



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in
Information Technology (WIT14/ 01)

Unit 4

Paper WIT14/01

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 2024

Publications Code WIT14/01_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

This report is split into two sections: General Comments and Specific Comments. In the Specific Comments, there will be comments about the candidates' responses to the written and coding questions.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The format of the question paper is a combination of written questions and practical database tasks. It is intended that the structure of the paper is such that demand increases through each question and through the paper as a whole. There are two extended written questions to answer with the rest being practical database activities evidenced through screen-prints.

The only document that needs to be submitted for marking is the completed candidate evidence template, which has been saved using this format:

Centre Number_Candidate_Number_Candidate Surname

For example 12345_0001_Meek

A number of candidates did not ensure their screen-prints could be read even when examiners had zoomed in as far as they could. Others truncated criteria in queries etc. Both affect the marks that can be awarded.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Written response questions

Question 1

- Q01ai This majority of candidates achieving at the mark for setting the MinSellingPrice to Currency.
- Q01aii This was a well answered with the majority of candidates achieving at least both marks for the correct range and suitable validation text to let user know how to correct their mistake. Where two marks were not achieved it was usually because the candidates had set the Required property to Yes rather than using a validation rule such as Is Not Null along with a suitable error message that the user would see. Those who set Required to Yes and also specified an error message in the validation text property did not achieve the second mark unless they had also set the validation rule as described.
- Q01b It was nice to see the number of candidates who had made sure the form would be easy to use. However, there are a number who still simply rely on the default form created by the wizard. In terms of the format and layout of the interface this will not attract many marks. It was expected that candidates would have ensured:
- generated fields were disabled
 - field labels were appropriate and consistent (spaces between words, consistent use of case)
 - the form had a meaningful title from which the user could clearly see its purpose
 - the field widths were considered - not too wide for the data they would hold
 - there would be instructions telling the user how to use the form
 - asterisks would be present on all fields that required the input of data
 - there would be a save button, clearly labelled as such.

There was a number of candidates who did not achieve the mark for at least one of the two generated fields being disabled and the ease-of-use mark as the form did not include at least three of the above.

Automation in this paper included:

- opening the form ready for data entry
- generating the ArtID as one number higher than the number currently used
- setting the status to Available

- asking the user if they wanted to save the details of the new work of art
- saving the new work of art in the Art table (if appropriate)
- displaying a message to say the save was cancelled (if appropriate)

Opening the form ready for data entry

Some candidates had set the Data Entry property of the form to Yes to achieve this, others had used a macro or code to go to a new record, others used an unbound form. Any method that showed the form would be clear and ready for data input was acceptable.

Generating the ArtID

Candidates who changed the data type to Autonumber did not achieve the mark for this. It was expected that some form of a formula or equivalent would be used. Those who achieved the mark tended to use a DMax formula. In terms of work required those who used DMax/Max in the default property of the field did not need to add further steps in the save process to ensure the value would be saved. Those who used an unbound form would be expected to have the design view of an append query (or equivalent) and to see that query being run in the macro or code.

Default values

Many used the default property of the status field to set the default value to Available. Some chose to use a macro or code to do this when the save process was carried out. Any method that successfully set the value to Available was awarded credit.

Save process

This was really well evidenced on the whole with a good number of candidates meeting all the requirements. Generally this was achieved through the use of an If statement and message box that asked if the user wanted to save, their response was checked and then the appropriate action taken.

Q01c Many candidates achieved the full 11 marks for their database structure with very clear screen-print evidence.

The majority of candidate has appropriately used tbl in some format as part of the name for each table and most had used a consistent format for field names e.g., camel case, _ or space between words.

The majority of candidates recognised the need for a customer and sale table. Fewer recognised the need for a sale details (or equivalent) table, or they had recognised this but not the fields that should be in it.

Relationships needed to have referential integrity enforced in order to achieve marks. The majority of candidates ensured this had been done.

The majority of candidates achieved the marks for an appropriate primary key for the customer and sale tables. The majority of candidates who recognised the need for a sale detail table correctly identified and used SaleID and ArtID as the key.

There were very few candidates who did not achieve the mark for using the correct data types.

Q01d A good number of candidates achieved all three marks. However, there marks were affected where candidates did not include the sale detail table.

Also, a number of candidates did not ensure the number of records could be seen. They were asked to take a screen-print of the first five records including the number of records.

Question 2

Q02a This question was well answered with many candidates achieving all of the marks. However, there were some candidates who had not used criteria or had truncated the criteria.

Q02bi A good number of candidates also achieved full marks in the questions. However, aspects of the question were missed at times e.g., March 2024 with an actual selling price of £500 or more.

Q02bii There was evidence seen across a wide range of the marks with a number of candidates achieving all 10 marks.

- Including the title in the page or report header and ensuring it was as given were common marks achieved.
- Grouping was successfully achieved in most responses.
- The problems with not taking the scenario into account
- The formula for calculating the Highest selling price and the Total Sales were not always correct or in the correct place
- Formatting marks were less frequently awarded i.e. shading, centre alignment etc

Q02c This was the first of the essay questions in this paper. Candidates were told that Julietta wanted to invite customers who had bought more than five items in 2024 to a special event.

They were asked to analyse the database to determine the information needed to produce the invitations and the data that was already present along with any additional data needed.

The full range of marks was awarded in this paper with a good number of candidates achieving level 3. Many candidates were able to determine that customer details were needed in order to send invitations and sales data to be able to find out which customers should get the invites. Many clearly identified the data that was already present and what additional data would be needed - most picked up on a field to contact the customer e.g. email address or similar. Fewer were able to say that a query would be needed to filter to the correct customers though, even if they did not say this, most were able to describe at least one of the criterion that would be required – count the number of pieces of art and look for ≥ 5 etc. However, there were a number who thought that a new table should be introduced with replication of data including CustomerID, name etc.

Question 3

Q03a Very few candidates included fields that were not required, which was good. Many were able to calculate the difference between the ActualSellingPrice and the MinSellingPrice, however fewer ensured results were only present where the difference was greater than 150. A number got the value incorrect i.e. searching for ≥ 150 or < 150 etc. Most who did a calculation ensured the field had an appropriate field name. On the whole it was well answered with many candidates achieving full marks.

Q03b Most candidates achieved the marks for creating a chart, using a meaningful chart title, ensuring the axis showed Art names (bar chart) or the legend used the Art names (pie chart) and using a suitable scale.

However, a number of candidates did not ensure there was at least one suitable axis label which made it hard to judge if the chart was fit for purpose.

Most candidates ensured a suitable scale was used.

Question 4

Surprisingly, some candidates still label the buttons inappropriately e.g. query 2(a), form, query, report etc. The labels have to be detailed enough that an end user would know their purpose. Run query, open form are not detailed enough. Most candidates achieved the marks for opening the data entry form and the query and for exiting the database. Fewer ensured the report opened in print preview.

Question 5

The full range of marks were used. However, some candidates did not provide a response that actually answered the question – they evaluated Figure 2 itself rather than focus on how the structure of the database could be modified to allow the data shown to be recorded/generated. This impacted the marks that could be awarded. Of those who answered the question with the focus intended there were some excellent responses that were well worthy of full marks.

