

FASHION AND FABRICS

GCE Ordinary Level

Paper 6050/01
Written

General comments

Answer papers were generally 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. A few scripts had the answer pages for **Section B** at the front of the question paper (between pages 2 and 3), which breaks up **Section A**. It is not necessary to include the insert sheet unless the candidate has written on it.

Section A was attempted by everyone and parts of it were well answered, but other areas were not. A few candidates may have spent too long on **Section A** and not had sufficient time to complete all answers in **Section B**.

The vast majority of candidates attempted the choice of three questions in **Section B** but the standard of response varied widely. **Question 6** was by far the most popular question and was generally well answered. **Questions 3** and **5** were also popular questions but the standard of response varied. It was evident if the Centre had covered the relevant part of the syllabus in detail. **Question 7** was only attempted by a handful of candidates and the responses were generally very poor.

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. A very small number of candidates answered all six questions in **Section B**. Where diagrams were asked for they were sometimes very small and not always labelled as instructed.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Generally well answered, but in some cases only one word was used to describe the style features.
- (b)(i) Very few correct answers - many named a cotton fabric but not a knitted fabric e.g. poplin. Some named jersey but then gave the structure as plain weave/woven. Appearance and feel/handle were often incorrect but weight was usually correct, maybe due to guesswork rather than knowledge.
 - (ii) Some good answers, but many gave responses that could relate to any fabric, not specifically a knitted cotton fabric.
 - (iii) 'Stretch woven' - very few candidates understood the meaning of this term, many mentioned knitted fabrics.
 - (iv) Reasonably well answered, although appearance and feel/handle were not always correct.
 - (v) General reasons were usually given, e.g. looks nice, washable etc. and not reasons specific to polyester crepe and/or the style.
 - (vi) Some accurate answers, others were too vague to get the mark.

- (c) Generally well answered, with correct pattern markings drawn, but not always labelled. Some candidates confused the top and bottom of the trouser pattern piece and drew a dart on the hemline.
- (d)(i) Some relevant body measurements were listed but few candidates achieved maximum marks here. A few candidates confused *shirt* with *skirt* and included leg length etc. although view A was only a shirt.
- (ii) Many gave correct amounts but some candidates lost marks by failing to put metres/yards etc by the amount, or by confusing the metric and imperial amounts.
- (iii) Generally very well answered, but again candidates need to remember to put cms/ins etc by their answer to gain full marks. The amount of thread given by some candidates was excessive as they were only asked for the amount for the skirt, and Drima/Sylko was named and not the fibre content.
- (e)(i) The vast majority of candidates could name the pattern pieces although a few confused back and front.
- (ii) Generally well answered, although some candidates only indicated one selvedge edge and not both, which was necessary for full marks.
- (iii) Many candidates knew the piece had to be cut on single fabric but others said it had to be cut twice, was for the interfacing etc.
- (f) 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.
- (g)(i) Reasonably well answered, with suitable methods drawn but many failed to label the diagrams. Answers that were not allowed included 'French seam', 'bias binding' and 'using pinking shears'. Some diagrams were very clearly drawn, but others were very poor.
- (ii) The majority of candidates included inserting a zip in the order of making up the skirt, but the skirt in view C has an elasticated waist and no zip. The rest of the order of work was usually correct.
- (iii) Generally well answered, but some were vague, not indicating a different coloured thread etc. Some appeared not to understand the meaning of 'decorative' and said hemming/slip-hemming etc.

Section B

Question 2

This was not a popular question, being attempted by only about 30% of candidates. Some responses were good, showing evidence that this had been taught well, other answers appeared to be more guesswork than knowledge. A candidate should have thorough knowledge of fibres to answer this type of question.

- (a) Generally well answered.
- (b) Some properties were known but others mentioned were not relevant to polyester.
- (c) Vague explanations were given - basically only knowing that filament means long, and staple means short.
- (d) Very few named a knitted polyester fabric and the descriptions were generally very poor.

Question 3

A popular question which, in many cases, was not well answered.

- (a) Reasonably well answered with at least one correct advantage given.

- (b)(i) Generally this was not well answered. Many candidates did not join the waistband to make a circle and joined it onto the skirt as if there was a zip attached. Many only slip-hemmed the waistband to the first line of machining. Some diagrams were clear and labelled but many were poor and did not even indicate RS/WS.
- (ii) Few candidates understood that this part followed on from the previous part of the question. Many included the preparation of the waistband again (this time correctly) and then put the elastic in, or sewed the elastic into the waistband before turning it over to the WS.
- (c) Some relevant points were mentioned, but there were some very extreme ways of removing a fruit stain. There appeared to be more guesswork than knowledge. Some candidates failed to give any answer for this part of the question.

Question 4

Not a popular question.

- (a) Some notes and labelled diagrams were good, but others were not clear at all.
 - (i) Attaching the lace to the upper edge was poorly answered, some candidates had it turned over to the WS instead of having it on the RS.
 - (ii) The narrow machine-stitched hem was generally answered in more detail, but some candidates still slip-hemmed/hemmed it rather than machining the hem.
- (b) The care label was not fully answered. Washing/ironing/bleaching may have been answered but not everything that could be on the label was mentioned. With a maximum of 6 marks, candidates should realise that more than one or two points should be given.

Question 5

This was a very popular question, answered by about 70% of candidates. There were a number of very good responses, but others showed little knowledge of some of the terms. Some candidates confused notching with notches and slip-hemming with hemming. A few candidates used no diagrams at all to answer this question while others drew very accurate, clear diagrams.

Question 6

The most popular question, answered by 90% of candidates.

Generally this question was answered well or very well. Good points were given about buying shears, and most candidates could draw 6 small items of equipment and give a use for each. Marks were lost by some candidates who failed to describe the items.

In giving points for looking after garment-making equipment, some candidates confused this with looking after garments.

Question 7

There were so few answers to this question that it is difficult to comment. Smocking was quite well answered, but the other three sections were hardly attempted.

Paper 6050/02

Practical

General comments

The candidates were required to cut out and make up the right half of a shortened top. This included stitching on a patch pocket, attaching a front and neck facing, setting in a short sleeve and tacking the sleeve hem.

The test was straightforward and included processes with which the candidates were familiar at this level. The majority had understood the question paper and the pattern. In a few cases the candidates must have been given **more** fabric than the specified amount as they were able to cut out the **unshortened** top. Unfortunately, this does not help the candidates, as marks are given for accurate measurement.

The choice of fabric was most satisfactory.

There were some very good results this year and very few muddled scripts.

Comments on specific issues

Cutting out

Marks were awarded for placing the pattern accurately on the fabric and for the careful use of scissors. Unfortunately, a few candidates placed the lower edge of the pattern to the torn edge of the fabric, and although this may have saved time, marks were lost for inaccurate cutting. The majority of candidates scored well in this section.

Pattern marking

This was much improved, as very few candidates spoilt their work by using a tracing wheel.

Patch pocket

Although this was usually of the correct size and of a good shape, it was not always placed accurately on the top. Concerning attaching the pocket, there was usually a good line of stitching, but few candidates reinforced the corners. Very few trimmed the seam allowance well and the majority did not attempt to do so. Very few candidates fastened the ends by hand, although they had been instructed to do so.

Facing

Most candidates joined the facing correctly at the shoulder seam, and pressed the seam allowance open and flat, but few gained marks for trimming here. Neatening of the free edge was generally satisfactory, showing good control of the machine. Few candidates secured the facing well at the shoulder seam.

Attaching the facing

The length of the centre back and centre front, and width of the front facing were generally accurate, as was the matching of the centre back bodice and back facing. Most candidates worked a good line of stitching to attach the facing, but few trimmed and clipped the seam allowance well. However, the seam was generally manipulated well enough to produce a good shape with the seam on the edge.

Seams

The majority worked edge stitched open seams satisfactorily. One or two worked French seams and a number of candidates neatened the sleeve seam when instructed not to, so lost a mark here.

Setting in the sleeve

Marks were given for accuracy in matching notches, seams and a smooth sleeve head, and a good line of stitching on the fitting line. Marks were lost here where candidates trimmed the seam allowance.

Sleeve hem

Most candidates recognised the correct width, but not all were even in width. Hems were generally flat, with the seams matching, but tacking was not always of good quality; many candidates used double thread.

Presentation

The presentation was generally satisfactory.

Paper 6050/03
Coursework

General comments

For the Coursework, two garments made of different fabrics must be submitted, together with a folder giving details on *one* of the two garments. This year, all folders were correctly based on one garment only. The majority of candidates did their best to produce a reasonable folder. Folders should include the following:

- illustration and/or description of the garment;
- reasons for choice of pattern, style, fabric and colour;
- list of requirements;
- costing of fabric and notions;
- a plan of work.

The plan of work was the weakest part of the folder from some Centres, where candidates gave the order of work and details about the working of different processes with diagrams copied from books. This part requires that candidates include samples, illustrating the experimental work carried out before working processes on the garment, and explaining the reason for their final choice. Samples should not illustrate the step by step working of processes. Some candidates included the burning test in order to identify the fabrics used, but they were unable to make the appropriate inferences, which led to wrong information about these fabrics.

Folders varied considerably from poor to excellent. In one Centre, folders were prepared on a piece of Bristol paper, on which candidates were unable to enter all the information required.

Candidates should be reminded that their name, that of their Teacher and/or their Centre should not be included on the folder.

Regarding the costing of fabric and notions, candidates should pay particular attention to the amount of fabric used: the cost of this, as well as the notions, should not be overestimated or over evaluated. For example, a dozen hooks and bars for Rs 10.00, when only two of these were used on a skirt, or 2 x 1.50 m of fabric to make up a straight skirt of size 34, which was only 50 cm long.

Examiners noted with concern that, although there was a good choice of fabric for the garment styles in general, the work of many candidates used wrong notions, was not clean and had loose threads. A few candidates chose too elaborate styles and were unable to work the processes skilfully.

Although embroidery was not expected of them, some candidates scored a bonus mark for working examples perfectly.

A few candidates from one Centre had the same processes on both garments: a skirt and trousers. Both had darts, zip fastener, hooks and worked bars and a straight waistband. All candidates from another Centre submitted blouses and skirts with the same style features. Teachers should encourage candidates to choose styles that are as different as possible. Furthermore, candidates should be advised not to use striped or checked fabrics, as these were not properly aligned.

Labels were machined to single fabric, instead of being hand stitched, in all garments from one Centre, and in some others, the labels were sewn over processes or on double fabric. Candidates should be reminded that labels should be attached to single fabric to facilitate marking.

On too many garments, only the cut and assembly of the different pieces, and lines of machining were well done. Otherwise, the different processes were wrongly worked. For example, a plain edge-stitched seam had a good line of machining, but the seams were often pressed downwards instead of upwards on both the front and back. Crotch seams were often very wide and not properly neatened. Many garments had crossway strips to neaten the armhole or neckline, but as these were too wide, they did not produce a neat finish. The joining of crossway strips should be done along the grain of the fabric, but too many candidates seemed to ignore this process.

In general, zip fasteners were well inserted, but on WS, tapes were not always neatened and reinforcement at the base not done. A few garments had the wrong length of zip for the opening. Many candidates wrongly neatened the zip tape on the WS. Instead of loop stitching these to the seam allowance, they simply hemmed them. Others worked the loop stitches on the zip tapes only, which is useless in holding the tapes flat on the seam allowances.

Waistbands should be of a good shape, with proper weight of interfacing, seams well trimmed and pressed towards waistband, snipped corners and hemmed into the machine stitches on WS. Many candidates had very poor waistband shapes, mainly due to uneven width and improper tacking before hem stitching on the WS. From one Centre, all candidates hem stitched the waistband to the garment below the line of machining, thus getting visible stitches on the RS. Corners were very often bulky and poorly shaped due to uneven trimming. Many skirts had faced waistlines but had poor alignments at the CB seam. Candidates also omitted to attach a hook and worked bar at the waistline to secure the garment at the top of the zip. The facing was not secured in position on darts on the WS in many cases, as this was done only at the CB and side seams, resulting in a loose facing, especially on the front of skirts and trousers.

Although darts were of a poor shape, and did not taper to a point, candidates finished them off properly at the pointed ends by darning the ends of machine threads into the machine stitches, even if, in some cases, this was done unnecessarily on the whole dart. Care should be taken to get the same size and length of corresponding darts, as, too often, the matching front or back darts were of uneven width and length.

The attaching of hooks and eyes, press studs and buttons ranged from poor to very good. Most candidates showed good workmanship in making the worked bar and buttonholes by hand. A few machine-made buttonholes did not have the corners reinforced. In one Centre, the distance between the buttons and buttonholes was either too close (less than $\frac{1}{2}$ the diameter of the button) or too far (up to 3 cm) from the CF edges. Many candidates omitted the press stud on the waistband, but attached 3 hooks instead. This was not very practical to fasten and unfasten, especially at the CB. A few candidates still made use of a large trouser hook and metal bar on very narrow skirt waistbands, giving a heavy and thick look. Skirt waistbands should be fastened either with hooks, worked bars and a press stud, or hooks, eyes and a press stud or button and buttonhole.

Most candidates had their hems beautifully slip hemmed, with proper hemming stitches across underarm and side seams with good alignments. It is useful to point out here that the type of hemming depends on the style, weight and fibre content of the fabric.

Many skirts had a CB slit opening which was made wrongly most of the time. The slit was made before the hem, and no mitred corner or trimming was done. Furthermore, no reinforcement was made.

Sleeves were of varying length, with a majority of set-in sleeves with a hand stitched hem. The armhole seams were of varying quality, ranging from very narrow to very large. Loop stitches used to neaten this seam were, in general, of a good standard. Candidates should avoid using zig-zag stitches to neaten armhole seams and seams in general, as they do not master this process well. Distribution of gathers or easing was very well done on sleeve heads, resulting in a good shape and look on the RS of the garments.

Pockets were a very common feature on many garments; patch pockets were attached to many blouses and hip pockets were worked on skirts, shorts and trousers. The hip pocket openings were not always of the same width on the side seams. Rolled edges were beautifully worked on many garments. Top stitching lines were straight and of even distance from the edge. For top stitching, the stitches can be lengthened or the upper thread doubled to produce a decorative finish. Patch pockets were neatly attached on the whole.

The majority of blouses had a straight collar attached. Some candidates achieved perfection, while others had difficulties with the process. A few candidates still attached it the wrong way round to the neckline. In one Centre, where candidates attempted shirt collars with band, they scored minimum marks, as this process seemed to be far beyond their capabilities. A few garments had a shaped facing to neaten the neckline and CF. This was quite well done, with only some poorly rolled edges on the RS.

Presentation of Coursework of a good standard was quite limited. In such cases, both the garments and the folders were of a correct standard. Most garments had enough processes, with a good mixture of hand and machine work. Some garments showed evidence of pressing during construction and most garments were well folded. Candidates should be reminded that the Coursework should be done during the two year course and Teachers should encourage the candidates to practise the different processes before working these on their final garments. Examiners would welcome improvement in garment construction and folder presentation next year.