

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each stage of this assignment.

Candidate 1

Stage 1: design

Themes

The candidate was awarded **2 marks out of 2 marks** because they identified two themes: '1960's' and 'Teenagers' and provided explanations for both.

Investigations

The candidate was awarded **18 marks out of 18 marks**.

Investigation 1

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used 'Visit to Mary Quant exhibition. Kelvin grove Art gallery'. They gave an accurate explanation of the investigation and provided four progressive summary points. The additional summary points 'disposal of fullness' would not have been awarded any marks as they are not related to the evidence from the investigation.

Investigation 2

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used 'Questionnaire to my target group - 21 teenagers'. They gave an accurate explanation of the investigation and provided four progressive summary points .

Investigation 3

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used 'interview with..., Fashion and Textile Teacher at my school'. They gave an accurate explanation of the investigation and provided four progressive summary points. Please note: the candidate would not have received a mark for their final point, as it simply restates information from the interview and mention of the seam alone is unlikely to persuade the target audience to purchase the item.

Solution

The candidate was awarded **14 marks out of 18 marks** for the presentation and justification of the features of the solution.

Present the solution

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

The candidate presented a solution which was clear and could be visualised and provided a reasonable amount of detail. The following areas were omitted: type of seams, hem, fastening, if the white fabric is the same (polyester) and whether or not the belt is detachable or sewn on.

Justify features of the solution

The candidate was awarded **12 marks**.

The candidate provided four accurate justifications for their design features. These justifications were clearly linked to the evidence gathered during the investigations, and the candidate effectively explained their relevance to fulfilling the design brief.

The candidate provided accurate justifications for the properties and characteristics of the textiles, effectively linking them to evidence from their investigations and clearly explaining their significance in meeting the design brief.

Point 5 (durability) was a statement from investigation 3 and was not supported with an accurate justification therefore **0 marks** were awarded.

The candidate provided four accurate justifications for their construction techniques, effectively linking them to evidence from their investigations and clearly explaining their significance in meeting the design brief.

Stage 2: evaluation

Testing

The candidate was awarded **3 marks out of 3 marks** because they provided a technique (sensory test) and source (10 teenagers). The test was clear and easy to interpret, it included a rating system that enhanced validity, and generated data that could be effectively analysed.

Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **3 marks out of 3 marks** for all the evaluative responses.

Amending the solution

The candidate was awarded **1 mark out of 2 marks**.

Amendment and justification 1: length

The candidate identified that they may require more investigation but did not give a reason why this would benefit the design, for example, appeal to more teenagers therefore **0 marks** were awarded.

Amendment and justification 2: colour

The candidate identified a change from the test and provided a reason for carrying out further research (**1 mark**).