Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In Information Techonology
(WIT12) paper 01

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

This was the first series of the WIT12 examination.

There were approximately 335 candidates in this series. The large majority of candidates attempted all questions and the three hours allowed for the examination did not seem to be an issue for most candidates.

The format of the question paper is a combination of written questions and practical coding 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. The approximate split, in terms of marks, is approximately 29% written responses and 71% coding responses. There will normally be 6 questions. Questions 4 and 5 are extended coding exercises intended to allow candidates to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and understanding of HTML, CSS and JavaScript, whilst question 6 is an extended written response question.

Candidates are required to complete the coding exercises using a simple text editor only e.g Microsoft Notepad they should not be using WISYWIG software nor software that completes code for them or helps to find errors. For example, but not limited to, DreamWeaver, FrontPage etc.

Most centres submitted the candidates' work in the appropriate manner with the scripts and the coding responses in the same envelope. For the most part, candidates' work was correctly identified. However, some centres identified the candidates' work by the name of the candidate and not according to the instructions in the ICE document (**I**nformation for the **C**onduct of **E**xaminations). This document (updated each year) is usually available on the Pearson website early in the year of the examination. A few centres had to be contacted because the script envelope did not contain one of either the written responses or electronic coding files (on a CD/DVD or a USB drive). In terms of the practical coding questions, some candidates had included absolute references to images/resources on their desktops, others had only included their answer files. In both cases the full range of marks could not be accessed as resources that were part of the solution were missing. Candidates should ensure they save their finished responses in the same folder as the original question file(s) and that all of the files are submitted.

Due to the format of the question paper, the mark scheme is arranged so that the questions with written responses are grouped at the start of the scheme, followed by the questions with coding responses. Examples of coding that meet the requirements of the extended coding questions were grouped at the end of the mark scheme.

Early in the Autumn term, some further material will be available to provide exemplar materials with commentaries. This will be available on the Pearson website on the pages for International Advanced Level Information Technology.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Written response questions

Question 1

Q01a   This question was quite well answered with the majority of candidates achieving at least 1 mark. The most common mark tended to be the 'refresh' response. Fewer candidates recognised that the refresh would take place every 5 seconds.

Q01c   The majority of candidates also achieved at least 1 mark for this question. The most common mark tended to be for specifying the correct source. Fewer were able to write the correct code to insert audio with visible controls.

Q01d   This question was not well answered with some candidates appearing to not understand the term 'embed'. Out of the candidates who achieved marks the most common mark was for the tag used to embed content. Few were able to expand upon the tag name.

Question 2

Q02c   This question was well answered with a lot of candidates achieving both marks. Most did recognise how the CSS worked with the HTML to set the original properties of the rectangle and then to rotate it 90° from its originally position.

Q02d   This question was quite well answered with most candidates achieving at least 1 mark for this question. Many recognised that a child 'inherited' values from the parent. Fewer were able to go on and say that the child could, in fact, override the values of the parent.

Question 3

Q03a   This was a very well answered question with the majority of candidates achieving both marks. Those that did not achieve any marks tended not to recognise they had been asked to describe the code using the specific values given.

Q03d   This question was poorly answered by the majority of candidates. Many did not achieve any marks at all. The most common mark achieved was for the 'allowing JavaScript to change the appearance of a web page' mark. Overall the responses were very general making it hard to see the relevance to the question asked.

Question 6

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.