

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations



**GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION
GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION
(SHORT COURSE)**

**GCSE 1995
GCSE 1095**

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY B

**REPORT ON THE UNITS
JANUARY 2003**

GCSE



OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2003

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY B

General Certificate of Secondary Education 1095 (Short Course) General Certificate of Secondary Education 1995 (Full Course)

Component	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
2377	Foundation Tier and Higher Tier	2
2378	Coursework	3
2379	Coursework	5
2380/1	Foundation Tier	7
2380/2	Higher Tier	9
*	Grade Thresholds	11

Chief Examiner's Report

The general feeling seemed to indicate that candidates performed according to the teaching of the Centre.

This was the first time that the full course was offered. There were a few Centres that submitted coursework for the full course. The coursework was generally of a very good standard and was very pleasing to see. A number of Centres entered candidates for the full course examined paper. The standard of answers on this first time through was generally good. It showed evidence of considerable hard work from teaching staff to make this new examination so successful in its first cohort.

2377 – Foundation Tier and Higher Tier

Candidates generally performed very well and the papers produced a good distribution of marks. Performances by candidates were in line with expectations.

There were a small number of concerns raised by Centres relating to specific questions but the overall feedback on the question papers was positive.

2378 – Coursework

General Comments

Candidates following this course were required to submit coursework based on an Entertainment Theme – most submitted work around the “Big M Cinema” multiscreen complex as provided in the specification.

Most Centres followed at least one of the sample assignments found in the ‘Approved Specification’.

Centres had taken more notice of the 2nd paragraph of 7.1, Marking Criteria for Internally Assessed Work on page 40. “Each successive statement builds upon the previous statement and candidates must have completed the lower statement before they can be awarded the next mark range.”

In general, the standard of marking by Centres was better than in 2002, although a number of issues did arise.

Annotation

Most Centres used the Assessment Sheets giving the page numbers where evidence could be found. This helped with cross-referencing and aided the moderation process.

Some Centres gave extra annotation within the coursework portfolios, and this was greatly appreciated by the moderating team.

Arithmetic errors

It was worrying to see a disturbing number of arithmetic errors in the marks submitted by Centres. The marks on the MS1 Form differed from the mark on the front cover Assessment Sheet. Centres are advised that it is their responsibility to ensure that the marks they submit are accurate since moderation cannot begin until all such arithmetic errors are resolved.

Assessment Objective 1

Choosing and Describing Applications

In the main candidates did well in this AO. Although few candidates commented in detail on the benefits and drawbacks of a selection of different types of hardware and software that could have been used, for the 4/5 mark threshold.

Using Hardware & Using Software

Again these were well done, but few candidates reached the higher mark threshold. Candidates did not describe the benefits and drawbacks of their chosen hardware very well, and the comparing and contrasting of alternative systems was in the main non-existent.

Report on the Components taken in January 2003

Inputting Data

Most candidates were in the 2/3 mark threshold. Candidates need more work on the needs of the user and how the designed system reduces the possibility of data errors.

System Output

Depending on the assignment chosen, not all candidates were able to describe alternative outputs or the benefits and drawbacks of each.

Assessment Objective 2

Analysis

Candidates who performed well here tended to perform well throughout the coursework. When done well, candidates maintained their focus and knew exactly what they were designing and why.

Design, Implementation, Testing

Most candidates performed well, but to secure marks candidates should annotate their own work giving reasons as to why changes have been made and why some designs have been retained.

Evaluation, Application and Effects

This was the weakest aspect of coursework. Candidates did not compare ICT with other methods, or justify when and why using ICT is more appropriate.

Documentation

This could be improved by stating who the User Guide is aimed at. That will then focus the candidates into the type and detail of guide needed, e.g. is it for the worker or client? Not many candidates showed evidence of either refining or testing their user guides.

Assessment Objective 3

A number of candidates did not attempt this AO. Those candidates who did, attempted this in various ways. Some had tried to meet the criteria within other reports, whereas some gave this a discrete section within the coursework. Moderators reported that those Centres who tried the former found annotation more difficult to follow.

Assessment Objective 4

Again those candidates who scored well on "the effects of ICT use in the wider world" did so using a discrete section of coursework.

2379 – Coursework

General Comments

Candidates following this course were required to submit coursework based on an Entertainment Theme – most submitting work around the “Big M Cinema” multiscreen complex as provided in the specification.

Most candidates designed a website for their cinema.

Centres had taken notice of the 2nd paragraph of 7.1, Marking Criteria for Internally Assessed Work on page 40. “Each successive statement builds upon the previous statement and candidates must have completed the lower statement before they can be awarded the next mark range.”

Even though this was a small entry there were a number of issues most notably –

Annotation

Most Centres used the Assessment Sheets giving the page numbers where evidence could be found. This helped with cross-referencing and aided the moderation process.

But only a few Centres gave extra annotation within the coursework portfolios. Where this was available, it was greatly appreciated by the moderating team.

Assessment Objective 1

Choosing and Describing Applications

In the main candidates performed well in this AO. Although few candidates commented in detail on the benefits and drawbacks of a selection of different types of hardware and software that could have been used, for the 4/5 mark threshold.

Using Hardware & Using Software

Again candidates performed well, although some candidates did not describe the benefits and drawbacks of their chosen hardware very well. Comparing and contrasting of alternative systems was in the main non-existent.

Inputting Data & System Output

Candidates linked these sections very well with the above sections and performed well.

Assessment Objective 2

Analysis

Candidates who performed well here tended to perform well throughout the coursework. When done well, candidates maintained their focus and knew exactly what they were designing and why. Overall those candidates who scored highly had put in a lot of work into this section. Probably more than the 5 marks merited but candidates benefited in the final mark.

Report on the Components taken in January 2003

Design, Implementation, Testing

Most candidates performed well, but to secure better marks candidates should annotate their own work giving reasons as to why changes have been made and why some designs have been retained.

Evaluation, Application and Effects

This was the weakest aspect of coursework. Candidates did not compare ICT with other methods, or justify when and why using ICT is more appropriate.

Documentation

Candidates scored well here. There were some good refining and testing of user guides.

Assessment Objective 3

Candidates attempted this in various ways. Some tried to meet the criteria within other reports, whereas some gave this a discrete section within the coursework. Moderators reported that those Centres who tried the former found the annotation more difficult to follow.

Assessment Objective 4

Those candidates who scored well on "the effects of ICT use in the wider world" did so using a discrete section of coursework.

2380/1 – Foundation Tier

General Comments

Generally a satisfactory response to the first year of this examination.

The main weaknesses shown in this first year was the candidates' lack of ability to read the questions thoroughly and structure their answers accordingly. It was clear from some responses that candidates had not prepared adequately for the examination.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1) (a) Most candidates were able to give two situations where monitors would be used and related their answers to the theatre.
Marks were sometimes lost where candidates did not read the introduction carefully and referred to the monitor as an output device.
- (b) A range of answers given. Most candidates were able to state one place where a touch screen would be useful.
- (c) Generally well answered. Most candidates were able to provide one reason, some struggled to find two different reasons. Some candidates did not read the question properly and gave two situations where a touch screen would be used, rather than reasons for its suitability.
- (d) Most candidates found this question easy to answer and generally candidates scored highly.
- 2) (a) A wide range of answers. Some candidates listed specific tasks rather than answering the question from a 'systems analysis' approach, some confusion as to how to answer this.
Good answers stated a range of research tasks and related descriptions to the tasks stated.
Some repetition of answers e.g. same type of research repeated for each task.
- (b) A straight-forward question.
Most candidates were able to correctly identify the symbols shown. The stronger candidates correctly identified the symbols and related their use to a ticket booking system.
Some candidates displayed a basic lack of knowledge of the purpose of hardware components.
- 3) A mixed response to this question. Stronger candidates were able to identify and explain three issues relating to staff. Some candidates failed to relate their answers to issues that would affect staff. Weaker candidates gave short statements without any explanation or justification.
- 4) A wide range of answers given. Where candidates understood the difference between a ticketed and ticket free system some good answers given. Most candidates were able to give a variety of advantages, however some candidates struggled to find four advantages. Many candidates included the disadvantages of each system as well.

Report on the Components taken in January 2003

- 5) (a) Generally well answered. Most candidates could give one reason, some candidates struggled to give two. Some vague answers given.
- (b) Mixed response from different Centres. It was obvious which candidates had not adequately revised this topic. Where candidates were able to state four principals high marks were scored.
Generally well answered. A straight-forward question that allowed candidates to be creative. Some candidates repeated the example given. Candidates often repeated contact details e.g. name, address, telephone number instead of expanding their answer to include other fields.
- (c) Very poorly answered. Many candidates did not attempt this question. Most candidates referred to the Data Protection Act.

2380/2 Higher Tier

General Comments

Most candidates coped well with the first year of the examination, although surprisingly few candidates achieved very high marks. Some candidates lost marks because they didn't read the question carefully before answering.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1) (a) A mixed response to this question and a number of candidates failed to answer the question from a 'systems analysis' point of view. There was also some repetition of answers e.g. same type of research repeated for each task. The stronger candidates did provide very good answers and included a range of research tasks and related descriptions.

(b) Generally well answered with high marks scored by most candidates. The diagrams were well presented by the majority of candidates, who showed a good understanding of a systems flowchart. Most candidates gained marks for a logical order of events and a showed a sound knowledge of flow chart symbols. The majority of candidates gained an extra mark for including the credit card check.
- 2) Most candidates were able to identify the need for training but some candidates clearly did not read the question thoroughly. Stronger candidates were able to identify and explain three issues relating to staff. Weaker candidates gave short statements without any explanation or justification.
- 3) Generally a well answered question, most candidates gave a range of advantages and disadvantages. Most candidates listed advantages/disadvantages and discussed each. Some candidates listed the advantages and disadvantages and there was some repetition of answers.
- 4) (a) Mixed response from different Centres. It was obvious which candidates had not adequately revised this topic. Where candidates were able to state four principles high marks were scored.

(b) Most candidates were able to give four items of information to gain full marks. Some candidates repeated contact details e.g. name, address, telephone number instead of expanding their answer to include other fields.
- 5) (a) Generally well answered – most candidates were able to identify two ways in which data could be misused and consequently scored high marks here.

(b) Most candidates mentioned a password and gained one mark, but fewer candidates commented on the idea of a hierarchical structure.

(c) Disappointing response to this question. Many candidates showed a lack of understanding of unique nature of key fields. Postcodes were often given as a key field.
- 6) Some good uses of software given, and most candidates gave detailed explanations of how the software could be used. Many candidates gave the brand names of software, instead of generic types of software, even though it is stated on the front of the question paper that no marks will be awarded for using brand names of software packages or hardware.

Report on the Components taken in January 2003

7) (a) and (b)

Generally well answered, with a wide range of answers given. Most candidates gained full marks.

(b) Good answers given and most candidates able to state three different advantages. Some candidates stated that having a digital camera was 'better' or gave a better picture, without expanding their answer.

(c) (i) Many candidates did not attempt this question. Generally poor understanding of differences between vector and bitmap graphics.

(ii) Candidates who understood (c)(i) correctly answered this question – some guesswork by weaker candidates.

8) (a) (i) Well answered by most candidates.

(ii) Well answered by the majority of candidates. A clear understanding shown of the importance of a well designed home page. The stronger candidates related their answer to the theatre.

(b) (i) Well answered. Most candidates correctly identified three different types of information for a home page. Many candidates scored high marks here.

(ii) A range of responses to this question. Good candidates provided detailed annotation with their answer.

(iii) Generally well answered by most candidates, although some candidates tended to include further information to be included on the website, rather than stating different features.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
Information Communications Technology (1095/1995)
January 2003 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a*	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	u
2377F	Raw	40				37	33	29	25	21	0
	UMS	55				48	40	32	24	16	0
2377H	Raw	40	38	34	30	27	24				0
	UMS	80	72	64	56	48	40				0
2378	Raw	64	58	51	44	37	30	24	18	12	0
	UMS	120	108	96	84	72	60	48	36	24	0
2379	Raw	64	58	51	44	37	30	24	18	12	
	UMS	120	108	96	84	72	60	48	36	24	0
2380F	Raw	55				34	27	21	15	9	0
	UMS	55				48	40	32	24	16	0
2380H	Raw	80	64	57	50	43	36				0
	UMS	80	72	64	56	48	40				0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
1095	200	180	160	140	120	100	80	60	40	0
1995	400	360	320	280	240	200	160	120	80	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U	Total Number of Candidates
1095	1.00	8.77	29.88	60.36	76.89	86.06	92.43	97.21	100.00	502
1995	0.00	25.00	62.50	95.83	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	24