

## ITGS

This is a supplementary report following the May 2011 session and should be read in conjunction with the full May 2009 subject report and any subsequent reports.

### Overall grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	E	D	C	B	A
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 28	29 - 36

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

There was a strong emphasis on the application of teaching aids in schools and other technologies relating to the overall management and performance of schools. These topics were generally suitable, lending themselves to appropriate primary research. A number of essays investigated the application of systems, often internet-related systems, in the running of businesses. These were generally appropriate if they were locally focused with candidates having access to personnel in the businesses investigated, but were weak where access was not possible or the investigation was too broad. Some essays were peripheral to ITGS and some were very vague, indicating a failure to grasp the purpose of an extended essay in the subject being studied. A large number of essays looked at privacy and social networking. Especially when dealing with social networking, there was a lack of appropriate secondary sources and an over reliance on primary sources, in most cases extrapolating the results of a small sample to a much larger universe. Worse than that was when candidates wrote their essays based solely on observation, opinions, and speculation, which happened in many instances. A cause of concern is the large number of statements made in extended essays without the citation of sources or the support of evidence – these usually led to low marks in several criteria, such as E (argument), F (analysis), and H (conclusion).

### Candidate performance against each criterion

#### **A: Research question**

Many candidates failed to focus adequately on their research question. A small number were outside the subject area altogether. Candidates are reminded that the research question should be stated in the introduction.

#### **B: Introduction**

Approximately half of candidates met this criterion fully, with a quarter failing to grasp the requirement at all.

**C: Investigation**

Many candidates did not attempt, or failed to document, primary research. Many secondary resources were used superficially and only a small minority of candidates gathered a good quantity of material from a wide range of appropriate sources.

**D: Knowledge and understanding of the topic studied**

Overall marks for this criterion were in the lower levels. Many candidates failed to demonstrate knowledge of relevant IT much beyond general knowledge.

**E: Reasoned argument**

A few candidates supported arguments well but the majority tended to place too much emphasis on unsubstantiated opinion.

**F: Application of analytical and evaluative skills appropriate to the subject**

Generally candidate performance against this criterion was weak; analysis was usually superficial and, in some cases, flawed.

**G: Use of language appropriate to the subject**

Generally again performance was weak; frequently, terms were not explained and knowledge was not presented clearly.

**H: Conclusion**

Performance against this criterion was disappointing; the function of a conclusion was frequently misunderstood. Too many pieces of new or extraneous content were introduced at this point.

**I: Formal presentation**

Many candidates appeared to be casual in the referencing of material from sources and many did not know how to produce a bibliography. A few essays were very good in terms of their formal presentation.

**J: Abstract**

Nearly half the candidates failed to meet this criterion, apparently not understanding the purpose of an abstract. In many cases, the research question stated here was different from the one stated elsewhere. Also, many candidates failed to provide the conclusion of the essay.

**K: Holistic judgment**

A range of achievement with most candidates demonstrating attributes sought at a fairly modest level.

## Recommendations for the supervision of future candidates

The assessment criteria have to be clearly explained and made available to the candidates before they embark on the development of their extended essays. Teachers must master the criteria. Teachers need to ensure that candidates have a clear understanding of the meaning of the criteria against which they will be assessed. Too many candidates do not understand

the concept of an extended essay being an in-depth study of a focused topic. It would seem that many candidates do not understand the concept of referencing material from sources and producing a bibliography listing sources used from which a reader can check the sourced material.

A number of supervisors did not comment on the work of candidates, although this issue seems to be less prevalent than in previous years. The time spent by supervisors with candidates was generally appropriate, with only a small number being very low or very high.

Teachers must make use of the OCC ITGS forum to learn from the tips of their more experienced colleagues.