

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	1
FASHION AND FABRICS.....	2
GCE Ordinary Level	2
Paper 6050/01 Written	2
Paper 6050/02 Practical	4
Paper 6050/03 Paper 3	6

FOREWORD

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned.**

FASHION AND FABRICS

GCE Ordinary Level

Paper 6050/01

Written

General comments

The majority of the answer papers were well presented and legible, with most of the extra answer sheets for **Section B** attached to the back. Some papers were tied so tightly it was difficult to turn pages over - candidates should be asked to tie papers loosely but securely. Candidates should be advised to start each new question on a clean page, or at least leave a couple of clear lines between questions.

Section A was attempted by everyone and parts of it were well answered, but some areas were not. A small number of candidates may have spent too long on **Section A** that they did not have enough time to complete all answers to the required number of questions in **Section B**.

In **Section B** the three required questions were attempted by the vast majority of candidates but varied widely in the standard of response. This year all six questions seemed roughly equally popular.

The majority of candidates still do not fill in the numbers of the questions answered in **Section B** in the spaces provided on the front cover. This should be encouraged as it helps to find quickly the number of answers attempted for each question in this section. Where diagrams were asked for they were sometimes very small and unclear and not always labelled as instructed.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a)(i) Generally well answered, but in some cases only *one* word was used to describe the style features.
- (ii) Not well answered and those candidates that understood a multi-sized pattern may have only given one advantage/disadvantage.
- (iii) Some good answers, but many candidates named a cotton fabric that would be unsuitable for the pyjamas e.g. denim, gaberdine, organdie. Some named woollen fabrics and others gave no name but completed the descriptions. Correct names must be given to gain marks in the rest of the question.
- (iv) Many correct answers given for using cotton fabric for the pyjamas.
- (v) Some good reasons but some responses did not relate to using stretchable ribbed knit - e.g. looks nice/comfortable.
- (vi) Some accurate fabric finishes suitable for cotton but many candidates mentioned seam finishes, finishing a garment with buttons, lace etc. or gave unsuitable fabric finishes e.g. anti-static.
- (b)(i) Very well answered - relevant body measurements.
- (ii) Generally very well answered, but candidates need to remember to put cms/ins, metres/yards by their answers to gain full marks. Some candidates lost marks by mixing up widths and amounts. The amount of thread given by some candidates was excessive and some gave the answer as Drima or similar and not the fibre content.
- (iii) With nap - very well answered.

- (c)(i) Very few candidates gained all 5 marks as they failed to label both folds and all three selvages. A number of candidates did not attempt this question although it clearly showed that 5 marks were available.
 - (ii) Generally well answered although there was some confusion over the front and back.
 - (iii) The meaning of WITH NAP was not widely understood.
 - (iv) Very few accurate answers as to why the pieces were shaded.
 - (v) Some very good answers with clear pattern markings drawn and labelled, but others were very poor. The pattern markings were not known or put in completely the wrong place on the pyjama top front.
 - (vi) The majority of answers were too vague to get the one mark that was available e.g. match the sides.
- (d) Generally very well answered with maximum or near maximum marks. A very few candidates either left some of the spaces blank or put in words that were not on the page.

Section B

Question 2

- (a) Reasonably well answered but some examples were incorrect or missed out completely.
- (b) Reasons for blending and the examples given were not well answered.
- (c) Some very good knowledge of acetate fibres, but other answers were complete guesswork and incorrect.

Question 3

- (a) Generally poorly answered with little detail mentioned and many marks lost. Some candidates wrote exactly the same for all 3 fabrics.
 - (i) Wool felt - structure not known and often confused with woollen fabric.
 - (ii) Cotton towelling - structure not known.
 - (iii) Vilene - structure not clear but appearance and weight known.
- (b) Uses of Vilene was reasonably well answered.
- (c) Reasons given were quite well known.
- (d) Washing Vilene was poorly answered and included removing it from the garment and washing separately, washing in cold water/boiling water, scrubbing it etc.

Question 4

- (a) There were some very good sketches with labelling, but not all sketches were of a faced neck opening e.g. mandarin collars, rever collars etc.
- (b) (i) and (ii) did not ask for diagrams but the candidates who used them found it easier to describe how to work the faced opening and hook and bar fastening and generally achieved higher marks.
 - (i) Some good explanations of working a faced opening, but others used a continuous strip or bias binding.
 - (ii) Hook and worked bar were quite well answered but some candidates referred to a metal bar.

Question 5

- (a)(i)(ii) Some very good, clear labelled diagrams, but others were very small, unclear and not labelled. It is very evident if the Centre teaches candidates to produce clear labelled diagrams.
- (iii)
- (b) The explanation of repairing a hem was reasonably well answered although some candidates missed out any diagrams, and some candidates failed to answer this part of the question.

Question 6

- (a) The care label symbols were very poorly answered. Some candidates confused the symbols with pattern marking symbols.
- (b) The correct stain removal for each stain was not well known - there were some very extraordinary methods of removing the stains.
- (c) The instructions for patching a hole were not clearly given and some candidates failed to answer this part of the question and therefore lost 7 marks.

Question 7

- (a) Some very good designs using 3 suitable hand embroidery stitches, but there were candidates who did not draw and/or label the stitches and some designs were not suitable for the pocket. Some designs were very small and a few candidates drew 3 separate pockets with one embroidery stitch on each.
- (b) The working of some embroidery stitches was clear e.g. satin stitch but others were very poorly drawn and explained e.g. stem stitch.
- (c) Specific detail was missing e.g. needles and scissors were mentioned but not crewel needles and embroidery/small pointed scissors. Advice regarding care of the equipment was reasonably well answered.

<p>Paper 6050/02</p> <p>Practical</p>

General comments

The Paper this year compared equally with those of previous years. The Question Paper was entirely within the standard expected of candidates at this level. The process involved only straightforward basic methods used in the making of a simple garment. The average and above average candidate was able to produce a fairly neat right half of a pair of shorts.

The majority of candidates completed or almost completed the tests.

Comments on specific parts

The candidates were required to cut out and make up the right half of a pair of shorts, this included making and attaching a patch pocket, a dart at the back, making up and attaching a waistband and working a narrow hem. The test was straightforward and included processes which were familiar to the candidates. The majority understood the Question Paper and the pattern. Once again this year candidates tended to lose marks for inaccuracy – often the patch pocket was not placed in the correct position and many did not follow the instructions very carefully when attaching the waistband.

Choice of fabrics and interfacing

Generally fabrics were most satisfactory and the majority of Centres used iron-on interfacing of a suitable weight.

Cutting out

Marks were awarded for placing the pattern on the fabric accurately and for using the scissors carefully. The candidates showed that they had followed the instructions by placing the pattern pieces on the straight grain of fabric. However, a number did not use the scissors carefully when cutting the curves on the front and back and thus lost marks. The majority of candidates made up the right hand side of the shorts, a few made up the left hand side and there were only a few muddled scripts.

Patch pocket

Although a diagram was given in the instructions, not many candidates ease-stitched the curved edges of the pocket, thus making it easier to make good curves. Many did not hold the pocket facing in place by top-stitching 2.5cm from the folded edge. The pocket turnings were not well trimmed, but generally it was attached by two rows of machine stitching 6mm apart – not always accurate machine stitching and only in the better test did the candidate lengthen the machine stitch. Despite being instructed to fasten off the ends of machine stitching by hand, there were a number of loose ends!

The dart

Most candidates worked the dart well with a good line of stitching tapering to a point, with the ends woven in by hand. Most of the darts were pressed towards the centre back and were flat into the waistband.

Side seam

Most candidates made a neat open seam, one or two French seams which were pressed towards the centre back.

Inside leg seam

This process was usually worked accurately.

Waistband

There were very few waistbands of the correct length - many did not stitch the centre front of the band and very few were even in width. The seam allowance inside the closed end was usually well trimmed but the seam and corner were not always a good shape. In a few Centres the candidates must have been given more than the stipulated amount of iron-on interfacing as they often had enough to press on to the full width of the waistband, when they should have folded the waistband pattern in half lengthways and cut out the interfacing and thus only interfacing the front of the waistband - they lost marks here.

Attaching the waistband

The majority of candidates who attached the waistband turned the front opening and centre back seam allowance of the shorts to the wrong side but not always accurately. The tacking along the centre front fold to hold the facing in place was generally very neat. Very few eased the upper edge of the shorts into the waistband and had a good line of stitching on the right side. A number of candidates did not turn the front extension to the wrong side as instructed before attaching the waistband and thus lost several marks. Few matched the band and shorts to give a good line at the centre front. In general, the trimming of the seam allowance was poor, few attempted to trim the interfacing separately and/or trim the last turning of the waistband, so as to reduce the bulk further. Hemming was good when attempted.

Shorts hem

Very few hems were of the correct and even width as only 1.5cm was allowed on this pattern. Machine stitching was uneven in a number of scripts.

Presentation

Unfortunately, not many gained full marks as they had machine stitched the label onto their shorts instead of tacking it on as instructed. There were a number of the poorer test where the tailor tacks and unnecessary tackings had not been removed. The pressing and folding of the test were of a higher standard this year.

General comments

Candidates are required to submit two garments for the coursework together with a folder.

In general, folders were of a good standard. Most of them included:-

- illustration and/or description of one garment
- choice of style and pattern
- choice of fabric and colour
- list of requirements (fabric/s and sewing notions) costing of fabric/s and notions
- plan of work.

The presentation of folders was generally pleasing, giving details of the planning required for making one of the garments that should fit the candidate. Many candidates scored maximum marks for their folder. The weakest part of some folders was the 'plan of work'. Candidates still could not make out the difference between 'order of work' and 'plan of work'. They gave the order of making up the garment together with diagrams of different processes instead of discussing the difficulties encountered during making up and attaching the samples tried before achieving perfection on processes. They should show evidence of experiments and should also justify the processes chosen. Otherwise, marks were lost by just producing few samples showing the working of tailor's tacks, working of a seam, stitching of one dart, sewing of one button/or buttonhole, etc. Few candidates included the layout prior to cutting out and the detailed steps to be followed for assembling the garment, thus making their folder very bulky. 'The plan of work' should include specimens of processes and the candidate should mention the difficulties they encountered and which method was most suitable for the fabric and style of garment. For example, different specimens of the various types of seams were given and the candidate then specified the best one chosen for the garment.

As far as presentation of garments was concerned, most candidates chose the right style for the fabric and the right notions also. A different type of fabric should be used for each garment. Fabric/s used for each garment should be from different fibres or from the same fibre but of different weight. While the majority of garments were clean, a few were over-handled during construction and/or spoilt by the use of dark-coloured carbon paper or tailor's chalk or pencil. Candidates should be encouraged to use tailor's tacks for transferring pattern markings to the fabric as these are easily removed after tacking. Selvages were still left on seams and waistband in few garments. Some were penalised for leaving loose ends of tailor's tacks, tacks and machine threads on their garments. In general the garments were well pressed and folded for presentation but few garments showed no sign of pressing during construction.

A few candidates still submitted garments which were far beyond their capabilities; e.g. processes on sheer fabrics were not properly stitched, checks and striped fabrics were not well joined at seams. Few candidates lost marks by using two different colours of thread for stitching. Different colours could be used only for decoration e.g. top-stitching. One candidate submitted three garments of which two only had been marked. Seven other candidates submitted incomplete garments for e.g. lay of crossway strip not turned under and secured to armhole, fastenings not applied. In one Centre, all candidates presented either a blouse and a child's dress or a skirt and the child's dress. All blouses, skirts and child's dresses were of the same style. Some garments were far too simple. 14 candidates submitted garments of only four processes. A minimum of five processes is required per garment. Those scoring full marks on 'presentation' had good choice of styles and fabrics for both garments. The notions were also well chosen. Their garments were clean on both R.S and W.S and all the processes were well pressed. Both garments were well folded and their labels tacked on single fabric and not over any process.

Candidates should be familiar with the basic processes e.g. seams, hems, fastenings, sleeve setting, collar setting, attachment of pockets etc. Too many candidates had their side seams and/or underarm seams of uneven length. A plain seam was expected to have a good line of machining along fitting lines and the neatening correctly done. Unfortunately, too many candidates still had edge-stitched seams of uneven width, edge-stitching done too far from the fold, turnings not trimmed and the seams not properly pressed. Those seams were not always flat at the hem or armhole or waist. From one Centre, during the cutting-out, the notches were cut inside the seam allowance and after edge-stitching that edge, the cut was still visible. Candidates should be encouraged to cut notches outside seam allowances, thus having a nice finish after trimming the edge-stitched seam. Few seams were neatened by overlock or zig-zag and on the whole, that was nicely done. Seam allowances were often too wide for e.g. more than 3cm for the C.B seam of a skirt or dress. Curved princess seams were too often not snipped or notched, thus resulting in pulled or flared seam allowances. From one Centre, the curved seam was clipped but not neatened. Many had their yoke seams nicely neatened by loop stitches. Few candidates did not know how to start and end the loop stitches. Some candidates had different methods of neatening the seams on their blouse even though the style did not require it, e.g. French seams for the side seams, edge-stitched seams for the C.B and loop-stitched seams for the shoulders, all of which were straight seams. Same method of neatening all seams could have been done for that particular blouse. Method of working out a seam depends upon the style and fabric, e.g. the crutch seam could have been snipped, neatened either by loop stitch, overcast stitch or zig-zag and pressed open. Another method was to neaten both seam allowances together, trimmed and then pressed to one side. The finished width should not be more than 1cm. The armhole seams (curved seams) also should not be more than 1cm. Few garments had that seam trimmed to 3mm and thus weakened that part of the garment.

Most candidates showed good workmanship while stitching their darts. Most of the darts had good lines of machining, tapering to a point and the ends of machine threads darned into few stitches. Bust darts were well pressed downwards and waist darts towards C.F and C.B. They were also of even lengths and even widths. On few blouses, both bust darts were not of the same distance from the armhole seams, and on skirts also the distance between the darts and the side seams were not always the same. Wide darts were nicely cut before being neatened by loop stitches and were also pressed flat. Candidates should not have double lines of machining (reverse machine stitches) at the points of darts. Loose threads of machine stitches should not be tied into knots but should be woven in about five last machine stitches.

Few pockets were well-handled. The patch pocket was well stitched with one or two lines of machining with the machine stitches lengthened. Pockets with two lines of machining had their raw edges between the machining lines and those with a single line of machining had their seam allowances trimmed to less than 5mm and neatened either by loop or overcast stitches. Corners were sharp, reinforcement done at top corners and on W.S neatening done by weaving threads into few machine stitches.

Few candidates attached outer edge of the collar to the neckline and thus resulting in a poor shape at neckline. That can be avoided by transferring the balance marks on both neckline and collar and by making use of different colours of threads for marking. Interfacing was of correct weight for the fabric. Lapels were not always of same size. Too often, candidates had the seam allowances of collars not trimmed, snipped, notched or layered. Straight collars were often attached to garment by front and back facings or crossway strip at the back neckline. Few collars were nicely hemmed into machine stitches at the back neckline. Different methods were thus used for attachment of collar. Unfortunately, joins of facings were not always trimmed and pressed open. Few were trimmed but were still too wide, that is more than 5mm on a light-weight poplin fabric. Some candidates were penalised for edge-stitching the seam after joining facing.

Most garments had short set-in sleeves. Attachment of sleeves was not always done with a good line of machining. Quite often, reinforcement was done by a second line of machining at the underarm or all around the armhole seams. Few garments had those seam allowances either too narrow (3mm) or too wide (more than 1.5mm). The finished width of armhole seams should generally not be more than 1cm. The most common stitch used for neatening was loop stitch which was on the whole of a poor quality. The starting and finishing of loop stitches were not always properly done, where insecure and loose threads were often left. Seam allowances of armhole were not always of even width and too often garments had no alignment at the underarm seams. On few garments, there were gathers instead of ease along the sleeveheads and others even had ease or gathers or small pleats on the bodice at the armhole. Pressing was well done with the seam allowances pressed towards the sleeves. Gathers along puff sleeves were not always evenly distributed. To obtain an even distribution of fullness for gathers or ease, two parallel lines of running stitches should be worked between balance marks.

Most garments had short set-in sleeves. Otherwise, the armhole was neatened either by a crossway strip or a shaped facing. Crossway strips were often wrongly joined as machining was not done along the grain of fabric. Line of machining was not always well done for attachment of crossway strip to armhole thus spoiling the shape of the armhole. After machining, seam allowance should be well trimmed and snipped. The lay of the outer edge of crossway strip should also be trimmed. In too many garments made from light-weight cotton/polyester fabrics, the lay was more than 5mm.

The majority of candidates submitted an A-line skirt with a straight interfaced waistband. Very few had interfacing of correct weight to fabric. The weak point was again the trimming after attachment of waistband and too often lay of waistband was also not trimmed. Few candidates were penalised for not hemming the waistband into the machine stitches on the W.S. At times, overlap or underlap of waistband was either too short (less than 1cm) or too long (more than 4cm).

Working of fastenings ranged from very poor to excellent. Many candidates seemed unfamiliar with the concealed method for zip application. Otherwise, the semi-concealed were well inserted with a good line of machining, lower ends of zip tape trimmed and tape secured to seam allowance by loop stitches. Reinforcement was not always done at the base of zip and few did it only on the R.S. Few candidates had the zip too long or too short for the opening. From one Centre, all candidates had their zip fastener too long for the opening. Very often the upper position of zip was wrong. For example, on an A-line skirt with waistband, the metal part of upper zip should be to the fitting line of the waist and a skirt whose waistline had been neatened by a shaped facing, the zip should be about half to one cm from the fitting line with a hook and eye or worked bar at the waistline. In general, hooks and eyes and worked bars were well secured to garments. Few skirts and trousers had metal trouser hooks and metal bars on their waistband and those notions were too heavy for the weight of the fabric. Few garments had a button and a worked loop at the C.B opening of a blouse. Most of those candidates scored maximum marks for fastenings as the button was well positioned, well secured and on the W.S the strands of thread were neatened by loop or buttonhole stitches. The worked loop was also of correct size. Many blouses had buttons and buttonholes as fastening on the C.F of blouse. Workmanship of buttonholes varied from very poor to excellent. Marks were allocated for position of buttons and buttonholes, even distance between them, even distance from the fold, of correct distance from the fold (depending upon the diameter of button and the style of garment), correct size of buttonhole for button and quality of buttonhole stitches and/or oversewing for the round end and/or worked bar for the square end. From one Centre, many candidates used double threads for working the buttonhole thus making it too heavy for the weight of the fabric. From another Centre, many buttonholes were wrongly worked. The vertical buttonhole should have two round ends or two square ends; whereas the horizontal buttonhole should have a round end closest to the opening and a square end at the other end.

Width of hem was always correct according to the style and fabric. But the hems were not always of even width and very often there was a difference of more than 2mm. Many candidates did not trim the lay of hem e.g. on a poplin blouse the lay was more than 5mm. On dresses made from heavy-weight fabric, the seam allowance at hem should have been trimmed off to remove bulk. Seams were not always aligned along hemline. Common stitches used for securing the hem were 'hemming stitches', 'slip-hemming stitches' and machining. Many candidates did not make the difference between hemming and slip-hemming. Note that slip-hemming is an invisible stitch from the R.S whereas hemming is a visible stitch. On many garments slip-hemming stitches were often too far apart. From one Centre, many candidates started the hemming stitch either with a knot or double back stitch of about 5mm wide which was not acceptable.

Coursework is to be worked over a two-year period and too many works reflect limited time for finishing. Only 8% of the candidates submitted garments of a very high standard. During and after each process, proper pressing had to be done. A final pressing should also be given to garments. Examiners note with concern that in few Centres, most garments had a very poor workmanship on a variety of processes. The quality of machine stitches was good. Candidates should be encouraged to choose garments with processes within their capabilities. They should also practice the different processes on samples before working them on their garments. Examiners will gladly welcome improvements in garment construction next year. Note that name of candidate/or needlework teacher/or rector/or school should not be written on any page and cover of the folder. Candidate's name should be written only on the label provided by the 'Mauritius Examination Syndicate'. Label should be tacked on garment or stuck to folder along the indicated arrows.