to retain a space between the fields, deleting line spaces and punctuation as the fields are inserted,

and not replacing the chevrons in the text. Most candidates inserted their name in the letter and included their details in the header of the document although some incorrectly entered these in the footer or did not include their centre number and candidate number.

Question 32 and 33

The merge selection was based on two search criterion and was completed well. A few candidates incorrectly changed the criteria to OR instead of AND. The search criteria '*intermediate'* was occasionally spelt incorrectly. Screenshot evidence of a tick box selection method does not evidence that an automated filter has been used. A few candidates continue to use '*find'* or '*find in field*' to select recipients at the printing stage which did not merge the letters.

Task 6 – Presentation

Question 34

Most candidates successfully imported the 6 slides, presenting each slide as a title and bulleted list. Slide 1 was usually formatted with a title slide layout so the title was larger than the subtitle and both were centred on the slide. A few candidates did not enter their name after the subtitle text and some left a bullet on the subtitle. Those applying built-in slide designs often incurred faults as the layout did not meet the requirements.

Question 35

The master items were entered onto the slides although these were not always positioned consistently suggesting a master slide had not been used. Marks were not achieved if for one or more elements were not in the same position on all slides and occasionally master items overlapped the table on slide 4. The most common error was the omission or inconsistent position of the slide numbers.

Question 36

Candidates who followed the instructions to create the table structure and copy the data into this structure presented the table well. Some candidates opened the rtf file and copied and pasted the table onto the slide without creating a structure first. Either method was acceptable but without the table structure more manipulation was required to resize and position the table. The table often overlapped the master slide items, was too wide to fit on the slide or data in the last row was incomplete or truncated. The most common error was shading applied to the table cells and some did not display the table gridlines. It was evident from the number of data entry errors that some candidates had attempted to type the complete table.

Question 37

Most managed to insert a new row above the first row of the table and enter the heading although this text often contained capitalisation or data entry errors. A few candidates entered the heading in a separate text box which they positioned above the table, or inserted the new row as the second row of the table.

Question 38 and 39

Those that inserted a new row in the table usually merged and centred the heading. Most applied bold enhancement and shading to rows 1 and 2. The font size was enlarged but this was not always size 20 in both rows. Occasionally the font size was increased in columns 1 and 2 rather than rows 1 and 2.

Question 40

Presenter notes were not well understood and very few candidates entered the text as presenter/speaker notes or printed as presenter/speaker notes. Some candidates entered the text onto a slide or entered them in the header/footer area. Where the text was entered correctly as presenter notes it often contained data entry or capitalisation errors, most commonly the full stop was omitted.

Question 41

A number of candidates printed all slides in the presentation as full-page slides, or printed all slides with 2 slides to the page. A few correctly printed only slides 1 to 4 with 2 slides to the page and a small number printed only slides 1 and 4.

Question 42

Some candidates submitted no printout of the Evidence Document. It is essential that candidates print their Evidence Document as failure to do so can result in a number of marks not being achieved. Candidates should be encouraged to print this towards the end of the exam, regardless of whether they have finished the paper.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

> **Paper 0417/31**
> **Practical Test B**

Key messages

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

• Candidates need a better understanding of how to produce an effective evaluation. This should be a critique rather than a description of the subject matter and should include problems or issues as well as positive elements
• Candidates need to understand the importance of following the instructions on the question paper
• Candidates need to take greater care with the accuracy of data entry.

General comments

The paper gave a good spread of marks and candidate errors were spread evenly over the sections of the paper.

A small number of candidates failed to print their name, centre number and candidate number on some of the documents submitted for assessment. Without clear printed evidence of the author of the work, examiners were unable to award any marks for these pages. It is not acceptable for candidates to annotate their printouts by hand with their name as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work.

In this session a significant number of candidates printed work that was too small to read even using magnification devices. Candidates MUST ensure that all text can be easily read with the naked eye.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Most candidates produced a table with the correct number of rows and though many failed to set the table with four columns, only creating three. This did not allow the top centre cell to span two columns to match the diagram.

Common errors included:
• Setting table width to 100 per cent
• Mistakes in setting the widths and/or heights of cells – a few candidates misread the QP and reversed width and height dimensions
• Some candidates produced a new table for each row
• Borders and gridlines were often not visible.

Question 2

Most candidates placed the brickwork image as specified.

Question 3

While many candidates added the text accurately and set it into style h2, there were a significant number of typographical errors in the accuracy of the text entered.

Question 4

Most candidates placed the paving image as specified, although not all of these candidates resized the image as specified without distorting it.

Question 5

The logo image was frequently placed as specified although not all candidates included the hyperlink. Of those candidates who did include it, there were a number of accuracy errors, as well as a number of candidates who had used mailto: with the website URL. The target window was often omitted or inaccurately entered.

Question 6

Many candidates performed this question well, although a few candidates truncated the text. Some candidates did not set this into style h1.

Question 7

The text was usually inserted as specified, but not always correctly formatted, for example, some candidates set all the text as h3. A few candidates omitted part of their candidate details.

The hyperlink was frequently entered correctly, but the target window was often omitted. Again, a mailto: link was erroneously used by several candidates.

Question 8

Almost all candidates completed this step as instructed.

Question 9

Many candidates added text to each image using the alt attribute, but not always to all four images. Fewer candidates gave all of these images an appropriate description.

Question 10

This was often set in the html but it is not possible to see evidence of centre alignment where the table width was overwritten by being set to 100 per cent the width of the window.

Question 11

The stylesheet was often attached as specified to the web page, although some candidates did not place this in the head section.

Question 12

Many candidates created the stylesheet, a small number of candidates erroneously included html within their stylesheet. There were a number of common errors, which included:
- incorrect font colour settings, including the use of text based colours like color:red
- incorrect border colour settings, including the colour set correctly for the table but omitted for the table data (and vice versa)
- incorrect or omitted font styles
- the use of classes rather than styles
- inefficient syntax, for example. setting h1 h2 and h3 font styles and alignment separately
- spelling errors in the font names.

Evidence 1

Most candidates produced a screen shot of a browser window which included the address bar but it was unusual for the text to be clearly legible, since many screen shots were too small to see easily. A few screen shots were cropped making it impossible to award some of the marks.

Evidence 2

This was usually competed successfully, but some candidates produced screen shots which were often so small they were extremely difficult or impossible to read and some of these screen shots did not show all of the html.

Evidence 3

This was frequently completed successfully.

Question 13

There were few good answers to this question, many incorrect responses included a description or an explanation of the font hierarchies rather than the choice of fonts for this page.

Question 14

Most candidates completed the first three answers correctly, although fewer gave an appropriate response for the 'is not equal to' symbols.

Question 15

Most candidates edited the correct file and saved their work as a spreadsheet with the correct filename. Not all candidates merged the correct cells, but other formatting of rows 1 and 2 were frequently completed well. Row 3 was less frequently reduced in height, and cells A4 to A11 were not always right aligned.

Question 16

Most candidates completed this although the items were not always placed as specified within the header and footer. Other errors included; the use of incorrect filenames and the placing of the filename in the footer without including the automated file path.

Question 17

Unfortunately, a significant number of candidates did not show all the evidence of this in their Evidence Document. Where candidates produce solutions looking up against a list, evidence of the list must be seen. Of those using the correct validation approach, a significant number entered 'S or D' for the Source instead of 'S,D', Some others attempted validation using a Custom method but did not apply a suitable formula.

Question 18

Many candidates completed this well using nested IF statements, although there were a number of typographical errors. A number of candidates attempted to use IF functions without the use of an equality or inequality.

Question 19

Many candidates produced a viable VLOOKUP function for this question. The data set that was used for the lookup range in the csv file was not sorted so the LOOKUP function was not appropriate for this task and the final False (or 0) parameter was required when using the VLOOKUP function. Some candidates omitted this parameter.

Question 20

Few candidates completed this step to calculate the correct number of bricks. There were a variety of methods seen, with many correctly calculating the area of the wall with accuracy. Other errors included:
- erroneous formulae to find the face area of the brick from the table in j1831bricks.csv – some candidates simply typed in a value
- formulae which worked only for a single (or double) skin wall
- errors in the calculation for the extra 10 per cent with many candidates using +10 per cent
- omitting to add 50 bricks or 10 per cent extra to *both* single and double skin walls
- omitting the use of a function to return a whole number of bricks.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

Question 21

Most candidates successfully saved and printed their spreadsheet, but a number failed to display the row and column headings and/or set the column widths so that all data and formulae, particularly the contents of cell B11, could be seen by the Examiner.

Question 22

Most candidates completed this as specified, although few candidates displayed the correct number of bricks due to errors in their formula in cell B11.

Question 23

Many candidates completed this as specified.

Question 24

Many candidates completed this as specified.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Paper 0417/32
Practical Test B

Key messages

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

- Candidates need a better understanding of the hierarchical nature of font lists within a cascading stylesheet
- Candidates need to create an evaluation of their work rather than just a description of what they have attempted
- Candidates need to understand the importance of following the instructions on the question paper
- Candidates need to take greater care with the accuracy of data entry.

General comments

The paper gave a good spread of marks and candidate errors were spread evenly over the sections of the paper.

A small number of candidates did not print their name, centre number and candidate number on some of the documents submitted for assessment. Without clear printed evidence of the author of the work, examiners were unable to award any marks for these pages. It is not acceptable for candidates to annotate their printouts by hand with their name as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work.

In this session a significant number of candidates printed work that was too small to read even using magnification devices. Candidates MUST ensure that all text can be easily read with the naked eye.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Most candidates produced a table with the correct number of rows and columns. The most common error was setting the table width to a fixed percentage (often 100 per cent) which overwrites the values entered within each element of table data. A small number of candidates erroneously created a new table for each row of the table shown in the diagram with the question paper. A significant number of candidates did not remove the borders and gridlines from the table.

Question 2

Most candidates placed the cabin image as specified, resizing it to 570 pixels wide.

Question 3

The image was frequently placed as specified, with the correct image resizing completed in the mark-up.

Question 4

Many candidates added alternate text to both the images. Fewer candidates gave both of these images an appropriate description, many descriptions were very limited.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

Question 5

Almost all candidates placed the text in the correct table cell, however not all candidates entered this text accurately. Most candidates set this text as style h1 although a number of candidates attempted to set the style using classes rather than styles.

Question 6

The text was usually inserted as specified, but not always correctly formatted into style h2. A significant number of candidates attempted to set the style using classes rather than styles.

Question 7

The text was usually inserted as specified, but not always correctly formatted, there appeared to be a greater use of CSS classes in this session.

Question 8

This was often set in the html but it is not possible to see evidence of centre alignment where the table width was overwritten by being set to 100 per cent the width of the window.

Question 9

Few candidates set the default target window. Not all the candidates who attempted to set a default target window did so in the head section of the webpage.

Question 10

The hyperlink was frequently entered correctly, although some candidates who included additional text within the hyperlink. A small number of candidates erroneously attempted to make the hyperlink a mailto: link. Not all those who entered the hyperlink correctly ensured that it opened in a new window called **_new**.

Question 11

The cabin image was frequently used to create the hyperlink for the mailto link. Of those candidates who did include it, there were a number of accuracy errors in the email address and even more where candidates attempted to insert the automated subject line into the mail message. A number of candidates made the logo image the hyperlink rather than the cabin image.

Question 12

The stylesheet was often attached as specified to the webpage, although some candidates did not place this in the head section.

Evidence 1

Most candidates produced a screen shot which included the address bar but it was unusual for the text to be clearly legible since many screen shots were too small to see easily. A few screen shots were cropped making it impossible to award some of the marks.

Evidence 2

This was usually competed successfully, but some candidates produced screen shots which were often so small they were extremely difficult or impossible to read and some of these screen shots did not show all of the html code. Some candidates did not produce the html but pasted a link to the work on their local machine.

Question 13

This question was frequently answered poorly, with few candidates understanding the hierarchical nature of font selection within a cascading stylesheet. A significant number of candidates did not identify the speech marks are required by some browsers to indicate font names with multiple words.

Question 14

Most candidates edited the correct file and saved their work as a spreadsheet with the correct filename. Not all candidates merged cells A1 to F1 and A2 to F2, but formatted rows 1 and 2 as specified with a black background and a white sans-serif centre aligned text. Row 3 was less frequently reduced in height, and cells A4 to A11 were not always right aligned.

Question 15

Most candidates completed this although the items were not always placed as specified within the header and footer. Other errors included; the use of incorrect file names and the placing of the filename in the footer without including the automated file path.

Question 16

Unfortunately, a significant number of candidates did not show all the evidence of this in their Evidence Document. Where candidates produce solutions looking up against a list, evidence of the list must be seen.

Question 17

Many candidates completed this well using nested IF statements, although there were a number of typographical errors. A number of candidates attempted to use IF functions without the use of an equality or inequality.

Question 18

Few candidates scored high marks on this question. A significant number described the use of data validation but went on to describe improving the user interface rather than the data restrictions.

Question 19

Many candidates produced a viable VLOOKUP function for this question. The data set that was used for the lookup range in the csv file was not sorted so the LOOKUP function was not appropriate for this task and the final False (or 0) parameter was required when using the VLOOKUP function. Some candidates omitted this parameter.

Question 20

Many candidates completed this step to calculate the correct cost per day or per week. The calculation performed depended on whether the cabin was to be hired by the day or by the week. There were a number of correct solutions to this question and although many candidates created successful formulae that worked for either hire period, others edited their formulae for each instance modelled.

Question 21

The majority of candidates completed this as specified.

Question 22

Fewer candidates than anticipated were successful with this question, candidates did not always identify the cells that contained monetary values correctly, so formatting some cells inappropriately.

Question 23

Many candidates completed this as specified, though not all showed row and column headings and/or the contents of all cells. A number of candidates produced the values view but did not print the formulae view.

Question 24

Many candidates completed this as specified and attained the correct values for this booking. Not all candidates formatted the column widths appropriately, in some cases the columns ran into multiple pages. A significant number of candidates omitted the 'w' option.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

© 2018

Question 25

Many candidates completed this as specified although the errors identified in step 24 were seen in this printout.

Question 26

Again, many candidates completed this as specified, using their sheet to model the data and attained the correct values for this booking. Not all candidates formatted the column widths appropriately, in some cases the columns ran into multiple pages.

Question 27

Many candidates completed this as specified although the errors identified in step 26 were seen in this printout.