

Design and Technology: Textiles Technology

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J307**

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

OCR Report to Centres

June 2013

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

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
A571 – Introduction to designing and prototyping	4
A572 – Sustainable design	10
A573 – Making Quality Products	13
A574 – Technical aspects of designing and making	15

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 is the fourth year of the Innovator Suite.

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.

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

Written Examinations – 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 January 2013 series. There are variations within the subject specialisms and Centres would benefit from reading the individual subject reports for this unit.

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. There was also a significant improvement in the extended response style question* this series, with candidates giving detailed answers combining good subject knowledge with an ability to produce a structured response.

In **Section A** of the papers most candidates across the suite attempted to answer all questions, with few candidates giving no response (NR), although these do still occur. Candidates should be encouraged to attempt these types of questions if unsure, rather than giving no response at all.

Candidates generally demonstrated an improved understanding of sustainable design, but were often still hampered by their exam technique. Misunderstanding or misinterpreting the question, or not reading the question carefully enough was evident throughout the suite of papers. Candidates must be encouraged to take notice of the key word in the stem of the question to identify whether the question requires them to explain, describe, discuss, state, name or give.

There was less duplication of answers seen during this examination session, although one area of concern is that of the 'scattergun' approach to answering questions. Candidates need to be aware that where one answer is asked for and multiple answers are given by the candidate, candidates will lose the mark for the correct answer if an incorrect answer is also given. Some candidates approached these questions by supplying multiple answers, writing everything they can think of about the subject. Examiners cannot credit the one correct response out of several provided in a question which explicitly asks for '**one** reason' or '**one** example' because the candidate has not adhered to what has been asked for. It would be unfair on other candidates

who had several possible answers in mind but addressed the question and selected their one final answer to provide rather than 'hedging their bets'.

Section B of the papers showed a greater range of responses in terms of quality and teachers need to ensure they read the subject specific reports for further detailed feedback on specific issues and individual question performance.

Candidates need to be careful that they do not repeat the question in their answer or repeat the same point within their answers.

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. Many candidates did manage to use subject specific terms in their answers, but at times lacked sufficient depth and tended to be repetitive which compromised marks.

Hand writing at times was difficult to decipher and candidates need to do everything possible to ensure that their writing is legible. Centres are reminded that candidates are marked on spelling, punctuation and grammar on this question.

It was noticeable that where extra paper was required to continue a question response, many candidates did not reference the question number on the extra sheets used. It is important that Centres instruct candidates how to highlight where they are continuing an answer on a different page in the examination script to ensure that examiners are clear where an answer continues on a separate page in order that the candidate's full response is considered.

Centres need to be aware that questions may appear on the back page of the examination document and candidates should be encouraged to check carefully that they have completed ALL questions.

Unit 4

For this examination series of the Innovator suite entries were seen from all six subject specialisms. The overall performance of candidates was varied across the suite once again this series.

Some key areas which Principal Examiners have highlighted as giving scope for improvement are as follows:

- Candidates should attempt every question.
- It is important that candidates read the questions carefully to determine exactly what is required before attempting an answer. It can be helpful for candidates to highlight what they consider to be the 'key' words or instructions.
- In those questions that require candidates to produce sketches and notes, it is essential that answers are made as clear, detailed and technically accurate as possible.
- There were many instances where examiners were unable to decipher illegible handwriting and poor quality sketches.

Controlled Assessment – Units 1 and 3

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 portfolios to the moderator within three days of receiving the sample request.**

Centres are reminded to forward form CCS160 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.

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 as different files.

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 must ensure that candidates clearly label each file using the marking criteria section headings; this facilitates a more effective completion of the moderation process.

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.** (e.g. 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.*

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.** Marks were compromised here this examination series.

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.**

A571 – Introduction to designing and prototyping

Centres receive the document 'Report to Centre' which is compiled by the moderator and sent to the Centre electronically in September. A wealth of support material is also available on the OCR Professional Development website at: <https://www.ocronlinetraining.org.uk>

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 OCR Repository (component 01), the marks must be uploaded onto OCR Interchange and **NOT** sent through to the moderator on a disc. This is classed as being postal (component 02) moderation.

Centres submitting portfolios by post for the June series have been prompt in the despatch 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/recycling aspect of the specification for Unit 1, either through the theme selected or points covered in the candidate specification.

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 to adhere to the time controls stated in the specification.

All centres seen this series included a Controlled assessment Summary Form (CSF) or cover sheet illustrating the breakdown of individual marks for each candidate.

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 was noticeable this series that the size of font in some candidate portfolios was very small (size 8) making the work very difficult to moderate/read. It is advisable to ensure that candidates use at least font size 10.

It is a requirement for the Controlled Assessment Unit A571 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 therefore ensure 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 requested 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.

Note: Paper clips and elastic bands are not robust enough to keep the portfolio together and should be avoided.

Important: centres should ensure that they make reference to the present specification available on the OCR website when assessing candidates' work.

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', 'Textile Techniques' and 'Recycled Denim'.

The themes most popular this series for Unit A573 were 'Twentieth Century Influences', 'Celebrations' and 'Children's Educational Toys'

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 series.

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 candidates' 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 the moderation process 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 series once again with centres awarding full marks for very little evidence. Care must be taken not to assume that evidence of problem solving is implicit in other aspects of the portfolio

and centre assessors need to remember that the moderator has not seen the candidate at work, and as such can only award marks for explicit evidence of the criteria being met within the submitted portfolio.

On the whole, centres have recorded and totalled marks accurately this series and fewer arithmetic errors were corrected, which was pleasing to see.

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 portfolios with care and thought.

Points to note:

- It is important that candidates include **acknowledgements or a bibliography** in the portfolio. 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 are 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.

COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA AREAS:

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 this series that candidates are answering this section better. Research is concise, accurate and relevant. **However, there are still some candidates who have not specifically linked research to the theme or starting point**, this being the main reason why marks have been compromised. Where candidates scored highly in this section, the work was clearly focussed, was often short in length and had clear purpose.

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 series with many portfolios illustrating a lack of design variety.

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 6Rs 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 6Rs, 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 candidates' 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 achieving 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.

Most candidates presented specifications of a suitable standard this series - 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.

It was noticed this series that very few specifications referred to a prototype product being made with many referencing 'quality' as a bullet point.

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 series. 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 series.

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 the products chosen are not so simplistic as to compromise access to the higher mark bands. The relative complexity of the products produced should be borne in mind when marks are being awarded by centre staff against the assessment criteria.

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

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 detail in this criteria area was varied and often this area was generously marked, with too much weight given to the solving technical problems in particular. **There must be clear, written evidence of this, particularly where it has been awarded high 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 series 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 high marks.

Further developments by higher achieving 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.

It was noticeable this series that where there was no evaluation evident in the portfolio, centres awarded no marks at all. Up to three marks should be added here for SPAG (spelling, punctuation and grammar).

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

The majority of centres had included evidence of referencing/bibliography in this unit which is to be commended.

A572 – Sustainable design

The overall performance and range of results was similar to January 2013. 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 all candidates to access the questions and gain marks. The vast majority of candidates attempted to answer all questions and there was no evidence to suggest that they did not have sufficient time to complete the paper. When candidates require additional answer space or need to re-write an answer there is space provided at the back of the answer booklet. However candidates do need to highlight/mark if they have done this this on their answer paper.

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 attempt an answer for these types of questions even 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 and 10.

On some short response questions 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. It is 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. Questions 16(d), 16(e) and 18(a) showed where candidates had not fully read the question and therefore scored poorly. Explanations were often vague and did not convey sufficient understanding to warrant marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

- 1 A number of candidates were able to correctly that Alpaca was a source of natural fibres although a surprising number of candidates answered oil.
- 2 The majority of candidates answered this correctly, the correct answer being planned obsolescence.
- 3 Well answered, with a high majority of students correctly identifying risk assessment.
- 4 Very well answered, with a high majority of students correctly identifying toxic chemicals.
- 5 The majority of candidates answered this correctly by identifying thermochromic dyes are heat sensitive.
- 6 Many candidates were able to answer this correctly.

- 7 This was surprisingly poorly answered by the majority of candidates. There were a high percentage of candidates who provided no response. The correct answer being the Mobius loop.
- 8 This was poorly answered by the majority of candidates with many not giving a response. This question was targeted at A / A* grade candidates and it was generally the higher scoring candidates who correctly identified Radio Frequency Identification Data. This question required all four words to be correct to gain the mark.
- 9 The majority of candidates were able to correctly identify one fibre made from oil with Polyester being the most typical answer.
- 10 The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.
- 11 The slight majority of candidates answered this question correctly.
- 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 correctly.

Section B

- 16(a) The majority of candidates answered this correctly. Candidates generally were able to score marks with several scoring full marks. Good answers generally referred to sustainable, natural fibre and no chemicals being used.
- 16(b) This question differentiated well with the higher achieving candidates scoring full marks. The most typical responses referred to dyes from plants or animals. There were however a surprising number of candidates who provided no response on this question.
- 16(c) The majority of candidates were able to achieve marks, with the most popular answers relating to embroidery and applique.
- 16(d) This question was not well answered with few candidates scoring full marks. Marks were awarded for reference to the social advantages of manufacturing by hand and candidates need to ensure they read a question fully before answering.
- 16(e) The slight majority of candidates answered this question well with many being able to correctly refer to the disadvantages of high energy usage in manufacturing and pollution from the use of chemicals.
- 17(a) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates clearly able to correctly identify two different household textile items.
- 17(b) This question was not well answered. The majority of candidates only obtained one mark.
 - (i) Many candidates simply failed to write about how materials can be from renewable or natural sources and therefore link to cost and Fairtrade. Marks could also have been accessed by referring to the use of recycled materials or components.

- 17(b)** There was a mixed response seen to this question with a combination of good answers and no responses. Good answers seen referred to a reduction in the carbon emissions and the use of local manufacturing and therefore less transport.
- 17(b)** This was well answered by the majority of candidates and candidates are clearly more confident with regard to the disposal and recycling of products. Some excellent answers were seen where reference was made to the ways in which textile products can be repaired, recycled or disposed of.
- 17(c)** This was well answered with a range of excellent answers seen. Most scored marks for reference to colour, fastenings and safety. However some candidates repeated answers and therefore did not achieve marks.
- 18(a)** Responses this examination series were disappointing. Many candidates did not write about the social and moral effects and did not appear to have fully read the question. However, some candidates scored full marks and it was clear where candidates had practised 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 or 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. Many candidates wrote on the back pages of the answer booklet and it is good practice to get them to highlight where they are continuing their answer on in this way.
- 18(b)** The majority of candidates attempted this question and a range of responses was seen. Most candidates attempted or sketched a logo but often failed to pick up maximum marks by simply not labelling or naming the logo. Reference is again made to the question and the importance of clearly reading it. Where the question asks for a sketch **and** a label, candidates need to do both to ensure they access the marks.
- 18(c)** Surprisingly, a small number of candidates were able to correct identify globalisation or export/import. This question also had a high level of candidates who provided no response at all.
- 18(d)** There was again a mixed response seen to this question. Many candidates only scored one or two marks as they did not give three clear explanations as to how computer technology can benefit the environment. Good responses however referred to the saving of materials/paper and the advantages of email in saving resources.

A573 – Making Quality Products

COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA AREAS

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 eras, 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.

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 for the higher marks.

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.

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

On the whole, candidates have produced very logical and well organised portfolios for both Units A571 and A573 this series that have been a pleasure to moderate.

A574 – Technical aspects of designing and making

Candidates seemed generally well prepared for the examination and a wide range of marks were seen. Candidates responded well to the question paper, with most questions attempted and a generally good understanding of the requirements of the questions shown. More candidates used the additional page at the end of the paper than have in the past, and candidates need to be reminded to indicate that they have done so. They also need to identify the question they are answering in this space so that marks can be credited accordingly. There is still some evidence of a lack of technical knowledge and terminology, but candidates have a better understanding of how to approach the longer response answers.

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates could give one benefit of the feature they identified, but many did not give sufficient detail or explanation in their answer to gain both marks. Some repeated answers and therefore did not gain marks. Candidates who scored well here were able to link the feature to the use of the trousers. Most referred to the number of pockets, elasticated waist and the zip-off lower leg.
- (b) Most candidates scored two or three marks here with zip, elastic and popper or button being popular answers. Some candidates lifted design features such as 'belt loops' and did not gain marks. There was less evidence of pupils confusing tools and equipment with components than in previous years.
- (c) This question was generally not well answered. Most candidates gave quicker and easier as reasons. A few gave more in-depth answers such as not needing to train staff to make them.

Question 2

- (a)(i) The most popular correct answers here were computer controlled embroidery, appliqué and free machine embroidery. A significant number of candidates were unable to give a suitable technique.
- (a)(ii) Approximately half of the candidates who could name a suitable technique were able to give a reason for their choice.
- (b) Approximately half of the candidates could give the correct term for making fibres in to yarn.
- (c) The majority of candidates could give at least one reason for using industrial cutting tools when manufacturing in quantity and a significant number could identify three reasons. Most common answers referred to the ability to cut a number of layers of fabric at once. 'More accurate' needed to be linked to computer controlled cutting in order to gain a mark.
- (d) Many candidates could identify performance characteristics of acrylic fibres, fewer knew as much about wool fibres. Good quality answers compared the two fibres and related the performance characteristics back to the use of the fabric produced. Reference to durability, washing, the need to dry quickly and cost featured in many answers.

Question 3

- (a) Fewer than half the candidates were able to correctly identify the symbol.
- (b) Many candidates were able to identify at least one substance covered by COSHH regulations. A small number were able to give two. Bleach and chemicals were the most common correct answers. Some candidates gave different types of dyes and failed to gain marks.
- (c) The majority of candidates were able to give three items of protective clothing that should be worn when working with dyes.
- (d) This question was well answered by candidates who had clearly used batik to decorate fabric. However, a number of candidates simply wrote out the stages without adding any additional information. Candidates did not give details about how to prepare the dye bath and few were able to explain how to create an interesting effect. Some candidates confused batik with tie dye.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates continue to enjoy the design questions with most scoring over half marks. Some did not link the design featured they included to the specification points and therefore did not gain marks. How they addressed the 'environmentally friendly' requirement was not well explained. Good responses included information about components and construction details.
- (b) Candidates drew on knowledge gained from A571 when answering this question, but many did not develop their ideas fully. Few candidates mentioned using a prototype to aid with planning and costing, or to carry out market research. Many mentioned using it to avoid making mistakes and the ability to change aspects of the product before manufacturing in quantity.

Question 5

- (a) A significant number of candidates were unable to recall any facts about a double stitched seam. This is a process identified in the specification. Some confused the seam with a French seam. A small number wrote excellent explanations, with diagrams, and scored full marks.
- (b) This question was not well answered, with many candidates being unable to identify a twill weave.
- (c) Most candidates were able to give one reason for this weave being suitable for the jacket, but few were able to give two. Hardwearing or durable was the most popular answer.
- (d) Most candidates were able to give the meaning of the symbol, although few could state the temperature.
- (e) The majority of candidates were able to give at least one way of modifying the jacket to extend its use. Some misread the question and made another item from the fabric used for the jacket. Popular answers were removing the sleeves, adding decoration and using appliqué to cover worn areas or holes.

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 2013

