

GCSE 2005
January Series



Report on the Examination

**Applied Information and
Communication Technology
(Double Award)**

■ Unit 3 ICT and Society

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available to download from the AQA Website:
www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

CONTENTS

Applied Information and Communication Technology (Double Award)

	<i>Page No.</i>
3850/3 Unit 3 - ICT in Society.....	5
Mark Ranges and Award of Grades	15

Applied Information and Communication Technology (Double Award)

Unit 3: ICT and Society

Introduction

Over the past two terms, AQA has provided a large amount of support to centres following disappointing candidate performance in previous examination series. In the summer term 2004, a series of meetings was held around the country specifically focused at centres starting delivery of the specification in September 2004. These meetings gave detailed information on the content of the specification, and advice on its delivery and assessment. The meetings were well received by the centres that attended, with positive feedback on their usefulness, and it is intended to run similar meetings in summer 2005.

In the autumn term a series of meetings was held which focused exclusively on Unit 3. These meetings were this year funded by DfES as part of the Applied GCSE implementation strategy, and ran in parallel with standardisation meetings for Units 1 and 2. Well over 200 centres were represented at these meetings, which provided delegates with an insight into candidates' performances in summer 2004 and previous examination series. Previous candidates' strengths and weaknesses were identified, and strategies for improving candidates' performances were suggested. A range of exemplar material was issued, with commentaries explaining where marks had been achieved by candidates. Those centres that chose not to attend were sent materials by post so that their candidates were not disadvantaged.

The Candidates' Booklet and Teachers' Notes were extensively restructured in order to clarify exactly what is required of candidates. Candidates were presented with a series of clearly described stages which combine together to form each task. Working through these stages allowed candidates to produce tasks which demonstrated the depth and range of knowledge and understanding required by this Double Award specification.

Centres were also sent copies of the detailed mark scheme used by examiners. Although the allocation of marks has not changed throughout the life of this specification, by considering last year's mark scheme, based on a different set of focus areas, centres will have been able to clarify exactly what candidates are expected to do in order to achieve specific marks, and guide their students accordingly.

Centres are reminded of AQA's expectation that candidates are taught the ICT content for all five focus areas identified in Unit 3 prior to their starting the assessed tasks. Evidence from Teacher Support meetings and questions raised by centres with Portfolio Advisers suggest that a number of centres did not teach the content in sufficient depth or detail to provide their candidates with opportunities to achieve success. This assessed unit represents one-third of a double award GCSE qualification, and the teaching and study allowed should reflect this, both in the amount of time and depth of preparation. It is clearly unreasonable to expect candidates who have been given reduced teaching and study time to achieve similar marks to those who have received the 5-6 hours per week that would normally be allocated to two GCSEs.

General issues

Examiners were pleased to note during the marking process that, since the last examination in June 2004, many teachers had clearly taken on board the advice that they had been offered through all the above routes, and the evidence produced by candidates was considerably improved, with a significant increase in the mean mark. However, many candidates had left large gaps in their evidence, and had not produced the evidence required for certain sections of marks. It was disappointing to note that in some centres, candidates had misinterpreted the purpose of the mark scheme, resulting in a ‘minimalist’ approach to the tasks. The mark scheme is intended as a guide to candidates, not as a set of discrete questions. Candidates are expected to produce evidence which is a coherent whole and which considers the concepts required, rather than evidence which is a series of sometimes unrelated statements demonstrating little depth of ICT knowledge or understanding.

Examiners were pleased to note that candidates had in the main heeded advice regarding use of software for Tasks One and Three particularly. ICT skills are assessed explicitly in *Unit 1: ICT Tools and Applications*, and so there are very few marks indeed in Unit 3 for skills in the use of desktop publishing or presentation graphics software, and candidates should be encouraged to focus their efforts on the content of the presentation and newsletter/brochure rather than its appearance, whilst at the same time maintaining its fitness for purpose.

The structure of candidates’ scripts was again improved, with comparatively few centres ignoring the instruction to avoid plastic wallets and ring binders. Script pages should simply be attached loosely by means of a treasury tag.

A number of centres did not include *Candidate Record Forms* or *Record of Controlled Sessions* with their candidates’ scripts, with the result that AQA staff had to contact centres to obtain them. Centres are reminded that both documents are specifically required, and must be included with sets of scripts when they are sent to examiners.

A number of centres failed to send candidates’ scripts to examiners by the required date (21 January for the January series). Centres are again reminded that failure to meet this deadline is very likely to result in a delay in the issue of results.

As part of the marking process, AQA undertook a detailed item analysis of a sample of candidates’ scripts. This identified exactly where candidates had achieved marks, and also where marks had been lost. Some of the results of this analysis are included in this Report on the Examination, and centres are very strongly advised to take note of the points made in their preparation of future cohorts of candidates.

Task One: Presentation on Law and Order

The presentation task this session was changed to be Task One, rather than Task Two as in previous years, although the requirements of the task itself were identical.

The requirement was for candidates to focus the content of their presentation exclusively on the effects of ICT relating to Law and Order on three identified groups. Examiners were again disappointed to note that a number of candidates had produced generic presentations which did not relate to any particular focus area. Presentations of this type were unable to achieve more than a minimal number of marks as responses were not sufficiently detailed.

For a number of centres it was clear that a significant number of presentations were quite similar, for example they related to the same groups or areas of content. Centres are reminded, therefore, that

candidates must produce individual presentations and be unaided by the teacher whilst working under the controlled conditions. It is totally inappropriate for the teacher to influence this.

It is important for candidates to realise that the presentation must be produced for a specified audience, and must focus on the **effects** of ICT on the three identified types of groups or individuals. It is not sufficient for candidates to offer generic responses which do not relate to the identified groups. The presentation is essentially an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate that they are able to use ICT knowledge and understanding that they have developed through the teacher's delivery of the content, and **apply** that knowledge and understanding to a new context. Many weaker candidates will find that application challenging, and one of the distinguishing characteristics of higher-level candidates is their ability to transfer their knowledge.

Candidate describes types of groups and/or individuals affected by ICT systems

In identifying the three groups or individuals, candidates will establish much of the content focus of their presentation, and so it is important that candidates consider carefully which groups or individuals they will use. The majority of candidates identified groups or individuals that had some relation with the context of law and order, many using examples recommended at Teacher Support meetings. Groups such as police officers, forensic scientists, victims of crime, etc were therefore common. Some candidates ignored advice and opted for groups or individuals which were too closely related, for example 'criminals' and 'victims of crime', or 'criminals' and 'police officers'. Whilst selections such as these allowed candidates to achieve marks for group identification, the inter-relation of information often precluded the award of marks for later items, such as consequences and benefits, and details of future effects, where answers were too similar to be awarded full marks. Some candidates failed to achieve full marks in this section through their identification of inappropriate groups. Examples such as 'people', 'the public' or 'the community' are not sufficiently specific to provide meaningful structures. Similarly, 'me' 'my ICT teacher' or 'Miss Jones' are too specific, and do not constitute a **type** of group or individual.

The majority of candidates attempted to identify three groups, although in a number of cases one or more of these was unacceptable, for the reasons outlined above. Examiners were very disappointed to note that very few candidates indeed described their groups to demonstrate their own knowledge. Candidates may have felt that the definitions of their groups were common knowledge and therefore unnecessary, which is not the case. A candidate who identified 'motorists' as a group described them simply as 'people who drive their cars on public roads', which was just about sufficient to achieve the A2 description mark.

Very few candidates related their groups to the use of ICT, with very little detail of what each of the groups actually used ICT for, to provide a focus for later sections of the presentation. A number of candidates identified 'court officers' as a group, and went on to describe how courts use ICT, in terms of word processing, databases and CCTV cameras. There was often an incorrect assumption on the part of candidates that people do not need to be involved in deciding how ICT is used. This is clearly an area which is outside candidates' experiences, and so must be taught or researched in detail, rather than simply assumed by candidates.

Candidate considers consequences of lack of access to ICT and benefits available through use of ICT

Many candidates interpreted the two requirements of this criterion as being opposites, but they are not. Additionally, many candidates confused **benefits** of the use of ICT with the **purposes** of using it, suggesting that they did not have sufficient understanding of the way in which ICT is used. Consequently, marks achieved were often low.

Many candidates assumed, for example, that if the police did not have speed cameras, then they could not catch speeding motorists, or if there was no national police database then criminals could not be

caught, which is clearly not the case. Again, many candidates seemed to be under the impression that it is the technology that catches criminals, rather than police officers supported by technology.

Very few candidates described accurately what would have to be done if there was no access to ICT, for example if there were no speed cameras then speeding motorists could be timed over a fixed distance manually, or followed by police cars. This was rarely mentioned.

Many candidates in this section gave extensive details of features such as DNA testing, fingerprinting, tagging of criminals, but did not relate that information to the use of ICT in relation to law and order, and so rarely achieved marks. Details of how technologies such as these are used to solve crime, or systems which reduce crime, would have achieved marks. Additionally, there was evidence that much of this had been copied verbatim from websites, and so it was therefore inadmissible as the candidate's own work.

Candidate's work is effective and appropriate to the needs of the audience, and is produced using fully the software features available

Included within this section is the requirement for candidates to identify an audience for their presentation. The audience may or may not be related to the groups or individuals identified, but many weaker candidates appeared to confuse the two, thereby losing the mark for audience selection. Some candidates proposed 'generic' audiences such as 'the public' or 'adults' which were unacceptably vague. Audiences such as 'my ICT group' or 'students at a police training college' or even '15-year olds interested in law and order' were quite acceptable.

A surprising number of candidates failed to identify an audience at all.

Most candidates who identified an audience also achieved the mark for appropriateness for audience, which was judged in terms of content, language, appearance, format, etc.

Virtually all candidates achieved at least half of the marks available for use of software features, with the majority earning full marks. Some candidates may have included a background, which could have been awarded a mark, but did not achieve that mark as their printouts were produced in black and white. There is no requirement for colour printing in this section, but backgrounds often 'disappear' when printed in monochrome due to the design of the software. A simple annotation by the candidate indicating that a background has been used is sufficient for the background mark to be awarded.

Very few candidates provided evidence of slide transitions or build effects, both of which would have earned marks. Again, a simple annotation or screen print of the transition setup window is sufficient for the mark to be awarded.

Candidate's work includes evidence of the use of ICT to search for and organise information

Most candidates achieved at least 1 mark for providing evidence that they had used ICT to search for information. The most common approach to this criterion was the use of an Internet search engine, with appropriate search criteria included, which is quite acceptable. A number of candidates lost marks due to their use of inappropriate search criteria. Typing in the name of the Task, for example, is not acceptable. Higher-level candidates achieved more marks through appropriate selection of some of the hyperlinks generated by the search and relating that to the content of the presentation. Weaker candidates who included a screen shot of a search engine without any search criteria did not achieve marks.

Most candidates achieved at least one mark for use of ICT to organise information through their use of bulleted items in the presentation. Examiners were pleased to note that large numbers of

candidates had followed the advice regarding inclusion of graphical information. Stronger candidates produced graphs of relevant information which were referred to in the presentation. Candidates who included a graph but did not identify its content could not be awarded marks, similarly candidates could not be rewarded for simply including the default graph generated by the software. Worryingly, a small number of mainly weaker candidates included a cartoon image of a graph taken from a clipart gallery, which did not earn marks.

Candidates who had pasted graphs from other sources into their presentation could not be awarded D2 organisation marks, but were often rewarded with C3 use of software marks, for demonstrating the skill of insertion of an object.

Many candidates achieved organisation marks in other ways, for example through the use of tables, flowcharts, some diagrams, etc.

Candidate demonstrates depth of knowledge of the effects of ICT developments on the chosen groups and/or individuals

This criterion is intended primarily to identify higher-level candidates and to provide them with an opportunity to demonstrate their extensive knowledge of the subject. Examiners were disappointed to note that marks were awarded to very few candidates for this criterion. Candidates were often happy to rely on bulleted slides supported only by the briefest of speaker's notes, which did not provide the depth required. A number of candidates simply inserted large sections copied verbatim from websites or other published sources, which could not be awarded marks as it was not the candidate's own work.

Many candidates provided depth of knowledge of the technical aspects of some ICT developments, for example extensive technical descriptions of types of speed cameras were common, as were notes on the intricacies of different types of DNA testing. The language used often suggested that these were copied verbatim from published sources and the candidate did not understand what had been written. Usually technical details such as this did not relate to the **effects** of the developments on the identified groups, and so could not be awarded marks. Responses could have related to the ability to solve more complex crimes in specified ways, the increased speed at which crimes can be solved using technology, and the stronger reliability of evidence for identified reasons, although many other types of responses could have earned marks.

Candidate makes informed suggestions how ICT developments will affect the chosen groups and/or individuals, based on knowledge of the effects of ICT developments

This criterion again is aimed primarily at more able candidates, as it requires them to interpret the information they have already researched and project that into the future to make realistic predictions. This is a high-level skill, and weaker candidates will find it extremely challenging. Candidates who do not have sufficient knowledge of the effects of ICT developments on their groups will have great difficulty in meeting this criterion.

A number of candidates achieved some marks for F1, which required only basic details, but most candidates limited their responses to suggestions of 'more....', 'better....', 'faster....' or 'cheaper...'. A number of candidates suggested, for example, that security tags fitted to criminals in lieu of prison sentences could be made 'more efficient', without going into any detail, and so could not be awarded marks. It is almost always the case that one-word or limited responses such as this are not acceptable.

Some candidates made suggestions that were actually in place now, such as in some areas of forensics. One suggestion was that police officers could be issued with mobile phones to reduce crime. As well as not earning marks, responses such as this demonstrated the candidates' lack of detailed knowledge.

A number of candidates discussed possible future events related to mobile phones, ATM machines and PDAs, which were usually not related to law and order. Again, these could not normally be awarded marks unless they were linked directly to an identified aspect of law and order.

Candidate evaluates own work and details validated sources of information. Candidate recognises and explores ethical and moral implications of access to ICT

Evaluation of one's own work is a skill which most candidates, even those working at a higher level, find particularly challenging. However, examiners were pleased to note that the general standard of evaluations had improved compared to previous examination series. Many candidates were able to highlight the strengths of their presentations, some relating it to the identified audience. However, candidates often found difficulty in identifying weaknesses in their presentations, or suggesting areas for improvement. Weaknesses identified were often trivia such as 'it is too long' or 'it is too short' or 'there is not enough information', without any explanation of the implications of those shortcomings. Weaker candidates' evaluations tended to be largely descriptive diaries of what tasks had been carried out, usually of little or no evaluative merit.

Candidates had been issued for the first time this session with a proforma for recording sources used, and this certainly improved candidates' performances in this area. Most candidates identified some sources of information worthy of marks. A few candidates still included sources such as 'the Internet' or 'the ICT text book' which could not be credited, as full names and details of books, and addresses of specific websites are required. Some candidates simply listed a vast number of websites which appeared to be the output from a search engine, and in many cases it was clear that these sources had not been used, or even considered. Candidates commonly named Internet search engines as sources. Centres are reminded that such websites are content free, and are merely tools to identify other sites, and so cannot be considered as sources.

A large number of candidates attempted validation of sources, although in many cases these 'validations' did not contain sufficient detail to be of any merit. Many candidates made claims such as 'I checked the information with other websites and it was the same', without identifying the information or the other sites, and so could not be awarded marks. Similarly, candidates who claimed 'I checked everything with my teacher and he said it was OK' could not be awarded marks.

It was clear in the vast majority of scripts, however, that candidates had little idea of what was required to validate sources, and centres are encouraged to develop this area, which is also a feature of Task Two and Task Three, as part of their delivery of the specification.

Many candidates attempted a response to ethical and moral considerations, but in most cases answers were trivial or simply a repeat of information included elsewhere. Candidates who simply listed, without explanation, suggestions such as 'hacking', 'paedophiles', etc, did not achieve marks as the criterion specifically requires candidates to 'explore' ethical and moral considerations rather than simply list them. What is required is identification of a number of issues, supported by descriptions and explanations which clarify the issues, and relate them specifically to an area of law and order.

Task Two: Report on Businesses and Organisations

Whereas the presentation focuses on the effects of ICT on identified types of groups or individuals, the report is concerned primarily with the available technology. The requirement is for candidates to focus exclusively on Businesses and Organisations, and to relate the contents of their report to that area. Many candidates produced generic reports which were not sufficiently focused on the prescribed area, and so they were unable to achieve the full range of marks.

Examiners were pleased to note, however, that the general standard of candidates' reports had improved in comparison to previous examination series, with candidates achieving more of the lower-level marks than previously. Higher-level marks for development and predictions, however, were still only achieved by a minority of stronger candidates.

Some candidates appeared, in this Task particularly, to be adopting a 'minimalist' approach, sticking rigidly to the mark scheme wording, often trying to respond in a single sentence. Candidates who simply wrote unrelated sentences in response to each mark criterion, rather than expanding on the task list of requirements, missed out on achieving many of the marks for detail.

Candidates who used the marking criteria as side headings in their report often produced more structured evidence with more detail included.

Candidate produces a basic description of three technologies available to access and exchange information and carry out transactions

The vast majority of candidates identified three technologies, with the Internet, mobile phones, e-mail and PDAs being amongst the most popular technologies listed. Some candidates lost marks by including technologies which were not relevant to Businesses and Organisations, often those that had been identified for Task One.

Many candidates did not describe their three technologies, or their responses did not suggest any significant degree of technical knowledge or understanding. Examples of this were, a candidate who discussed the Internet but did not mention the requirement for computers, or a candidate who discussed e-mail but did not include reference to a correspondence between two computers by way of the Internet. Again, as in the descriptions of the groups or individuals for the presentations, it appears that candidates assumed that such items were commonplace and did not require a description.

More candidates achieved marks for H3 by giving technical details of the technologies, despite not having offered a basic description.

More detailed description, including the main purposes of technologies available, giving advantages and disadvantages, using ICT to search, select and organise information

Many candidates appeared confused between the meanings of advantages, disadvantages and purposes, with the result that responses often tended not to distinguish between them.

Candidates rarely achieved more than minimal marks for details of purposes, as their responses did not demonstrate any depth of understanding. Comments often referred to what a piece of technology was **able** to do (often actually an advantage), rather than what it was **intended** to do.

Responses regarding advantages and disadvantages were very often generic, and therefore rarely worthy of marks. Answers such as 'quicker', 'easier', 'cheaper', etc are unacceptable without amplification and reference to context. Examiners were again surprised to note that candidates had included little, if any, reference to effects of the use of technologies on the environment, job losses, etc.

This section in many cases suggested that candidates did not have sufficient depth of knowledge or understanding to formulate a response, and centres are encouraged to develop this area in the preparation for their teaching of future cohorts.

Candidates were again required to search for, select and organise information, as in the presentation. The single mark available for searching for or selecting information was achieved by most candidates

mainly through evidence of searching rather than selecting. The comments made in the section of this Report on the presentation are also relevant here.

Very few candidates could be credited with the organisation mark. The requirement is for candidates to organise their own data which could be achieved through the production of charts, graphs, tables, diagrams, etc but most candidates tended to produce a text-only report. Features such as graphs or charts which have been pasted in from published sources are not acceptable for this mark.

Candidate identifies trends over time based on detailed descriptions of purposes, advantages and disadvantages

This criterion is an extension of the previous section, and is intended to provide candidates with opportunities to demonstrate a higher level of understanding by identifying trends through the past, present and future based on the evidence they have accumulated in their research.

Most candidates were able to identify at least one trend and describe it in simplistic terms, although responses were very often bullet-pointed sentences rather than in-depth discussions. Candidates often talked about mobile phones reducing in size over the years but did not offer any explanation as to why this is, or details of the consequences or benefits of that trend. Responses appeared often to be guesswork rather than developments of information researched. In many cases, responses were simply a repeat of information previously included. Consequently, very few candidates were able to be awarded the higher-level J2 marks for additional detail.

Candidate produces a well-structured description, including a list of sources of information, with each source evaluated and validated

Most candidates were able to achieve at least 2 of the 3 marks available for the structure of the Report through the use of sub-headings, appropriate paragraphs, bullet points, numbering, etc. Very few candidates indeed provided acceptable introductions or summary conclusions to their reports to obtain full marks.

The candidates who identified lists of sources generally did well and achieved marks, with most able to relate the source specifically to a section of the Report content. Some candidates, however, gave information that was too vague, such as, 'I used this book to find out about mobile phones,' rather than a more precise description. Candidates who chose to use the proforma provided did significantly better than those who used their own format, and centres are again asked to encourage their candidates to use the structure provided.

As discussed in the presentation, validation of sources is still proving difficult to a majority of candidates, with responses such as, 'I checked it with my teacher,' or, 'I found it again on another website,' very common unacceptable responses. The comments made earlier regarding validation are relevant in this task.

Many candidates did not attempt to evaluate a source, those that did tended to produce descriptive responses rather than evaluative reflection. Evaluations of websites tended to say that they were 'useful' or 'good' with no reference to detail, appearance of the site, ease of finding the information on the site, whether there was a search facility, etc. Examiners were surprised to note this weakness, as evaluation of websites, and other documents, is a feature of the Key Stage 3 ICT strategy.

Task Three: Newsletter or Brochure on Legislation

This task is constant each examination series in that it always focuses on ICT legislation as detailed in the specification. Candidates are required to produce a DTP document, this year for a new employee of a company, discussing the purposes and effects of legislation related to ICT. Marks are awarded predominantly for content rather than technical DTP skill, as this is assessed explicitly in Unit 1: *ICT Tools and Applications*.

Examiners were disappointed to note that this task was often executed poorly by candidates. A number of candidates appeared to have started but not finished the brochure, possibly due to lack of effective time management on their part. Some candidates simply produced essays on the various acts, rather than structuring the required newsletter or brochure.

Many candidates did not know the proper names of the Acts, and some candidates discussed irrelevant issues such as the rules of ICT rooms in their own school or college. The important Acts are listed in the specification, although candidates may wish to include other pieces of legislation.

Those candidates that did this task well, however, produced some very impressive documents which demonstrated detailed knowledge and understanding.

Candidate produces a simple description of the main purposes of legislation covering working with, and using, ICT

This initial section requires candidates to identify and describe the purposes of the various Acts. It does not require detailed working knowledge of the Acts' contents.

Most candidates were able to describe purposes of 2 or 3 Acts adequately, but few scored full marks. Many candidates thought that the main purposes of the Acts were to make something 'illegal', without identifying the precise purposes. A large number of candidates identified some purposes of the Health and Safety at Work Act, but referred to the non-ICT issues such as heavy lifting, dangerous substances, etc which did not achieve marks. Some sections of the Health and Safety Act are related to use of ICT, such as reference to trailing wires, time spent looking at monitors, etc, and these will achieve marks.

Candidate produces a more detailed description, which includes an explanation of implications for users of implementing the legislation

This criterion is an extension of the previous one and requires candidates additionally to identify the implications for users, at any level, of the Acts they are considering. These implications could be related to working practices, efficiency, costs, etc, and may be different for different types of users.

Very few candidates achieved significant marks in this criterion, largely due to their lack of detailed responses. Candidates tended to provide the most comprehensive information about the Data Protection Act, but often this was simply a list of the principles of the Act, rather than a discussion of what the implications of it are in practice.

Candidate produces a detailed and well-structured description which includes details of the sources of information, and validates these as part of a detailed evaluation of the work

A number of candidates produced word processed 'essays' rather than the required newsletter or brochure, and so could not be awarded the marks for structure. Some candidates had used software templates or 'wizards', which is quite acceptable, but had selected a template which did not provide

space for sufficient detail, and so lost marks. The majority of candidates, however, earned at least 1 mark for structure, most achieved 2.

Details of sources has been discussed earlier in this Report, and the comments are again relevant here. Most candidates, however, achieved the source mark for this task, although again very few produced an acceptable validation. These usually consisted of checking with the teacher, or including the ISBN number of a book, neither of which approaches are worthy of credit. Details of specified pieces of information that have been located in two or more identified sources would have achieved marks for candidates.

Most candidates did not produce an evaluation of their document. Evaluations, where they were produced, were usually brief and descriptive with little substance, rather than evaluative. Candidates found it difficult to justify why a particular feature was a strength or a weakness. Successful evaluations usually consisted of details of identified strengths and weaknesses, appropriateness of format, content and language to the intended user, and suggestions for possible future improvements.

Conclusion

Generally, examiners were pleased to note that there was some improvement in the quality of candidates' work, and centres appeared to have taken on board the advice offered by AQA at Teacher Support meetings and through other means.

There is still a long way to go, however, and centres are very strongly encouraged to note carefully the comments in this Report when preparing candidates for future examination series.

Centres should always be prepared to seek advice or clarification from their Portfolio Adviser, or from ICT Subject Support at AQA.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Unit	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
Unit 3 – ICT and Society : 3850/3	100	100	27.06	13.34

For units which contain only one component, scaled marks are the same as raw marks.

Unit 3 (4194 candidates)

	Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Scaled Boundary Mark	100	62	54	47	40	32	25	18	11
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum (scaled) mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

Mean Mark: is the sum of all candidates' marks divided by the number of candidates. In order to compare mean marks for different components, the mean mark (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Standard Deviation: a measure of the spread of candidates' marks. In most components, approximately two-thirds of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean, and approximately 95% of all candidate lie in range of plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean. In order to compare the standard deviations for different components, the standard deviation (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Uniform Mark: a score on a standard scale which indicates a candidate's performance. The lowest uniform mark for grade A* is always 90% of the maximum uniform mark for the unit, similarly grade A is 80%, grade B is 70%, grade C is 60%, grade D is 50%, grade E is 40%, grade F is 30% and grade G is 20%. A candidate's total scaled mark for each unit is converted to a uniform mark and, when subject grades are awarded in 2004, the uniform marks for the units will be added in order to determine the candidate's overall grade.