

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this question paper.

## Candidate 2

### Question 1(a)

The candidate was awarded **9 out of 10 marks** because they identified three key features: colour, shape, texture (**3 marks**). The discussion points clearly linked the inspiration from the images to the item, allowing the design to be visualised. The candidate also provided a rationale and explained the intended impact on the item (**6 marks**).

The following statements were not awarded marks for the following reasons:

- 'neckline' – the candidate used the images to visualise the curve of the bridge as an inspiration. However the candidate then discussed the suitability of a v neckline on the item.
- 'denim' – the candidate discussed denim as rough / hardwearing, but this does not link directly to texture as this is not always the case.
- 'silk' – the candidate discussed silk in relation to warmth rather than texture.
- Diamond shaped print – the candidate indicated that this will create an 'autumnal feel' but this is not an accurate understanding of the use of shape.

## Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** for responses 'cheap' and 'worker fatigue' as these are evaluative responses linked to mass manufacture of the autumnal collection.

The following responses did not gain a mark:

- 'faster' did not gain a mark as the consequence was not accurate **0 marks** awarded.
- 'average size' did not gain a mark as no full consequence was provided **0 marks** awarded.

## Question 1(c)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because the prototype production was fully explained.

Please note: 'concept screening' did not gain a mark because although it was factually correct no explanation of the importance to concept screening was provided.

## Question 2

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 10 marks for the following:** 'durability', 'mildew', 'top stitching', 'snap buttons' and 'absorbency' (please see response on the additional pages).

These responses were all linked to the jacket/cheerleader. They provided factual information on the fabric property/construction technique and analysed the impact on the wearer.

The following responses did not gain a mark:

- 'absorbency' (attempt 1) – inaccurate understanding of the fabric property as they stated 'cool' rather than 'comfort'.

- 'warmth' – response was repetitive about warmth. The candidate did not provide any further link.
- 'elasticated cuff sleeves' – construction technique incorrectly identified.
- 'machine embroidered' – candidate did not provide a full discussion point on embroidery or link it to the identity of the team.
- 'mandarin / chef style collar' – construction technique incorrectly identified.
- 'crease resistance' – candidate has not demonstrated an understanding of crease resistance to the lining of the jacket.
- 'elasticated waist' – construction technique incorrectly identified.
- 'side pockets' - construction technique incorrectly identified.

### Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** because they correctly identified past trends: 'polka dots from the 1950s' and 'Dior New Look" from the 50s ... brought about the rise in cinched waists.' The additional feature of midi A line skirt hoop would have been awarded a mark if the two allocated marks had not been given.

However, no further marks were awarded because the candidate did not explain how the identified trends were applied to the party dress.

### Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because they provided an explanation which is linked to an environmental impact.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for responses on fibre choice and water consumption because each provided an explanation linked to an environmental impact.

Response on natural dyes did not gain a mark as the response was not fully explained, repetitive and only provided a fact therefore **0 marks** awarded.

### Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because they demonstrated a clear understanding of the importance of the pattern information, specifically the grainline and lay plan.

'The front and back view' did not receive a mark, as the candidate gave only a factual statement without linking it to the significance of the pattern information.

### Question 4(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** because they identified two surface decorations 'embroidery' and 'appliqué'. However, the explanations did not demonstrate a clear understanding of how the decorations would impact the football top. In addition, the candidate suggested 'beading' as another surface decoration. This could have been credited had embroidery and applique not already been identified but the explanation provided was too vague to merit a mark.

### Question 4(b)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 2 marks** because they did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the fabric finishes.

### Question 4(c)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they identified two principles of design 'function' and 'safety' and provided explanations for each of them.

The candidate provided an additional principle of design 'hygiene' which could have been awarded a mark. However, the explanation linked to this was too vague and did not establish a clear link to the fabric, so no mark would have been given for the explanation.

