



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
in Applied Information and Communication
Technology (WIT03) Paper 1

The Knowledge Worker

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2017

Publications Code WIT03_01_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

General Comments

The paper was of a similar standard to previous 6953 papers, producing a range of marks which enabled candidates to demonstrate their skills in problem solving. There were many centres where candidates were very well prepared, however, there were others where it was clear that candidates were entered too early and lacked preparation to meet the demands of the paper.

Many centres supported candidates producing bulky scripts composed of a large number of printouts. Candidates were frequently unable to restrict each required printout to one page.

Truncated formulae were quite common. Candidates can often lose many marks if their formulae are not completely visible.

Comments on individual questions

Activity 1 – Understanding the situation

(a)

The majority of candidates were able to identify ten pieces of information from the scenario that were important to the working of the model. A few candidates simply quoted text from the beginning of the scenario which usually resulted in gaining few marks. Some candidates misread the question and tried to answer part (b) relating to inaccuracies in timings. Where candidates listed more than ten points credit was only given for their first ten.

(b)

Candidates were usually able to identify factors which led to inaccuracies in timings. Some were too brief, stating just the words traffic or weather. Candidates are expected to qualify their statements.

(c)

Many candidates were able to correctly identify three data sources and the associated data. Some candidates incorrectly identified some of the worksheets as data sources.

Activity 2 – Completing the Model

(a) Timings

Most candidates correctly imported the text file into the 'Timings' worksheet. Many printed out the data on several sheets, rather than the single sheet required.

(b) Time Calculation 1

The majority of candidates entered a formula in cell G9 to calculate the visit start day. The formula `=IF(F9+I9<=TIME(19,0,0),E9,E9+1)` or a variation was expected. Many had the wrong cell references with the true and false parts the wrong way around. Some used 07:00 instead of 19:00, with quite a few omitting the TIME function. There were similar errors with the formulae entered in cell H9. Frequently only there was no time comparison.

Generally, this was a section that candidates struggled with.

(c) Time Calculation 2

Most candidates were able to enter an appropriate VLOOKUP formula in cell I9. Common errors were using an incorrect lookup value and omitting absolute addressing on the range.

=H9 +I9, in cell J9 was generally used to calculate the visit end time.

(d) Time Calculation 3

Some candidates entered quite complex formulae in cells L9 and M9. All that was required was a simple = G9 and J9, respectively.

Very few candidates entered a correct formula in cell L9 to calculate the journey start time.

The majority of candidates were able to enter the correct formula for the journey end time in cell O9, although many surprisingly used the SUM function, which for this calculation was unnecessary.

(e) Using the model

The majority of candidates were able to use the model to visit all the attractions over a period of greater than four days. Most candidates were unable to access the final four E marks as this required the formulae to be correct in sections B, C and D.

(f) Printouts

Where candidates produced more than the required five printouts they were unable to gain marks. Row and column headings were often omitted, which prohibited candidates from accessing simple marks.

Activity 3 – Cost/Revenue

(a) / (b)

The majority of candidates were able to access the A1 and B1 marks, occasionally, printouts displayed data instead of formulae, which gained no marks.

(c) Cost/Revenue

Most candidates used the MIN function to identify the smaller of the values B18 and B19. Some candidates just used B20 / B21 to calculate the number of coaches required without rounding. It was expected that they should use some form of rounding in the calculation.

Frequently the formula shown for costs for the week had too few or too many elements in the calculation. It was not expected that candidates had to use the SUM function for this calculation.

(d) Using the model

Candidates were unable to gain marks in this section beyond the first mark unless their formulae in activities two and three were correct.

(c) Printouts

Only four printouts were required for this activity, candidates producing more than the required number were unable to gain this mark. Candidates frequently lost a mark for printing out too many columns for parts (a) and (b).

Activity 4

Candidates were not well prepared for this activity. Many appeared to have run out of time producing very brief reports.

Titles for the report were often inappropriate for the target audience. Many candidates omitted section headers. Most candidates included an introduction, although many simply quoted, almost word for word, elements from the scenario. Suggestions were usually given for the order of the trip, although with little justification. Most candidates mentioned aircraft types usually showing a screenshot of their solution, with nothing more to justify their solution.

There were some good realistic recommendations for the cost of the tour, however, some were recommending the individual price of the tour to be in excess of £350,000. Candidates need to think carefully if they are producing meaningful answers.

Suggestions for improvements and an evaluation of the model generally were brief.

Standard Ways of Working

Overall the majority of scripts were assembled correctly and included the appropriate authentication.

