Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In Information and Technolgy
(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 second series of the WIT12 examination.

Many candidates attempted all questions and the three hours allowed for the examination did not seem to be an issue for most candidates. However, a number of candidates did not attempt any of the JavaScript questions at all leading to the thought that this aspect of teaching/learning may have been missed or not had enough time spent on it.

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 with 2 being extended coding exercises intended to allow candidates to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and understanding of HTML, CSS and JavaScript, whilst one requires an extended written response.

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.

It should be noted that the coding file for candidates should be uploaded in a single zipped file per candidate. A number of centres uploaded multiple files proving to be a very time-consuming process for examiners to be able to mark the work.

It was sad to see that 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 in one zipped folder.

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.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Written response questions

Question 1

Q01a   This question was very well answered with the majority of candidates achieving at least the mark.

Q01c   The majority of candidates achieved at least 1 mark for this question. The most common mark tended to be for at least one data item added. The most common mark not achieved was the mark for using colspan correctly.

Q01d   This question was not well answered. Many candidates did not achieve marks for this question. Of those that did, few described in the detail needed to achieve both marks. The most common mark awarded was for the candidates realising the tab index specified the order of the paragraphs.

Question 2

Q02ai   This question was not well answered. Very few candidates knew that the + selector using in line 2 of the CSS code as the adjacent sibling selector.

Q02aii   The majority of candidates achieved 1 mark from this question though very, very few were able to say where the font size change would occur. Most assumed it was for all paragraphs or were very vague about where to would apply.

Q02b   This was quite well answered in that many candidates achieved at least one mark. The most common answer focussed on either the user being able to see the content, or the fonts being standardised across browsers. It was sad to see that fewer could put both points forward as an answer.

Question 3

Q03ai   This was a very well answered question on the whole with many candidates achieving all 3 marks.

Q03aii   Fewer candidates could correctly state the purpose of the + in line 17 of the code i.e. to display the value of totalCharges on the same line as the message or equivalent. The most common in incorrect answer was 'to add the charges.'

Question 5

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 their own solution and how useful each had been with level 3 being very detailed. There were some excellent, detailed responses seen.

Coding response questions

Question 1

Q01b   This was a very well answered question with the majority of candidates achieving the marks.

Question 2

Q02c   This was also quite a well answered question. Of those candidates who achieved marks setting the background URL was the most common. Many candidates achieved all 3 marks, which was nice to see. However, at times where candidates had not ensured the images provided were included the marks were affected.

Q02d   This was a well answered question too. Many candidates achieved all 5 marks. The two most common marks not achieved were setting the border radius at all/correctly and providing a method of ensuring the layering of the shapes was correct. The candidates were guided to use the z-index but there were many different methods seen of achieving the same affect.

Question 3

Q03b   It was disappointing to see how many candidates did not attempt this questions. However, where it had attempted this question, it 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.

Q03c   Again, a number of candidates did not attempt this question. Where it had been attempted it was nice to see the number who achieved both marks.

Question 4

Achievement for this question was generally very good though some candidates did not attempt the question. Of those who had attempted it, there was a very good range of marks seen. There were the same weaknesses present as in other questions that included images i.e., some candidates included absolute references to images/resources on their desktops and others did not ensure their answer was saved in the same folder as the question. In terms of the individual marking points most candidates used an external stylesheet and at least one HTML5 semantic element (though some are still using divs and naming them "footer" etc), set the colour appropriately for at least one of the specified elements, set the width of the logo and the font size correctly and had the three smaller images in a row. It was nice to see how many candidates had a solution that was perfect/very nearly perfect. The skills demonstrated by the candidates in answering this question is wonderful to see.

Question 5

Many candidates did not attempt this question. When it had been attempted responses 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. There was also a number who achieved all of the marks. The changePassword.html aspects were quite well done where they had been attempted though some candidates did not have the skills needed to be able to work with the array. In terms of costs.html, most candidates who attempted it were able to add a button. Fewer were able to ensure either one of the given costs would appear when a customer type was selected, and few could determine whether the selection made was a new or existing customer.