

Design and Technology: Textiles Technology

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J307**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **J047**

OCR Report to Centres

June 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2012

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Design and Technology: Textile Technology (J307)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Design and Technology: Textile Technology (J047)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Overview	1
Moderation Report on GCSE Design and Technology: Textiles Technology	5
A571 Introduction to Designing and Prototyping	8
A572 Sustainable Design	12
A573 Making Quality Products	15
A574 Technical Aspects of Designing and Making	17

Overview

This report provides an overview of the work seen in the written examination Units 2 and 4 and the Controlled Assessment Units 1 and 3, for candidates who took the examination during this series. It precedes a more detailed report to centres from each subject area within the Innovator Suite and highlights general issues that have occurred across the suite of specifications.

This report has been prepared by the Chief Examiner, Assistant Chief Examiners, Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators and covers all specifications within the Innovator Suite. It should be read in conjunction with the examination papers, the mark schemes, and the marking criteria for assessment given in the specification booklets.

This is the second examination series in the third year for the new Innovator Suite.

A reminder: An important point for teachers to note about the Terminal Rule in relation to this suite of specifications and re-sits: The terminal rule is an Ofqual requirement. Candidates must be entered for at least two units out of the four (full course) at the time that they certificate. ie the end of the course.

Please be aware that the Ofqual rule states that marks scored for terminal units will be the marks used in the calculation of candidate grades. Therefore, if one of the candidate's terminal units is a re-sit and the mark is poorer than the original mark, the poorer mark will be used to calculate the final grade for that candidate.

Obviously, the terminal unit marks are then added to the highest marks scored in the other units making up the certificate.

Centres are reminded that it is also a requirement of Ofqual that candidates are now credited for their accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar across all four units.

It is pleasing to see that centres and candidates have continued to respond well to the new style of examination approach. Centres are to be commended for this.

It is obvious that Centres have benefitted from previous reports and training sessions available for the qualifications.

Written Examination – Units 2 and 4

Unit 2 – For this examination series of the GCSE Innovator suite entries were seen from all six subject specialisms.

The overall performance and range of results for Unit 2 was generally the same as seen in the last examination session – January 2012. It was pleasing to see that many candidates had been well prepared for the examination by Centres and clearly had a sufficient knowledge base to answer the questions. It has been encouraging to see that candidates have been able to access the higher marks.

In **Unit 2 – Section A** of the papers most candidates across the suite attempted to answer all questions, with few candidates giving no response (NR) answers. It was noticeable that, at times, candidates had not read the instructions correctly and centres would benefit from explaining the correct examination requirements to the candidates. Candidates need to be encouraged to give an answer for the multiple choice style questions even if they are uncertain that they are correct. Centres are reminded that questions 1–15 cover the grade range from A* to U.

There was less duplication of circling answers seen during this examination session.

Important: Centres need to be aware that where a candidate has provided multiple answers to a single response question, no marks will be awarded.

Unit 2 – Section B of the papers showed a greater mixture of responses and teachers need to ensure they read the subject specific reports for further detailed feedback on specific issues and individual question performance.

Important: Candidates need to be careful that they do not repeat the question in their answer or write the same answer for several questions. Similarly candidates must not use certain terms as ‘stock’ answers. Such answers included:

- ‘Environmentally friendly’ and ‘better for the environment’ or ‘damages the environment’.
- To ‘recycle’ and ‘recycling is good for the environment’.
- ‘Cheaper’, ‘better’ and ‘stronger’.

The questions marked with an asterisk * provided candidates with an opportunity to give a detailed written answer combining good subject knowledge with an ability to produce a structured response. There has been a significant improvement in the written response style question this session, with candidates giving detailed answers combining good subject knowledge with a clear, structured response.

It was noticeable this session, that where extra paper was required to continue a question response, many candidates failed to reference the question number thus compromising marks. It is important therefore, that centres teach candidates how to highlight where they are continuing an answer on a different page in the examination document.

Centres are reminded that candidates are assessed on spelling, punctuation and grammar on the banded mark scheme question.

It is also important to note that candidates need to ensure that they write legibly and within the areas set out on the papers.

Unit 4 – For this examination series of the Innovator suite entries were seen from all six subject specialisms.

It was encouraging to see improvements in candidate performance across the Innovator suite this session. The following improvements were noted:

- Candidates appeared to be better prepared to ‘tackle’ the questions than in previous sessions.
- Candidates managed their time effectively, most attempted all of the questions and there were fewer No Response (NR) answers recorded.
- A better standard of response to the Quality of Written Communication questions was seen.
- More candidates demonstrated high levels of knowledge and understanding and were able to access the higher marks.

It was encouraging to see however, that most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the technical aspects of designing and making across the specifications.

Important Note: Candidates need to:

- **Read through the complete question before attempting to answer.** The examination includes sufficient reading time for candidates to focus on the key points to address in their answers. It was pleasing to see that some candidates produced a ‘plan of action’ before giving their answer to the questions with a high mark allocation.

- **Look carefully at the mark allocation and available space for their answers.** Candidates need to be aware that there is a relationship between the space available and the length and quality of the expected answer, and thus the mark allocated.
- **Have a better understanding of the different command words used throughout the exam paper in order to respond appropriately to the questions.** Across the suite there were many answers that lacked detail and clarity. Terms such as ‘cheaper’, ‘quicker’ and ‘easier’ were often used and meant very little without qualification or justification.
- **Become familiar with the quality of written communication questions marked with an asterisk*.** These questions provide candidates with the opportunity to give detailed written answers combining good subject knowledge with an ability to produce structured, **coherent** responses and accurate spelling. Simply repeating the same point several times will not lead to the award of marks. A list of bullet points does not represent an adequate answer and will compromise the higher marks. Practice of this type of question which carries [6] marks is strongly recommended.
- **Respond to specification and/or bullet points accurately.** In design type questions this is important if the candidate is to achieve the maximum marks available.
- **Make sketches large and clear enough to convey meaning.** It is equally important that notes should be clearly written and reinforce what appears in the sketches.
- **Make their answers clear and technically accurate.** In questions that require candidates to produce sketches and notes, it is essential that answers are made as clear and technically accurate as possible. Marks may be compromised through illegible handwriting and poor quality sketches.

Controlled Assessment – Units 1 and 3

This examination series has seen portfolios for all subject specialisms being submitted for Unit 1 and Unit 3 both through postal and repository pathways. Most centres have been prompt in the dispatch of documentation to OCR and moderators, which is to be commended. **It is important that Centres return the request for portfolios within three days.**

Centres are reminded to forward form CCS160 in particular to moderators. It is helpful if centres also include a record of the marks allocated to each candidate, for each of the marking criteria sections.

Important Note: Candidates producing paper portfolios should be entered for postal (02) moderation. Candidates producing their portfolio on a CD or memory stick should also be entered for postal (02) moderation.

Centres must ensure that if candidates are entered through the repository (01), the portfolios must be uploaded via Interchange and **NOT** sent through to the moderator on a disc. The preferred format of files presented for this type of moderation needs to be PowerPoint, PDF or Word, with work saved in ONE file only and numbered, not as individual sheets saved in different files.

In general, Centres have been successful in applying the marking criteria for both Units 1 and 3. Centres are reminded to apply the mark scheme on a ‘best fit’ basis which may mean allocating marks across the assessment grid. Marks should be positive, rewarding achievement rather than penalising failure or omissions.

It was still evident that a significant number of portfolios, particularly for Unit 1, resembled the legacy format, especially in terms of the excessive research and inappropriate critical evaluation.

It is important that centres encourage candidates to organise the portfolio according to the different marking criteria strands as it enables the candidates to produce work that clearly shows an understanding of the controlled assessment requirements. Portfolios should be clearly labelled with the Candidate and Centre name and number, with the unit code and title also evident. (*Specification – 5.3.5 Presentation of work*) This is particularly important when the Centre submits work via the OCR Repository, where individual files are used to store portfolio work. Centres need to ensure that candidates clearly label each file using the marking criteria section headings; this facilitates a more effective completion of the moderation process.

Important: Centres are also reminded to ensure that the OCR cover sheet is included with each portfolio of work, **outlining the theme and the starting point chosen by the candidate.**

JCQ documentation on Controlled Assessment (September 2011 – August 2012) clearly states that any guidance given to candidates must be clearly recorded. *4.5.2 When marking the work, teachers/assessors **must not** give credit in regard to any additional assistance given to candidates beyond that which is described in the specification and **must** give details of any additional assistance on the appropriate record form(s). **This includes providing writing frames specific to the task.** (eg outlines, paragraph headings or section headings).* In light of the information given above, Centres need to take care when using writing frames in the controlled assessment portfolios.

Many candidates included a bibliography or referenced their research sources, which was pleasing to see. **It is good practice to ensure that candidates acknowledge sources of information used for the development of their portfolio work.** *5.3.2 Definitions of the Controls* section in the specification states: “*The teacher must be able to authenticate the work and insist on acknowledgement and referencing of any sources used*”.

Centres are to be reminded that the ‘*controlled assessment task must NOT be used as practice material and then as the actual live assessment material. Centres should devise their own practice material using the OCR specimen controlled assessment task as guidance.*’ *Specification – Section 5.2.2 Using Controlled Assessment Tasks.*

Resits – Centres must remember that the theme, starting point and research aspects of the portfolio can be maintained. However, the remaining portfolio and final prototype should be redeveloped for submission.

It is a requirement in the Making criteria that candidates “*demonstrate an understanding and ability in solving technical problems*”. **Centres must therefore ensure that problems encountered are written into the record of making, for the higher marks.**

4.1 ‘Schemes of Assessment’ clearly states that “*A Minimum of two digital images/photographs of the final product showing front and back views*” should be evident in the candidate portfolio. **It is the centre’s responsibility to ensure that photographs are evident, are of a good quality and are of the candidate’s own work.**

Moderation Report on GCSE Design and Technology: Textiles Technology

This report provides an overview of the work seen in the Controlled Assessment Units A571 – Introduction to designing and making and A573 – Making Quality Products, for candidates who took the examination during this session.

This report has been prepared by the Principal Moderator and Team Leaders and covers both specifications J307 and J047 (short course). It should be read in conjunction with the marking criteria for assessment outlined in the specification.

This is the third examination year for the Innovator Suite Specification in Textiles Technology J307 and J047. Entries have been seen for both Units A571 and A573 this session.

CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT – J307

Controlled Assessment for this specification can be submitted by post or as an electronic version via the OCR Repository. Where Centres submitted portfolios for electronic assessment, moderation was efficient and effective.

Important Note: Centres must ensure that if candidates are entered through the repository (01), the marks must be downloaded onto the OCR site and **NOT** sent through to the moderator on a disc. This is classed as being a postal (02) moderation.

Centres submitting portfolios by post for the June series have been prompt in the dispatch of documentation; MS1 and form CCS160 to OCR and moderators. **It is important for centres to note that form CCS160 needs to be sent with the MS1 to the moderator.**

Most centres have made clear links to the sustainability aspect of the specification for Unit 1, either through the theme selected or points covered in the candidate specification. This is to be commended.

The quality of practical prototypes seen this session has been of a very good standard.

Most Centres are to be commended on the amount of work produced for the portfolios, which has been realistic in terms of the amount. There is concern that some Centres are spending more than the allocated time of 20 hours producing the work. Care needs to be taken here.

The majority of Centres included a Coursework Summary Form (CSF) or cover sheet illustrating the breakdown of individual marks for each candidate. This is a useful document which helps the moderator to understand where a centre has allocated the marking criteria. This allows for more accurate feedback to Centres and its inclusion is strongly recommended.

Centres are reminded that it is not necessary to make reference to, or include notes, about specific industrial methods of production within Units A571 or A573.

It is a requirement for the Controlled Assessment Unit A571 component to consist of one portfolio where candidates are expected to design and make a **prototype textile product**. The Specification clearly states in the Making criteria that materials selected must be 'appropriate to realise the **textile** product'. Centres must ensure therefore, that candidates produce a prototype that is textile based.

The portfolio work **only** needs to be seen during moderation. Centres are requested not to send any practical work with the portfolio. Similarly, the Centre only needs to forward the portfolios of the selected sample.

Work should be removed from ring binders, presented so that pages can be turned without having to remove sheets from plastic wallets and securely fastened together eg by means of a tag, then clearly labelled with Centre Number, Name and Candidate Number. Mark sheet/annotation sheet should be attached to each piece of work.

Important: Centres are to ensure that they make reference to the present Specification available on the OCR website (revised January 2010 version) when assessing candidate's work. The OCR Textiles Technology text book (Hodder Education) has an error in the marking criteria for A571, which has been addressed by Hodder Education.

Marks should read:

Cultural Understanding	= 5 marks max
Creativity	= 5 marks max
Designing	= 14 marks max
Making	= 28 marks max (20, 4, 4)
Evaluation	= 8 marks max

THEMES SET

Candidates must select **one** of the eleven published themes from the specification. Starting points linked to the theme may be modified to suit candidate and/or centre circumstances. However, the theme itself must **not** be altered.

The themes most popular this series for Unit A571 were 'Eco-wear', 'Recycled Denim', and 'Traditional Techniques'.

Important: Centres need to ensure that the theme and starting point is clearly stated on the front of each portfolio or on the Controlled Assessment Cover Sheet (CCS) which includes a 'Task Title' box allowing space for the theme to be entered.

Centres have been realistic in the setting of tasks this examination session.

Care must be taken to ensure that the candidate does not mistake the starting point for their design brief. Marks may be compromised if the candidate's own design brief is not evident in the portfolio.

APPLICATION OF THE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

On the whole centres have interpreted the marking criteria well, applying the marks appropriately and fairly across all criteria areas. However, it has been necessary, in some instances this series, to make adjustments to bring candidate's marks in line with the agreed National Standard. Where any adjustments have been made, this is as a result of misinterpretation of the marking criteria or a lack of evidence to justify the marks awarded in the portfolio.

Point to note: The Report to Centres is an important document where issues raised from moderation are highlighted and suggestions for improvement given. It is recommended that all staff responsible for the delivery of this specification read this document thoroughly.

ANNOTATION OF THE CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT PORTFOLIO AND RECORDING OF MARKS

It is pleasing to see that centres are using the Controlled Assessment Cover Sheet; CCS, issued by OCR, showing where and how the marks have been awarded for each assessment area. This has greatly helped in making the moderation process quicker, fairer and more accurate and is particularly helpful in the moderation of the 'Making' section where there are larger mark ranges.

Important – The understanding and solving of technical problems (4 marks for Unit 1 and 6 marks for Unit 3) is a marking strand that needs to be evident in the **writing of the key stages of making** in order for the higher mark to be awarded. This section caused the most concern this session with Centres awarding full marks for very little evidence. Care must be taken here.

On the whole, centres have recorded and totalled marks accurately. However, there has been an increase in the number of errors recorded through incorrect/differing data this session.

It is helpful to encourage candidates to organise the portfolios according to the criteria areas. This reduces the need to annotate the work itself and makes identifying marks during moderation easier and quicker. It was noticeable this series that candidates had presented their portfolio's with care and thought. Centres are to be commended for this practice.

Points to note:

- It is important that candidates include acknowledgements or a bibliography in the portfolio. Marks can be compromised if this is not evident. There was a noticeable increase once again this series, in the number of candidate portfolios without reference to research sources.
- It is essential that the candidate includes photographic evidence of their prototype/product in the portfolio. 'A minimum of two digital images/photographs of the final product' is required in the evaluation section. (4.1 of the specification). Photographic evidence of the key stages of production is also required in the 'Making' section of the marking criteria for controlled assessments (Appendix B of the specification). Marks may be compromised if candidates do not provide sufficient evidence of making.

A571 Introduction to Designing and Prototyping

Cultural Understanding

In most cases candidates work towards a design brief by analysing examples of how designing and making reflects and influences culture and society.

If a questionnaire was used, successful candidates analysed the results in relation to user lifestyle, personal choice and the design need. However, it was noticeable this series that more candidates relied upon quantity rather than quality, with a lot of time being directed into producing a questionnaire and analysing every question whether relevant or not. This can be completed through a written summary only; the actual questionnaire does not need to be evident in the portfolio.

It has been noticeable that candidates are still not providing enough detailed evidence in relation to the identification and comparison of appropriate textile examples to show how lifestyle and choice can be improved for the consumer. Centres need to be careful that they do not streamline/over-simplify this section too much and compromise the high mark.

Mood boards when used were, on the whole, appropriate and annotated to show design direction. Successful candidates were able to illustrate how different cultures, fashion periods, designers etc influenced consumer choice and lifestyle.

Creativity

On the whole centres have tackled this criteria area with confidence. Research was relevant and appropriate to the theme. It was encouraging to see centres suggesting appropriate research into sustainable design and the 6 R's in relation to designer and high street products relevant to the candidate starting point.

Centres need to be mindful that copious notes based around the 6R's, recycling and sustainability are not a requirement of this unit.

Good use of the internet has been seen, with centres ensuring that internet research is only one aspect of candidate's research and does not exclude other, relevant avenues. However, it is evident that candidates are not acknowledging sources when used and this is an area that needs addressing by Centres.

Few candidates fully demonstrated creative competence. The higher attaining candidates very successfully, and with creative competence, analysed their products showing clear and appropriate design and make direction.

They were able to:

- illustrate how the use of past and present trends have helped to inform design ideas and high street trends, with many candidates capitalising upon the wealth of ideas available from designers, fashion era's, high street stores etc.
- choose existing products appropriate to their theme and starting point. These were investigated and evaluated in depth, with relevant conclusions drawn.

Designing

Most candidates have a clear understanding of the difference between the theme, starting point and the design brief. However, care must be taken here to ensure that the design brief has been developed as a considered response through appropriate research into the starting point. Candidates cannot be credited marks for identifying the starting point as the design brief.

Design briefs need to be kept 'brief', to the point, and not become too lengthy and lacking in focus.

Important: Care needs to be taken to ensure that the candidate does not write the design brief too early in the portfolio, thus stifling a range of creative and varied design ideas from being developed. This was a concern this session with many portfolios illustrating a lack of design variety.

Most candidates presented specifications of a high standard this session – the best of these:

- being detailed and providing the basis for design and development work in later criteria areas.
- incorporating a reference to environmental awareness/sustainable design.
- referencing the production of a working prototype NOT a 'quality' product.

Specifications with 'how to achieve' points are not substantial enough for the higher marks and greater care must be taken here by candidates. Greater care needs to be taken here.

Designing is still enjoyed by most candidates and some good work has been seen, which is to be commended. This said, it was a concern to see that this section was the least well executed area of the portfolio this session. The quality and variety of sketching and range of methods used were not particularly polished or very creative.

There is increased evidence of candidates still fully evaluating their design ideas against the specification for this unit. This is not a requirement for Unit 1. Care must also be taken to ensure that the ideas presented by the candidate are different in style and shape, not just colour and pattern for the higher marks.

There has been very little evidence of CAD specialist design software in this section this examination session.

Candidates who achieve high marks will have:

- presented a wide range of freestyle illustrated and annotated design proposals/sketches and identified the final idea. These will have been annotated referencing important features, components and materials/fabrics only.
- Included creative and original ideas that are fully developed into a final idea with some modelling relevant to the theme.

Good modelling of a whole product or important features/details of an item (in paper or fabric) helps the candidate to access the higher marks and to realise the textile prototype product.

Making

It is noticeable this series that candidates are moving towards producing less complex, prototype products which can be completed within the recommended time limit of 12 hours for this criteria area. This is to be commended. However, centres need to be careful that products requiring less skill, do not compromise the high mark.

The Specification clearly states in the Making criteria that materials selected must be ‘appropriate to realise the **textile** product’. Centres must ensure therefore, that candidates produce a prototype that is textile based.

The range of prototype products seen this session has been encouraging and has covered mainly garments and fashion items.

Teacher annotation in this section showing how marks have been awarded continues to be most helpful to assist accurate moderation and this is to be encouraged.

Candidates that did well have:

- Made detailed references to an appropriate production system/step by step plan which is relevant to the actual textile prototype made.
- Highlighted all technical problems (in writing) encountered through the making process. This helps to structure in-depth and rigorous analysis of the making and design process.
- Included the use of ICT to produce effective work-flow charts.
- Used good quality photographic evidence and comprehensive notes, to show the key stages of making the prototype textile product/item. This helps to reinforce decisions made about alterations/modifications, choice of components etc and is to be encouraged in helping the candidate to highlight good working practice. (Key stages can be defined as the following: pattern lay, cutting out, marking of important features, sewing stages, insertion of fastenings, stages of a technique and/or construction/decorative feature, finishing detail, final product)

Points to note:

- Care and attention to the details in this criteria area was varied and often this area was over-marked, with too much weight given to the solving technical problems in particular. There must be written evidence for the higher marks.
- Centres need to remember that comprehensive notes **AND** photographic evidence of the key stages of production, need to be evident for the higher marks. It was noticeable this session that candidates had not included enough photographic evidence of the making process for the marks awarded.

Critical Evaluation

It is still a concern to see that the majority of candidates have tended to evaluate the portfolio and final realisation against the specification. This is not a requirement for Unit 1. Candidates should **only** evaluate the processes involved in making and designing the prototype product.

Candidates who had evaluated the making process had done this well and achieved full marks.

Further developments by better candidates identified modifications to their own production system rather than the actual prototype product. Weaker candidates were restricted in this section when they had not thought through their ideas, and produced a thorough and complete plan of action.

Candidates have benefited from the use of digital photography and **must** present at least **two** photographs of their prototype in this section. Marks will be compromised if photographs are not evident in the portfolio for this section.

It is important to remember that candidates' work should show clear progression and demonstrate an accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar for marks to be awarded in this criteria area. It is difficult to allocate marks within this area, when much of the candidates' work is reliant on teacher direction or when writing frames and pre-printed sheets have been used to guide candidate response. Care must be taken here.

It is important that high achieving candidates are given the opportunity to show flair and creativity in approaching the assessment criteria.

Few Centres had any evidence of referencing/bibliography in this unit once again this session.

A572 Sustainable Design

The overall performance and range of results was similar to the last examination session- January 2012. The paper proved to be accessible to all candidates and a good range of differentiated responses were seen throughout the paper. There were plenty of opportunities for candidates of all levels to access the questions and gain marks.

Candidates generally performed better on the section A of the paper. Many candidates had been well prepared for the examination and clearly had sufficient knowledge to answer the questions. Some candidates were able to access the higher marks and there was significant improvement in the written response style question 17d* with candidates giving detailed answers combining good subject knowledge with an ability to produce a structured response.

However there was still some evidence of candidates not having covered the whole of the A572 unit. This was evident in question 17d where candidates did not understand life cycle analysis, Q18a(i) regenerated fibres and 18c- medical textiles and the application of smart modern materials.

With reference to section A of the paper it was noticeable that candidates generally attempted all of the multiple choice questions and the true or false questions with the majority also attempting the remaining five questions that vary in style and required response. Candidates should be encouraged to have a guess at these types of questions if unsure, rather than giving no response at all. There were still questions where candidates gave 'no response' and these generally appeared on questions 7, 8 and 10. It is disappointing to see candidates not attempting some of the questions in section A.

On some short response questions some candidates wrote down several answers for a one response question. When multiple answers are given to a single response question, candidates will lose the mark for a correct answer if an incorrect answer is also given. Some candidates penalised themselves by supplying multiple answers. This is referred to as a 'scattergun' answer. On this paper this was particularly evident on questions 6 and 16a(i). It is therefore critical that candidates are taught to answer the question specifically rather than write everything they think they know.

Section B of the paper requires candidates to give some answers in more depth. Some candidates wasted time and space by re writing the question before they began their answer. Many candidates also presented answers to 'explain' and 'discuss' style questions as a haphazard collection of facts, not necessarily relating to the question and through repetition of answers. Answers need to be in sufficient depth to merit marks and need to relate to the question asked. Explanations were often vague and did not convey sufficient understanding to warrant marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

- 1 A high percentage of candidates were able to correctly identify British Standards Institute.
- 2 The majority of candidates answered rejects correctly.
- 3 Well answered; with a high majority of students correctly identifying that 'good conditions for workers' is a moral issue.

- 4 There was a disappointing response to this question with many candidates giving the whole range of incorrect answers with a proportion of candidates correctly identifying 'taking photographs'.
- 5 There was a mixed response to this question, with the slight majority answering 'oil' correctly.
- 6 Many candidates were able to answer this correctly although some candidates lost marks due to the 'scattergun' approach.
- 7 This was poorly answered by the majority of candidates with many NR responses. This question was targeted at A grade candidates and it was generally the higher scoring candidates who correctly wrote about size and measurement of the product or how it fits in their answer.
- 8 There was a variable response to this question. Many candidates knew the correct answer and it had clearly been taught in many centres. There were however also a number of NR responses for this question.
- 9 A good response to this question with the correct answer being 'toxic'.
- 10 This was poorly answered by the majority of candidates with many NR responses. This question was targeted at the A/A* candidates and it differentiated well. For some candidates there was confusion with the 'I' industry and institute being the most commonly seen wrong answers, the correct answer being Initiative.
- 11 A mixed response with many candidates answering this incorrectly.
- 12 The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.
- 13 The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.
- 14 The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.
- 15 The majority of candidates answered this question incorrectly.

Section B

- 16 (a) (i) The high majority of candidates answered this correctly, 'jeans' being the most common answer. A few candidates failed to score marks as they just said denim and some lost marks due to the scattergun approach.
(ii) Well answered with a range of answers from the mark scheme seen. The most common ones related to cost, reducing waste and materials not going to landfill sites. There were some candidates who did not read the question correctly and wrote about the performance characteristics of the fabrics they were reusing.
- (b) This question differentiated well with the more able candidates scoring high or full marks. Some excellent responses were seen for the aesthetics section of the question, with the functionality description being at times repetitive and unclear. Functionality – candidates generally made reference to the product being fit for purpose and meeting the customer requirements, a few were able to relate to size and the advantages of pockets. Aesthetics – candidates scored better on this usually referring to appearance, customer appeal, colour and pattern.

- (c) This question was well answered by a high number of candidates. Most candidates scored at least one mark for knowing it was the Fairtrade symbol. Many candidates then wrote about workers receiving a fair wage and working conditions, and how this is important to the consumer. Many candidates scored full marks.
- 17 (a) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates clearly able to correctly identify two pre-manufactured standard components. The most typical responses related to the zip and the button.
- (b) The majority of candidates attempted to answer this question and it differentiated well. The more able candidates were clearly able to identify four points with the most typical answers showing reference to natural fibres, recycled materials, not using chemicals and reference to carbon footprint.
- (c) There was a mixed response seen to this question with a combination of excellent full mark answers showing clear and well written responses relating to the breaking down of products, reformulating fibres and the typical example of plastic bottles being used to make fleece fabric. However some candidates were completely unsure and gave muddled answers relating to recycling three times. A number of NR responses were also seen on this question.
- (d*) Product lifestyle had clearly been taught by many centres and it was pleasing to see many candidates scoring in the top mark boundary. Responses this examination session were much improved. It was clear that many candidates had had practice at answering banded response style questions. There were a few candidates who scored in the lowest band; this was because their answers did not show a thorough description and use of specialist terms. Some candidates used the space at the side of the question to note the key facts they wanted to discuss and generally these were the higher scoring answers.
- 18 (a) (i) This question and the answer regenerated fibres was not well known by the majority of the candidates, only higher scoring candidates answered this well.
- (ii) This question was not well answered. Some candidates did not read the question and wrote wrongly about performance characteristics of the fibres. The most common correct answers referred to recyclable, biodegradable and renewable/sustainable advantages.
- (iii) Generally well answered. The most common correct responses were related to soft/smooth/comfortable and strong/durable/hardwearing. Some candidates failed to score two marks as they put the same characteristic twice eg soft/comfortable.
- (b) Many correct answers the most typical responses seen being solar/water.
- (c) There was a mixed response seen to this question. Many candidates only scored two marks as they did not fully explain their answers clearly enough to gain two marks per point. In some cases the vague use of poor terminology and 'not good for the environment' answers meant they only scored one or two marks. Candidates need to ensure they are able to clearly recognise the key words used in a question and where an 'explain' trigger word is used ensure they give sufficient detailed answers.
- (d) Many candidates did not read this question clearly and gave numerous examples of smart and modern materials but not related to medical textiles. A high proportion of candidates just listed products and again candidates are reminded of the need to ensure they read the question stem carefully. Generally, a disappointing range of responses with only the higher scoring candidates achieving good marks.

A573 Making Quality Products

Designing

Candidates are asked to demonstrate an appropriate response to a design brief initiated from their theme/starting point and produce a specification. Responses therefore need to be relevant, clear and thorough to achieve the high mark.

Some Centres had spent too much time on research which lacked thorough conclusions. In a few cases, notes about production methods and how to complete various construction and decorative techniques were included in the portfolio. This is not necessary in Unit 3 and will not be allocated marks.

Candidates do not need to include product analysis in this Unit. It is sufficient to add a detailed and informed personal analysis of aspects of the theme that has inspired the candidate. This information can then help the candidate to formulate a detailed specification.

Successful candidates are able to:

- illustrate how the use of past and present trends has helped to inform design ideas, capitalising upon the wealth of inspiration available from designers, fashion era's etc.
- present their background research based around the theme/starting point concisely and on no more than 4 x A3 sheets.
- write a detailed specification making reference to a quality product, providing the basis for design and development work in later criteria areas.
- produce a clear, concise design brief.
- present a wide range of creative and innovative design ideas (up to 6 detailed, not sketches) with care and thought using appropriate strategies from CAD, use of swatches and mixed media illustration work.
- Include detailed annotation of their design ideas in relation to the specification and clearly identified their final design idea, with reference to their specification.

Point to note: Writing specifications with 'how to achieve' points are not substantial enough for the higher marks.

Making

The candidate is required to produce a **quality** product and clearly demonstrate (in writing) how to solve any technical problems they have encountered for the higher marks.

The range of quality products seen this session has been encouraging and has covered mainly garments, fashion items and wall panels. There were a few Centres this session where the final piece did not constitute a 'quality product' and resembled more of a prototype.

Care must be taken to ensure that there is sufficient visual evidence to support the use of quality checks when making.

Point to note: Marks may be compromised if detailed and clear photographic evidence of the key stages, with reference to quality checks is not evident within the portfolio.

Teacher annotation in this section showing how marks have been awarded continues to be most helpful to assist accurate moderation and this is to be encouraged.

NB Points considered for Unit A571 in this report also apply to this section.

Critical Evaluation

Candidates should evaluate the product against the **specification** in this unit and include relevant and detailed testing strategies.

Candidates should include at least two photographs of their final product. An inside photograph showing finishes, seams etc is encouraged to illustrate the completion of a quality product.

Once again few Centres had any evidence of referencing/bibliography in this unit this session.

NB Points considered for Unit A571 in this report also apply to this section.

A574 Technical Aspects of Designing and Making

Overall, candidates seemed better prepared for this paper than they were in the January series and marks were awarded across the range, although there were a few candidates who achieved very low marks. Most questions were attempted and there was a significant improvement in the number of candidates attempting the longer response questions.

There was evidence of specific technical knowledge in a significant number of papers about both fibres and fabrics and techniques. Some candidates continue to give vague answers and therefore cannot gain maximum marks.

Candidates still struggle to provide good quality answers to the Quality of Written Communication questions. More candidates are structuring their answers in an appropriate way, but many still do not provide sufficient detail. Candidates should be encouraged to use technical terms and appropriate vocabulary when answering these questions.

Some candidates made use of the additional page at the end of the paper and most indicated which question they were answering. Candidates need to be encouraged to indicate if the answer to a question is continued on the additional page near where the answer should be written.

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates scored 2 or 3 marks for this question. Some gave answers such as 'hair tied back' or 'no loose clothing' which did not relate to checks on the sewing machine and therefore did not gain marks. Some candidates gave several checks relating to correct threading of the sewing machine rather than a range of checks to carry out. There was some confusion between the foot control and the presser foot in some answers.

Good answers referred to checking plugs and wires and ensuring the stitch settings were correct for the job.

- (b) Most candidates were able to identify zigzag stitch, but fewer correctly named straight stitch, often calling it 'plain stitch' or 'normal stitch'. Some candidates adopted the 'scattergun' approach and provided multiple answers, expecting the examiner to select the correct one. Candidates who used this approach did not gain any marks.
- (c) Some candidates confused the technique of free machine embroidery with computer controlled embroidery and therefore did not gain maximum marks. Marks were gained for preparation and finishing, including the use of an embroidery ring, changing or removing the presser foot and lowering the feed dogs. There was evidence that correct terms had not been used, for example, candidates wrote hoop/loop/ring rather than embroidery ring and 'teeth' rather than feed dogs.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates who wrote in general terms about the qualities of polycotton fabrics did not gain full marks for this question. Good answers linked performance characteristics to either the cotton or polyester fibres in the blend and explained why the characteristics were important for the shirt. Some candidates gained a mark for giving the reason for blending fibres.

- (b) (i) Most candidates were able to identify a place on the shirt where interfacing would be used, the most popular answers being collar, cuffs and pocket.
- (ii) Many candidates were able to give a reason why interfacing was needed in this area. The most popular correct answers were to strengthen or to stiffen the area.
- (c) It was disappointing that few candidates were able to identify a double stitched seam. The most frequent wrong answer was French seam.
- (d) There were some excellent answers to this question. It was clear where candidates had worked a buttonhole, either by hand or machine and were writing from personal experience. Many candidates made good use of diagrams when answering this question. Unfortunately a significant number of candidates scored less than half marks. Good answers referred to the use of a buttonhole foot, different widths of zigzag for the different stages and cutting the buttonhole after it had been stitched.

Some candidates explained how to fasten a button rather than how to stitch the buttonhole.

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify pleats and therefore scored at least one mark. Candidates need to give a specific product rather than 'clothing' for this type of question and to avoid repeating answers already given. This is another question where some candidates gave a selection of answers for examiners to choose the correct one from the list. Candidates who did this did not gain any marks.
- (b) Few candidates gained marks for this question as they failed to give industrial methods of transferring pattern markings. Hot notcher and drill marker were the most popular correct answers.
- (c) This question took the quality of the written response into account as well as the information provided in the answer. Most candidates wrote in sentences and some used paragraphs. Most candidates gained some marks here, although few provided sufficiently detailed answers to gain full marks. Emphasis was on the making stages and quality checks with the design element being less detailed and mainly related to colour, safety and aesthetics.

Question 4

- (a) To gain full marks for this question, candidates needed to annotate their designs to show how they had met the specification points given in the question as well as providing additional information on factors such as construction techniques, colour, size and decorative techniques. Most candidates scored at least half marks for this question.

Some candidates produced designs for cases not made from fabric, choosing plastic, wood or metal to make their case. Obviously these candidates could not gain many marks.

- (b) Most candidates gained at least one mark, but many candidates had little idea of what pattern pieces should look like, or the information that should be on them. Some produced very detailed pattern pieces showing all of the pattern markings and symbols found on commercial patterns and therefore gained full marks.

- (c) The majority of candidates scored at least one mark, many gaining two. Most correct answers referred to achieving the correct size and shape, the ability to reproduce the product and help with the making stages.

Question 5

- (a) Many candidates were able to identify at least two of the symbols in this question. The tumble dry symbol was often confused with that for a washing machine, and the 'do not bleach' with 'do not iron'. Candidates frequently lost marks for failing to give specific products the symbols would be found on. Answers such as 'clothing' or 'toys' were too vague to be awarded a mark. This was another question where some candidates gave a list of answers for the examiner to choose the correct response from. These candidates did not gain any marks.
- (b) Most candidates scored at least two marks for this question. Many knew natural fibres came from plants and animals and were sustainable and biodegradable. Some knew manufactured fibres were made from chemicals and finite resources such as oil. Some candidates thought natural fibres required no processing and therefore used no energy and caused no pollution. Some candidates used a range of appropriate terms and therefore achieved a higher level of response.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2012

