



GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**ICT
AS/Advanced**

JANUARY 2012

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 2012
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 | 3779 | 80 | 37.2 |

Grade Ranges

| | |
|---|----|
| A | 59 |
| B | 52 |
| C | 46 |
| D | 40 |
| E | 34 |

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

Comments on particular questions

- 1(a) Fairly well answered, most candidates could give examples of data and information. Surprisingly some candidates were able to give an example for knowledge but couldn't define the term.
- 1(b) Generally well answered. Weaker candidates lost marks by being too vague using expressions like 'less space', 'easier to find', etc. 'More data can appear on screen' is not really an appropriate answer at this level and will not be accepted in future years.
- 1(c) Generally a well answered question, with most candidates being able to give an example, but the weakest couldn't fully describe the problem. However, some candidates thought that the problem with encoding data was either because it could not be understood or that, for example, B could be encoded for blue, blonde or black.
- 2(a) Most candidates answered well.
- 2(b) The majority of candidates gained one mark but lost the second by giving an unrealistic example or failed to mention the actual validation method.
- 2(c) It was disappointing to see the number of candidates who could not give two characteristics let alone describe them. 'Timely' is not a suitable answer as it is too often confused with up to date.
- 2(d) This was better answered than in previous years with more candidates able to give a way of adding value, some of the examples were too vague, to gain the second mark.
- 3 Surprisingly poorly answered. Candidates either just re-hashed the question or did not give enough detail in their answer. For example 'zoom in and out of the design', 'walkthrough the house' and 'find the stresses/strains on the building'. Some candidates referred incorrectly to the stress put on the architect and others thought that a finish was the end of the design process.
- 4a(i) A number of candidates confused animated transitions with animated objects and thus wrote about text or pictures appearing in different ways, most though, could gain a mark for the benefit.
- 4a(ii) Not as well answered as in previous years. Candidates did not give the detail needed for an AS answer or wrote about document templates. The benefit here proved to be a good discriminator.
- 4a(iii) Marks were lost because candidates failed to appreciate that for hyperlinks to work there has to be some action on the part of the user, e.g. clicking, touching. Few candidates gave an indication of what is 'seen' once the hyperlink is clicked.
- 5 Most candidates gained at least two marks. A common mistake was just stating that email is cheaper, ignoring the fact that this was only true if you already had access to the network. Others dropped marks by not qualifying their answers enough to discriminate them from manual methods.

- 6 Again most candidates achieved at least half marks, because they could give a number of ways but dropped marks by either not giving extensions or giving duplicate extensions. Gaming proved to be very popular but only counts once, in its many forms. Candidates could have written about MP3 players, digital photography, social networking, mobile phones, betting, dating, online shopping, surround sound systems, etc. It was surprising to see that banking and doing school homework were thought of as entertainment/leisure activities.
- 7(a) This was not well answered. There is a comprehensive list in the specification and candidates need to study it.
- 7(b) A number of candidates either did not understand the term 'process data' or did not read the question. A number wrote about inputting data and validation and many thought that mail merge was repetitive processing.
- 8 (a) Those candidates who understand what an expert system is scored well. Many were able to give the three components and give at least three advantages/disadvantages. Unfortunately there are still candidates who haven't come across the term and think an expert system is to do with life support.
- 8 (b) The more able candidates obtained high marks on this question. It was clear that those who had revised well were rewarded. The poorer candidates seemed to think that blood tracking was to do with blood testing and that sensors were used for security or body scanning.
- 9 Generally a poorly answered question. A number of candidates cannot apply their knowledge of spreadsheets which is surprising since they appear to be able to produce some quite complex spreadsheets of their own, doing similar tasks to what is asked in the question.
- 10 (a to d) Candidates are now much better at evidencing their spreadsheets. Unfortunately there are still some candidates who either do not give the examiners a reasonable chance of finding their formulas by not indicating where they are or do not display them at all.

Most candidates can say what a formula does, but fewer can say why. Wonderful spreadsheets are being produced but it is very evident that if there has been a lot of teacher input then the candidates don't really understand why a function was used. If candidates had more ownership of what they produced, they might understand why they did some of the things they did.

IT3
General Certificate of Education
January 2012
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 | 1881 | 90 | 44.7 |

Grade Ranges

| | |
|----|----|
| A* | 77 |
| A | 68 |
| B | 59 |
| C | 50 |
| D | 41 |
| E | 32 |

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

Comments on particular questions

- 1 This was the best answered question on the paper with most candidates having prepared at least 3 factors well. The weaker candidates tended to get confused between the factors and tended to write about layout, which if referred to task, was part of the question or too vague to give a mark. If candidates give *offline and online help* as the factor then they must clearly develop the online help to show that they know what they are talking about.
- 2 Most candidates could give two factors but only the better candidates could develop them. Common mistakes were to give *size of network* (instead of organisation) and *cost* as factors. When discussing performance they didn't give it in terms of anything such as reliability and speed of processing.
- 3 The better candidates did very well here but a lot got confused with peer-to-peer and client/server and gave advantages pertaining to them rather than ring/star or gave the advantage of one as the disadvantage of the other.
- 4 Weaker candidates tended to repeat themselves in this question by saying dialup fast and broadband fast, and then didn't develop the points. Similarly they would say that dialup was cheaper but not why. Weaker candidates also wasted effort discussing wireless.
- 5 To do well in this question, candidates needed to concentrate on where rather than when. Most candidates could mention two points but few could give the level of detail needed to get a good mark or looked at it simply as teleworking.
- 6 This question was quite well answered, with most candidates scoring at least half marks. Marks were dropped in the example by not being able to say exactly what use was made of the data.
- 7 This question was poorly answered because a lot of candidates thought they were answering last summer's question about an effective MIS or they could name some factors but could not describe them effectively.
- 8 Most candidates could come up with two out of the three factors but only the better candidates could extend these with enough detail to give good descriptions.
- 9 Few candidates were able to say why a council should have a security policy but most candidates could give two examples of what it should contain.
- 10 To get a good mark candidates needed to say in detail the information in the log i.e. who, what and when the data was accessed.
- 11 Most candidates could give the fact that the computers are networked together and the first bit of the example, only the better candidates could give a complete definition.
- 12 Weaker candidates mixed up distributed computing with distributed databases and consequently tended to give only the disadvantage to do with security.
- 13 This was a very poorly answered question with very few candidates being able to give more than one design process let alone discuss them. One would have hoped that their A2 coursework would have helped.
- 14 Candidates tended to lose marks by giving points from the same consequence, and mentioning losing jobs more than once.

- 15 Most candidates could score at least half marks on this question but tended to lose marks by making duplicate points. The impact of 'reliability of delivery service on reputation' is not specific enough for credit.
- 16 Again fairly well answered, but only the very best candidates could give the detail required for very good answers.
- 17 Most candidates could give part of the definition but candidates dropped marks by either forgetting the links in the first half or forgetting one of foreign or primary in the second half.
- 18 Candidates could mention an advantage and give a brief explanation but very few could give the depth for a good answer.
- 19 Most candidates could give a definition and give an idea of the data that is captured but very few could say why the data was needed.
- 20 Most candidates were able to say that data mining was about looking for patterns and give the first part of the example but very few candidates could give the new connection needed for the second mark.
- 21 Most candidates were quite good at giving at least two of the advantages/disadvantages of distributed computing.



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