



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Subsidiary In Information Technology (WIT14)
Paper 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 2025

Publications Code WIT14_01_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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 screenprints.

Please note candidates do not submit a zipped file containing their candidate evidence template and any other resources the only thing that should be submitted is their completed their completed candidate evidence template, which must be saved using this format:

Centre Number_Candidate_Number_Candidate Surname
For example 12345_0001_Meek

A number of candidates did not ensure their screenprints 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

- Q01a The majority of candidates achieved the mark for setting the ActivityDuration to number.
- Q01b There were a number of candidates who achieved very good marks for this question ensuring all aspects of the question were answered. It is clear to see that candidates have a good range of knowledge in terms of how to validate fields, however a number of did not go on to specify the test data that should be used to prove only valid data would be accepted while others did give test data that would prove the data would be rejected but did not go on to give test data that should be accepted.
- Q01c In terms of ease of use, 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. For this particular paper it was expected that candidates would have ensured:
- 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
 - a save button clearly labelled was present

Surprisingly, there are still very few candidates who achieve the mark for ease of use because they fail to consider the labels and do not consider the width of the data that will be entered into the fields. Most achieved the mark for the save button.

Automation in this paper included:

- opening the form ready for data entry
- including a drop down box containing the activity levels
- saving the record (including the activity level) in the activity table
- displaying a save message
- clearing the form ready for the next data entry

Opening the form ready for data entry

The easiest way to demonstrate this is for candidates to ensure the screenprint of the form in form view does not have any data in it, they then do not need to provide any other evidence for this. Where this was not the case some candidates had set the Data Entry property of the form to Yes, 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 is acceptable.

Drop down box containing the activity levels

This was generally well evidenced with candidates ensuring they showed the properties for the ActivityLevel field where the row source and its contents could be seen. Note that the mark for C8 also depended on the evidence for this i.e., the control source field needed to be seen (ActivityLevel as the control source rather than unbound).

Saving the record

There were no validation requirements in this paper nor a requirement for a message to be displayed asking the user if they wanted to save the record. Where the form was bound examiners looked for a method of forcing a save. Most candidates who included their macros or code (bearing in mind the comments above about the drop down box) achieved this.

Where an unbound form was used examiners looked for another method e.g. an append query in design view clearly showing all fields being appended to the activity table and this query being run in the macro or code.

Save message

Most candidates achieved the save message mark though please note where candidates asked whether the user wanted to save the record rather than a post save message this was not awarded.

Clearing the form ready for data entry

A number of different methods were seen and any that would clear the form were awarded e.g. moving to another record, closing the form and reopening it, re-querying etc.

Q01d Many candidates achieved the full 11 marks for their database structure with very clear screenprint evidence.

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

The majority of candidates achieved the marks for an appropriate primary key for the day and trainer tables. In terms of the key for the class table only those who considered what was said in the scenario and the data given in the activity table got the correct composite key, many went on to give a three or four part key, which was not required.

A number of candidates imported the given class spreadsheet extract into their database, kept all the fields in it and then linked all the other tables to it. This was not appropriate and was not taken as being a class table.

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

Q01d A sizeable number of candidates achieved all three marks. However, the marks were affected where candidates did not ensure the number of records could be clearly seen (or counted).

Question 2

Q02a This question was well answered with many candidates achieving all of the marks. However, some candidates did not consider needing Wednesday or DayID 4 as criteria, others used `>=#17:00:00#` rather than `>#17:00:00#` for the time and `>45` rather than `>=45` for the duration. A number did not carry out the sort and others did a sort on multiple fields. Note, where a sort on multiple fields had been done candidates did not achieve the mark unless the ActivityDuration sort was first.

A number of candidates truncated at least one field name in the datasheet view of the query, meaning the A5 mark was missed.

Q02bi Many candidates also achieved full marks in this question. However, some candidates missed aspects of the question. A number did not filter the ActivityLevel to advanced, some did not apply a count, others did use Max and Min but did not use generated field names so the examiner could not identify which was meant to be the earliest and which was meant to be the latest. Where candidates need to use any form of calculation in a query, they should always rename the field(s) appropriately.

Q02bii There was evidence seen across a wide range of the marks with a number of candidates achieving all 11 marks.

- Including the title in the page or report header and ensuring the title was appropriate were common marks achieved.
- Grouping was successfully achieved in most responses with candidates noticing the **For each day** in the paper telling them that grouping was expected.
- The calculation and display of the results was less well achieved. It was expected the calculation would give the correct results for these marks.
- Many candidates did not ensure the labels were easy to read (spaces etc.) meaning B13 was missed.
- Where candidates included a print preview of the report achievement was mixed with some achieving all three of the available marks and others none. Considering how the report looks is often overlooked by the candidates – has the space been used effectively, is it easy to read the data that belongs to the labels etc.

Question 3

Q03a Very few candidates included fields that were not required, which was good. Many were able to apply a count and most used the correct criteria to find the classes that run less than five times a week. It was generally very well answered.

Q03b Most candidates achieved the marks for creating a chart, using a meaningful chart title, ensuring the axis showed Activity name (bar/column chart) or the legend used the Activity names (pie chart).

There were a number of candidates who did not ensure a sensible scale was used (bar/column chart) e.g. 0.5, 1, 1.5 etc. without realising a half a class is not sensible. Where candidates had this scale but had gone on to add the data values to the bars/columns this mark was awarded, where that had not been done the scale was judged as is.

There was also a number of candidates who did not ensure each axis (bar/column) chart.

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 report are not detailed enough.

Examples that are appropriate (clearly tell the user their purpose):

- Print the activity table
- View activities that run less than 5 times a week
- Open and print the Wednesday evening classes
- Exit

Many candidates achieved all the marks for the actions to be carried out. However some opened the activity table before printing, which was not required.

Question 5

The full range of marks were used with some excellent responses seen. However, some candidates did not answer the question, they tried to repeat their answers for 1b and talked about what validation they would carry out.

Where candidates had answered the question that was asked most did identify that there was no table to hold member details and went on to recommend creating this table.

Recording of the attendance was less well understood or not considered at all. Where it was considered at the lower level many suggested adding the MemberID to the classes table/suggested adding the Trainer ID / ActivityID / DayID / ClassID to the member table without realising the consequences.

Mid level candidates realised that a new table was needed to record attendance and suggested a primary key but did not then go on to link it to the class table at all or linked it incorrectly to either the class or member table.

Higher level candidates realised that the key from the class table needed to be used in the attendance table – either taking across the composite or removing the composite and adding a new ClassID or similar and that the MemberID would also be needed as part of the key as well as giving a precise response to the need for the member table. Their analysis was also very good.

There were other sensible solutions that also achieved very good marks.

