

GCSE 2003
June Series



Report on the Examination

Design and Technology:
Textiles Technology

- Full Course
- Short Course

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

© Assessment and Qualifications Alliance 2003

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee, registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered Charity 1073334. Registered address Addleshaw Goddard, Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ.

Kathleen Tattersall, Director General

CONTENTS

Textiles Technology

	<i>Page No.</i>
Full Course Foundation	4
Full Course Higher	7
Short Course Foundation	10
Short Course Higher	11
Coursework	14
Mark Ranges and Award of Grades	19

Design and Technology: Textiles Technology

General comments

This was the first year of examination of the new specification and candidates and their teachers are to be congratulated on the high quality of the responses. Many candidates responded with enthusiasm to the set theme, which generated some appropriately creative and imaginative use of vocabulary, particularly when describing fabrics, e.g. shimmering, iridescent, camouflage, lustre and sheen. Many were able to apply the theme to many of the current teenage trends such as floating fabrics, asymmetric hemlines, beading and embroidery. Generally those who chose fashion garments tended to gain the highest marks.

Most candidates followed their teachers' advice to look at the breakdown of marks for the design question and to use the information given to make sure they had addressed all parts of the question.

Presentation was generally good with few candidates failing to use colour. The handwriting of a minority of candidates is so bad as to be almost illegible making papers very difficult to read and interpret.

Full Course Foundation

General

Most candidates attempted to answer the questions as fully as possible. Overall the quality of the work was better on the design question than on the rest of the paper. The majority of candidates had obviously prepared very well and presented their ideas clearly with good annotation and colourful, imaginative designs. There were few low scoring papers. At the top end of the scale there were some high scoring candidates who showed a good level of understanding. The quality of answers to the manufacturing question varied greatly between centres, showing a lack of knowledge in some instances.

Question 1

Part (a) was answered very well with almost all candidates gaining full marks. The Internet and books were the most common responses.

In (b) these questions posed a number of problems although they were tackled well by some candidates who achieved full marks. However, many answers were confused and candidates did not relate the use of colour, shape or pattern to their product or the insect theme.

The main problem area in (b) was (iii) where the word 'pattern' was misinterpreted by many as meaning shapes previously referred to in (ii), or with paper templates as in pattern for a garment/item. Answers were sometimes superficial or a repeat of the information given in (i) and (ii).

Question 2

The design question was generally well answered since the structure enabled a lot of candidates to obtain high marks.

In part (a) there was some confusion between a 'design specification' and a 'manufacturing specification'. Candidates seemed to know what might be included in a specification but not why it was important, mostly referring to it as being a guide for the designer to work to.

Part (b) (i) was well answered in the majority of cases with candidates often annotating and colouring in their initial designs. Sometimes it was not clear what the products were as just an insect design was shown. There were some very original ideas, especially for the fashion option.

Valid reasons were given for the chosen design in (b)(ii) but occasionally superficial, simplistic reasons were given.

Part (c) was usually well answered with a wide range of possible development areas identified; candidates showed sound awareness of alternative decorative techniques and some described processes in some detail. Many candidates achieved full marks. Some candidates mistakenly thought that they were being asked to describe how the product was made. Many repeated what was already in the initial design instead of developing it.

Designs in part (d) were neatly presented with detailed annotation. The techniques for answering this question are obviously being taught well in schools, as responses improve year after year. Many candidates gave front and back views with detailed information. Suitable fabrics and components were selected by some candidates and used with care and understanding in the designs.

Many imaginative designs were shown with the quality of fashion tops tending to be higher than the furnishing products. However, products in many answers would not be easy to manufacture in quantity.

Question 3

Few candidates in part (a)(i) achieved full marks for this question as many gave information appropriate for part (ii) rather than (i). The majority gave basic answers, e.g. Internet, with clear, specific answers not forthcoming. Many gave ‘CAD’ and ‘CAM’ as answers with no explanation. Only a minority of candidates appeared to know about image mapping or virtual prototypes.

Fibre/fabric properties in part (ii) were frequently given. Some candidates gave vague information about what they would find and often related to it to insects or other research.

Part (b), on the whole was well answered. In (i), it was encouraging that many candidates were able to name a fibre but there was still some confusion between ‘fibre’ and ‘fabric’.

The majority of candidates in (ii) achieved half marks or above with many giving valid reasons for choosing the fibre. More able candidates, achieved full marks here but many gave a reason for choice without a detailed explanation. Many qualities were related to the chosen fabric but not to the chosen design.

Part (c) of this question was poorly answered on the whole. Many candidates confused quality checks with testing fabrics, cutting out correctly or quality control before selling.

In (d) the majority of candidates clearly knew what a component was, whilst less able candidates referred to equipment or suggested techniques used on a product, e.g. embroidery. On the whole appropriate components were chosen and sound explanations given for choice. The high marks achieved by many candidates demonstrated a sound understanding of the question.

Question 4

Candidates answering part (a) often misinterpreted this question but many were able to correctly list design specification criteria such as fabrics, components, size and care of products enabling them to achieve 3 marks. Part (b) produced very mixed responses to this question differentiating between those who had experienced pattern lays and pattern cutting and those who had not.

Candidates either understood what the question was asking and gave correct detailed answers worthy of full marks, or they misunderstood completely and answered vaguely, suggesting that a larger piece of fabric was used or rearranging the pieces.

Few candidates explained why piece C had to be put on the straight grain.

In part (c), few candidates were able to demonstrate a clear understanding of tolerance levels. There was a general understanding that they referred to a standard that had to be reached. This lack of understanding in part (i) led to obscure suggestions in (ii) with many giving only generalised descriptions of the product.

Question 5

Overall there were very many weak answers to this question.

In part (a)(i) knowledge of batch production appeared weak with most candidates receiving only one mark for brief or vague answers referring to 'a lot', 'many', or 'not a lot' in their explanations. In (ii) explanations about batch production were often confused with other production methods and it was obvious that some candidates were just guessing at the answer.

Many candidates in part (b) gained full marks on this question. The majority achieved two marks for referring mainly to fabric/ component changes.

Part (c) caused problems for candidates with many scripts left blank. The majority of answers confused sub-assembly in (i) with assembly lines used in mass or batch production. However, many candidates were able to score one mark by being able to name a part of their product, which could be made by sub-assembly in (iii).

Most candidates answered part (d)(i) with the majority gaining marks for accuracy, speed and reduction in labour costs. Some achieved full marks but the majority obtained only two or three marks.

Few candidates answered part (ii) of this question correctly because they did not relate it to their own product. This may have been due to either misreading or misunderstanding. Mostly generalised comments were made about the machines and speed without reference to the product.

Part (e) on the whole was well answered. The reasons given were sound but some candidates did not access the full marks because of a lack of detail. The answers were generally justified and mostly related to cheaper labour, better technology and ease of obtaining fabrics.

Candidates in part (f) often related their answers to school based textile environments e.g. no running, holding scissors correctly, rather than industrial manufacture. Responses were not always expanded upon to enable candidates to acquire higher marks. There were, however, some very good answers given with candidates showing sound knowledge of accident prevention within industrial premises, e.g. staff training, use of safety gear.

Question 6

Overall this question was poorly answered. In all sections candidates simply repeated information they had been given in the diagram.

In part (a) candidates at the higher end gave examples of what the bag could be used for, but many candidates simply repeated the information from the diagram rather than giving uses and reasons.

Many candidates who gave detailed explanations answered part (b) quite well. There was some difficulty differentiating between (a) and (b) with many candidates simply repeating their responses. The less able candidates tended to focus on the strength or durability of the fabric.

Part (c) was often well answered but few candidates accessed the full six marks. Most were able to name the components but gave little real detail about them. Answers referred to the function and not the position. Some candidates did not understand ‘components’ as a term and gave fabrics or pockets as an answer.

Both parts of (d) were answered well with many candidates achieving full marks for making comparisons, referring to safety elements and properties of various fastenings.

Full Course Higher

General

Examiners reported many high quality papers, which were interesting and pleasurable to mark. Many candidates demonstrated good textile knowledge, outstanding design skills, clear knowledge of ICT and industrial practices, sound understanding of social and environmental issues and a clear ability to evaluate products.

The response to fabric manipulation was the most disappointing aspect of the higher tier papers with many failing to understand the term or interpreting it as decoration. Few used the traditional and expected techniques of pleating, gathering, tucks, etc. It was obvious that many candidates had not researched this area thoroughly in preparation for the examination, especially as many of them would have used such techniques in coursework projects. Most candidates attempted every section of the paper.

Question 1

Part (a) was generally a well answered question with the most common answers being related to fashion shows and magazines. However many candidates overlooked the fact that the question was about future trends and launched into the well-practiced response of questionnaire/survey/market research type answer.

Part (b) was well answered with most candidates gaining three or four marks. Candidates easily identified how they might use colour, texture and pattern to reflect the theme.

Question 2

Part (a) was poorly answered with many points unrelated to the design specification. Obvious points such as ‘must be original’ or ‘attractive’ were used. Only a few recognised that they needed to include specific points.

Sketches were well done for (b)(i). Lots of interesting ideas were given with many gaining six to eight marks.

Reasons for choosing a particular idea for (iii) was sound. There were many well reasoned answers, which related to product development.

Part (c) was a well-answered question. Candidates were able to identify a particular area of their product and explain how they would develop or change it. The majority gave reasoning related to changing or enhancing the pattern or creating texture or 3D areas.

There were some very well thought out designs with plenty of good colour and detail to part (d). Most candidates gained their highest marks on this question. There were many excellent, original and innovative ideas combined with a high standard of drawing and detailed annotation.

There were a surprising number of candidates who failed to use a main fabric. The problematic area of this question was the manipulation of fabric as candidates did not grasp the idea of manipulation well. Those that did have an understanding incorporated quilting, appliqué or tie-dye. More ingenious designs showed pleating or boning.

Most candidates chose the fashion option and the standard of these designs tended to be higher than furnishing options where ideas were a little basic.

Question 3

Although databases were generally not specified in answers to part (a), many candidates implied that they knew that properties and qualities of fabrics could be stored or held. The Internet was mentioned frequently but there was little explanation of how this could be used to help choose fabrics and components. The most common answers explained how designers might look at different fabrics to find which ones matched or were suitable.

In part (b) candidates could identify fabrics or components used but most had difficulty in explaining how these related to the theme. Many gave reasoning related to techniques used or colours. Fabrics commonly named were organza or 'floaty' fabrics to show delicate wings or shimmering effects. Sequins were used to reflect ladybird spots or insect eyes. Velvet or felt were sometimes and predictably used for furry insects or the hairs on insect legs.

Part (c)(i) was a very poorly answered question. Candidates tended to describe the process of a technique such as appliqué or tie-dye rather than explaining how they had manipulated the fabric. Often these answers did not relate to anything seen or indicated on their design. Common answers referred to a sewing technique or how fabrics might be attached together.

Part (ii) was answered well with candidates being able to identify that they wanted fabrics to be shiny or flexible and most were able to give sensible reasons for this.

Question 4

There were many excellent answers to part (a) alongside many weak ones which went into considerable detail about the need to check that the fabric was the one ordered, with 'rips' and 'stains' added as an afterthought.

In part (b) there were many good answers, most commonly identifying that computer technology helps reduce waste and is more economical. Better answers referred to the matching of patterns or the fabric grain.

A surprising number still do not understand the just-in-time system in part (c). Those who did were able to give a full answer relating to storage as well as production or delivery. Many referred to the system as being something about workers being monitored, delivery of a product to a retailer or points of sale.

In (d) many candidates found batch production a difficult term to define and explain why it was a good method.

Those who understood the term tended to pick up full marks in part (e) of this question. Sub-assembly was often confused with the general assembly line and production process. There was some confusion with reasoning in (ii) but candidates who did have an idea gave good answers relating to changing fashion or trends and the avoidance of waste. In (iii), many gave parts of their product, which it would be unreasonable to make as a sub-assembly.

Part (f)(i) was well answered by most candidates who were clearly aware of the advantages associated with the use of computerised sewing machines. In (ii) many lost marks by failing to relate the advantages to their own product or gave very generalized responses such as ‘it can sew the seams’.

Most candidates in part (g) made a good attempt to answer this question and there were many well informed responses despite the general trend to concentrate on the issue of low paid workers and increased profits for manufacturers.

Question 5

There were some good answers to part (a) but many either repeated the information given or lost marks by referring to fabric properties.

There were mixed responses to part (b); those who read the question and related their answer to the suitability of the fabric usually gained good marks. Others tended to consider the suitability of the design features and repeated answers given in (a).

In part (c)(i) most answers related to security, safety and keeping sand or water out. Many answers related to other fastenings but candidates were not able to identify why buttons, poppers and Velcro would not be as suitable as a zip.

Some excellent responses to part (ii) with sensible evaluation of the suitability of a number of methods that might have been used for the strap attachment. There were also many weak responses which suggested changing the straps to leather or plastic.

Many candidates confused a basic block pattern with a wooden block for printing or a simple design in part (d). Those who did answer it correctly often had insufficient knowledge to gain full marks despite the lenient approach taken to the marking of this question.

Short Course Foundation

General

Overall the paper was answered reasonably well this year with the majority of candidates attempting all of the questions. Where questions were misinterpreted this often reflected either poor language skills or an apparent lack of basic knowledge and understanding. In some instances it was evident that the candidates had not read the question properly and were responding to similar questions set in previous years' papers.

Question 1

Part (a) was very well answered with most responses gaining two marks.

In part (b)(i) most candidates displayed some knowledge of how they might use colour in their design; those candidates who gained full marks were also able to give examples of techniques which might be used. In part (ii) most candidates managed to gain at least one mark by referring to either using shape as the design of the product or putting the shape of the insect on to the product. More able candidates gave both methods. The majority of candidates answering part (iii) were very vague as to how patterns associated with insects could be used; many failing to gain any marks here.

Question 2

Part (a) of this question was poorly answered by many, usually because the question was misinterpreted. Candidates gave a design specification for their product rather than explaining why a designer works to a specification.

There were some excellent responses to part (b)(i) with most candidates clearly showing two different initial ideas. Many were very well presented and gained full marks. Part (b)(iii) was well answered with clear reasons given.

Although most candidates could identify a suitable part of their product for development in part (c), many were very vague as to how they would achieve it.

Part (d) had many excellent responses with all parts answered well and many candidates gaining high marks. The choice of fabrics and components was generally appropriate. Showing colour is a problem if coloured pencils are not used. Candidates should be reminded of this. Many of the final designs displayed originality, particularly by those candidates choosing the fashion option.

Question 3

Where candidates in part (a) understood exactly what was required, answers were good, but many misinterpreted the question and listed ways in which computers could be used for designing rather than choosing fabrics. In part (b) reasons for the choice of fabric were very disappointing with 'it's cheap' being a common response. Few candidates gave enough detail to gain full marks here.

In part (c) many candidates still failed to understand why the fabric would be checked before cutting. Common responses were 'it is the right colour' or 'it doesn't fray'.

Question 4

Many candidates confused a manufacturing specification with a design specification in part (a) and therefore failed to gain any marks. In part (b), where candidates understood the importance of pattern lays high marks were gained. Unfortunately, many failed to understand what was required.

Although most candidates in part (c) had some idea of tolerance level in relation to standards and quality, few were specific enough to gain the two marks allocated and many failed to identify an appropriate part of their product which would have a tolerance level.

Part (d) was generally well answered and in part (e) most candidates appeared to be aware of reasons for many companies having their textile products made abroad but few gave enough detail to gain full marks.

Safety issues frequently appear on the paper and it was disappointing to see in part (f) so many candidates still referring to classroom safety rather than safety in industry.

Question 5

This type of question, not relating to the theme and context, was new to the paper this year. It was well answered by many and the majority of candidates attempted all parts.

Part (a) was well answered by most but some candidates lost marks by concentrating on the fabric rather than the design features.

Part (b) on fastenings, was very well answered, and in part (c) knowledge of nylon was good.

Short Course Higher

General

Work of a high standard was seen this year with many innovative and highly effective designs showing real creativity and flair. Overall the questions appear to have been well understood by the majority of candidates but a number continue to lose marks because of misreading questions. Many answers showed a detailed understanding of the subject content and candidates had clearly been well prepared for the examination.

Question 1

Generally part (a) was a well answered question although many candidates overlooked the fact that the question was about future trends and made detailed references to research on current trends.

Part (b) was well answered with most candidates gaining three or four marks. Candidates easily identified how they might use colour, texture and pattern to reflect the theme.

Question 2

Part (a) was poorly answered even by high scoring candidates. Many repeated points given to them and only a few recognised those specific points were needed.

Sketches in (b) (i) were well done. Lots of interesting ideas were given with many gaining six to eight marks and in (iii) most candidates were able to justify their choice.

Part (c) was a well-answered question. Candidates were able to identify a particular area of their product and explain their ideas for development.

There was some very well thought out designs with many candidates being awarded very high marks in (d). There were many excellent, original and innovative ideas although many clearly did not understand what is meant by fabric manipulation. Most candidates chose the fashion option and the standard of these designs tended to be higher than furnishing options where ideas were often lacking interest and originality.

Question 3

More candidates who answered (a) were aware of how ICT is used in industry and were able to describe how 3D modelling and information on databases might help a designer choose appropriate fabrics.

In part (b) candidates were able to identify fabrics and components and explain how these related to the theme. Some, however, did not read the question carefully and there were many vague references to colour and techniques.

How well part (c) (i) was answered was directly related to candidates' understanding of fabric manipulation. The level of response was similar to that seen on the full course paper.

Part (ii) was answered well with candidates being able to identify that fabric qualities were needed. Weaker answers referred in general terms to fabric properties rather than those specific to the technique used in (i).

Question 4

There were many excellent answers to part (a) alongside many weak ones which went into considerable detail about the need to check that the fabric was the one ordered, with 'rips' and 'stains' added as an afterthought.

In (b) again there were many good answers, most commonly identifying that computer technology helps reduce waste and is more economical. Better answers referred to the matching of patterns or the fabric grain.

Candidates either knew the meaning of a Just-in-time (JIT) system in (c), in which case they tended to score full marks, or they had no idea.

Those who understood the term tended to pick up full marks on part (d) of this question. Sub-assembly was often confused with the general assembly line and production process in (i). There was some confusion in reasoning (ii), but candidates who did have an idea gave good answers relating to changing fashion or trends and the avoidance of waste. In (iii), many gave parts of their product, which would be unreasonable to make as a sub-assembly.

Candidates responded well to part (e) (i) with many answers gaining high marks. There was a slight tendency for some to make repetitive comments about saving time/money.

Many lost marks by failing to relate the advantages to their own product or gave very generalised responses to part (ii) such as 'it can sew the seams'.

Question 5

There were some good answers to part (a) but many either repeated the information given or lost marks by referring to fabric properties.

There were mixed responses to part (b); those who read the question and related their answer to the suitability of the fabric usually gained good marks. Others tended to consider the suitability of the design features and repeat answers given in (a).

In part (c) most answers related to security, safety and the need to keep sand or water out. Many answers related to other fastenings but were not able to identify why buttons, poppers and Velcro would not be as suitable as a zip.

Coursework

General

In this the first year of the revised and updated Design and Technology: Textiles Technology specification candidates were required to produce a single coursework project, which addressed all the assessment criteria in an integrated way. Evidence that they had used their personal designing and making skills, combined with a knowledge and understanding was demanded in the form a project that consisted of a textiles product and a *concise* design folder. The main changes were that greater emphasis should be placed on: ICT, particularly CAD/CAM; the industrial aspects of designing and making; and the wider effects of technological activity on society and the environment. All of this was required as evidence in candidates' projects. Time spent on the coursework should not have exceeded 40 hours for Full Course and 20 hours for Short Course. Teachers were advised during the Autumn training meetings that quality of work was more important than quantity and size. Though no estimate of page numbers was given in the specification, it was generally felt that 20 to 25 pages of A3 work was, in most cases, more than sufficient to enable candidates to demonstrate the assessment criteria at the highest levels.

In the Full Course the response to this challenge has been outstanding and teachers are to be congratulated on the way they have guided candidates to present design work that has been focused and communicated in the most appropriate way. They have encouraged meaningful development work and have taught candidates to manufacture some of the most original, demanding, high quality textile products we have ever seen. In the best instances this has been done in less than 40 hours, on no more than 25 sheets of A3 paper and though the resulting products have not been large or complex they have included a wide variety of skills and techniques all completed to the highest standards. This success has not just been the domain of our high achieving A grade candidates. It has been encouraging to see those of lower ability completing coursework folders and presenting textile products that reflect a real sense of achievement at each level. It has shown that this specification is truly one that allows candidates of all ability to succeed.

It is the candidates' ability to focus on the task and to work with speed, direction and enthusiasm to get to the heart of designing, with one sole purpose, to produce a quality outcome that satisfies the design brief, that has impressed the moderating team so much. The distinguishing feature in many projects was that this specification is about using knowledge to design products for the real world, for modern consumers whilst showing and understanding the application of industrial practice. At last candidates are no longer designing and making products for themselves, jumping through hoops to produce meaningless questionnaires or pages of useless research. There were few unimaginative fashion garments made from un-adapted commercial patterns with no originality or those cushions based on cartoon characters. Producing technique samples for the sake of it or testing fabrics to establish qualities that have already been identified in fabric specifications is clearly becoming a thing of the past. Focus, sense of purpose, enthusiasm, direction, rigour, no time to waste and speed are all key words for the candidates.

Teachers have become more confident in interpreting and using the assessment criteria in the spirit intended. There is a greater acceptance that by the very nature of designing some criteria will be met with masses of evidence whilst others, because it has not been vital to the task, may have very little. It is not necessary to contrive evidence and teachers are now confident that holistic assessment works and allows candidates who produce the most innovative, quality work to achieve the highest grades.

Teachers' assessments have been justified and the assessment of designing was very accurate with few adjustments being made. The making component was on the whole accurately assessed though a few teachers over rewarded when work had a very poor standard of quality and finish. Internal standardisation was excellent. The subject continues to go from strength to strength with the manufacture of many exciting, high quality textile products from all ranges of ability being in evidence.

The problems reported last year of: shortage of textile specialist teachers; lack of specialist training in Design and Technology; lack of ICT facilities particularly computer operated machines and lack of funding to purchase modern fabrics appear to have been less evident this year. Very few candidates appear to have been taught by non-specialist teachers, far greater use has been made of ICT and modern fabrics and there have been reports of improved conditions in the textiles areas of many schools.

Textiles Technology teachers have been very keen to embrace the recommendations of the new specification and have used the advice and exemplar projects presented by the board very wisely. There has been far less pressure not just on the candidates but also teachers who have in the past been overwhelmed by the enormity of the task to get candidates working on individual projects to meet deadline dates.

With the continued pressure of inspections, the necessity to improve examination results on a yearly basis, and now the strong recommendation to limit time spent on projects, there was some concern that teachers may over structure and lead students through the designing stage too rigorously to the detriment of original, textile product design. It is pleasing to report that on the whole this has not been the case. In fact quite the reverse as it seems many candidates did not lose interest early on because of the limited amount of time spent on research and in many cases they have displayed strong, individual approaches to the work. They have been enthusiastic and determined to take ownership of the project. They have not been prepared to present information they already know or carry out investigations to establish answers they already have. Lower ability candidates have however quite rightly been given a great deal of direction with excellent use of writing frames and this has allowed them to achieve success at their level. Teachers of candidates with learning difficulties are to be congratulated on the level of success seen at the lower end of the grade range.

Choice of project

Candidates have used an excellent range of new, original projects this year allowing the assessment criteria for industrial practice, systems and control to be met effectively. Candidates have been able to show their true capability with a wide range of both fashion and interior design based projects. Many teachers have used adapted briefs from the new specification with great success. It is important that candidates are not encouraged to make two items when one has sufficient complexity and demand to meet the assessment criteria.

Designing

There has been a great improvement in meeting the designing assessment criteria in all aspects of designing and moderators report that this year they have seen the best design work ever. This is in part due to the fact that candidates have been more focused, have cut back on research and have consequently had more time to spend on developmental work. This has always been the key to success though until this year has been a serious weakness. Very few have spent a disproportionate amount of time on the design folders to the detriment of the making component. Teachers are very comfortable with the specification, have got to grips with the assessment criteria and are much more confident in applying the ‘best-fit’ approach when holistically assessing the coursework folders.

Quality indicators that provide evidence of good practice

- Design briefs are challenging but not daunting. The tasks can be completed in 40 hours. They allow and make it straightforward for candidates to address and meet the assessment criteria.
- Research is minimal, necessary and focused. Research analysis has improved though candidates should be advised to present information they already know in their analysis particularly when they need to use this knowledge when making decisions. Some candidates only analysed the information presented on the design sheets and then the detail on the specifications seemed to emerge out of the blue.

- Candidates have given greater attention to meeting the requirements of the consumer and we have seen some excellent profiles, which have clearly focused the designers thinking. Specifications have received much greater attention and they have been used well by candidates.
- In the past two years development work has been a focus for improvement and it is pleasing to note there has been a major improvement. Weaknesses tend to be in full centres as opposed to individual candidates. Some candidates failed to develop the product shape and decoration and merely saw technique samples as a means of practising techniques not establishing the most appropriate for their product. They should consider spending more time testing out their ideas and less on merely drawing out their design development. Many creative ideas were often presented without any regard for the techniques or construction required for the final realisation.
- Excellent disassembly activities were often included in the folders and proved of real value in the development of the product.
- There has been a marked increase in the number of candidates who produce mock-ups and planning for making has been detailed and accurate.
- Increased funding has enabled our candidates to continue enjoying the benefits of modern technology and again the use of ICT has improved and moderators have enjoyed looking at some very innovative work again this year. It has become a natural, more integral part of candidates' work with wider evidence of it being used as a tool to aid the process. The use of the Internet as a means to researching existing products has been invaluable and perhaps in some ways responsible for the greater variation in products and an improved level of product design. The work of other artists and designers is so easily accessible. Other examples of good practice were the use of digital cameras for evidence of making/fitting, scanners, web sites and spreadsheets. There was far more evidence of word processing, the use of Excel, and graphics packages for designing and colourways. There has been again a massive increase in the use of ICT this year with many exploiting fully the use of software and equipment available to them. There was evidence of much more meaningful CAD/CAM work which was directly related to the products being designed.
- When work relating to the wider issues was presented it was as an integral part of the projects and related directly to the products being designed and made. This is an area for development in future years.
- It was encouraging to see a wider range of approaches to product design with many candidates reflecting techniques and methods used by professional designers. There were many instances when industry had become involved with the work of the candidates and designers and manufacturers have offered excellent support and feedback in many centres.
- Several new features have emerged this year. More candidates have completed the design and make task and have gone on to give attention to producing labels, tags and ideas for promotional material and packaging. Owing to the use of ICT this activity has not taken a great amount of time and it has concluded the projects very well.
- Candidates have been more focused and have perhaps worked more quickly through the project resulting in an improvement in testing and evaluating of the final product. Excellent use has been made of the digital camera to record testing and an increased number have evaluated their final outcomes against products already on the market. Power point presentations evaluating and promoting products have also been included.

- Many continue to present their work for moderation in soft, lightweight folders, which is excellent as they protect the work and hold technique samples in place. Coursework is presented in exemplary fashion, highly organised and generally a pleasure for moderators to assess.

Making

There was no evidence to suggest that the 40-hour project had resulted in candidates making products that were insufficiently demanding to meet the assessment criteria at the highest grades. Moderators reported that they had seen some of the most innovative work ever.

- Teachers continue to be more proficient and comfortable with assessing the work and very few adjustments were made to centres marks this year. The level of demand in the made outcomes has increased with only a few centres asking for high grades for simple, undemanding products.
- There was a significant improvement in the quality and degree of complexity of the fashion garments designed and made. Commercial patterns were used wisely as a means of providing a basic pattern for adaptation to suit their design needs. There was little evidence of copying designs and there was an excellent range of garments and fashion accessories particularly when they reflected a chosen theme. There was some particularly impressive work, which was inspired by other cultures. Very few candidates used the ‘Sixties’ fashion brief, which has presented problems in the past. Pop Art proved to be a popular and successful theme particularly when used for fashion bags.
- Most students had enhanced their fabrics or products in some way and many of the products for spaces were outstandingly creative and manufactured with real attention to detail.
- There continues to be some variation in the level of accuracy and finish shown. Some adjustments had to be made to very exciting, creative work because the actual level of finish was weak.
- It is important for candidates to remember that the assessment criteria for making are not just concerned with the completed outcome. Plans for making, experimentation, testing and trials plus other evidence of making skills shown during development and presented in the folder are taken into consideration.

Short Course

There was a significant reduction in the number of candidates entered for the short course. Unfortunately much of the work produced did not reflect 20 hours and a great deal of it resembled full course projects. Candidates are clearly struggling with reducing the folder content while still addressing the assessment criteria at the highest levels.

Comments on the Full Course given above are also relevant to the Short Course.

- Candidates need to be advised on choosing suitable design briefs as many were too demanding and insufficiently focused.
- Careful planning before embarking on the project is vital. Realistic and proportional time for the various stages and activities must be planned and adhered to.
- Analysing the task in more depth will eliminate wasteful research.
- Candidates are not expected to produce the same quantity of ideas.
- Workable design solutions need producing quickly in order for candidates to spend two thirds of their time on making activities.
- Moderators continue to be impressed with the made outcomes produced by candidates following this demanding course. Some excellent innovative practical work was again presented for moderation.

Conclusion

The 40/20-hour issue was always going to be an anxiety for teachers. However they have placed their trust in the Board and worked to the coursework standards presented. The moderation team have felt enormous pride in the ability of our young designers and in our Textile teaching profession for the way they have worked so professionally and so hard to ensure this specification was an improvement to be enjoyed as well as being a success this year.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Full Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3547/F	125	140	67.8	18.3
3547/C	95	210	119.4	37.0
Foundation tier overall 3547	--	350	186.78	47.51

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3547/F boundary mark	raw	125	74	63	52	42	32
	scaled	140	83	71	58	47	36
3547/C boundary mark	raw	95	58	46	34	22	10
	scaled	210	128	102	75	49	22
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		350	208	170	133	96	59

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3547/H	125	140	85.5	17.6
3547/C	95	210	174.9	27.6
Higher tier overall 3547	--	350	260.35	38.63

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
3547/H boundary mark	raw	125	94	83	72	62	47	-
	scaled	140	105	93	81	69	53	-
3547/C boundary mark	raw	95	95	83	70	58	46	-
	scaled	210	210	183	155	128	102	-
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		350	311	273	235	198	154	132

Although component grade boundaries are provided, these are advisory. Candidates' final grades depend on their total marks for the subject. In particular, A* is determined on candidates' total marks, not on each component, and candidates do not have to obtain 95 marks on the coursework component in order to gain grade A* on the subject as a whole.

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (15345 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	35.8	64.9	81.9	91.5	96.8

Higher tier (18933 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	8.1	41.0	75.7	93.9	98.9	99.4

Overall (34278 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	4.4	22.5	41.4	67.6	83.5	91.5	95.8	98.2

Short Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3557/F	100	120	62.1	15.8
3557/C	95	180	92.7	32.1
Foundation tier overall 3557	--	300	155.64	40.93

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3557/F boundary mark	raw	100	63	55	47	40	33
	scaled	120	76	66	56	48	40
3557/C boundary mark	raw	95	59	47	35	23	11
	scaled	180	112	89	66	44	21
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		300	182	152	122	92	62

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3557/H	100	120	79.9	17.0
3557/C	95	180	145.6	26.4
Higher tier overall 3557	--	300	225.61	36.43

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
3557/H boundary mark	raw	100	93	79	65	52	36	-
	scaled	120	112	95	78	62	43	-
3557/C boundary mark	raw	95	95	83	71	59	47	-
	scaled	180	180	157	135	112	89	-
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		300	282	247	210	174	132	111

Although component grade boundaries are provided, these are advisory. Candidates' final grades depend on their total marks for the subject. In particular, A* is determined on candidates' total marks, not on each component, and candidates do not have to obtain 95 marks on the coursework component in order to gain grade A* on the subject as a whole.

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (449 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	27.6	56.9	74.2	88.6	95.5

Higher tier (921 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	3.5	32.4	68.9	89.4	97.7	98.0

Overall (1370 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	2.3	21.8	46.4	69.1	84.3	90.2	95.0	97.2

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum (scaled) mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade. Although component grade boundaries are provided, these are advisory. Candidates' final grades depend only on their total marks for the subject.

Mean Mark: is the sum of all candidates' marks divided by the number of candidates. In order to compare mean marks for different components, the mean mark (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Standard Deviation: a measure of the spread of candidates' marks. In most components, approximately two-thirds of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean, and approximately 95% of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean. In order to compare the standard deviations for different components, the standard deviation (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).