

MARKSCHEME

May 2001

COMPUTER SCIENCE

Standard Level

Paper 2

1. (a) Good answers should earn marks even if they do not comply with the markscheme.

New INDEX / pass-by-reference / variable parameters pass changes back to the calling routine / main program [1 mark].

NUMBERS / pass-by-value parameters do not pass any changes back [1 mark].

(Accept an answer along the lines of INDEX uses less memory space than NUMBERS. This would get *[2 marks]* even though it is not fully explained.)

POS	NUMBERS[POS] < VALUE	VALUE	INDEX[1]
		5000	
1	true	27	1
2	false	27	1
3	true	15	3
4	true	2	4
5	false	2	4

(b) Award marks as follows:

Award [2 marks] for each correct column of VALUE, INDEX [1], and NUMBERS[POS]<VALUE (give [1 mark] if only one error, and then correct follow through). (A maximum of [6 marks]).

(c) The two main ways of doing this, are to set values to 5000 once their subscripts have been transferred to INDEX, or to record the fact that a subscript has been used in INDEX by using a separate Boolean array of order 5, and set the corresponding entry to true when a subscript has been used in INDEX:

```
procedure SORT
declare I integer
for I <-- 1 upto 5 do
VALUE <-- 5000
for POS <-- 1 upto 5 do
    if NUMBERS[POS] < VALUE then
       VALUE <-- NUMBERS[POS]
       INDEX[I] <-- POS
       endif
endfor
       NUMBERS[INDEX[I]] <-- 5000
endfor
endprocedure SORT
```

```
procedure SORT
   declare I integer
   declare USED boolean array [1..5]
   for I <-- 1 upto 5 do
      USED [I] <-- false
   endfor
   for I <-- 1 upto 5 do
      VALUE <-- 5000
      for POS <-- 1 upto 5 do
         if notUSED[POS] then
             if NUMBERS[POS] < VALUE then</pre>
               VALUE <-- NUMBERS[POS]
               INDEX[I] <-- POS</pre>
             endif
         endif
      endfor
```

```
USED [I] <-- true endfor
```

```
endprocedure SORT
```

Award marks as follows:

```
[2 marks] for outer loop; ([1 mark] for any loop, [1 mark] for 1 upto 5)
[1 mark] for setting INDEX[I] <-- POS (i.e. change from INDEX[1])
[3 marks] for not re-testing a value once the subscript has been used in INDEX:
(e.g. setting NUMBERS[INDEX[I]] <-- 5000, or setting USED[I] <-- true and
testing if notUSED[POS] then)</pre>
```

- [1 mark] for any attempt at this
- [2 marks] for a good, but incorrect, attempt
- [3 marks] for a totally correct solution (NOTE: if the "Boolean" method is used, do not deduct marks for not including the initialisation to true or declaring the equivalent of USED)

```
(d) procedure SORTED
    declare POS integer
    for POS <-- 1 upto 5 do
        SORTED[POS] <-- NUMBERS[INDEX[POS]]
    endfor
    endprocedure SORTED</pre>
```

Award marks as follows:

[1 mark] for correct loop and declaration of variable as an integer

[1 mark] for a correct array and subscript for SORTED in the assignment

[2 marks] for value in the assignment ([1 mark] for a good, but incorrect, attempt at using INDEX and NUMBERS to get the value). The candidate may have separated the values, which is acceptable, *e.g.*:

```
for POS <-- 1 upto 5 do
    SUB <-- INDEX[POS]
    SORTED[POS] <-- NUMBERS[SUB]
endfor</pre>
```

```
(e) Two solutions are:
```

```
procedure TALLY
  declare POS, COUNT, CURRENT integer
  POS <-- 1
  COUNT <-- 1
  CURRENT <-- ORDERED[1]
  repeat
      while POS < 600 and ORDERED[POS+1] = CURRENT do</pre>
         COUNT <-- COUNT+1
         CURRENT <-- ORDERED[POS+1]
         POS <-- POS+1
      endwhile
      output CURRENT, " is stored ", COUNT, " times "
      if POS < 600 then
         CURRENT <-- ORDERED[POS+1]
         COUNT <-- 1
      else
         output ORDERED[600], " is stored once "
      endif
  until POS = 600
endprocedure TALLY
```

Or:

```
procedure TALLY
declare POS, COUNT, LAST integer
COUNT <-- 1
LAST <-- ORDERED[1]
for POS <-- 2 upto 600 do
    if ORDERED[POS] = LAST then
        COUNT <-- COUNT+1
    else
        output LAST, " is stored ", COUNT, " times "
        LAST <-- ORDERED[POS]
        COUNT <-- 1
        endif
    enddo
    output LAST, " is stored ", COUNT, " times "
endprocedure TALLY</pre>
```

Award marks as follows:

[2 marks] for initialisations ([1 mark] for an incomplete list).

[1 mark] for outer loop until 600 locations have been tested

[2 marks] for a correct test of same values (e.g. ORDERED[POS+1] = CURRENT in the while, or ORDERED[POS] = LAST in the if etc.); ([1 mark] for a reasonable, but incorrect, attempt)

[2 marks] for a correct increment of a counter (eg COUNT) in the correct place ([1 mark] for a reasonable, but incorrect, attempt)

[2 marks] for correctly updating test value (*i.e.* CURRENT<--ORDERED[POS+1] in the first algorithm, or LAST<--ORDERED[POS] in the second) in the **correct** place ([1 mark] for a reasonable, but wrong, attempt in the correct place, or correct statements in the wrong place; [0 marks] for a reasonable, but wrong, attempt in a incorrect place)

[2 marks] for the output (the wording is not important, even though it is given in the question, but it must contain the equivalent of CURRENT/LAST and COUNT and be in the correct position for both marks, deduct a mark for any of these points that are missing (but do not give [-1 mark] if all are missing!))

[1 mark] for a good attempt at the final **output** required (i.e. as part of the **else** in algorithm 1 for a single value in location 600, or in the final display in algorithm 2)

2. (a) Award [1 mark] for any feasible sensor.

e.g. Temperature, moisture, pressure, barometric etc.

- (b) Award marks as follows, up to [2 marks] max:
 - new supercomputers would have predicted bad storm [1 mark], whereas less powerful ones didn't [1 mark].
 - newer computers will be able to process equations faster [1 mark], giving forecasts earlier [1 mark].
 - new computers will be able to process more complex equations (*i.e.* more than 7 variables) [1 mark], giving more accurate predictions [1 mark].
- (c) Award [1 mark] for defining archive data, and [2 marks] for a clear description of its use ([1 mark] for a reasonable attempt), up to [3 marks] max:

- Data kept after initial use / for long-term store not required for on-line access [1 mark]

- Used for research / tracking history *[1 mark]* to test for patterns *[1 mark]*

- (d) Award marks as follows:
 - (i) Data collection site \Rightarrow National Weather Service [1 mark]
 - (ii) forecasting based on it *[1 mark]*, so important for accuracy *[1 mark]*
- (e) Award [1 mark] for a correct identification, and [2 marks] for a clear reason, for two reasons, giving a maximum of [6 marks].

new media will take less space [1 mark]. As archive data continues to increase [1 mark], it will keep space used to a minimum if more compact media is used [1 mark]

current media will become out-of-data / obsolete [1 mark]. New media is always being developed [1 mark] and if data is not changed with the new media, it may not be able to be read [1 mark].

(f) (i) Award [1 mark] for:

the bad snow storm [1 mark]

(ii) Award up to [3 marks] maximum for a discussion on trusting computers more than people, eg:

peoples' skills become devalued / not trusted [1 mark] so less people will have those skills [1 mark], and since people program computers [1 mark] forecasts will get worse [1 mark]

(g) Award [1 mark] for a suitable form and up to [2 marks] for a clear outline ([1 mark] for a partial outline), for two forms of output, up to [6 marks] maximum, e.g:

Text [1 mark], a forecast in printed form [1 mark], so that a weather forecaster can read it out [1 mark].

Graphic *[1 mark]*, a forecast in pictorial form *[1 mark]* so that a copy can be shown on the television as a map so that viewers can see it *[1 mark]*.

Note: the question does not require the candidate to explicitly state the form (*e.g.* text or graphic), so if the format is clear from the description, allocate this mark as well.

3. (a) Allow other answers that involve data storage that is input and storage of data that may change.

To store the data from the sensors *[1 mark]*

(b) Award [1 mark] for any feasible input device, and [1 mark] for a good attempt at a description / reason. Award [1 mark] for any feasible output device, and [1 mark] for a good attempt at a description / reason. To a maximum of [4 marks]. If it is feasible, possible and sensible, and if the description works award the marks even if its not likely e.g:

keyboard / keypad **[1 mark]** to allow entry (code) of destination **[1 mark]** presence sensor / any feasible sensor **[1 mark]** so that it doesn't hit any objects / people **[1 mark]**

Speaker / sound device *[1 mark]* to warn people of approaching buggy *[1 mark]* (Remember, no marks for motor as this is given in the question)

(c) Award [1 mark] for identifying a suitable implication, and [2 marks] for a good discussion for [3 marks] maximum. e.g:

Loss of work time **[1 mark]**. Without buggy heavy objects cannot be transported / have to be done by hand **[1 mark]** which will slow / halt production **[1 mark]**.

Possible danger [1 mark]. If any sensor malfunctions / doesn't work [1 mark] then if there is not an auto-shut off [1 mark] the buggy may crash into objects / people [1 mark] (causing injury).

Note: the candidate does not have to identify the implication explicitly. If it is clear from the description, this mark is to be awarded.

(d) Award up to [3 marks] maximum by giving [1 mark] per valid point. e.g.:

the new layout must be recorded into the buggy's processor [1 mark] the ROM must be reprogrammed [1 mark] by creating a new one [1 mark]

if movement is by sensing (*e.g.* following white line on floor, reading barcodes around the factory *etc.*) [1 mark] these will have to be relocated [1 mark]

time will be required to do this *[1 mark]* therefore must be planned / tested beforehand / or time lost *[1 mark]*

must be tested thoroughly, otherwise collisions may occur [1 mark]

Do **not** give any marks for a statement along the lines of 'the buggy will crash', unless justified (similar to the final point above).

(e) Award [1 mark] for identifying an advantage, and [1 mark] for an elaboration and [1 mark] for identifying a disadvantage, and [1 mark] for an elaboration. [4 marks] maximum. e.g:

Remember the advantage / disadvantage is for the management, not the workers!

Advantage:

The payroll will be lower / saves money **[1 mark]** because robots do not need to be paid **[1 mark]** / because costs on heating / lighting will not be needed **[1 mark]**.

Consistency of work *[1 mark]*, because robots do all work to the same standard, quality is more assured *[1 mark]* (than reliance on humans).

Do **not** accept 'robots can work 24 hours', 'factory can work 24 hours' *etc.* This can be done with a human workforce by shift-work. If linked to costs of employment, then this is ok. The statement 'Robots can work 24 hours, but humans cannot' on its own would get *[0 marks]*. 'Robots can work 24 hours, but humans need rest so work is limited' gets *[1 mark]*.

Disadvantage:

Breakdown of robots / machines *[1 mark]* means the factory has no standby workforce and so must stop production *[1 mark]*

Do **not** accept 'if electricity stops then factory cannot work because robots need electricity' *[0 marks]*. (If there was a power cut with **no** robots there would be no production without power for hand-controlled machine or heating, lighting!)