Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Subsidiary
In Information Tecnology (WIT12/01)
Unit 2

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

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.

There were very few entries for this series. There were several candidates who did not attempt one or more of the questions.

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 6 being the extended coding exercises intended to allow candidates to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and understanding of HTML, CSS and JavaScript, question 5 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.

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).

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 well answered with most candidates achieving the mark. Where the mark was not awarded it tended to be for similar reasons. At times, no response was given or there was not quite enough detail to be sure the candidate understood the purpose of CSS e.g. *'CSS is to create graphics for the web page'*.

Q01c   Many candidates also achieved at least 1 mark with approximately a quarter of the candidates achieving the full 3 marks. The most common mark awarded was the height/width mark, fewer achieved the iframe or source marks.

Q01d   This question was well answered with many candidates achieving the mark. Where the mark was not awarded it tended to be for similar reasons. At times, no response was given or there was not quite enough detail to be sure the candidate understood what was meant by the term metadata e.g. *'attributes of the website'*.

Q01e   This question had a mixed response. Approximately a third of candidates achieved the full 2 marks. When a question uses the **Explain** command it is expected candidates provide an explanation that includes justification/exemplification of a point. The candidates who achieved the 2 marks had ensured their response included this e.g. '*line 3 provides a description of the webpage which may be useful by search engines to identify what the webpage is about*. The exemplification/justification mark came from the comments about the search engine. Those who achieved 1 mark did not tend to include justification/exemplification of their initial explanation e.g. *'to provide a description of the webpage'*. Those who did not achieve any marks did not include a response or the response was too vague e.g. *'the code in line 3 is use to store the information in the html file'*.

Question 2

Q02a   This question was very well answered with most candidates achieving both marks. Where only 1 mark was awarded it tended to be because the **one** difference was not clear e.g. *External style sheet is where it is not be done in the same style sheet e.g. (HTML combining with CSS). Internal style sheet is where everything or coding done in one (e.g. HTML only, Javascript only*), there was not enough to clearly see that this candidate understood the difference with the mark awarded for the explanation of the external style sheet. Where no marks were awarded the response was usually vague or was not quite true.

Q02d   This question was very well answered with most candidates achieving at least 2 marks for this question. Where full marks were not awarded one of the most common reasons was the references to image_a and image_b were transposed etc.

Question 3

Q03a   This question was quite well answered. Where no marks were achieved it tended to be because there was no response or the candidate did not answer the question e.g. *'1 - (a-z)[a-z] = The webpage may not be case sensitive. 2 – Its complicated'*. Where 1 mark was awarded it was usually because the candidate had answered the question whilst referring to the first regular expression *[A-Z][a-z]{2}\d{3}(a|b)q+* rather than the given regular expression *(E|R)[a-z][A-Z]+\d{4}*.

Q03b   There was the same number of candidates who scored 1 mark for this question compared to those who scored 0 marks. Those who did not achieve the mark either did not answer the question e.g. *A password'* or they had multiple errors in their response e.g. *\d {1}/[[A-Z]{4}/(0/1)/[a-z]'*.

Q03d   This question was poorly answered. It was surprising that many candidates did not achieve the mark for specifying the HTML code for the creation of the button. Very few achieved both marks with around a third achieving 1 mark. This was the first of the questions that specifically required knowledge and skills in terms of JavaScript coding.

Q03e   This was a very well answered question with most candidates achieving the mark. Where the mark was not awarded the candidate either did not provide a response or the response was too vague e.g. *using comments, tasks done by each and every code can be displayed'*.

Question 5

This question was well answered overall. Very few candidates achieved no marks at all, where they did it tended to be because they had not included a response. Most candidates achieved a mark of 5 or higher. Of those who scored at least 5 marks but no higher it tended to be because they concentrated purely on how the page looked rather than thinking of the wider SEO issues etc.

Coding response questions

Question 1

Q01b   This was a very well answered question with most candidates achieving at least 1 mark. The most common mark achieved was for correcting the <cit> error. However, some candidates did not realise that this should have been a cite tag and applied <i></i> in its place. In this instance I this method was accepted for that. Fewer were able to change the bullet type so that it displayed as a circle.

Question 2

Q02b   This was well answered where 3 was the most common mark awarded. The most common mark not achieved was the mark for applying a red 3px border.

Q02c   This was another very well answered question where 3 was the most common mark awarded. One of the most common marks missed was the 'right' setting for vehicle2. Where this mark had not been achieved, if the vehicle moved from the right of the page to left of the page from the candidate's starting point then the mark for movement was awarded.

Question 3

Q03c   This was the first time a specific JavaScript object-oriented coding question was asked, and overall it was poorly answered. However, it must be said that it was nice to see some candidates achieve all 3 marks.

It was anticipated that many candidates would achieve the mark for assigning form values to variables and the mark for resetting the form and that the real challenge would be creating the new Guide object. As such only 1 of the 3 marks required 'object oriented coding'. The code supplied also included a subprogram *function Guide(gID, ln, fn)* that clearly showed the involvement of parameter passing and that three values would be required. It was hoped this would provide a starting point for the candidates in terms of thinking what code they needed to add to call this function correctly. That was not the case with few candidates being able to add *inputID, inputLastName, inputFirstName* (or the equivalent) into the call to this function.

Question 4

This question was well answered overall with a very good spread of marks achieved. Very few candidates did not achieve any marks, where this was the case it tended to be because they had not provided a response.

As in the last examination it was clear that many candidates can follow a wire frame and style guide and use HTML and CSS successfully to create the given page.

However, it was also clear that some candidates are still missing marks due to the inclusion of absolute references to images/resources on their desktops or not ensuring the original assets were also included with their answer files. If an 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.

In terms of the individual marking points the most common marks awarded were for:

- using an external style sheet correctly
- using at least one html5 semantic element
- setting one of the given colours correctly.
- setting one of the given font sizes correctly
- inserting the two column, five row table
- applying bold and italic to 'Love London Tours'
- ensuring both images were the same width. If the resources were missing the mark was awarded if the sizes were clearly specified within CSS and they were the same.

Many candidates also achieved the marks for:

- adding a button
- setting the given colour for the table header
- aligning 'Love London Tours' to the right

Fewer achieved the marks for:

- ensuring the bottom or at least one column had rounded corners
- ensuring at least one image had rounded top corners
- ensuring suitable padding/margins were used
- setting the alignment for either the column text or table text correctly.

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 6

This was the final JavaScript coding question. The responses were mixed with some candidates achieving the full 20 marks and others achieving 0 marks. Many of those awarded 0 marks did not include a response to this question. It was anticipated the search page would be the more challenging of the two pages.

In terms of the newMember.html page, candidates needed to validate user input and display the results. They had to make sure a first name and last name were present and that the age was at least 18. The output was either the new member details or a suitable error message. It was surprising to see some who did not achieve any marks for this section of the question. However, of those who achieved marks in this section most managed to produce suitable error messages and/or validate at least one of the inputs.

In terms of the search.html page, this was the first time a 2d array was included in a question. The array itself was already set up and code pre-supplied demonstrating how to loop through a 2d array accessing elements etc. This should have provided a reference point for the candidates in terms of the code they had to add themselves.

It was expected that many candidates would be able to successfully code the comparison of the name in the array to the name input and, indeed, where marks were awarded this was the most common mark. Fewer were able to code the display required if the guide was not found and fewer still were able to successfully loop through the array. Whilst this differentiation was expected differentiation it was disappointing that more of the candidates did not achieve at least one of those more complicated marking points.