



GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**ICT
AS/Advanced**

JANUARY 2011

Statistical Information

This booklet contains summary details for each unit: number entered; maximum mark available; mean mark achieved; grade ranges. *N.B. These refer to 'raw marks' used in the initial assessment, rather than to the uniform marks reported when results are issued.*

Annual Statistical Report

The annual *Statistical Report* (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

Unit	Page
IT1	1
IT3	4

ICT
General Certificate of Education
January 2011
Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

Principal Examiner: Dai Rudge

Unit Statistics

The following statistics include all candidates entered for the unit, whether or not they 'cashed in' for an award. The attention of centres is drawn to the fact that the statistics listed should be viewed strictly within the context of this unit and that differences will undoubtedly occur between one year and the next and also between subjects in the same year.

Unit	Entry	Max Mark	Mean Mark
IT1	4406	80	34.6

Grade Ranges

A	56
B	50
C	44
D	38
E	32

N.B. The marks given above are raw marks and not uniform marks.

General Comment

Candidates continue to write well and appear to find the paper accessible. Some candidates still aren't numbering/labelling their spreadsheets and consequently are getting few if any marks for question 10. Other candidates are dropping marks in this area because the task and the answers they have prepared are too teacher led and they then do not understand enough of what they have done to answer the questions properly.

Comments on particular questions

- Q.1 (a) A well answered question but candidates lost marks by only including one example of knowledge. Weaker candidates did not understand the difference between knowledge and information and failed to give the standard answer that data is raw facts and figures.
- (b) Generally well answered although some candidates thought that encoding meant encryption and that the problem was that you didn't understand the code. A number of candidates also seemed preoccupied with the fact that it allowed more data to appear on the screen which is a by-product rather than a reason for doing it.
- Q.2 (a) A significant number of candidates still do not understand what a command line interface is, even though they knew it was something to do with DOS they could not come up with an appropriate use. Most candidates gained a mark because they could give a disadvantage.
- (b) Many candidates could give both an advantage and a disadvantage of a speech recognition system and yet could not provide an appropriate use or could show that they were discussing input only.
- Q.3 Most candidates could name the characteristics but could not go on to describe them as the question asked and so only got the list mark. Most, however, did then get good marks for appropriate examples.
- Q.4 A poorly answered question by many candidates. Examples were sometimes nothing to do with schools' administration systems and referred to applications covered in previous years.
- (a) (i) Most candidates could explain what a query was but gave no reason for its use in their example.
- (ii) A lot of candidates thought that a report was just a printout, not that it involved formatting.
- (iii) Candidates often included import and export in their definition and thus gained no marks for that part but some did gain a mark for an appropriate example.
- (b) A lot of candidates seemed to think that flat files referred to paper records and did not appear to understand the advantages that a relational database gives you.

- Q.5 (a) Weaker candidates would often use the name of the feature to describe it or did not actually state which feature they were describing. For example walkthrough is a valid answer but gains no marks for merely stating the feature. It has to be explained, for example, 'walkthrough is walking through the design' gains no marks, neither does 'stresses and strains can be used to calculate the stresses on a building'.
- (b) The majority of candidates could state the relationship between CAD and CAM but could not give an actual example including what is being produced and how it is produced, for the additional mark.
- Q.6 Most candidates could give the definitions of validation and verification but marks were lost when candidates gave an example that had nothing to do with pupil record systems or were unrealistic.
- Q.7 (a) Candidates lost marks by not referring to the crime which broke the act e.g. hacking, creating viruses but instead wrote about fraud or stealing someone's identity.
- (b) Backing up was frequently given but candidates needed to add more detail such as stored in a fireproof safe or stored off-site. Weaker candidates also didn't seem to read the question and wrote about prevention of deliberate actions, i.e. passwords.
- Q.8 (a) Candidates often wrote about stock control rather than just barcodes as the question asked. A significant number of candidates thought that the price was on the barcode! Most gained some marks though by being able to give an advantage and a disadvantage.
- (b) Surprisingly some candidates did not appear to have come across the term 'just in time' stock control but most candidates did gain some marks on this question by giving answers to do with the general principles of stock control.
- (c) Most candidates scored well on this part.
- Q.9 Candidates often gave general answers about the features of a spreadsheet rather than specific points about using a spreadsheet for quotations and working out commission.
- Q.10 (a) Candidates lost marks by simply discussing the function in general terms indicating where it was used but did not apply it to what they had used it for in their spreadsheet (1 mark) and why they used it (1 mark).
- (b) Marks were lost by candidates not giving sufficient detail about the validation technique used. There were 3 marks for each method. One for naming the method and stating exactly where and on what field it was used, the other two marks were for the detailed description.
- (c) Some candidates wrote about functions mentioned in question 10a, which gained them no marks. For the 2 marks candidates were expected to say what they had used the function for and why.

IT3
General Certificate of Education
January 2011
Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

Principal Examiner: Dai Rudge

Unit Statistics

The following statistics include all candidates entered for the unit, whether or not they 'cashed in' for an award. The attention of centres is drawn to the fact that the statistics listed should be viewed strictly within the context of this unit and that differences will undoubtedly occur between one year and the next and also between subjects in the same year.

Unit	Entry	Max Mark	Mean Mark
IT3	1768	90	41.2

Grade Ranges

A	63
B	54
C	46
D	38
E	30

N.B. The marks given above are raw marks and not uniform marks.

General Comment

Candidates continue to write well but the weaker candidates found the more technical questions quite challenging. The change to on-screen marking also put more emphasis on the need for exactitude of candidate answers.

Comments on particular questions

- Q.1 Candidates need to pay attention to the factors mentioned in the specification and not to try and mix and match them. Font size is not a factor but could be a development of disabled access or customisation. Candidates also seem to confuse consistency of signposting and popup information with clear navigational structure.
- Q.2 Many candidates could not describe what is meant by FTP or make it clear that they weren't writing about email.
- Q.3 A lot of candidates were able to gain the first mark by giving an appropriate advantage of FTP but failed to go on to gain the example marks because they either didn't refer to a company or didn't give any detail about what was being transferred.
- Q.4 Many candidates didn't seem to understand what a URL is.
- Q.5 On the whole this wasn't well answered because candidates failed to distinguish between a web crawler and a search engine.
- Q.6 Weaker candidates seemed to think that a Boolean search was a yes/no search, confusing it with the data type.
- Q.7 Most candidates were able to give two factors but often failed to get the second mark for each because they couldn't give enough detail in their description. Candidates who used performance as one of their factors invariably did not get the mark as they failed to state in terms of what, i.e. reliability or speed of processing. Security was condoned if candidates referred to level of risk rather than just hacking or viruses.
- Q.8 Most candidates got some marks here but only the best were able to give 5 or 6 distinct points, without duplication.
- Q.9 This question was also quite a good discriminator as again most candidates scored some points but only the better ones could go on to discuss four different problems and their consequences.
- Q.10 Reasonably well answered by most candidates in that they were able to describe two different methods but fewer could then go on to develop this with either more details on the method or to state in enough detail what they were trying to find by using each method.
- Q.11 Weaker candidates seemed to be confused between a feasibility report and analysis, but this still allowed them to gain some marks for the contents of the report.
- Q.12 Most candidates were able to gain one of the marks for the definition but lost marks for the guidelines because they tended to duplicate the areas they were looking at.
- Q.13 A significant number of candidates were not able to give the penalties for breaking the code of conduct.

- Q.14 This question was very well answered with most candidates able to get at least half marks but they had to cover all the 4 sections to get full marks.
- Q.15 It was pleasantly surprising to see candidates being able to discuss risks as they do not seem to give these points when the question is only about risk. As expected, backups also featured quite well but the better candidates really had a good go at this question and came up with some good responses, covering many angles.
- Q.16 Most candidates got at least 1 mark for their definitions but failed to score for the example because they didn't stick to the school context of the question.
- Q.17 Most candidates could give three features of a good MIS but only the better candidates gained the second mark for these features by giving enough detail or an appropriate example.
- Q.18 Candidates seemed to find this part harder than question 17 because they either gave the negative of question 17 or repeated the same factor over and over. There are enough factors given in the specification to allow candidates to answer this question well.
- Q.19-22 Candidates need to learn what the terms consistency, redundancy and independence mean. Most candidates seem to know the meaning of data integrity.
- Q.23 Candidates continue to answer this type of question well. They seem to understand the simplified nature needed for this type of solution.
- Q.24 Most candidates got 1 mark for the definition of a data warehouse, though some of the weaker candidates got carried away with stock control and seemed to be referring to a physical building. Only the very best candidates were able to give more than one advantage.
- Q.25 A significant number were able to give an appropriate definition of data mining and a simple example.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk