

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 9(d)

Candidate 2

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for incrementing the total using the `guests` array with an index.

A third mark could have been awarded if the candidate had used the `length` function within `range()` to ensure the loop iterated for each element of the array.

Candidate 3

The candidate has written their answer in Visual Basic code. They were awarded **3 marks** for looping 365 times and incrementing their total using the `guests` array with an index.

Although the total incremented would be incorrect, due to the input on line 2, this was ignored so that the candidate was not penalised twice for the same error.

Candidate 4

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for incrementing the total using the `guests` array with an index.

The fixed loop syntax can be identified as Python code and will therefore only repeat 364 times.

Candidate 5

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. In this Python example, the candidate's note explains that they have changed this value from 364 to the correct value 365.

Candidate 6

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for the correct number of loop iterations.

Candidate 7

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. Had they answered 'range (365)' this would have been a perfect answer in Python.

Question 11(a)(i)

Candidate 9

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. This a design question so the candidate declaring this as an 'until' loop with post-conditional conditions can be ignored as the logic of their answer is correct.

Candidate 10

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. They could have potentially gained 1 mark had their conditions been correct.

Candidate 11

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** as their condition should have used the OR logical operator.

Candidate 12

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. This was nearly a very good example of a post-conditional loop answer. While it is acceptable in a design question to write the conditions using words rather than operator symbols, the candidate's loop conditions do not include the limits of 5 and 75.

Candidate 13

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. They have provided both the conditional loop and correct conditions, but did not include the input or error message.

Candidate 14

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. While this candidate's answer may seem minimalist at first glance, it successfully accesses all marks.

Candidate 15

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. They did not access the mark for the error message as they have used AND instead of OR. The candidate may have added the outer fixed loop because the context of the question outlines that four distances would be entered, but this is ignored.

Question 11(c)(ii)

Candidate 17

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for a perfect answer. Note that the candidate has reversed the conditions and subsequent assignment of 'intermediate' and 'advanced' compared to candidate 16.

Candidate 18

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** as both the structure and assignments are incomplete.

Candidate 19

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for identifying the new structure. The conditions, however, remain inefficient as `totalDistance >= 25` is not necessary.

Candidate 20

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**. They have implemented nested IF statements which may be accepted as equivalent to ELSE IF statements, however they have not removed all of the unnecessary conditions.

Candidate 21

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for the correct structure, however, as with candidate 19, `total_distance >= 25` is not necessary.