Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In Information and Technolgy
(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

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.

The only document that needs to be submitted for marking is the completed candidate evidence template saved using the 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 possibly could. Others truncated criteria in queries etc.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Written response questions

Question 1

Q01ai   This was quite well answered with the majority of candidates achieving at least 1 mark. Where 2 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.

Q01aii   The majority of candidates achieved the first mark for applying a combo box to the Average Review Rating field. Not many achieved the second mark i.e., most had the correct range but did not ensure further values could not be added e.g., setting the Limit to List property to Yes.

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 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 - they were 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 this mark as they did not include at least three of the above when creating the form.

Automation in this paper included:

- opening the form ready for data entry

- generating the PartyManagerID as one number higher than the number currently used
- setting the DateAdded to today's date
- setting the AverageReviewRating to 5
- saving the record in the table
- displaying a message to say that the record had been saved.

There were many different methods used by candidates, which was very nice to see.

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 PartyManagerID
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 in the default property of the field did not need to add further steps in the save process in order to ensure the value would be saved. Those who did not i.e., the field became unbound, did need to add further steps in the save process to ensure the value would be saved in the table. Many candidates successfully achieved this mark.

Default values
Many used the default property of the Date Added and Average Review Rating fields to set the default values. This was good as it meant that these values would be appended to the table as part of the save process, However, some had used methods that, in effect, meant the fields were no longer bound to the relevant fields in the table. This meant that further intervention would be required as part of the save process in order for these values to be saved.

Save process
There were many different methods seen. Whether the form was bound or unbound was significant in determining whether the method given was markworthy.

If the form was unbound, then simply using the command to save the record was not enough evidence. The candidates would have needed further evidence e.g., an append query shown in design view and running the query in their macro or equivalent.

Where individual fields were unbound, again if the save command alone was used this was not enough evidence to suggest the values of these fields would be saved in the table.

Many candidates achieved the mark available for ensuring the LastName and Email would saved in the table. Many also achieved the mark for a save message displaying.

The mark for the save message displaying only if a full record had been saved was not achieved by as many candidates. As mentioned, it had to be clear that each of the values would save. It also had to be clear the save message would only display if the record had been saved – errors should have prevented the message from displaying.

Q01c   Many candidates achieved the full 11 marks for their database structure with very clear screenprint 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 party and item table though credit for these was hampered, at times, because the need for a party item table was not meaning the party and/or item table did not include the correct fields.

Relationships needed to have referential integrity enforced in order to achieve marks. Those who did not include the party item table missed out on the relationships that were expected between them and the party table.

The majority of candidates achieved the marks for an appropriate primary key for the party and item tables. Of those who had the correct structure a number did not use a composite key for the party item table.

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 was a knock-on effect where candidates did not include the party items table. Generally the party table suffered in that too many records were present.

At times candidates did not ensure the number of records could be seen. They were asked to take a screenprint of the first five records including the number of records.

Q01e   The full range of marks seen for this question. There were some excellent responses and then some very general responses that gave the theory of normalisation or responses that did not match the question asked.

High scoring responses ensured it was clear to see they were talking about their own solution.

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.

There were a number of candidates who did not achieve the date criteria as they had used the incorrect range e.g. including 31/12/2016.

Q02bi   This was very well answered with the many candidate achieving both marks.

Q02bii There was evidence seen across a wide range of the marks with a good number of candidates achieving all 8 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.
- Calculating the number of parties and ensuring it was in the correct footer was awarded in a lot of instances
- Formatting marks were less frequently awarded i.e. shading, centre alignment etc.

Question 3

Q03a   There were a number of candidates who did not attempt question 3 in its entirety. Where it had been attempted many candidates achieved 4 marks. Ensuring the generated field had a suitable field name was not achieved in a number of cases.

Q03b   Where this had been attempted most candidates achieved the marks for creating a chart, using a meaningful chart title, ensuring the axis showed item names (bar chart) or the legend used the item names (pie chart) and using a suitable scale.

Some candidates did not ensure there was at least one suitable axis label.

Few candidates formatted the total cost as currency, and few achieved the overall fit for purpose mark.

Question 4

There were a number of candidates who did not attempt this question. This was the first time the menu included radio options as menu choices and, where the question had been attempted, it was nice to see the number of candidates who achieved the full 8 marks.

The most common marks awarded were for adding a button and at least one radio button, ensuring all options were as given and that the data input form from 1b would open when the Add party manager option was selected.

Again, formatting marks were not always achieved, which was surprising as they are quite straightforward marks i.e., adding the shading and borders where shown.

It was good to see the number of candidates who achieved the mark for creating and exporting the pdf as part of their macro or code. This was more commonly achieved than the mark for using shading or mark for using a border.

Question 5

A number of candidates did not attempt this question. Where it had been attempted a good range of marks were seen. There were some excellent responses well worth the full 9 marks.

The majority of candidates analysed the present database structure with very good reasons given why it was not suitable for allowing Sandeep to record/generate the party booking data given. Candidates gave very good examples of fields that were missing from the database and fields already present.

There were some very good recommendations put forward to that would work in terms of an appropriate structure for the database. Many recognised the need for a customer table, and it was really nice to see how many recognised that generated fields did not need to be stored as they could be generated as and when required.

This question was well answered overall. Many candidates achieved marks in level 2 or 3. The majority who answered quite clearly fell into one of the three levels. Level 1 tended to lack focus, be very vague and have little detail. Level 2 tended to have some very good points about semantic elements and the layout of the page etc. Only those in level 3 clearly understood ARIA/made any relevant reference to it. There were some excellent, detailed responses seen.

Coding response questions

Question 1

Q01b   This was a very well answered question with the majority of marks achieved. There was very little difference between applying underline or italics as specified in terms of the candidates who only achieved 1 mark.

Question 2

Q02a   This was quite a well answered question with many candidates achieving all 4 marks. The most common mistake was incorrectly applying 'text-size' for font size. In other instances candidates applied all of the CSS styling to the div tag meaning the styling was applied to both the heading and the paragraph of text. If this was the case the candidates could access some, but not all, of the marks.

Q02b   This question was not very well answered, many did not achieve any marks, many achieved 1 mark, very few achieved both marks. Where 1 mark was achieved there was very little difference as to whether the candidate achieved the hover or the opacity mark. Where CSS was specified and the candidate had correctly used the opacity property

some incorrectly specified the value e.g. 50%, which did not work. Candidates who had used absolute referencing to images on their desktop or had not included the images supplied were not affected in terms of the marks they could achieve. When viewing the page in a browser, even without the images, it could be determined whether the method they had used worked.

Question 3

Q03b   This question was quite well answered. However, the achievement of marks was affected if the candidates had specified absolute links to the images on their desktops or did not include the image files. Viewing the page in a browser could not determine whether the question had been responded to appropriately. Examiners needed to see the method in action. Where candidates had included the images, if they got 1 mark, they tended to get all 4 marks. Very few skewed the images or took the user away from the original page.

Q03c   The majority of candidates achieved at least 2 marks from this question. The most common marks achieved were for adding the back button, calling the 'move' function and passing a suitable parameter to it. Many were also able to successfully return to the fourth image when the back button was clicked after the first image. Fewer were able to successfully increment the index and move forward when appropriate. Where candidates achieved 4 marks the majority achieve the 5th as very few introduced any new variables, realising all the variables were already present in the code given. Again, though, this was a question where the marks awarded were affected if the candidate had included absolute references to their desktop or had not included the images supplied.

Question 4

Achievement for this question was good, proving that the majority of candidates can follow a wire frame and style guide and use HTML and CSS successfully in order to create the page given. However, candidates who had included absolute references to images/resources on their desktops and those who had not included the marsRover.html page could be affected. In terms of the individual marking points most candidates specified the charset, used at least one HTML5 semantic element, sized the banner or other element correctly, had at least three images sized at 150 x 150 pixels, set one of the colours correctly and centre aligned the text. Common marks lost tended to be lack of a description, having three images in a row, emphasising the heading and using a semantic tag to do so, having a functioning email address, taking padding into account and using an external style sheet. In terms of the level-based marks, it was pleasing to see many candidates achieving an additional 2 or 3 marks.

Question 5

This responses to this question were mixed. It was not uncommon to see 0 marks being awarded for the question as a whole, it was also not uncommon to see marks at the lower end of 1 to 3 and marks at the higher end of 11. Very few achieved all of the marks. In terms of filter.html, most candidates were able to declare an array. From here there were varying degrees of success with storing the information in the elements/correct elements and displaying the correct output. Very few candidates were able to add a suitable placeholder. In terms of login.html many candidates were able to achieve the marks for only accepting the authorised username and password and displaying a suitable message for a valid login. Some were able to redirect to the success.html page. Few were able to concatenate a message with the number of attempts remaining, suitably increment/decrement the number of attempts left or disable the form after the third invalid login attempt.