



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Subsidiary
In Information Technology (WIT12)
Paper 1

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 2025

Publications Code WIT12_01_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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. However there are still entire cohorts who do not attempt any of the JavaScript questions at all.

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. A number of candidates appear to amend their CSS filename for Question 4 after they have completed the question – they add FINISHED to it, however they do not then go on to change the name of the external style sheet link in their web page to reflect this meaning their CSS code is not accessed when the web page is displayed in the browser.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Written response questions

Question 1

- Q01ai This question was very well answered with the majority of candidates achieving the mark for naming one piece of information that could be included in the head element. The most frequent response was **title** though all of the examples in the mark scheme were seen.
- Q01aii This question was generally well answered with candidates able to infer that the purpose of the **src** attribute is to specify the location of the audio file. However, there were a number of instances where the answers were too vague for the examiners to be sure this is what the candidates meant.
- Q01b This question was not so well answered with many candidates being too vague with their response e.g. the form will reset, which was not enough to gain the mark. The candidates were expected to realise from the code given that the age value would reset to 18.
- Q01c Candidates who understood the difference between the GET request and the POST request methods tended to achieve both marks. Some guessed by repeating the question – GET is used for a get request, POST is used for a post request etc. Some gave vague answers e.g. POST is more secure, without specifying the difference between the two that makes POST more secure. All of the responses given in the mark scheme were seen and, in a number of cases, from candidates in the same centre showing they had learnt the topic in depth, which was good.

Question 2

- Q02a This was quite well answered, however it was clear to see that some candidates mistake a CSS framework as designers creating stylesheets themselves and then using them on multiple pages. Where candidates knew what a CSS framework is they tended to at least gain one mark. The most common response was **faster development because the CSS does not need to be written again** though all of the responses in the mark scheme were seen.
- Q02b This question was very well answered with the majority of candidates gaining all three marks. If marks were missed it tended to be because it was unclear if the candidate meant the user hovered over the image or they clicked on it or they thought the rotation took place after three seconds had passed.

Question 3

- Q03a This question was not well answered. Some candidates managed to achieve both marks but there were many who did not achieve any. Where candidates achieved one mark it tended to be for the output for line 34. A number of responses did not include the full display e.g. **Small packages** was omitted or **Small parcels** was given rather than Small packages. In other cases the lines of code were written out in full again.
- Q03b This question was reasonably well answered with a number of candidates achieving both marks clearly showing they understand the difference between arguments and parameters using examples from the code. However, a number of candidates transposed parameters and arguments, a number correctly identified parameters but then gave line 12 as the arguments and others did not use examples from the code in their response.

Question 6

There were some excellent responses but, on the whole, this question was not very well answered. Many responses were descriptive rather than showing understanding of the different types of testing with some confusion between functionality and usability testing. There were many responses where the candidate had written about validating codes to allow access to a web page (adding if statements, iteration, username and passwords etc) rather than validating the code of the web page to check it was correct and complies with standards and some had misconstrued cross browser testing by writing about testing their preferred web browser against other web browsers rather than testing the created web page in different web browsers.

Coding response questions

Question 1

- Q01d This was a very well answered question with the majority of candidates achieving both marks. A small number of candidates put the tag before the heading.
- Q01e This was quite well answered with many candidates achieving both marks, however some candidates applied IDs to both the anchor and the internal hyperlink, others gave an external hyperlink or omitted the hash.

Question 2

- Q02c This was also a well answered question. Many candidates achieved both of the marks. Where candidates had attempted the question but did not achieve marks it tended to be because they omitted solid from the CSS code for the border, or they did not attempt to set the background of the table or failed to ensure the background was for the table.

Q02d This was well answered with most candidates scoring at least one mark and a respectable number achieving all four marks. The most common marks missed were not using underline correctly i.e. within CSS not HTML, using the UK spelling for "centre" for alignment, not attempting the CSS code for setting the left margin or putting the heading style in the paragraph style or vice versa.

Question 3

Q03c It was good to see the number of approaches to answering this question with most who attempted it achieving some marks and many achieving full marks. The most common mark missed was checking whether the first image should be displayed.

Q03d Most candidates managed to call the displayOff function in at least one of the required places, but a number did not ensure it was called when the page loaded. This did affect achievement of the final mark. Most were able to set the image source, please note png or jpg format was accepted. The question asked for png and it was expected candidates would convert the images to png, however this is the first time this has been expected in any of the papers so either format was accepted. Fewer were able to ensure only one button was shown at a time.

Question 4

A number of candidates achieved full marks for this question. However, weaknesses are still present in terms of images/hyperlinks i.e., some candidates using absolute references to images/resources on their desktops and/or not ensuring their answer files were saved in the same folder as the question meaning any resources specified in their HTML code were missing.

In terms of the individual marking points most candidates:

- used an external stylesheet and <header></header>, <nav></nav> and <footer></footer> elements
- set the colour for at least one of the elements
- set the font size for at least one of the elements below 600 pixels
- used italics for **Why we need trees**
- centre aligned the heading and article sub-headings
- added a hyperlink to the help.html page

Fewer candidates managed to:

- set the images to 100% of the width of the page for below 600 pixels – note if the images could not be seen in the browser this was not awarded
- add an email link
- set the colour of the links to white
- set the top/bottom border of the header
- display the images as ovals
- float the images as specified on the 600 and above version – note if the images could not be seen in the browser this was not awarded

Some candidates created two separate pages and two separate CSS files – one for below 600 pixels and one for 600 pixels and above. This is not a responsive web page. Others ensured that at 600 pixels the page looked exactly like the wire frame but then increasing the page size had no effect on the display, in effect it became a static page at 600 pixels. This is not a responsive web page.

Overall it was really nice to see how well the candidates respond to this question and the number of different ways they approach answering it.

Question 5

In terms of the registration page, where it had been attempted, most candidates were able to store the age from the form in a variable.

Fewer were able to create a regular expression for the postcode format specified in the paper. Where candidates did make a reasonable attempt at the regular expression they usually managed to go on to score quite well.

Validating the age was usually done quite well though a number of candidates did not use the correct age e.g. >18 and <100 , ≤ 10 etc. and others did not use the age variable they had specified earlier in the code meaning there was nothing to check.

Validating the postcode was also done quite well even if the regular expression was not correct. The code that was already present for validating the name helped with this.

For both the age and postcode most candidates were able to store the error message in the variable message, however a number did not go on to display the error message anywhere.

There was also varying degrees of success with concatenating the valid volunteer details and displaying them.

In terms of the volunteer page most of the candidates who attempted it were able to generate the loop interface (or their equivalent) correctly. A number of candidates were able to access the names in the array successfully but were then unable to append them to the volunteer drop down box or display the selected name.

It is worth reiterating topic area three of the levels based marks requires candidates to comment their own code. Very few candidates do this, which does affect the marks that can be awarded in that topic area.

