



grids. That was fine by me, the ignominy of getting a purely mathematical question wrong being my only concern. It still does seem strange that this must be the only examination board not to recognise the fact that an "answers-only" examination paper needs somewhere to do the working out. I was lucky with the intelligent thinking of my invigilator; other candidates might not be, so I hope that City and Guilds will rethink this problem and issue suitable instructions to their examination centres.

But back to the question in hand, for you may be wondering why I didn't use my calculator like all the other candidates seemed to be doing, clicking away at their keyboards. I suppose it stems from my schooldays (before calculators) when you were taught to "cancel down" all sums before resorting to your log tables. In fact, armed with my working out paper, I simplified this question until I was left with just one reciprocal sum to do on my calculator. This being quickly accomplished imagine my surprise when I looked at the four choices of answer provided and found that not one of them agreed with my answer. I checked carefully through my well set out calculations and, finding no error, I also joined the calculator brigade just in case I had overlooked something. Having convinced myself that I was correct, I again attracted the invigilator to ask if he had any corrections to this question. He told me that the answers should be right but added that if there was still an error the question would be discounted so not to worry.

For the benefit of those who were not in the May 1982 examination let me explain the problem with the four answers given. They all in-



**By Sharon Metcalfe B.Sc.  
LTCL and lately G6LCC.**

involved the same digits (937, I believe) but with different decimal places. The correct answer should have been 0.937MHz but the question paper had answer (d) printed 1.937MHz. To any experienced teacher setting a multiple choice paper, this type of printing error should be obvious. I cannot help wondering how carefully the City and Guilds do check their examination papers before despatching them to the examination centres.

Like many other candidates, I cannot help feeling disgruntled for the time I wasted on this and other invalid questions. One fellow candidate later remarked that this particular question had used up two sets of calculator batteries!

Another problem with this paper was the quality of the circuit diagram on the last page. The diagram had a large number of transistors and resistors with their values written alongside and required the

calculations of a voltage.

The paper had been printed in standard typeface except for certain 'additions', in this case many of the components' values, which appeared to have been 'pencilled in' just before the actual printing. The result was that the relevant figures needed for the calculation were either illegible or, I suspect, still actually missing. This question was a deserving case for making an intelligent guess at the correct answer for, being one of the final questions, I had had enough. I would like to thank my invigilator G3ZYE for his patience, for suffice to say I was the only female candidate at the Hove centre, Sussex, and the only candidate who queried anything.

In conclusion, I still say good luck to prospective candidates, the joy of being on the air more than compensating for the irritation of sitting the examination. I only hope that the City and Guilds received enough complaints about the unprofessional quality of the May 1982 Radio Amateurs' Examination papers that future candidates will not be similarly inconvenienced. ●