Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

October 2021

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

There were several candidates who did not attempt one or more of the questions. The questions not attempted tended to be the JavaScript questions. It was clear to see that some candidates were not fully prepared for those questions and that they had perhaps focussed more on HTML and CSS.

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. In this paper there were 6 questions with questions 4 and 5 being the extended coding exercises intended to allow candidates to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and understanding of HTML, CSS and JavaScript, question 6 was the extended written response question.

Centres must ensure that candidates complete the coding exercises using a simple text editor and that no WISYWIG software nor software that completes code for them or helps to find errors is used. For example, but not limited to, Microsoft Word (or equivalent) documents that are then saved as HTML documents, DreamWeaver, FrontPage etc.

There are still some candidates who include absolute references to images/resources on their desktops and others who 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 must ensure they save their finished responses in the same folder as the original question file(s) and that all the files (finished responses and original question 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.

Overall, there was a clear distinction between the marks achieved for HTML/CSS type questions and marks achieved for JavaScript questions with more candidates achieving marks for the former.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Written response questions

Question 1

Q01a   This question was quite well answered with many candidates able to name another content model.

Q01b(ii)   Very few candidates did not achieve at least one mark and it was very common to see three marks awarded. The anchor mark was the most common mark not achieved.

Q01c   Many candidates were able to explain one difference between an HTML tag and an HTML attribute though there were some who did not achieve any marks. Where one mark was achieved it tended to be the mark for the tag.

Question 2

Q02a   This question was not well answered. Many candidates were not able to name another selector that could be used in CSS.

Q02e   This question was not well answered with many candidates relating margins to the edges of the page only rather than showing full awareness of the difference between them and padding. However, there was some very good descriptions of a difference too.

Question 3

Q03a   This question was quite well answered. Where no marks were achieved it tended to be because the candidates just repeated lines from Figure 3 or thought the problem could be solved by amending line 2 to mark <= 40, which was incorrect.

Q03d(i)   This was a very well answered question with the majority of candidates able to give an example of an event. The most popular response was the onClick event.

Q03d(ii)   This was not quite as well answered but many candidates were able to give the purpose of an event handler.

Question 6

It was really nice to see how well candidates demonstrated their knowledge and understanding in this question. There were some fantastic responses. Candidates tended to either respond to the question in terms of each one of the devices used and how suitable the designs would be or in terms of the designs and how suitable they would be across all of the devices. Very few candidates achieved no marks where the question had been attempted. It was nice to see how many candidates achieved at least level 2.

Coding response questions

Question 1

Q01b(i)   This was quite a well answered question with the majority of candidates achieving the mark for correcting the spelling of the filename. Many were also able to remove the scroll bar from the inline frame. Some candidates increased the size of the inline frame so that there was no scroll bar – this was not markworthy.

Question 2

Q02c   Many candidates achieved both marks. Where only one of the marks was awarded it tended to be the mark for the transition to become a circle. Fewer were able to ensure it took one second to do so.

Q02d   This was a well answered question with many candidates achieving at least three marks. The most common mark awarded was for the background colour with the mark least awarded for the rotation.

Question 3

Q03b   This was the first JavaScript question and many candidate did not attempt to answer it. Where the question had been attempted the majority achieved the mark for calculating the highest mark. Where three marks were achieved it was very nice to see the different methods used in order to calculate the average marks.

Q03c   Many candidates also did not attempt to answer this question. In some instances it was a shame to see the candidates did not achieve all four marks because they had failed to call the checkGuess() function to trigger their code. That mark and the mark for disabling the button were the most common marks not achieved.

Question 4

The majority of candidates attempted this question and it was really nice to see their achievement. It was well answered overall with a very good spread of marks. This was the second examination paper to featuring a responsive design and it was clear to see an improvement i.e. more candidates attempted to code for both 600 and over and less than 600.

However, it was sad to see that some of the issues that have been highlighted in the reports for past papers are still present i.e. missing marks due to the inclusion of absolute references to images/resources on desktops or not ensuring the original assets were also included within the answer files. If the examiner cannot see the actual resources loaded on the page it can make it more difficult trying to determine where and why to award marks.

The majority of candidates achieved the individual marks for:

- using an external style sheet
- using at least one HTML5 semantic element
- setting the colour appropriately for at least one element
- inserting the table
- adding an external hyperlink to the booking form
- emboldening the relevant text in the footer

Many achieved the below 600 pixels marks for:

- centre aligning the subheader text
- setting the images to 100% width of the page

Fewer achieved marking point for justifying the content text, the above 600 pixel marks and the marks for ensuring the hyperlink had black text and no underline and that it would change to white text on the mouse hover event.

It was nice to see the number of candidates who achieved level 2 from the levels-based marking points. There were also a number who achieved level 3 for both.

Question 5

This was the final JavaScript coding question, and it was not attempted by many candidates. Where it had been attempted it was nice to see the number of candidates who achieved full marks or nearly full marks. The staff.html page was expected to be the most challenging from the two pages.

In terms of the review.html page, candidates were to add code to:

- store the form comments in the reviewComments variable
- validate the input to ensure an email and comments had been input
- save the validated input in the array
- display the review in the saved review paragraph

Not many candidates were able to save the validated input into the array. There were varying degrees of success in terms of the other marks.

In terms of the search.html page, candidates were to add code to:

- find the staff member in the array whose image had been clicked
- display the staff member name and experience in the 'staffDetails' paragraph

The most common marks awarded were for:

- using the staffName as part of the condition
- incrementing the count

Fewer had the condition fully correct and displayed the details correctly.