

APPLIED ICT

Paper 9713/11

Written A

General comments

It was encouraging that the number of candidates who appeared to have been well prepared for this assessment continues to increase.

There remain many candidates who require extensive teaching to perform well at this level.

It is common to find candidates rote learning answers from past papers. This was particularly evident when, although questions might relate to a similar topic, the scenarios had changed markedly. In this paper, as with any exam paper at this standard, candidates are required to show a level of understanding as well as a depth of knowledge. As has been highlighted in previous reports, this cannot be achieved by simply repeating bullet points from previous mark schemes. For example, in **Question 6b** the question referred to the use of time management software to help with organising meeting times. A number of candidates just wrote down everything about time management software they had learned from previous mark schemes including critical path analysis and other aspects of project management rather than answering the question. Centres are reminded that this is 'Applied ICT' and candidates are expected apply their knowledge to the context of the scenario. It is important for candidates to realise that they need to refer back to the scenario when answering questions.

In scenario 2 it was clearly stated that Mary would use presence and existence checks on the data but would need additional checks. **Question 4b** asked for these additional checks to be described yet still some candidates described the use of existence and presence checks in their answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Many candidates did well on this question.

- (a) A number of candidates gained full marks with many scoring highly. There were a small number who were unable to describe any end effectors.
- (b) A number of candidates scored well on this question, although, not as well as part (a). A number of candidates did not go into sufficient detail omitting to write that the programmer *guides* the robotic arm apparently thinking that just holding the arm with no further explanation was enough.
- (c) This was also quite well answered but there were few disadvantages given.

Question 2

This question was also fairly well answered.

- (a) Candidates did well on this question with many stating product advertising and going on to describe it. Most did not however manage to describe it in sufficient detail to gain the third mark.
- (b) Again candidates answered this quite well. However, a number described a mouse when the question asked for devices used for entering information. Selecting from a menu is not considered to be entering information such as text.
- (c) This was the best answered part of the question. Pop-ups were well described although some candidates appeared to believe that they appeared on the web page rather than in front of it.



Candidates appeared to run out of ideas when describing how the drawbacks could be overcome with many re-wording the scenario.

Question 3

Many candidates gained one or two marks but appeared to lack the knowledge to gain more. Those candidates that did gain marks usually mentioned average mark being calculated and progress being compared. Conditional formatting was mentioned by some candidates but they often did not elaborate on this.

Question 4

This question requires further development of the candidates' skills.

- (a) Candidates did not appear to understand that the question was asking how information about the existing system would be recorded not how it would be collected. This distinction is made clearly in the syllabus. Many candidates described different methods of researching a situation. Candidates who did understand the distinction gave some good answers regarding Data Flow Diagrams in particular.
- (b) This question was answered better than part (a) few candidates gained very high marks. The majority of candidates did score reasonably well. Some candidates just reworded the scenario. A number described validation checks but did not refer to the candidate number or examination scores. Very few candidates actually discussed the suitability of the checks merely describing them.
- (c) This was the best answered part of the question. Several candidates managed to name types of data and give appropriate examples. Few, however, explained acceptance and rejection of data.

Question 5

This question requires further development of the candidates, skills.

- (a) (i) Many candidates did not score highly on this question despite it being basically a listing exercise. Candidates tended to gain at least one mark but few gained high marks.
- (ii) The vast majority of candidates did not identify the worker's number or its equivalent.
- (b) This part of the question was not answered very well. Many candidates just provided a list of items they would expect to see in a payslip.
- (c) This part of the question caused a number of issues for candidates. The question required candidates to compare and contrast the methods. Candidates could name and describe the methods but often did not compare them. Some stated that it was more expensive to have parallel running but not why or did not compare it to other methods. A number of candidates stated that direct changeover changed the old system to the new system. All methods do this but each method does it differently either immediately or over a period of time etc.

Question 6

Candidates generally did better on this question.

- (a) Candidates managed to make at least one or two points. The main issue with candidates' answers was the lack of specific use of the hardware and software with a number of answers lacking the detail required. For example, many wrote about email software being needed to send emails but not for what purpose.
- (b) Candidates were unable to score highly on this part of the question mainly for reasons given above.
- (c) This part of the question was well answered with many candidates doing well with most candidates gaining at least one mark.



APPLIED ICT

Paper 9713/12

Written A

General comments

It was encouraging that the number of candidates who appeared to have been well prepared for this assessment continues to increase.

There remain many candidates who require extensive teaching to perform well at this level.

It is common to find candidates rote learning answers from past papers. This was particularly evident when, although questions might relate to a similar topic, the scenarios had changed markedly. In this paper, as with any exam paper at this standard, candidates are required to show a level of understanding as well as a depth of knowledge. As has been highlighted in previous reports, this cannot be achieved by simply repeating bullet points from previous mark schemes. For example, in **Question 6b** the question referred to the use of time management software to help with organising meeting times. A number of candidates just wrote down everything about time management software they had learned from previous mark schemes including critical path analysis and other aspects of project management rather than answering the question. Centres are reminded that this is 'Applied ICT' and candidates are expected apply their knowledge to the context of the scenario. It is important for candidates to realise that they need to refer back to the scenario when answering questions.

In scenario 2 it was clearly stated that Mary would use presence and existence checks on the data but would need additional checks. **Question 4b** asked for these additional checks to be described yet still some candidates described the use of existence and presence checks in their answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Many candidates did well on this question.

- (a) A number of candidates gained full marks with many scoring highly. There were a small number who were unable to describe any end effectors.
- (b) A number of candidates scored well on this question, although, not as well as part (a). A number of candidates did not go into sufficient detail omitting to write that the programmer *guides* the robotic arm apparently thinking that just holding the arm with no further explanation was enough.
- (c) This was also quite well answered but there were few disadvantages given.

Question 2

This question was also fairly well answered.

- (a) Candidates did well on this question with many stating product advertising and going on to describe it. Most did not however manage to describe it in sufficient detail to gain the third mark.
- (b) Again candidates answered this quite well. However, a number described a mouse when the question asked for devices used for entering information. Selecting from a menu is not considered to be entering information such as text.
- (c) This was the best answered part of the question. Pop-ups were well described although some candidates appeared to believe that they appeared on the web page rather than in front of it.

Candidates appeared to run out of ideas when describing how the drawbacks could be overcome with many re-wording the scenario.

Question 3

Many candidates gained one or two marks but appeared to lack the knowledge to gain more. Those candidates that did gain marks usually mentioned average mark being calculated and progress being compared. Conditional formatting was mentioned by some candidates but they often did not elaborate on this.

Question 4

This question requires further development of the candidates' skills.

- (a) Candidates did not appear to understand that the question was asking how information about the existing system would be recorded not how it would be collected. This distinction is made clearly in the syllabus. Many candidates described different methods of researching a situation. Candidates who did understand the distinction gave some good answers regarding Data Flow Diagrams in particular.
- (b) This question was answered better than part (a) few candidates gained very high marks. The majority of candidates did score reasonably well. Some candidates just reworded the scenario. A number described validation checks but did not refer to the candidate number or examination scores. Very few candidates actually discussed the suitability of the checks merely describing them.
- (c) This was the best answered part of the question. Several candidates managed to name types of data and give appropriate examples. Few, however, explained acceptance and rejection of data.

Question 5

This question requires further development of the candidates, skills.

- (a) (i) Many candidates did not score highly on this question despite it being basically a listing exercise. Candidates tended to gain at least one mark but few gained high marks.
- (ii) The vast majority of candidates did not identify the worker's number or its equivalent.
- (b) This part of the question was not answered very well. Many candidates just provided a list of items they would expect to see in a payslip.
- (c) This part of the question caused a number of issues for candidates. The question required candidates to compare and contrast the methods. Candidates could name and describe the methods but often did not compare them. Some stated that it was more expensive to have parallel running but not why or did not compare it to other methods. A number of candidates stated that direct changeover changed the old system to the new system. All methods do this but each method does it differently either immediately or over a period of time etc.

Question 6

Candidates generally did better on this question.

- (a) Candidates managed to make at least one or two points. The main issue with candidates' answers was the lack of specific use of the hardware and software with a number of answers lacking the detail required. For example, many wrote about email software being needed to send emails but not for what purpose.
- (b) Candidates were unable to score highly on this part of the question mainly for reasons given above.
- (c) This part of the question was well answered with many candidates doing well with most candidates gaining at least one mark.



APPLIED ICT

Paper 9713/13

Written A

General comments

It was encouraging that the number of candidates who appeared to have been well prepared for this assessment continues to increase.

There remain many candidates who require extensive teaching to perform well at this level.

It is still common to find candidates rote learning answers from past papers. This was particularly evident when, although questions might relate to a similar topic, the scenarios had changed markedly. In this paper, as with any exam paper at this standard, candidates are required to show a level of understanding as well as a depth of knowledge. As has been highlighted in previous reports, this cannot be achieved by simply repeating bullet points from previous mark schemes. For example, in **Question 6** the question referred to the use of time management software to help with arranging workloads. A number of candidates just wrote down everything about time management software they had learned from previous mark schemes including the use of calendars to arrange meeting times and other aspects of time management software which were not applicable. Centres are reminded that this is 'Applied ICT' and candidates are expected apply their knowledge to the context of the scenario. It is important for candidates to realise that they need to refer back to the scenario when answering questions.

In scenario 2 a building materials company was described and the fact that it required a slideshow. **Question 4a** asked about the features specific to this slideshow could be used. Candidates rarely referred to the building company when describing slide show features.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Many candidates did well on this question with a number scoring highly.

Question 2

This question was generally well answered.

- (a) Most candidates gained some marks. The biggest shortcoming was the tendency for candidates to describe how to use an online system rather than how to register. Even then candidates still made some valid points.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe some features. Candidates again scored reasonably well.
- (c) This was reasonably well answered, although not as well answered as the other parts of the question. A number of candidates had appeared to have learnt previous mark schemes and answered from the point of view of the customer despite the question clearly referring to the bank.

Question 3

This question was also reasonably well answered. There were a number of candidates who had apparently learned answers from previous mark schemes and gave answers relating to the benefits of working from home rather than in an office.

Question 4

This question was not well answered as the scenario tended to be ignored particularly in part (a).

- (a) Candidates were able to name features but were unable to describe them in terms of how they would be used, particularly in the context of this scenario.
- (b) Candidates were often given the benefit of the doubt despite the lack of reference to the scenario and were therefore able to gain marks on this question.

Question 5

This question requires further development of the candidates' skills.

- (a) Candidates appeared to have only a general idea of the updating process. Very few were able to describe the steps in the process.
- (b) Candidates were unable to describe financial reports just listing items that would be found on a payslip. Where candidates did gain marks it was generally in their descriptions of exception reports.

Question 6

It appears that many candidates had learned facts about time management software but were unable to put them into context.

Question 7

This question was not well answered. Candidates did not appear to have much knowledge of the process. Many concentrated their answers on writing about the creation of databases of candidate information.

Question 8

This question was generally better answered than 5, 6 and 7, although candidates did much better on parts (c) and (d) than they did on parts (a) and (b).

- (a) Very few candidates appearing to know what a data flow diagram consists of. Those that did gain marks just wrote about selecting hardware and software based on an overall view of the existing system. Because of their lack of reference to aspects of data flow diagrams, candidates were unable to gain many marks.
- (b) Candidates appeared not to understand the design of file structure. Many wrote in detail about the need for indexed sequential access to data and little else. A sizeable number of candidates did not even attempt this question.
- (c) Candidates did well on this question, many giving good descriptions of the different methods although not so many gave detailed advantages and disadvantages of the systems.
- (d) Candidates were, again, able to describe the methods but few actually compared and contrasted the methods in any detail. A number of candidates repeated previous mark scheme answers such as examining documents despite the question asking for methods of obtaining feedback from users.

APPLIED ICT

Paper 9713/02
Practical Test A

General comments

The majority of candidates completed most elements of the paper. There were vast differences in the range of results from centre to centre and from candidate to candidate within centres. There were elements of all sections of the question paper that candidates had difficulty with and the paper gave a good spread of marks. Candidate errors were spread evenly over the sections of the paper, although the application of candidates' knowledge to produce the presentation and answer the questions within it caused a number of candidates some issues.

A very small number of candidates did not print their name, Centre number and candidate number on some of the documents submitted for assessment. Where clear printed evidence of the author of the work was present, Examiners were able to award the marks for these pages. If no evidence could be found, no marks were awarded to the candidate. 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.

Several candidates omitted one or more of the pages from the required printouts, the most frequent omissions being the formulae view of the spreadsheet and evidence of the file handling in the evidence document. A very small number of candidates submitted multiple printouts for some of the tasks and failed to cross out those printouts that were draft copies. If multiple printouts are submitted, Examiners will only mark the first occurrence of each page.

The presentation task gave some issues for candidates. While most demonstrated sound practical skills some did not attain many marks on the knowledge and understanding required for this paper. Despite an instruction to 'explain in your own words' a significant number of candidates copied blocks of text directly from the Internet. Examiners will give no credit for sections of text copied and pasted from the Internet.

Comments on specific questions

Question 2

The majority of candidates produced the presentation, although a very small number of candidates presented this as a document rather than presentation.

Question 3

This section was performed well by many candidates. A large number lost a mark for the selection of a sans-serif font for the candidate details. Some placed these details lower in the slide, resulting in this text overlapping the contents of one or more slides.

Question 4

The majority of candidates attempted most if not all of the questions set within the presentation. Few answered the first question correctly, with a significant number quoting text direct from the Internet which did not answer the question. Answers ranged from descriptions of housing projects in different parts of the world to a 'graphical representation of the company' and a variety of descriptions of a company logo. Few related this to the consistent set of formatting styles/rules/specifications or branding that was defined for the company. The second question was more frequently answered correctly, with the style ensuring a consistency of display or method of company recognition. There were a variety of answers for question 3, few discussing the development of templates or style guides, the most common incorrect answers were taken directly from websites that discussed the manipulation of various shapes to create a logo. The vast

