



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in
Information Technology (WIT12/ 01)

Unit 2

Paper WIT12/01

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 2024

Publications Code WIT12/01_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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

Many candidates attempted all questions and the three hours allowed for the examination did not seem to be an issue for most candidates. It is nice to see that the many more candidates attempt the JavaScript questions now.

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.

Despite comments in every Principal Examiner report, there are still a number of candidates who use/end up with absolute references to images/resources on their desktops and a number of candidates who only submit their answer files. In both cases the full range of marks cannot be accessed as resources that were part of the solution are 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** maintaining the original folder structure.

As with previous examinations, candidates tend to be better at the practical coding questions compared to the written questions.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Written response questions

Question 1

- Q01ai This question was not well answered with many candidates appearing to confuse declaring the language of a document with declaring the doctype.
- Q01aii This question was not well answered. Generally this was because candidates repeated the example given in the stem of the question rather than a different response.
- Q01b This question was well answered nearly all candidates achieving both marks and approximately half achieving both marks. The most common reason for not achieving the second mark was responses such as "at the top of the page as a title."
- Q01d Approximately 60% of candidates achieved one mark, this tended to be the mark for saying the browser emphasises by displaying the text using italics/bold. Fewer were able to successfully explain how a screen reader interprets the `` tag.

Question 2

- Q02a Approximately half of the candidates achieved at least one mark, some both marks. Where candidates did not achieve any marks, they had chosen not to answer the question or failed to relate their response to the design of the website changing.
- Q02b This question was well answered with the majority of candidates being able to gain the black background and white text mark, fewer were able to successfully indicate which paragraphs this would be applied to.

Question 3

- Q03ai This was the first of the JavaScript questions and it was not answered very well. A small number of candidates achieved both marks, and very few achieved both marks. Common responses included the variable `'i'` with a value of 15 and the variable name with Samihah. Candidates did not appear to have a grasp of 1D arrays nor of for loops.

- Q03aii This question was reasonably well answered with a number of candidates achieving both marks. However, many candidates did not appear to have a solid grasp of 2D arrays. Where candidates had attempted the question and gained one mark, it tended to be the mark for declaring the array, fewer were able to add the values to the array.
- Q03d This question was reasonably well answered with a number of candidates achieving both marks. Where only one mark had been achieved it tended to be the mark for saying the background of the age field would become yellow. Fewer were able to say when this occurred.

Question 6

It was nice to see candidates achieve the full range of marks for this question. The majority of candidates attempted the question with most achieving at least level 1, many level 2 and some level 3. In a number of cases candidates went off topic by describing fonts/colours etc that they would use if they were building the page rather than thinking of the form and how to validate it. In other cases candidates did not mention any form elements at all, or purely mentioned the form elements with no concept of how to validate the elements to meet requirements.

Coding response questions

Question 1

- Q01c This was a very well answered question with the majority of candidates achieving both marks.

Question 2

- Q02c This was also a well answered question. Setting the colour of the heading was the most common mark achieved. Many also achieved the mark for rotating the heading, though this proved to be the harder of the two marks.
- Q02d This was very well answered question and it was nice to see the number of candidates who achieved all four marks. Setting the border to 3 pixels was the most common mark achieved though many were also able to successfully set the colour of the border to

black. A sizeable number were also able to add controls to the video and set it to loop. A really well answered question.

Question 3

- Q03b It was nice to see the number of candidates who attempted this question. In previous papers many candidates did not attempt any of the JavaScript questions. The question was very well answered with well over half of the candidates achieving all three marks. The most common mark achieved was for resetting the position of the ballon, followed by adding 10 pixels.
- Q03c This was a very well answered question with over half of the candidates achieving all four marks. The majority of candidates achieved the mark for specifying the colour of the shapes correctly. Fewer were able to ensure the circle shape displayed as a circle.

Question 4

Achievement for this question was good. There was a very good range of marks seen including a sizeable number of full marks. However, there is still weaknesses in terms of images/hyperlinks i.e., some candidates including absolute references to images/resources on their desktops and/or not ensuring 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 and/or font size appropriately for at least one of the elements
- set the alignment appropriately
- added the hyperlink to the events.html
- set the width of the images.

Fewer candidates managed:

- to ensure the hyperlink text was white with no underline and that the colour of the font changed to back on the hover event
- to centre the images on the 600 and below version
- to float the logo and images as specified on the above 600 version

Some candidates created two separate pages – one for 600 and below and one for above. This is not what was required.

Many candidates achieved at least level 2 for the levels-based marks available.

Overall, it was really nice to see how well the candidates highlighted their knowledge and skills in this extended question.

Question 5

There were more candidates attempting this question than in previous examinations, which was nice to see. In terms of the zoom page, most of the candidates who attempted it did manage to achieve at least one of the points based marks, this tended to be checking the height or increasing/decreasing the height. Fewer were able to use parameters. It was very nice to see the many different methods candidates used of checking to see whether they should increase or decrease the height.

In terms of the author page, the majority of candidates achieved the mark for storing the last name in an appropriate variable. A sizeable number were able to show and hide elements accordingly. It was surprising to see how many candidates had the skills to show and hide elements yet did not do what the question asked. The question asked them to show/hide the output section and show/hide the author form. In a number of cases, at times entire centres, candidates disabled the form but did not hide it. If the form was not hidden and displayed, using code, when asked then those marks were not available.

