

# INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

---

Paper 0983/12  
Theory

## Key messages

Candidates that read the question carefully and planned their answers, resulted in more thorough responses being given. Candidates who performed well in this paper used specific and detailed language when replying to 'describe' and 'discuss' type questions. There has been an increase in this series, in the discussion questions, for answers to be split into advantages and disadvantages. However, this does not allow for a true discussion.

As with previous series, there is still a number of candidates not using generic names when referring to hardware and software. There has been an increase in the number of candidates using brand names to answer the question. 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.'

Occasionally candidates may need to expand their answers onto other parts of the examination paper or extra sheets. It is important that if this occurs, the candidate clearly states where the extra part is written.

It is important that candidates spend time reading a question thoroughly so that they are quite sure what is required in the answer.

## General comments

The paper gave all candidates an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of ICT using a wide variety of topics. The vast majority of candidates were able to complete the paper in the allotted time, and most were able to make an attempt at all the questions.

It is important, where a question indicates a specific number of answers, candidates should only write one answer in each allocated space, as only one response is marked in each space.

Candidates need to be clear in the answers given rather than using basic statements, like it is quicker. To achieve the marks a valid reason is needed. Most, if not all questions on the paper, relate back to the scenario set, candidates need to relate their answers back to the scenario. Use of comparison is causing some issues with candidates, especially in advantage and disadvantage questions. An advantage requires a comparison whereas a benefit does not. Discussion questions also require comparisons to be made rather than just a list.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Question 1**

The majority of candidates correctly identified keyboards with fewer candidates achieving the second mark for digital camera. Some candidates did not this answer question.

### **Question 2**

Most candidates achieved some marks for this question. Better responses identified that the context was growing plants in a glasshouse, so clearly identified suitable output devices. In order to improve on the answering of this type of question candidates need to be more specific in the types of output devices given.

### Question 3

Better responses achieved at least three marks for this question. Bridge and hub were incorrectly introduced for some responses, both of which were not relevant to the question. In general, this question proved to be quite challenging for candidates.

- (a) This part was fairly well answered with many candidates answering correctly, a modem.
- (b) This part was fairly well answered. Responses which gave a network device, mostly identified correctly, a router. However, many candidates incorrectly gave bridge or modem.
- (c) This part was answered well and, in most cases, better than **parts (a) and (b)**. The majority of responses correctly identified a switch; however, many candidates incorrectly gave hub.
- (d) This was a challenging question with very few candidates giving network interface card.

### Question 4

The question was generally well answered.

- (a) This part was well answered with the majority of responses achieving four marks. In order to improve answering this type of question candidates need to be specific in the terms used, rather than giving generic terms such as shading instead of the more specific highlight.
- (b) Most responses achieved some marks for this question, better ones made it clear as to the steps that were needed and used correct ICT terms.

### Question 5

Good responses highlighted a clear comparison. In order for candidates to improve their answers in questions like this, they need to be more precise in their answers rather than just giving statements. For example, RFID can be read from a distance, which is the same for both bar codes and RFID. In order to achieve higher marks in this question candidates needed to give clear comparisons between RFID and bar codes.

### Question 6

As with the previous question, candidates needed to give a good comparison to achieve marks. Many candidates did not do so. An example of a good comparison was that the cost was higher per Gb of memory. In order to improve the answering of this question candidates need to carefully read the question, as some candidates confused SSD with flash memory sticks, even though the question stated that the SSD was an integral part of the laptop.

### Question 7

- (a) Few candidates clearly identified the principles of a data protection act. In order for candidates to improve the answering of this type of question the principles need to be learnt in full, many candidates knew the principles, but some tended to split them into parts, therefore not achieving the mark. Again, as with other questions, candidates need to read the question carefully, which stated, apart from confidentiality and security, however, a number of candidates answered with security parts of the act.
- (b) Most candidates achieved some marks for this question, mainly by giving suitable examples of personal data. In order to improve the answering of these types of questions candidates need to be clear in the answers given, for example, bank account details is too vague an answer, but bank account number achieves a mark.
- (c) The better responses seen, identified substantially different ways that data could be used. Many candidates expanded on their answer by giving examples.

### Question 8

Many candidates achieved some marks in this question with at least one part correctly answered. If candidates produced a good answer in **part (a)** then **parts (b)** and **(c)** were well answered.

- (a) The majority of candidates achieved the mark for identifying the file name.
- (b) The majority of candidates achieved the mark for identifying the folder.
- (c) The majority of candidates achieved the mark for identifying the domain name.
- (d) Many candidates understood what was meant by http but did not give the 's' part of the protocol. This was a secure protocol. Most candidates who achieved the mark gave the full definition of HTTPS including secure.

### Question 9

- (a) Many responses attempted to explain the formula in context. In order to improve answers to questions like this, candidates should explain the formula in full rather than breaking the formula into the different components and then explaining each of them separately. Better responses clearly identified the use of the 2 was to find the corresponding value from the second column, also the correct use of exact match was clearly seen.
- (b) Better responses gave clear explanations of the types of test data using standard definitions. Candidates should give explanations where possible rather than just giving examples.
- (c) Some candidates achieved some marks for giving examples of a formula and a function. Better responses identified that functions were named, built in pieces of code in a spreadsheet and that formulas were written by the user. Also, that formulas can contain functions. Examples of both functions and formulas were allowed.
- (d) Those responses that achieved marks were, in the main, for either queries or relationships. Many candidates correctly stated that databases could use forms and reports, but so could some spreadsheets. Marks were achieved for stating that it was easier to create them using a database.

### Question 10

This question was a discuss question, therefore the examiners expected candidates to answer with positive and negatives and then draw conclusions. However, candidates were answering as if it was a describe question.

Most candidates achieved some marks for this question, but few achieved the full marks. Better responses matched the strategy with the health risk, which was needed to achieve marks and made the strategy clear using the correct terms for equipment. In order to do well in these types of question candidates should clearly link the strategy with the health risk. Also, candidates should be clear in the way they write their answers, for example, changing the brightness of the screen is too vague, but matching the brightness of the screen and the brightness of the room was far clearer.

### Question 11

There were many well-structured responses to this question. Better responses clearly identified the advantages and disadvantages, so it was clear where marks were achieved. To achieve good marks for this question, candidates needed to state clearly the comparisons between the use of robots and humans.

### Question 12

Few candidates achieved top marks. This question moved away from the more standard forms of analysing a system like questionnaires and interviews. For those that achieved marks it was mainly for identifying the Hawthorne effect and some comparison of the time needed, often with little appropriate explanation. Candidates appeared to understand observation more than reading current documentation.

### Question 13

- (a) The full range of marks were achieved for this question. Many candidates correctly named at least one type of verification, but better responses then gave a clear description of each. In order to improve the answers in these types of questions, candidates should describe the processes fully rather than just rewording the name of the verification.
- (b) This question required an explanation of why both validation and verification were necessary. Better responses made some attempt of stating the need for both and that neither by themselves nor both together could prove that the data entered was correct. In order to improve answers to this question, it would have helped if candidates had given applicable examples within the context of a college library system.

### Question 14

For this question, some candidates gave answers in **14(a)** that were correct for **14(b)** and vice versa. Spam is a term that most of the candidates understood.

- (a) The term 'spam' was often correctly described though few achieved both marks. Most responses achieved at least one mark either by stating junk mail or including advertising.
- (b) Many candidates achieved marks for clearly describing ways of recognising and methods to prevent spam with many achieving over half marks.

### Question 15

Many candidates obviously use the cloud, but many do not seem to really understand what it is.

- (a) Responses demonstrated different levels of understanding of the cloud and its use. Better responses clearly explained what the cloud is and made some attempt at explaining how it is used. Some candidates gave good answers about the different types of cloud, but this did not answer the question and therefore achieved no marks.
- (b) This type of question is better answered when candidates can clearly describe issues. For example, the mention of hacking is too vague as this would be true of any server. In order to achieve the mark, candidates should state the reason why hacking could be more of an issue as the data remained on the server for longer or that it was backed up to other servers.

### Question 16

- (a) Those candidates that identified a company uses a corporate house style would then go on to achieve at least some, if not full marks for this question, by stating it is used in branding and that it maintains a consistency of all documents in the company. Marks were not achieved for just giving an example of corporate house style as this did not answer the question.
- (b) Most candidates achieved a mark for this question with many achieving both marks. Often by stating the headers and footers are on every page and then giving an example.

# INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

---

**Paper 0983/21**  
**Document Production, Data**  
**Manipulation and Presentations**

## Key messages

Candidates must:

- be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types and select a font style for the type specified
- enter accurately text in bold on the question paper
- use proofing techniques to identify errors and ensure consistency of presentation
- be able to retain existing styles applied to recall text, therefore ensuring consistent spacing
- be able to distinguish between the database page header/footer area and the report header/footer area and understand which is appropriate to use
- be able to format numeric and currency database fields to a set number of places
- be able to produce labels of the correct size from the standard pre-set label sizes, or create their own labels
- be able to insert merge fields into a master document whilst maintaining the punctuation, layout and spacing of the original text
- produce printouts as instructed on the question paper
- ensure they include their identification details in tasks before printing, as instructed on the question paper
- produce legible screenshots which show the outcome of an action rather than the skill process
- printout the Evidence Document as this contains supporting evidence that could substantially improve their grade.

## General comments

The majority of candidates completed or attempted all elements of the paper and most showed a good level of skill. The mail merge task was particularly well done with many candidates achieving full marks for this task.

Candidates must be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types. These are not the actual names of font styles but categories of font type with specific attributes. Candidates must be able to select an appropriate font for the font type specified.

When creating or editing paragraph styles candidates must base the style on the 'normal' (Microsoft Office) or 'default' (Open Office) paragraph style.

Text to be entered by the candidate as part of a task is displayed in bold on the question 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 their data entry to ensure it matches the text on the question paper. Common errors on this paper included incorrect capitalisation, incorrect or missing characters, omission of spaces, truncated headings and superfluous punctuation.

Candidates are instructed to produce screenshots to evidence the ICT skills that cannot be assessed through the printed product alone. These screenshots must display the outcome of an action and not the process so for example, the saved word processing document must be seen in the file list within the folder – the ‘Save As’ dialogue box is insufficient as the save process is incomplete. Screenshot evidence is often too small and/or faint to be read even using magnification devices. Candidates must ensure that all screenshots can be easily read with the naked eye. Care should be taken when cropping and resizing screenshots to ensure important elements are still shown, such as primary keys in the table structure. Evidence in the style modification and database formula screenshots were often cropped or truncated so the marks could not be achieved.

The question paper prompts candidates to include their name, centre number and candidate number on all tasks prior to printing. Without clear printed evidence of the author of the work, marks cannot be achieved. It is not acceptable for candidates to annotate their printouts by hand as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work.

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.

Centres should return the Supervisor’s Report Folder with the candidates’ work. This identifies the software used and can be helpful if issues were experienced during the practical test. The candidates’ work must be submitted in the original hard-copy printed Assessment Record Folders that are provided to centres. Printed or photocopied Assessment Record Folders should not be used.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Task 1 – *The Evidence Document***

An evidence document was created and used by most candidates to store screenshot evidence. 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 achieved for these pages. A few did not present the evidence document for marking.

#### **Task 2 – *Document***

##### **Question 1**

Candidates opened the correct file and most saved it correctly with the file name given. Some candidates incorrectly saved in the original .rtf format rather than the format of the word processing software being used and a few did not enter the filename in capitals 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. Most candidates retained the page setup settings as instructed. A few candidates changed the font style of the body paragraph style which had already been created and applied even though the question paper instructed that no changes should be made.

##### **Question 2**

The header text was occasionally inserted as a title instead of in the header area so it appeared on every page. This text occasionally contained errors such as *Tamara* for *Tawara*, *Characters* for *Charters*. The footers were generally inserted and aligned as instructed. A few candidates omitted their centre number and/or candidate number from the footer details or incorrectly split their identification details in the footer area so their name was right aligned, the centre number centred and the candidate number left aligned, omitting the page number altogether. An automated field was not always used for the page numbers with the keyed number 1 appearing on all pages. Occasionally the header/footer items did not align with the page margins on all pages and candidates who used the built-in content control to align the items did not always remove superfluous text or placeholders in the header and/or footer areas.

### Question 3

The creation and storage of the title style was well done by the vast majority of candidates. Common errors included capitalisation or typographical errors in the style name, an underscore used instead of a dash, or the style containing additional formatting not listed. Candidates should make sure that the new style is based on the default or 'normal' paragraph style as this avoids the new style inheriting additional formatting. A small number of candidates entered 'sans-serif' into the font dialogue box as the font name. A font style with attributes of the sans-serif typeface category must be selected and applied. Screenshot evidence of the YC-title style provided details of the settings created for this style.

### Question 4

Most candidates applied their created title style to the title text. The formatting of the title text needed to match the settings seen in the Evidence Document screenshot. A few candidates applied the formatting to the title text without providing evidence of creating the title style and therefore did not gain any of the style marks.

### Question 5

Most candidates applied two equally spaced columns to the correct text with the correct spacing between the columns. Some candidates included the final paragraph in the column formatting or displayed the entire document in two columns, therefore not controlling the display of the columns. The space between the columns was occasionally set at the default or was much larger than 1 centimetre. Some candidates inserted the initial column break below rather than above the subheading and occasionally a page break was inserted instead of a section break.

### Question 6

Most candidates imported the correct image and positioned this in the correct paragraph. The image was occasionally aligned with the left margin instead of to the right of the column. Text wrap was mostly applied correctly as was resizing the image. Rotating the image by 180 degrees was not always done well with many flipping the image horizontally or vertically rather than rotating it.

### Question 7

The list was not always sorted correctly. Quite frequently '*fuel for navigation and generators*' appeared before '*food and drink*' in the list suggesting this had been rearranged manually instead of using an automated sort. Some candidates did not attempt to sort the list.

### Question 8

The application of bullets to the specified text was usually done well, although a few candidates did not include the final list item '*water sports equipment.*' in the bulleted list. Any consistent bullet style was acceptable. The presentation of the bullets was often not in single line spacing as specified and a 6 point space had not been left after the last item in the list. The bullets were often not aligned at the left margin as instructed.

### Question 9

The recall document contained the YC-subhead style that had already been created, stored and applied to the four subheadings in the text and candidates were required to modify this style's settings. There was a mixed response to this task. A number of candidates created a completely new style or applied the formatting to some text and tried to create a new style based on this formatting rather than modifying the existing style. Screenshot evidence needed to show that the original style had been modified. Occasionally the screenshot was too small or had been cropped making the evidence of modification inconclusive. With the modifications made to the YC-subhead style the subheading text in the document should have automatically updated to reflect the formatting changes made, but this was not always the case. Those candidates who did not include the final list item '*water sports equipment.*' in the bulleted list in **Question 8** often incorrectly applied the YC-subhead style to this text. Candidates generally applied the changes listed in the table, but a few did not remove the underline enhancement set in the original style to ensure the style matched the settings given on the question paper.

### Question 10

The recall document contained the YC-table style that had already been created and stored. This question tested the application of the YC-table style to the text in the table and was generally done well. Occasionally the style was not applied to the text in row 2.

### Question 11

The formatting of the first two rows of the table was mixed. Some candidates did not merge rows 1 and 2 in column 1 and some did not merge and centre row 1 over columns 2, 3 and 4. Cell shading was not always applied to rows 1 and 2 or was too faint to see. Occasionally gridlines were not applied to the complete table and/or the gridlines were more than 1 point. A number of candidates left no space after the table or the space was greater than 6 points.

### Question 12

In most cases there was evidence of good proofreading and document presentation skills. The table and/or list were rarely split. Spacing between items was not always consistent. A few candidates changed the body style spacing and left large gaps after paragraphs for no apparent reason. The columns and pages were not always aligned at the top of the page. Occasionally there was a widow or orphan, most commonly where a subheading or single line of text had been left at the bottom of a column.

### Task 3 – Database

#### Question 13

The importing of the .csv files and creation of primary keys were well done. The field names and data types were mostly set correctly although the date field was not always imported in the correct DMY format resulting in date import errors and blank records in this field in the report. The *Telephone* field format was often not set as text resulting in an empty field or the loss of the initial zero in all telephone numbers imported or entered. A few candidates incorrectly included ID fields in their table structures. Common errors included were not formatting the *Length(m)* field to 2 decimal places and the *Day\_Rate* field to 0 decimal places with several candidates rounding these numbers to integer format. A number of candidates did not provide screenshot evidence of both table structures in their Evidence Document.

#### Question 14

Most candidates had created a relationship between the tables, but the screenshot evidence supplied captured the process of creating the relationship rather than the outcome and this was insufficient to confirm a one-to-many relationship had been created. A screenshot of the relationship dialogue box will evidence the relationship type. The relationship diagram will only be credited if it shows the single and one-to-many infinity symbols confirming the relationship type.

#### Question 15

Most candidates entered the new record in the correct table. The new record occasionally contained data entry errors. The telephone number was often missing the initial zero due to the incorrect data type of the telephone field in the table structure. Candidates did not achieve one of the marks if they overwrote the first record in the database (*Ramesh Singh*) instead of entering this data as a new record.

#### Question 16

The first report used fields from both tables and was done well by candidates who attempted this question. The report title was usually entered in a larger font size at the top of the report. Occasionally this title contained data entry or capitalisation errors or displayed additional text such as 'Query 1' in the title area. The 'g' descender on the title was not always fully visible as the text box had not been adjusted to accommodate the larger font size. The new field heading was usually entered accurately with only a few incurring a fault for omitting the underscore, data entry or capitalisation errors. Most used the correct calculation although this was not always displayed with the same currency symbol as the *Day\_Rate* field or with 0 decimal places. The search was based on two criterion. The wildcard search on 'sea' was completed well by most candidates. The most common error was searching for *10 days or more* with several candidates confusing the greater than (>) and less than (<) operators and some not including those records equal to (=) 10. Most included the correct fields in the report although these were often in the wrong order as, without



manual intervention, the software placed the two sort fields at the start of the report. This can be avoided by setting the sort order in the report structure rather than during the creation of the report if a report wizard is used. The sort was not always set for both fields, probably due to the order of the fields with the second sort field appearing first. This again can be avoided by setting the sort order in the report structure after the report has been created instead of in the query. Occasionally data in one or more fields was truncated and required some manipulation to ensure all data was fully visible. The calculation to count the number of bookings was usually well done and could be positioned anywhere at the end of the report. Occasionally this calculation was placed in the page footer so it appeared on every page, instead of the report footer. The label was usually entered to the left of this value but often contained capitalisation errors and/or a superfluous colon. A number of candidates did not fit the report to two pages as instructed, but most did present the report in landscape orientation. Identification details were often entered in the report footer so they only appeared on the last page of the report rather than in the page footer so they printed at the bottom of every page. A common error was not removing any other fields such as date and page number from the page footer area.

### Question 17

The production of labels is still not done well by some centres. Candidates should be able to select labels of the correct size from the standard pre-set labels sizes or create their own labels. A number of candidates selected the wrong label size so it did not fit eight labels to the page in two columns and four rows. The selection of data was done well with only a few candidates not being able to find the records that did not include Croatia. Most candidates included the correct fields in their labels in the correct order, but these were not always on the correct lines and many did not leave a space between fields on the same line or omitted the punctuation that needed to be entered. A few candidates attempted to include the field headings with the data which was acceptable but occasionally resulted in truncated record data. Candidate identification details were often placed in the page header or footer so did not appear on every label and where they were on every label, they occasionally were not left aligned. The formatting of the top field to make it larger, centred and bold was not always attempted or the data was vertically truncated as the data box had not been adjusted to accommodate the larger text size.

### Task 4 – Mail merge

#### Question 18

The mail merge task was well done with many candidates producing error-free work. Most candidates correctly replaced the text and chevrons in the master document with the correct fields from the data source file. The most common errors continue to be not removing all the chevrons from the field insertion points and changing the spacing, punctuation and alignment of original text as the merge fields are inserted. Many candidates lost the comma and/or space between the *Depart\_port* and *Country* fields and/or deleted the £ currency symbol from the last field. The *Depart\_date* field was not assessed due to incorrect formatting in the source file, this source file has now been corrected as is available for download from the school support hub (SSH), so that centres can use this source file in past paper tests in centres for preparation for future examinations.

#### Question 19

A small number of candidates did not replace the text *Candidate details here* when entering their identification details. A few did not print their master document with the field codes and therefore did not provide evidence that mail merge had been used to create the forms. A small number of candidates took a screenshot of their master document and printed this which does not provide evidence of printing the master document.

#### Question 20

The merge selection was based on two search criterion and was completed well by most candidates who evidenced an automated selection method. Any search criteria which produced the correct records was acceptable. A few candidates used an automated selection but tried to enter the criteria for 4 or 5 in the same field using greater and less than operators that would not work. Criteria needed to be set on separate rows of the automated filter to obtain the correct result. Some candidates provided evidence of a tick box selection method which did not provide evidence that an automated filter had been used. A few candidates continue to use 'find' or 'find in field' to select recipients at the printing stage which does not merge the forms.

### Question 21

Almost all candidates merged and printed the forms as specified.

### Task 5 – *Printing the Evidence Document*

Some candidates did not submit a printout of the Evidence Document. It is essential that candidates print their Evidence Document towards the end of the examination time, regardless of whether they have finished the paper. Candidates should make sure that their screenshots are large enough for the evidence to be legible and that cropping/resizing has not removed essential evidence.

### Task 6 – *Presentation*

### Question 22

Most candidates successfully imported the seven slides and presented each as a title and bulleted list. Occasionally bullets and text on the chart slide were right aligned resulting in inconsistent presentation as on all other slides the text and bullets were left aligned. Marks were not achieved if incorrect software had been used such as the .rtf file opened, manipulated and printed in word processing software.

### Question 23

Most candidates entered their identification details on the master slide so they displayed consistently on all slides in the presentation. Slide numbers were not always aligned on the top left. Master slide items that overlapped the data on the slides or appeared in a different position on the second and subsequent slides did not achieve all of the marks. Built-in slide designs can be used but often apply a different layout to slide 1 so candidates must ensure the design chosen meets all the master slide requirements.

### Question 24

The majority of candidates changed the layout of slide 1 to a title slide layout, but often this was not centred vertically on the slide or the bullet had not been removed from the subtitle.

### Question 25

All candidates who attempted this task successfully deleted the correct slide.

### Question 26

Most candidates created a vertical bar chart, but the correct selection of '*Air Temp °C High*' and '*Air Temp °C Low*' for the correct months was not always well done. Occasionally a horizontal chart was presented.

### Question 27

The chart title was usually entered in the correct position but occasionally contained data entry or capitalisation errors. The degree symbol in the value axis label of °C was often incorrect or omitted. This could have been selected from the symbols dialogue box or copied and pasted from the supplied text on the slide. The category axis title was usually correct.

### Question 28

Candidates who charted the correct data had little difficulty displaying the correct legend. Displaying the data values as data labels along the top of each bar was not always done for both sets of data and occasionally these were placed in the middle of each bar making the values difficult to read.

### Question 29

Few candidates successfully controlled the value axis scale completely with a minimum value of 0, a maximum of 32 and increments of 4. Some did not attempt to change the value axis scale at all and those that set the correct minimum and maximum values did not always change the increments to 4.

### Question 30

This was completed well with most candidates placing the chart on the correct slide to the left of the bullets. A small number did not adjust the position of the bulleted text to make room for the chart on the left and instead placed it above or below the text. As mentioned in **Question 22**, some changed the alignment of the bulleted list to make it right aligned therefore losing consistent presentation of the bullets and text on every slide. Most printed the slide but often this was not in landscape orientation and/or the print had not been controlled to just the single slide with all slides being printed.

### Question 31

Few achieved full marks for this question. The majority managed to indent the original text and change the bullet style to a dash whilst maintaining the spacing between the bullet and the text. Very few evidenced a correct hanging indent so the second line was indented and aligned with '*Sirocco*'. A number of candidates retyped the text instead of formatting the original text and some deleted the other bullets on the slide. Few candidates displayed the demoted bullets in italic or a smaller font size.

### Question 32

Most candidates printed the full presentation with two slides to the page. Either portrait or landscape orientation was acceptable. A small number of candidates omitted the chart slide from this printout.

# INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

---

**Paper 0983/22**  
**Document Production, Data**  
**Manipulation and Presentations**

## Key messages

Candidates must:

- be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types and select a font style for the type specified
- enter accurately text in bold on the question paper
- use proofing techniques to identify errors and ensure consistency of presentation
- be able to retain existing styles applied to recall text, therefore ensuring consistent spacing
- be able to distinguish between the database page header/footer area and the report header/footer area and understand which is appropriate to use
- be able to format numeric database fields to a set number of places
- be able to control the display of Boolean/logical fields
- be able to insert merge fields into a master document whilst maintaining the punctuation, layout and spacing of the original text
- be able to select data to produce a graph/chart using non-contiguous data
- know how to create presenter notes in a presentation
- produce printouts and control printing as instructed on the question paper
- ensure they include their identification details in tasks before printing as instructed on the question paper
- produce legible screenshots which show the outcome of an action rather than the skill process
- printout the Evidence Document as this contains supporting evidence that could substantially improve their grade.

## General comments

The majority of candidates completed or attempted all elements of the paper and most showed a good level of skill. The mail merge task was particularly well done with many candidates achieving full marks for this task.

Candidates must be able to distinguish between the typeface categories of serif and sans-serif font types. These are not the actual names of font styles but categories of font type with specific attributes. Candidates must be able to select an appropriate font for the font type specified.

When creating or editing paragraph styles candidates must base the style on the 'normal' (Microsoft Office) or 'default' (Open Office) paragraph style.

Text to be entered by the candidate as part of a task is displayed in bold on the question 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 their data entry to ensure it matches the text on the question paper. Common errors on this paper included incorrect capitalisation, incorrect or missing characters, omission of spaces, truncated headings and superfluous punctuation.

Candidates are instructed to produce screenshots to evidence the ICT skills that cannot be assessed through the printed product alone. These screenshots must display the outcome of an action and not the process, so for example, the saved word processing document must be seen in the file list within the folder – the ‘Save As’ dialogue box is insufficient as the save process is incomplete. Screenshot evidence is often too small and/or faint to be read even using magnification devices. Candidates must ensure that all screenshots can be easily read with the naked eye. Care should be taken when cropping and resizing screenshots to ensure important elements are still shown such as primary keys in the table structure. Evidence in the style modification and database formula screenshots were often cropped or truncated so the marks could not be achieved.

The question paper prompts candidates to include their name, centre number and candidate number on all tasks prior to printing. Without clear printed evidence of the author of the work, marks cannot be achieved. It is not acceptable for candidates to annotate their printouts by hand as there is no real evidence that they are the originators of the work.

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.

Centres should return the Supervisor’s Report Folder with the candidates’ work. This identifies the software used and can be helpful if issues were experienced during the practical test. The candidates’ work must be submitted in the original hard-copy printed Assessment Record Folders that are provided to centres. Printed or photocopied Assessment Record Folders should not be used.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Task 1 – Evidence Document**

An evidence document was created and used by most candidates to store screenshot evidence. 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 achieved for these pages. A few did not present the evidence document for marking.

#### **Task 2 – Document**

##### **Question 1**

Candidates opened the correct file and most saved it correctly with the file name given. Some candidates incorrectly saved in the original .rtf format rather than the format of the word processing software being used. A few did not enter the file name exactly as shown on the question paper with some errors in case and some using a dash instead of an underscore in the file name. 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. Most candidates retained the page setup settings as instructed. A few candidates changed the font style of the body paragraph style which had already been created and applied even though the question paper instructed that no changes should be made.

##### **Question 2**

Headers and footers were generally inserted and aligned as instructed. A few candidates omitted their centre number and/or candidate number from the header details or incorrectly split their identification details in the header area so their name was left aligned, the centre number centred and the candidate number right aligned. An automated field was not always used for the page numbers in the footer with the keyed number 1 appearing on all pages. Occasionally the header items did not align with the page margins on all pages and candidates who used the built-in content control to align the items did not always remove superfluous text or placeholders in the header and/or footer areas.

### Question 3

The creation and storage of the two styles was done well by the vast majority of candidates. Common errors included capitalisation or typographical errors in the style name, underscores used instead of dashes, or the style containing additional formatting not listed. Candidates should make sure that new styles are based on the default or 'normal' paragraph style as this avoids the new style inheriting additional formatting. Several candidates incorrectly entered 'serif' into the font dialogue box as the font name. A font style with attributes of the serif typeface category must be selected and applied. Screenshot evidence of the TAM-subhead style provided details of the settings created for this style. The table style was assessed from the style list and the formatting of the table data.

### Question 4

The list of styles from the style manager/organiser provided evidence that the styles had been created and saved. It was not necessary to show all the attributes set for table style. Any screenshot that showed a list of the style names was acceptable although the style ribbon toolbar often truncated the style names. Application of the styles was only achieved if there was evidence in the style list that the style had been created and saved.

### Question 5

The title text was occasionally entered below the subtitle text so it was not entered as a title or contained spelling and/or capitalisation errors. The recall document contained the TAM-title style that had already been created and stored. Application of this style to the title text was usually done well.

### Question 6

The subtitle text was provided in the recall document and most candidates correctly entered their name after this text and applied the subtitle style. The recall document contained the TAM-subtitle style that had already been created, stored and applied to the subtitle text and candidates were required to modify this style's settings. There was a mixed response to this task. A number of candidates created a completely new style or applied the formatting to some text and tried to create a new style based on this formatting rather than modifying the existing style. Screenshot evidence needed to show that the original style had been modified. Occasionally the screenshot was too small or had been cropped making the evidence of modification inconclusive. With the modifications made to the TAM-subtitle style the subtitle text in the document should have automatically updated to reflect the formatting changes made but this was not always the case. Some candidates did not change the line spacing or the space after value resulting in additional space below the subtitle.

### Question 7

Most candidates applied two equally spaced columns to the correct text with the correct spacing between the columns. Some candidates included the final two paragraphs in the column formatting or displayed the entire document in two columns, therefore not controlling the display of the columns. The space between the columns was occasionally set at the default or was much less than 2 centimetres. Some candidates inserted the initial column break below rather than above the subheading and occasionally a page break was inserted instead of a section break. A small number of candidates inserted several section breaks to create the columns and therefore lost the flow of the text and consistent spacing between the paragraphs.

### Question 8

Most candidates applied bullets to the list although some used the software's default round bullet style instead of arrow shaped bullets. The presentation of the bullets was often not in single line spacing as specified and a 6-point space had not been left after the last item in the list. The bullet indent was not always set accurately with some candidates accepting the default measurement or indenting the text and not the bullet 1 centimetre from the left margin.

### Question 9

Candidates achieved this style application mark if the formatting applied to all five subheadings matched the settings shown in the screenshot of the TAM-subhead style seen in the Evidence Document. This mark was only achieved if there was evidence that the style had been created and saved in **Question 3**. A few candidates inserted extra space after one or more of the subheadings resulting in inconsistent spacing that did not match the spacing defined for TAM-subhead style.

### Question 10

Almost all candidates imported the correct image and positioned this in the correct paragraph. The image was usually aligned to the left of the column and top of the paragraph. Most candidates correctly resized the image and applied text wrap. A small number of candidates did not attempt to crop the image. Most cropped the bottom of the image correctly although a few cropped too much so the bottom of the anchor was no longer rounded.

### Question 11

Candidates achieved this style application mark if there was evidence in the style list (**Question 4**) that the TAM-table style had been created and saved, and the table formatting matched the settings shown on the question paper. A number of candidates had incorrectly set additional space after one or more rows in the table.

### Question 12

Most candidates correctly inserted a new row as the first row of the table. A few inserted a new table separate to the existing table and a small number inserted the row in the wrong position. The title was usually entered accurately with a few candidates not following the case shown on the question paper or not including the 's' on *Numbers*.

### Question 13

Most candidates who inserted the new row correctly were able to merge the cells so the title was centre aligned over the two columns. A few candidates centred the text in the first cell but did not merge the cells.

### Question 14

Occasionally gridlines were not applied to the complete table. The borders and data did not always fit within the column width. A number of candidates left no space after the table or the space was greater than 6 points. Most candidates printed the document at this stage.

### Task 3 – Database

#### Question 15

The importing of the .csv files was usually well done. The majority set the correct primary key on the marina table. A few candidates incorrectly included an ID field as a primary key in the vessels table. The field names and data types were mostly set correctly although the *Berth\_Fee* field was often displayed to 2 decimal places instead of 0 and the *Length(m)* and *Beam(m)* fields were often not displayed to 2 decimal places. Most correctly included the Boolean/logical field, but this was often not set to display as Yes/No. A number of candidates did not provide screenshot evidence of both table structures in their Evidence Document.

#### Question 16

Most candidates created a relationship between the tables but the screenshot evidence supplied captured the process of creating the relationship rather than the outcome and this was insufficient to confirm a one-to-many relationship had been created. A screenshot of the relationship dialogue box will evidence the relationship type. The relationship diagram will only be credited if it shows the single and one-to-many infinity symbols confirming the relationship type.

### Question 17

Most candidates entered the new record in the correct table. The new record occasionally contained data entry errors. A common error was the *Length(m)* and *Beam(m)* fields formatted to display as integer so the accuracy of the data entry in these fields could not be assessed. Candidates were not awarded one of the marks if they overwrote the first record in the database (*Adriatic Star*) instead of entering this data as a new record.

### Question 18

The first report used fields from both tables and was done well by candidates who attempted this question. The report title was usually entered in a larger font size at the top of the report. Occasionally this title contained data entry or capitalisation errors or displayed additional text such as 'Query 1' in the title area. The new field heading was usually entered accurately with only a few incurring a fault for omitting the underscore, data entry or capitalisation errors. Most used the correct calculation although this was not always displayed with the same currency symbol as the *Berth\_Fee* field or with 0 decimal places. The search was based on three criteria and was generally completed well. The wildcard search to find records ending in 'star' caused the most issues with a number of candidates searching for all records containing 'star' not ending in 'star'. Most included the correct fields in the report although these were often in the wrong order as, without manual intervention, the software placed the two sort fields at the start of the report. This can be avoided by setting the sort order in the report structure rather than during the creation of the report if a report wizard is used. The sort was not always set for both fields, probably due to the order of the fields with the second sort field appearing first. This again can be avoided by setting the sort order in the report structure after the report has been created instead of in the query or wizard if used. Occasionally data in one or more fields was truncated and required some manipulation to ensure all data was fully visible. The average calculation was usually well done although was often not displayed with 0 decimal places. Screenshot evidence occasionally showed a wrong or incorrect function had been used. The currency symbol used did not always match the other currency symbols used. The calculated field could be positioned anywhere at the end of the report. Occasionally this calculation was placed in the page footer instead of the report footer causing an error in the page footer of every page. The label was usually entered to the left of this value but often contained capitalisation errors and/or a superfluous colon. A number of candidates did not fit the report to two pages as instructed, but most did present the report in landscape orientation. Identification details were often entered in the report footer so they only appeared on the last page of the report rather than in the page footer so they printed at the bottom of every page. A common error was not removing any other fields such as date and page number from the page footer area.

### Question 19

The extract used fields from both tables and was well done by candidates who attempted this question. The search was based on two criteria. Most found the records matching *Adriatic*. The most common error was searching for *Length(m)* of 25 or more with several candidates confusing the greater than (>) and less than (<) operators and some not including those records equal to (=) 25. Most included the three correct fields in the extract although these were occasionally presented in the wrong order. Some candidates did not sort the data into ascending order of *Length(m)*.

### Question 20

Exporting the extract in rich text format produced a mixed response. Some candidates did not provide screenshot evidence of exporting the extract and some incorrectly exported it in .csv, .txt or .pdf format. Any reasonable file name was acceptable.

### Task 4 – Document 2

### Question 21

Importing the saved database extract into the word-processed document was not completed by a number of candidates. Where the extract was imported it was usually placed in the correct position in the document. The table did not always fit within the column width of the document and the column widths of the table were not adjusted to ensure all data displayed on one line, commonly with the data in the *Yacht\_Name* column wrapped within the cell. The table paragraph style was often not applied or had additional space after one or more rows of the table. Spacing below the table was often not set at 6 points.



## Question 22

In most cases there was evidence of good proofreading and document presentation skills. The tables were rarely split over columns or pages. However, the list was often split over columns. Spacing between items was not always consistent. A few candidates changed the body style spacing and left large gaps after paragraphs. The columns and pages were not always aligned at the top of the page. Occasionally there was a widow or orphan, most commonly where a subheading or single line of text had been left at the bottom of a column.

## Task 5 – Mail merge

### Question 23

The mail merge task was well done with many candidates producing error-free work. Most candidates correctly replaced the text and chevrons in the master document with the correct fields from the data source file. The most common errors continue to be not removing all the chevrons from the field insertion points and changing the spacing, punctuation and alignment of original text as the merge fields are inserted. Many candidates lost the comma and/or space between the *Insurance\_Co* and *Policy\_No* fields and/or deleted the £ currency symbol from the last field.

### Question 24

A small number of candidates did not replace the text *Candidate details here* when entering their identification details. A few did not print their master document with the field codes and therefore did not provide evidence that mail merge had been used to create the forms. A small number of candidates took a screenshot of their master document and printed this which does not provide evidence of printing the master document.

### Question 25

The merge selection was based on two search criterion and was completed well by most candidates who evidenced an automated selection method. Any search criteria which produced the correct records was acceptable and most set the search criteria correctly. Some candidates provided evidence of a tick box selection method which did not provide evidence that an automated filter had been used. A few candidates continue to use 'find' or 'find in field' to select recipients at the printing stage which does not merge the forms.

### Question 26

Almost all candidates merged and printed the forms as specified. A few candidates printed 3 instead of 4 forms. Candidates are expected to double check the data source file to ensure the search criteria has found the correct records.

## Task 6 – Printing the Evidence Document

Some candidates did not submit a printout of the Evidence Document. It is essential that candidates print their Evidence Document towards the end of the examination time, regardless of whether they have finished the paper. Candidates should make sure that their screenshots are large enough for the evidence to be legible and that cropping/resizing has not removed essential evidence.

## Task 7 – Presentation

### Question 27

Most candidates successfully imported the 6 slides and presented each as a title and bulleted list. Occasionally bullets and text on the chart slide were right aligned resulting in an inconsistent presentation as on all other slides the text and bullets were left aligned. Marks were not achieved if incorrect software had been used such as the .rtf file opened, manipulated and printed in word processing software.

### Question 28

Most candidates used a master slide to display the features specified. The horizontal line was not always drawn across the complete width of the slide. This line was usually in the correct position but often overlapped the slide titles or other slide content. A number of candidates did not enter the text *Support Coastal Tourism* and a few entered this on the first slide only and not on the master slide. Those that did enter this text on the slide master displayed it on one line but did not always align it to the top right of the slide. Slide numbers were not always aligned on the bottom left of the slide. Most candidates entered their identification details on the master slide so they displayed consistently on all slides in the presentation. Master slide items that overlapped the data on the slides or appeared in a different position on the second and subsequent slides did not achieve all of the marks. Built-in slide designs can be used, but often apply a different layout to slide 1, so candidates must ensure the design chosen meets all the master slide requirements.

### Question 29

Most candidates created a vertical bar chart, but the correct selection of only the top five ranked countries was not always well done. Some candidates selected more than the top five countries and several included the data for 2014 and 2018 in their selection. Occasionally a horizontal chart was presented.

### Question 30

The chart and axis titles were usually entered in the correct position but occasionally contained data entry or capitalisation errors such as *County* for *Country* and *Thousand* for *Thousands*.

### Question 31

Displaying the data values as data labels at the top of each bar was completed well by most candidates. Occasionally the labels were placed in the middle of each bar making the values difficult to read.

### Question 32

Few candidates successfully controlled the value axis scale completely with a minimum value of 0, a maximum of 1100 and increments of 100. Some did not attempt to change the value axis scale at all and those that set the correct minimum and maximum values did not always change the increments to 100.

### Question 33

Placing the chart on the correct slide to the left of the bullets was completed well by most candidates. A small number did not adjust the position of the bulleted text to make room for the chart on the left and instead placed it above or below the text. As mentioned in **Question 27**, some changed the alignment of the bulleted list to make it right aligned therefore losing consistent presentation of the bullets and text on every slide. The chart data was usually full visible with no overlap of any slide items. A few candidates incorrectly displayed a legend for the single series of data.

### Question 34

There has been some improvement in the creation of presenter notes but some candidates still find this challenging. This text was often entered as a bulleted item or comment on the slide or entered in a text box on the slide and then printed as a full-page slide. Occasionally the text was entered in the header/footer area. Candidates who entered the text as presenter notes usually entered this accurately. A few candidates printed all six slides in presenter note layout instead of controlling the printing to a single slide only.

### Question 35

Most candidates printed the full presentation as a handout with 6 slides to the page. Either portrait or landscape orientation was acceptable. A small number of candidates omitted the chart slide from this printout.

# INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

---

**Paper 0983/31**  
**Data Analysis and Website Authoring**

## Key messages

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

- Candidates need to understand the importance of following the instructions on the question paper.
- Candidates need to understand that external cascading stylesheets should not contain any HTML.
- Candidates need a better understanding of the syntax of CSS in a stylesheet.
- Candidates need a better understanding of HTML syntax, particularly in the use of head and body tags.
- Candidates must ensure that they include their candidate details in the correct place on all printouts.
- Candidates need to take greater care with the accuracy of data entry.
- Candidates need to take greater care with the formatting of the spreadsheet, particularly the setting of row heights and column widths to match both the question and the data or labels contained within the cells.
- Candidates need to be able to identify which spreadsheet function is the most appropriate for a task.

## General comments

There were significant differences in the range of results from centre to centre and from candidate to candidate within centres. The paper gave a good spread of marks and candidate errors were spread evenly over the sections of the paper.

Candidates must ensure that the text within the markup, stylesheet and spreadsheet printouts is large enough to enable examiners to read the work, without the use of magnification devices.

## Comments on specific questions

### ***Task 1 – Evidence Document***

Almost all candidates created an Evidence Document.

### ***Task 2 – Image Editing and File Management***

#### **Question 1**

Most candidates placed the specified files in the correct folder, although not all displayed the folder name in their screenshot evidence. Where candidates did display the folder name, it was frequently found with an initial upper case letter rather than the j2231 folder name given in the question paper. Some candidates did not include all the specified file details, for example: image dimensions, frame heights and widths were not always added to the folder specifications before the screenshot was taken. The image j31balloon.jpg was frequently saved with the correct file name, although the spelling of **balloon** was not always correct, but less frequently saved in .png format, as required by the task. A number of candidates saved this file as a .jpeg. Many candidates rotated the image through 90 degrees clockwise, a few were seen rotated anticlockwise, but fewer candidates also reflected this image horizontally, as required by the task. Screenshot details of this folder were often printed so small that examiners could not read the file details, even using magnification devices.

### **Task 3 – Web Page**

#### **Question 2**

Most candidates produced a table with the correct number of rows and columns. A number of candidates set dimensions in pixels instead of percentage values, whilst others used dimensions such as 35 per cent for cell B. A small number of candidates erroneously produced a new table for each row. A significant number of candidates did not show the table and cell borders separated as shown in the diagram. A small number of candidates produced web pages that included the cell reference letters despite clear instructions not to do so.

#### **Question 3**

Candidates who included the web page title often did so correctly, although a few candidates had text that contained data entry errors. A significant number of candidates incorrectly placed this outside the head section of the page.

#### **Question 4**

Many candidates omitted this step. Some did not place the **base** tag and **target** attribute in the head section and a small number of candidates omitted the underscore from the target window name.

#### **Question 5**

Although many candidates found some of this particular task challenging, most placed the correct still images in the correct cells. The requirements for the placement of the video were very specific in this question and required candidates to use the video tag, and its associated attributes and other tags, to place the video in the required cell. Whilst some candidates used this and the associated source tag to complete this task well, many used other methods such as the img or embed tags to attempt this. For videos placed with the video tag there is no requirement to place any tag before the error message providing it sits between the **video** and **/video** tags. Many incorrect attempts were made that included the use of no embed or alt tags. Most candidates who used the video tag also correctly included the source and /source tags to identify the source and file type of the video. The majority of the attempted error messages contained good descriptions of why the video did not appear.

#### **Question 6**

Many candidates were successful using the inline **style** tag to embed the CSS for the image width into the HTML. A significant number of candidates did not follow the instruction 'Place inline style attributes', but instead, used the HTML width attribute to attempt this.

#### **Question 7**

Few candidates completed this step as instructed. Most modern web authoring packages insert **alt=""** by default but many candidates left this unchanged or used alt text that did not describe to the user, details of the image that had been omitted.

#### **Question 8**

This was completed well by almost all candidates, with most also setting the text into style h2. A small number of candidates overwrote the style h2 from the stylesheet with additional inline style attributes.

#### **Question 9**

The text was often placed into the cell, but frequently contained data entry errors, including errors in spelling, punctuation and capitalisation. Candidates need to take greater care where data entry is required. Many candidates inserted break tags to split this into two paragraphs. Not all candidates who attempted this question set it in style h3.

### Question 10

Many candidates successfully created the anchors around the image tag, some successfully adding a correct hyperlink reference to the file j31kenya.htm. This file reference was not always a relative reference, a significant number of candidates included the file path to this file on their computer, which, whilst appearing to work for the candidate, would not work, unless the file path of the user's computer was identical, when the web page was uploaded to a web server. It is important that candidates understand how a web page will be used rather than just creating it because they have been instructed to do so.

### Question 11

Most candidates created the hyperlink as specified, but a fewer number of candidates did not include the target window attribute in their solution. This file reference was not always a relative reference, a significant number of candidates included the file path to this file on their computer, which, whilst appearing to work for the candidate, would not work, unless the file path of the user's computer was identical, when the web page was uploaded to a web server.

### Question 12

Most candidates attached the stylesheet as specified, although not all named it as instructed in the question paper. A number of candidates included file paths in their attached stylesheets which would enable them to work on the candidate's computer, but not on others with a different file/folder structure. A small number of candidates, having added the stylesheet correctly, then added extra styles, in the head section or inline, which overrode the stylesheet.

### Question 13

This question proved problematic for a number of candidates. Some candidates created a new stylesheet rather than updating the supplied stylesheet. Few candidates placed the background elements in the body section of their stylesheet, of those who did, a number did not set the correct background colour as they did not correctly rearrange the colour elements into their RGB components. Some candidates did not use the # symbol to denote a hexadecimal number. Candidates often did not use a single selector thereby increasing the chances of making mistakes when repeating the contents of styles h1, h2 and h3. Some candidates added the text colour as black rather than using the hexadecimal code #000000 as required by the question paper. A significant number of candidates omitted the speech marks around 'Times CY' and 'Times New Roman'. Very few candidates were successful in setting the table margins individually to 5 per cent of the width and height of the browser window. Some candidates set the margin-left, margin-right, margin-top and margin-bottom properties to 5 per cent. Many candidates attempted to use a single property with margin 5% which did not set all margins individually. It was acceptable to use a single margin property with all 4 values like: margin 5% 5% 5% 5%. Font sizes were frequently set in pixels rather than in points. Some candidates used a table, td selector to set the borders of the table and cells as specified, although some candidates used black rather than the hexadecimal #000000 for the border-color value. Border-spacing was frequently set to 10 pixels. Some candidates introduced errors into the setting of values with points or pixels assigned to them by including spacing between the value and unit, for example 10px is fine but 10 px is not, as the space negates the unit and the browser then decides what sort of unit it should use when the page is displayed. A number of candidates erroneously placed the padding property in the table selector rather than in the td selector. The CSS comment was not always set using /\* \*/. Some screenshots produced text so small it was impossible to read even using magnification. A significant number of candidates placed their CSS in a HTML shell, or just included HTML elements in their stylesheet despite clear instructions in the paper, that no HTML should be used.

### Question 14

Most candidates included the HTML source and browser view of the page, although there were still some submissions in an editor rather than a browser for the browser view. Some screen prints were cropped so that the address bar was not visible.

### *Task 4 – Printing the Evidence Document*

This was printed as specified by almost all candidates.

### **Task 5 – Spreadsheet**

#### **Question 15**

The correct file was used and saved with the correct file name by most candidates, although some candidates saved their work as a spreadsheet with a number of files still saved in .csv format. Almost all candidates placed their name, centre number and candidate number on the left in the header, fewer placed an automated file name **without** the file path on the right.

#### **Question 16**

This question was answered well by most candidates, although some candidates did not use the csv file, as specified in the question paper, or incorrectly set the lookup range.

#### **Question 17**

This question was more challenging for candidates, although some candidates did not use the .csv file, as specified in the question paper, or incorrectly set the lookup range. The most challenging part, the correct return column, B4 + 1, was not attempted by many candidates, with many opting to place a value like 8 as the return column and amending this as they tested or modelled the spreadsheet.

#### **Question 18**

This was completed well by almost all candidates, but row and column headings were often omitted and formulae were sometimes not fully visible.

#### **Question 19**

A large number of candidates produced the modelled printout with a significant number achieving full marks. Some candidates did not get the correct results due to errors in their formulae or by using the incorrect case when entering the data to be modelled. Some candidates displayed row and column headings despite a clear instruction in the paper, not to do so.

# INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

---

**Paper 0983/32**  
**Data Analysis and Website Authoring**

## Key messages

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

- Candidates need to understand the importance of following the instructions on the question paper.
- Candidates need to understand that external cascading stylesheets should not contain any HTML.
- Candidates need a better understanding of the syntax of CSS in a stylesheet.
- Candidates need a better understanding of HTML syntax, particularly in the use of head and body tags.
- Candidates must ensure that they include their candidate details in the correct place on all printouts.
- Candidates need to take greater care with the accuracy of data entry.
- Candidates need to carefully examine source data files before using them so that they understand the structure of these files.
- Candidates need to take greater care with the formatting of the spreadsheet, particularly the setting of row heights and column widths to match both the question and the data or labels contained within the cells.
- Candidates need to be able to identify which spreadsheet function is the most appropriate for a task.
- Candidates need to be aware that the linked .csv file must be open when printing out formulae in spreadsheets to avoid the appearance of long file paths which can lead to many marks not being achieved if this results in formulae not being fully visible.

## General comments

There were significant differences in the range of results from centre to centre and from candidate to candidate within centres. The paper gave a good spread of marks and candidate errors were spread evenly over the sections of the paper.

Candidates must ensure that the text within the CSS, stylesheet and spreadsheet printouts is large enough to enable Examiners to read the work, without the use of magnification devices.

## Comments on specific questions

### ***Task 1 – Evidence Document***

Almost all candidates created an Evidence Document.

### ***Task 2 – Spreadsheet***

#### **Question 1**

The correct file was saved with the correct file name by many candidates, although there were a number who saved this as the original .csv file or who introduced typographical errors, including case errors, into the file name. Almost all candidates placed their name, centre number and candidate number on the left in the header, fewer placed an automated file name with the file path on the right.

## Question 2

This question was answered well by most candidates using a VLOOKUP function, although some candidates did not use the .csv file, as specified in the question paper, often using a .xlsx spreadsheet, or incorrectly set the lookup range to include the header for the data.

## Question 3

This question proved more challenging to many candidates, with many opting for a VLOOKUP function rather than using a LOOKUP function, as VLOOKUP will not allow backwards referencing. A small number of candidates incorrectly set the initial lookup value as a range. Some excellent responses were seen using LOOKUP, with the absolute ranges set to B3:B184 and A3:A184. A small number of candidates used XLOOKUP functions to create a good working solution for this formula. Some candidates did not use the .csv file, as specified in the question paper, often using a .xlsx spreadsheet, in some cases changing the contents of this file. Some candidates appeared to copy the source file into the current workbook and hence referenced a sheet instead of the external file. Some candidates defined named ranges for the lookup range, but did not provide evidence of the definition of the range. With this evidence, marks could be given for the range, but without it the range would be unknown.

## Question 4

This question was answered well by most candidates using a reference to cell F7 divided by a VLOOKUP function, although some candidates did not use the specified csv file, often using a .xlsx spreadsheet, or incorrectly set the lookup range to include the header for the data. A significant number of candidates used an alternative method of cell F7 divided by a LOOKUP function. A small number of candidates used divide by F7 at the end of the formula, resulting in incorrect values.

## Question 5

Many candidates replicated their formulae for all transactions, although a number had truncated formulae because the column widths were too narrow.

## Question 6

The majority of candidates merged the required cells as specified.

## Question 7

Most candidates inserted the two new rows as specified in the question paper. A small number of candidates only inserted a single row.

## Question 8

The formatting of the spreadsheet as shown in the question paper was not completed by many candidates. Most candidates correctly formatted the merged cell A1:H1. Fewer candidates set the row height of rows 2 and 5 as shown in the question paper. Many candidates attempted to wrap some of the cell contents in row 6 but not all of these had done so for all the columns B, F, G and H. Not all candidates set the alignment in row 6 so that it was centre aligned both horizontally and vertically.

## Question 9

A significant number of candidates correctly set the cells in column H to be in \$ with 2 decimal places.

## Question 10

This was completed well by most candidates, but row and column headings were sometimes omitted, and formulae were sometimes not fully visible. A small number of candidates produced portrait printouts rather than the required landscape.

## Question 11

This was completed well by many candidates, although there were a number of printouts in portrait orientation and a small number with row and column headings visible. A significant number of candidates did



not ensure that the contents of all cells, particularly those in column D, were fully visible. Some candidates had this printout over two pages wide rather than the specified single page wide.

#### Question 12

Many candidates experienced problems importing the dates from the source files into their spreadsheets due to the regional settings of their software. Due to this issue full marks have been awarded to all candidates for this question to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

#### Question 13

Most candidates extracted the correct data, some erroneously selected a range for the AutoFilter that did not include row 6, others also included the row from Kenya stored in row 7.

#### Question 14

This was completed well by many candidates, although there were a number of printouts in portrait orientation and some where the contents of all cells were not fully visible. Some candidates had this printout over two pages wide rather than the specified single page wide.

#### Question 15

This question was completed well by most candidates. A small number sorted the data into descending order of country rather than ascending order of country.

#### Question 16

This question was completed well by many candidates who had successfully used a function to lookup the ISO code. Many candidates experienced problems importing the dates from the source files into their spreadsheets due to the regional settings of their software. Due to this issue the mark associated with the date criteria has been awarded to all candidates for this question to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

#### Question 17

This was completed well by many candidates, although there were a number of printouts in portrait orientation and some where the contents of all cells were not fully visible. Some candidates had this printout over two pages wide rather than the specified single page wide.

#### *Task 3 – File Management*

#### Question 18

This was attempted by most candidates, but a significant number did not display the image dimensions. A number of candidates also created the new folder with the name J2232 rather than j2232. A few candidates did not display the folder name.

#### *Task 4 – Web Page*

#### Question 19

This question proved problematic for a number of candidates. Despite a clear instruction that this was to be an attached stylesheet and must contain no HTML, many candidates ignored this and produced their CSS in a HTML shell or included HTML syntax in their stylesheet. Many candidates did not place their name, centre number and candidate number as a comment at the start of the stylesheet or placed it as a HTML comment rather than using CSS syntax. The font styles for h1, h2 and h3 were often correct, although not always in speech marks as each font name contained more than one word. There were some spelling errors in **Casion Pro Bold**. Most candidates got these correct and included the default serif as well, although there were a number of candidates that placed the word serif in speech marks which was the generic font style. Most candidates set these for all 3 styles. There were a number of candidates who set one or more styles and one or more classes for these fonts. Some candidates set a style of 'h1 h2 h3' rather than 'h1, h2, h3' to avoid duplication of the statements and produce a more efficient solution. A number of candidates did not attempt an efficient solution, setting each of the statements for each of the three styles. Most candidates successfully

set the colours and font sizes for these 3 styles, although a small number did not use hexadecimal notation, presumably because they used WYSIWYG packages and did not check the CSS that the package generated. Table margins were not always set as specified. Many candidates erroneously set the cell padding in the table section rather than in the td section. There were many successful methods used to set the table borders and gridlines (table data borders) so that they were not visible. The most common error was to only set one of these to not visible rather than both. Few candidates placed the background elements in the body section of their stylesheet. Of those who did, a number did not set the correct background colour as they did not correctly rearrange the colour elements into their RGB components. Some candidates did not use the # symbol to denote a hexadecimal number. Many of the areas that should have appeared within the body selector were seen using other erroneous selectors such as background, table or HTML. Those who used the body selector frequently set the background image as specified, although fewer candidates used the background-size as the declaration property for the two values. A number of candidates did not save the stylesheet with the specified file name or file type.

#### **Question 20**

Most candidates attached the stylesheet as specified, although not all named it as instructed in the question paper, as mentioned above. A number of candidates included file paths in their attached stylesheets which would enable them to work on the candidate's computer but not on other computers with a different file/folder structure. A small number of candidates, having added the stylesheet correctly, then added extra styles, in the head section or inline, which overrode the stylesheet.

#### **Question 21**

Many candidates successfully included the web page title as specified, although there were a small number of typographical errors. Some candidates placed this outside the head section.

#### **Question 22**

Most candidates included the HTML source and browser view of the page, although there were still some submissions in an editor rather than a browser for the browser view. Some screen prints were cropped so that the address bar was not visible.

#### ***Task 4 – Printing the Evidence Document***

This was printed as specified by almost all candidates.