

CARIBBEAN EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL

**REPORT ON CANDIDATES' WORK IN THE
SECONDARY EDUCATION CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION**

JUNE 2004

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Copyright © 2004 Caribbean Examinations Council
St. Michael, Barbados
All rights reserved

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
JUNE 2004**

GENERAL COMMENTS

In June 2004, 18,643 candidates from the participating territories entered for the Information Technology examination; 633 entered for General Proficiency and 18,010 for Technical Proficiency. This represents an increase of 5 per cent in registration for the Information Technology examination when compared with June 2003.

DETAILED COMMENTS

General and Technical Proficiencies

Paper 01 – Structured Essay

This paper consisted of four sections. Sections 1 and 2 consisted of ten compulsory short-answer questions testing the theory profile and is common to both the Technical and General Proficiencies. Section 3 is the Programming section for Technical Proficiency candidates only and Section 4 is the Productivity Tools section for the General Proficiency candidates only. The mean scores for General and Technical Proficiencies were 41.05 out of 90 and 26.31 out of 90 respectively. The range of marks obtained by the General and Technical Proficiencies candidates were 4 - 81 and 0 - 75 respectively.

Programming continues to be an area of weakness in Paper 1 for the Technical Proficiency candidates. Most candidates were not well-prepared to handle the questions in the Programming section.

SECTION 1

Question 1

- (a) (i) Well answered by the majority of candidates.
 - (ii) Well answered by the majority of candidates.
 - (iii) Poorly done. Many candidates were confused about the difference between ROM and RAM.
- (b) Well answered. Majority of the candidates were able to identify at least one of the factors that affect the quality of display on a monitor.

Question 2

- (a) (i) Fairly well done. Some candidates identified the equipment used and not the process involved.
 - (ii) Generally well done.
 - (iii) Poorly done. Majority of the candidates were not familiar with the concept of voice recognition. Some were not clear about the difference between sound input and sound output.
- (b) (i) Fairly well done. Some candidates could not explain how dot-matrix printers generate hardcopy output.
- (ii) Poorly done. Most candidates were not familiar with this type of printer.
 - (iii) Fairly well done. Some candidates could not explain how ink-jet printers generate output on paper.

Question 3

Poorly done. Many candidates were not familiar with integrated software packages and could not compare them with a single application package to provide the required answer.

Question 4

- (a) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates did the binary or the BCD but not both. Some candidates could not divide by 2.
- (b) Poorly done. Most candidates could not compute the two's complement of binary numbers.

Question 5

- (a) Poorly done. Most candidates did not give the difference between the two types of interface.
- (b) Poorly done. Many candidates viewed the question as asking for the installation of the two operating systems on two separate computers rather than on one computer.

Question 6

- (a) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates were able to provide the advantages and disadvantages of using a computer network.
- (b) Fairly well done. Some candidates were confused about the difference between a file and a folder.
- (c) Poorly done. Some candidates gave answers for the whole computer system rather than the monitor only.

SECTION 2

Question 7

- (a)
 - (i) Poorly done. Most candidates could not name the peripheral device.
 - (ii) Poorly done. Most candidates could not name the component.
 - (iii) Poorly done. Many candidates viewed the Internet service provider as the Telephone Company.
- (b)
 - (i) Poorly done. Most candidates stated what the search engine did rather than what it is.
 - (ii) Well done by the majority of candidates.

Question 8

- (a) Satisfactorily done. The majority of candidates gave general responses rather than specific uses of computers.
- (b) Well done. Most candidates only used security measures as a method of prevention of crimes. Very few candidates spoke about laws and punishment as a preventive measure.

Question 9

- (a)
 - (i) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates could define CAD but not CAM.
 - (ii) Poorly done. The majority of candidates were unable to establish the link between CAD and CAM.
- (b) Well done by the majority of candidates.

Question 10

- (a) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates could only provide one quality of information but not both.
- (b) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates could only provide two measures to protect a computer system from viruses.
- (c) Poorly done. Most candidates responses indicate that archiving is the same as backing up.
- (d) Poorly done. Most candidates were able to describe only one step to prevent the deliberate theft or corruption of data.

SECTION 3 – PROGRAMMING (For Technical Candidates)

Question 11

This question was generally well done. The candidates who scored full marks demonstrated excellent skills in pseudocode development. Some candidates found it difficult to write simple mathematical formulae to do simple calculations. Many candidates found it difficult to implement the IF –THEN –ELSE statement. Many candidates did not use the correct syntax.

Question 12

- (a) The majority of candidates showed adequate skills in assigning variables for data entry. However, some candidates used numeric values instead of variables for input and for their calculations. Arithmetic operators were not used correctly, with some candidates using the letter “A” for add and “S” for subtract.
- (b) This part was misinterpreted by most candidates. Most candidates rewrote the code although instructed not so to do. Many candidates knew that the WHILE statement was required but made a poor attempt at placing a proper condition with Boolean operators, variables and equality operators.

Question 13

- (a)
 - (i) Well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (ii) Most candidates figured it to be a high-level language. Some candidates indicated 3rd level language to 6th level language.
 - (iii) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates did not understand this part.
- (b) Poorly done. Few candidates stated the advantage of the compiler and the advantage of the interpreter. Most candidates stated the functions of the compiler and the interpreter and provided the difference between them.

Question 14

- (i) Well done by the candidates who attempted it.
- (ii) Well done by the candidates who attempted it.
- (iii) Poorly done. Very few candidates obtained any mark for this question.

SECTION 4 – PRODUCTIVITY TOOLS (For General Candidates)

Question 15

- (a) Well done by the majority of candidates. Some candidates incorrectly stated the use of the enter key.
- (b) Well done by the majority of candidates. Some candidates used copy and paste.
- (c) Poorly done. Most candidates could not explain the result of the full justification of a paragraph.
- (d) Well done. Some candidates explained how to print 13 pages instead of page 13.
- (e) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates were not familiar with landscape printing.
- (f) Poorly done. Many candidates did not mention how to centre the page number.
- (g) Poorly done. Many candidates could not explain why the tab moves an inch.
- (h) Well done by the majority of candidates.

Question 16

- (a) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (b) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates stated currency format but did not indicate the decimal places.
- (c) Poorly done. Most candidates were unfamiliar with absolute addressing.
- (d) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (e) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (f) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (g) Well done by the majority of candidates.

Question 17

- (a) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates found difficulty in proposing a suitable field size – too small or extremely large. Some candidates suggested a size for the logical field.
- (b) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (c) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (d) Poorly done. Many candidates did not know how to insert a field.
- (e) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates stated query without providing the criteria.
- (f) Poorly done. Many candidates did not indicate the use of the query in preparing the report.

Paper 02 – General Proficiency

This paper consisted of two sections. Section 1 consists of four questions on Information Processing of which candidates are required to do question 1 and any two other questions. Section 2 consists of four questions on Programming of which candidates are required to do question 5 and any two other questions.

The mean score for this paper was 49 out of 100. The range of marks obtained by the candidates was 6 - 92.

SECTION 1 – INFORMATION PROCESSING

Question 1

- (a) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (b)
 - (i) Poorly done. Many candidates could not state the reasons why documentation is important.
 - (ii) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates could not recognize the diagram.
 - (iii) Well done. Many candidates provided the description but not the data element.
 - (iv) Poorly done. Many candidates were not clear about the fields in the records.
 - (v) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates listed the names of the two checks rather than described them. Some candidates gave verification methods instead of validation methods.
 - (vi) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (vii) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (viii) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
- (c) Very well done by the majority of candidates.

Question 2

- (a)
 - (i) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates viewed typographical error as graphical error and transposition error as communication error.
 - (ii) Well done. Candidates were clear about the difference between batch and interactive modes.
 - (iii) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates could not give examples of data type checks.
- (b)
 - (i) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (ii) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (iii) Poorly done. Many candidates confused the fetching of data with instructions.
 - (iv) Poorly done as many candidates could not do part (iii).
 - (v) Poorly done as many candidates could not do part (iv).

Question 3

- (a) (i) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates connected transaction to update instead of transaction to master.
 - (ii) Generally well done. Many candidates did not take out the repeated numbers.
 - (iii) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (iv) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates could not describe the merging transaction.
- (b) Poorly done. Many candidates could not correctly identify the required conditions.

Question 4

- (a) Very well done by the majority of candidates.
- (b) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates were unable to differentiate between the base and the exponent.
- (c) Very well done by the majority of candidates.
- (d) (i) Very well done. Most candidates were able to give two or more ways to represent negative numbers.
- (ii) Poorly done. Many candidates were unable to use two's complement representation to do subtraction.

SECTION 2 – PROGRAMMING

Question 5

- (a) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates obtained 1 - 2 marks with very few obtaining the full marks.
- (b) Well done. Most candidates obtained full marks. Some candidates did not understand what was required.
- (c) Poorly done. Candidates failed to realize that there was a one to one relationship between the algorithm given and the program code required. Many candidates used pseudocode instead of actual programming statements.
- (d) Generally well done. The majority of candidates obtained full marks.
- (e) Poorly done. Candidates could not identify the iterative structures and most confused them with selection. Candidates were also unable to distinguish between a Repeat ... Until Loop and a While ... Loop.
- (f) Poorly done. Candidates were unable to identify unit testing and integrated testing as the solution for this question. Those candidates who understood the question scored full marks.

Question 6

- (a) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates scored 1 mark for this question losing the other mark for leaving out the data type in the declaration of the array.
- (b) Very well done. Almost all candidates who attempted this question scored the full marks.
- (c) Well done. Candidates were able to illustrate the swapping process successfully although they used a wide variety of diagrams.
- (d) Well done. Most candidates were able to gain full marks for the algorithm for swapping items in the array, however, they lost marks carelessly in the parts (ii) and (iii) by confusing their variable names and not using appropriate array references in their algorithms.

Question 7

- (a) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates misunderstood that 999 was the rogue value and that the algorithm had to determine the number of positive and negative integers. Some candidates did not use flowcharting symbols.
- (b) Candidates who did well on part (a) also did well in this part. Marks were lost because a full program was not written and hence declaration and initialization of variables were not done.
- (c) Fairly well done. Many candidates misinterpreted the question and gave different types of comments instead of giving actual examples which should be placed in the program.

Question 8

- (a) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (b)
 - (i) Very well done by the majority of candidates who attempted this part of the question.
 - (ii) Very well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (iii) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates did not use the terms ascending and descending sort, rather, they described the swapping operations.
 - (iv) Poorly done. Many candidates stated pseudocode algorithm as their responses.

Paper 03 — School-Based Assessment

The presentation of the general projects were wide and varied. There are too many projects written in Visual Basic where the candidates' knowledge in the rigors of programming cannot be tested.

A few projects were also not of the standard of this proficiency as they consisted of only 3-8 pages of basic information, and no other means to ascertain the candidates' knowledge of the various aspects of the project.

There were also some projects which were too similar in nature and others which were too complex for CSEC proficiency.

There were still instances of candidates having submitted General proficiency projects when they were registered for Technical proficiency.

Teachers' marking:

Generally teachers followed the SBA mark scheme allocated.

TECHNICAL PROFICIENCY

Paper 02 – Word Processing, Spreadsheets and Database Management

This paper consisted of three questions testing word processing, spreadsheet and database management. This paper contributed 50% towards the final mark in this examination.

The mean score for this paper was 45 out of 90. The range of marks obtained by the candidates was 0 - 90.

For spreadsheet, the candidates found difficulties with questions testing absolute addressing, date function, formatting the spreadsheet and appropriate labeling of axes in the charts.

For database management, candidates found difficulties with questions testing the linking tables, using calculated fields and summarizing statistics in queries and using landscape printing to ensure all relevant information are printed on the report.

For word processing, candidates found difficulties in questions testing integrating a database report into a word processing document. Many candidates found it difficult to use a database table as the data source to perform a merge. Many candidates did not ensure that all punctuation marks were included in the primary merge letter.

Question 1 – Spreadsheet

- (a) Well done. Some candidates retrieved the incorrect file from the disk.
- (b) Well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (c) Generally well done. Most candidates used the appropriate formulae.
- (d) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates did not do the calculation. Most candidates did not use absolute addressing.
- (e) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (f) Well done. Most candidates used the appropriate formulae.
- (g) Poorly done. Most candidates used incorrect formulae and did not provide the required format.
- (h) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (i)
 - (i) Well done. Some candidates did not use zero decimal position.
 - (ii) Well done. Some candidates did not right-align all numeric headings.
 - (iii) Well done. Some candidates found it difficult to centre and merge.
 - (iv) Well done. Some candidates placed the borders in the incorrect range.
 - (v) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates did not use the date function.
- (j) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates sorted only one column and not the entire spreadsheet.
- (k) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
- (l) Very well done. Some candidates did not label the axes appropriately. Some candidates used the incorrect data to construct the chart.
- (m) Very well done. Some candidates did not include the label and percentages for each slice. Some candidates used the incorrect data to construct the chart.

Question 2 – Database Management

- (a) Generally well done. Some candidates imported the field names as one record.
- (b) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates could not modify the database structure to insert a field.
- (c) Not well done. Many candidates ignore this question. Many candidates did not sort on the correct field and order.
- (d) Well done. Some candidates did not enter the data correctly.
- (e) Poorly done. Most candidates scored less than half of the marks for this part of the question. Many candidates found difficulty in joining tables. Most candidates felt that the fields to be joined must have the same name, which is not the case. The insertion of a calculated field in a query posed the greatest difficulty.
- (f) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates lost marks on the title and format of the report. Some of the information was truncated when the report was printed as candidates did not use landscape printing.

Question 3 – Word Processing

- (a) Generally well done. Some candidates did not change the font to Arial.
- (b) Some candidates confused footer with footnotes. Some candidates fully justified only part of the letter.
- (c) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates inserted the merge fields in the wrong order and without space between them. Some candidates were not keen in placing all the punctuation marks in the correct position.
- (d) Well done. Some candidates inserted only part of the spreadsheet.
- (e) Well done. Some candidates inserted the bar chart instead of the pie chart.
- (f) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates had difficulty in inserting the database report.
- (g) Merge was well executed by the majority of candidates. Most candidates did not print out the primary document and the required merge letters.

Paper 02/2 – Word Processing, Spreadsheets and Database Management

This paper is the alternative to paper 2 and consisted of three questions testing word processing, spreadsheet and database management.

The mean score for this paper was 44 out of 90. The range of marks obtained by the candidates was 0 - 89.

For spreadsheet, candidates found difficulties with absolute addressing, date and count functions, formatting the spreadsheet and labeling the axes in the chart.

For database management, candidates had difficulties with linking tables, inserting calculated fields and summarizing statistics in queries and the use of landscape printing where appropriate.

For word processing, candidates were not keen in including all punctuation marks in the merge letter. Candidates also found difficulty with integrating a database report in a word processing document and also in using a database table as the data source to perform the merge.

Question 1 - Spreadsheet

- (a) Well done. Candidates retrieved the correct file.
- (b) Well done. Candidates saved the file under a new name.
- (c) Well done. Most candidates were able to insert new rows.
- (d) Well done. Some candidates entered their candidate numbers in the incorrect cells.
- (e) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates did not right-align the headings.
- (f) Poorly done. Most candidates did not create the page header.
- (g) Poorly done. Most candidates could not use the COUNT function and therefore, did not answer this part of the question.
- (h) Well done. Some candidates did not enter data in the correct cells, while some candidates abbreviated the word maximum to max and minimum to min.
- (i) Well answered. Most candidates were able to use the MAX and MIN functions.
- (j) Well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (k) Well done. Some candidates did not format to one decimal place. Some candidates did not use the formula provided to calculate the batting average.
- (l) Well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (m) Satisfactorily done. Most candidates sorted only one column. Many candidates were unfamiliar with secondary sort.
- (n) Well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (o) Generally well done. Some candidates did not label the axes appropriately.
- (p) Generally well done. Some candidates did not include the percentages in each slice.

Question 2 – Database Management

- (a) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
- (b) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
- (c) Generally well done by the majority of candidates.
- (d) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (e) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (f)
 - (i) Poorly done. The majority of candidates could not insert a calculated field in a query.
 - (ii) Well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (iii) Well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (iv) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (g) Poorly done. The use of calculated field posed a difficulty to many candidates.

- (h) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (i) Poorly done. Many candidates found difficulty with joining tables.
- (j) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (k) Well done. Many candidates were able to do the grouping.

Question 3 – Word Processing

- (a)
 - (i) Well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (ii) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates did not change all the margins.
 - (iii) Well done. Some candidates confused footer with footnotes.
 - (iv) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates did not select all the text.
 - (v) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates did not select all the text in the body of the letter.
 - (vi) Satisfactorily done. Some candidates did not use the find and replace feature.
- (b) Well done by the majority of candidates.
- (c) Well done. Some candidates did not apply the bold feature.
- (d)
 - (i) Poorly done. Many candidates could not locate the data source and hence, could not insert the merge fields.
 - (ii) Poorly done. Many candidates could not locate the data source and hence, could not insert the merge fields.
 - (iii) Well done by the majority of candidates.
 - (iv) Well done. Many candidates did not insert all the punctuation marks.
- (e) Well done. Many candidates did not reformat the pie chart after insertion.
- (f) Well done. Many candidates did not reformat the query after insertion.
- (g) Well done. Many candidates did not reformat the report after insertion.
- (h) Satisfactorily done. Many candidates did not print out the merge letters indicated in the instructions.

Paper 3 – School-Based Assessment

General Comments

- Teachers should ensure that the samples submitted are properly organised (in terms of sequencing) and secured (bound). A minimum of five samples per teacher is required. These samples should be selected as specified in the SBA guidelines of the syllabus.
- Some teachers submitted samples with no criteria or mark scheme. This made it difficult at times to determine how the teacher allocated the marks. The mark scheme provided by CXC should be further subdivided in cases where two or more marks are awarded for a particular skill. The mark awarded should be clearly shown on the scheme. Marksheets must be submitted for all samples.
- In some cases, teachers showed marks awarded but no printed work was there to moderate. Teachers must ensure that the printed work is shown for the students to get the marks that they have awarded.
- Marks should not be awarded for skills that are substantiated by a hardcopy. The submission of floppy disks or other media is not required for moderation of the SBA. Only the printed copy of the SBA is corrected.
- Teachers should ensure that candidates are clear on the printing requirements. In some cases, candidates printed the same document several times. This succeeds only in wasting resources.
- Although the SBA is an integrated exercise, the individual components are still distinct. Hence candidates should ensure that the components are properly delineated in their submission.
- Unless it is absolutely necessary, candidates who obtain zero marks for any component should not have their SBA submitted for moderation.
- All formula sheets for the spreadsheet component should be printed (to include row and column headings where possible).
- Teachers should avoid providing templates for students. This hinders creativity.

Detailed Comments

Word Processing

Task A: Mail Merge

- This section was well done. Candidates showed competence in this area.
- Performance in this section was a marked improvement over last year. Most candidates used authentic merge codes and therefore performed the merge successfully. In some instances however, the primary and secondary documents were not included and therefore could not be evaluated.
- In most instances, data sources were complete and included for evaluation.
- Almost every candidate was able to submit an acceptable letter showing the first and last person from the data source.

Although this section was well done, teachers should revisit the format and presentation of letters.

Task B: Report

- Candidates did produce the list of participants and presenters. However, it was not imported or produced from the database in many cases.
- Most candidates attempted the sort by “country”. However, several teachers did not recognise that the sort was by country and not by last name.
- Most candidates attempted this part. In some cases the budget was inconsistent with that in the spreadsheet. Additionally, some candidates did not import the spreadsheet, but instead printed directly from the spreadsheet application and inserted the page into the document.
- In most cases a comment was made, although very brief in some cases, and irrelevant or inconsistent with what was shown in the spreadsheet.

Task C: Addendum

- It was perceived that many candidates were unaware of the meaning and content of an addendum. Therefore many variations were seen.
- Some candidates imported the “Additional Expenses” table instead of the report.
- Some candidates did not import the report, but instead printed directly from the database application and inserted the page into the document.

Formatting and Presentation

- Most candidates were able to gain these marks by showing consistency in the presentation of the letters and the report.
- In some cases, candidates did not effectively integrate their data, and as a result, items which should appear in both the word processing and spreadsheet or database application, appeared only once and varied in the other two.

Spreadsheet

- The spreadsheet component of the SBA was fairly well done. Candidates showed a high level of proficiency in the use of a variety of system functions such as table lookup functions, IF function and sum function. Candidates demonstrated a high proficiency in linking different worksheets in the same workbook.
- Weaknesses were seen in the use of absolute referencing. Candidates showed a preference for hard coding constants in formulas rather than using cell references.
- Some candidates had difficulty interpreting the requirements defined in SBA for creating the budget. Most candidates did not specify the assumptions made when doing their calculations. Further, some candidates did not follow the suggestions given for printing.
- Candidates should choose a layout for the spreadsheet that makes it easy to follow the work that they have done. They should make good use of page breaks and the formatting features available to make their submission attractive and readable. About 30% percent of the candidates were able to achieve this effectively.

Database Management

Use of consistent data from the spreadsheet:

- About 50% of the candidates used the correct data from the spreadsheet, which was from Task 2. The other candidates used either the data from Task A (before deleting the fourth person) or used the data source in the word processor.

Creation of tables

- Table “Persons”: Candidates did very well with this table adding Day 1 and Day 2. The candidates had all the fields. However, in populating Day 1 and Day 2, some candidates added records for all of the members in the table instead of adding for Participants only (not presenters).
- Table ‘Equipment’: Candidates prepared this table with all the fields very well. A few candidates put two or more types of equipment for one day in the same record or both days in the same record. Majority of the candidates added two or more topics to the ones listed. Some did not pay attention to field types. For example, the reference to auto-number.
- Table ‘Expenses’: This table was well created by all candidates. Some candidates did not include expenses that were rejected. Some candidates created a table with all the field names but only gave records to a few of the attendee’s names.
- Table ‘Linking’: The majority of the candidates performed the links well. They had the common field between the three tables created and populated correctly.
- Majority of the candidates created Expense as either currency or number but a few used this field as text and lost a mark.

Queries

- Calculation of OHP requests: This was not well done. Majority printed out the records that had OHP requests but did not count them. A minority of them did not attempt the question.
- Trinidad: Majority of the candidates performed this query well. A minority did not get a result. The candidates only searched for participants in 75% of the cases and the remainder searched for anyone, whether participant or presenter.
- Topics-2: This was not well done. Majority of the candidates had the right criteria (Day 2) but did not have all the fields required. Most of them had Topics but not the names of the presenters.
- Day 2: This query was well done by the candidates. In some cases candidates put more fields than needed but they had the criteria correct and equipment list.
- Rejected: This query was attempted by all candidates. Some candidates performed the update on a limited set of records from their expense table. Some candidates performed a calculation on the expenses but it was not 10%.

Reports

- Report of Participants: Majority of the respondents performed this report. In most cases it was well done. In some cases the candidates did not group by country or sorted by name or both. In a few cases the candidates did not have the right criteria – they printed all the names and not the names of the participants only.
- Report on Additional Expenses: Majority of the respondents attempted this report and in most cases it was well done. In some cases the respondents did not include all the fields that were requested and some of them did not give the report the heading that was given (“Additional Expenses from Participants”).