

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 a possible 2 marks** because they identified two themes (upcycled components and music festival) and provided explanations for both which were relevant to the brief.

Investigations

The candidate was awarded **17 marks out of a possible 18 marks**.

Investigation 1

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used (questionnaire with a named source). They gave an accurate explanation of the investigation and provided four progressive summary points (items/colour/pocket/fit). The additional summary points would have been awarded further marks however the candidate had already achieved the maximum number of marks for this investigation.

Investigation 2

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used (internet research with a named source). They gave an accurate explanation of the investigation and provided three progressive summary points (jackets/fabric/colours). The two summary points linked to tassels and pockets was not factually accurate as these design features were not the most common from the images provided.

Investigation 3

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used (interview with a named source). They gave an accurate explanation of the investigation and provided four progressive summary points (denim/pocket/seam/fit).

The tassel summary point was awarded 0 marks as this is not progressive and the candidate did not explain why it was included. The fit summary point was linked to trends rather than the construction techniques and two-piece collar was a direct lift from the interview answer.

Solution

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

Present the solution

The candidate presented a solution which was clear and could be visualised and provided a reasonable amount of detail. The following areas were omitted: length of fringing, how it was attached, edge finish on cuff and size of buttons. The candidate was awarded **3 marks** as they provided most details.

Justify features of the solution

The candidate provided four accurate justifications for their design features (fringing/patchwork/colours/fit). These justifications were linked to the evidence in the investigations and the candidate gave an explanation to their importance of meeting the design brief.

The candidate provided two accurate justifications for the properties and characteristics of textiles (absorbency/poor warmth). These justifications were linked to the evidence in the investigations and the candidate gave an explanation to their importance of meeting the design brief. The following justifications were not awarded marks: (durability) as the justification was a statement; (ease of care) and (strength) as the justifications were not related to the evidence.

The candidate provided five accurate justifications for their construction techniques (patch pocket/buttons/sleeve/collar/seam). These justifications linked to the evidence in the investigations and gave an explanation to their importance of meeting the design brief. The justification for jetted pockets was not awarded a mark as it was not generated from evidence in any of the investigations and would not be possible in an unlined jacket.

Stage 2: evaluation

Testing

The candidate was awarded **3 marks out of a possible 3 marks** because they provided their techniques (sensory analysis) with a named source. The test was well laid out and easy to interpret and had ratings which made the test valid.

Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **2 marks out of a possible 3 marks**.

Evaluation 1 – The candidate provided a fact (upcycled components), an opinion and an impact (results from test) therefore 1 mark is awarded.

Evaluation 2 - The candidate provided a fact (colour) and an opinion however there was no impact therefore 0 marks awarded.

Evaluation 3 - The candidate provided a fact (style), an opinion and an impact (appealing) therefore 1 mark is awarded.

Amending the solution

The candidate was awarded **2 marks out of a possible 2 marks**.

Amendment and justification 1 - The candidate provided an amendment (surface decoration) generated from the evidence in the test and a valid justification therefore 1 mark is awarded.

Amendment and justification 2 - The candidate provided an amendment (colour) generated from the evidence in the test and a valid justification therefore 1 mark is awarded.

Candidate 1 was awarded 40 marks out of a possible 46 marks.

Candidate 2

Stage 1: design

Themes

The candidate was awarded **2 marks out of a possible 2 marks** because they identified two themes (embellished and baby shower) and provided explanations which were relevant to the brief.

Investigations

The candidate was awarded **7 marks out of a possible 18 marks**.

Investigations 1

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used (internet research with named source). The candidate gave a statement rather than explanation of the investigation and provided one progressive summary point (embroidery). The other summary points linked to embellishments, baby clothes and colours were all statements not explanations and the summary point for cotton was not taken from the evidence.

Investigations 2

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used (questionnaire with named source). The candidate gave a statement rather than an explanation of the investigation and provided three progressive summary points (clothing/embroidery/colour). The two summary points linked to fabric qualities and theme were all statements not explanations.

Investigations 3

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they provided information on the investigative technique used (interview but with no source). The candidate gave a statement rather than explanation of the investigation and provided one progressive summary points (fabric). The other summary points did not gain marks because summary point 2 was not valid as it was linked to the trend not the construction technique/textile. Summary point 3, 4, 5 and 7 were all statements and summary point 6 had no evidence.

Solution

The candidate was awarded **8 marks out of a possible 18 marks** for the presentation and justification of the features of the solution.

Present the solution

The candidate presented a solution that was clear and could be visualised and provided a reasonable amount of detail. Areas that were missing were the type of embroidery and ribbed hem details. The candidate was awarded **3 marks** as they provided most details.

Justify features of the solution

The candidate provided three accurate justifications for their design features (collar/colour/sleeves). These justifications were linked to evidence in the investigations and the candidate explained it's importance of meeting the design brief. The justification for embroidery was a repeat/statement of results.

The candidate provided one accurate justification for the properties and characteristics of textiles (soft). This justification was linked to evidence in the investigations and the candidate explained it's importance of meeting the design brief. The following justifications were not awarded marks: anti-bacterial and brushed finish justification as these are fabric finishes not properties or characteristics of the textile, washable justification was too vague.

The candidate provided one accurate justification for their construction techniques (hem). This justification linked to evidence in the investigations and the candidate explained it's importance of meeting the design brief. The justification for embroidery, collar and sleeve were all direct lifts from investigation 3 answers and were not expanded on.

Stage 2: evaluation

Testing

The candidate was awarded **3 marks out of a possible 3 marks** because the candidate provided their techniques and source (sensory analysis with named source). The test was well laid out and easy to interpret and had ratings which made the test valid.

Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **2 marks out of a possible 3 marks**.

Evaluation 1 - The candidate provided a fact (design), an opinion and an impact (likely to buy it) therefore 1 mark is awarded.

Evaluation 2 - The candidate provided a fact (embellishment), an opinion and an impact (effective design) therefore 1 mark is awarded.

Evaluation 3 - The candidate provided a fact (colour) and an opinion however the impact was too vague and not enough detail given therefore 0 marks awarded.

Amending the solution

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

Amendment and justification 1 - The candidate provided an amendment (colour) generated from the evidence in the test and a valid justification therefore 1 mark is awarded.

Amendment and justification 2 - The candidate provided an amendment (embellishments) however it was not accurate against the test results therefore 0 marks are awarded.

Candidate 2 was awarded 23 marks out of a possible 46 marks.

Candidate 3

Stage 1: design

Themes

The candidate was awarded **2 marks out of a possible 2 marks** because they identified two themes (baby shower and embellished) and provided explanations for both which were relevant to the brief.

Investigations

The candidate was awarded **14 marks out of a possible 18 marks**.

Investigations 1

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used (internet research with named source). They gave an accurate explanation of the investigation and provided two progressive summary points (cotton/embroidery). The summary point for colour was not accurate, and the summary point for poppers was too vague.

Investigations 2

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used (questionnaire with named source). They did not provide an explanation of the investigation but did provide four progressive summary points (dress/colour/embroidery/fish). The additional summary point for poppers could have been awarded a mark however the candidate had reached the mark allocation limit. The summary point for cotton was too vague.

Investigations 3

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they provided information on the investigative technique used (interview and source). They did not provide an explanation of the investigation but they did provide four progressive summary points (cotton/seam/embroidery/poppers).

Solution

The candidate was awarded **8 marks out of a possible 18 marks** for the presentation and justification of the features of the solution.

Present the solution

The candidate presented a solution that was clear and could be visualised and provided an adequate level of detail. There were a number of areas missing such as; age/size, stitch type for embroidery, popper size, piping and thickness. The candidate was awarded **2 marks** due to the lack of detail.

Justify features of the solution

The candidate provided 2 accurate justifications for their design features (embroidery/fish). These justifications linked to evidence in the investigations and gave an explanation to their importance of meeting the design brief. The justification for dress and colour were statements not explanations.:

The candidate provided two accurate justifications for their properties and characteristics of textiles (absorbency/low warmth). These justifications were linked to evidence in the investigations and gave an explanation to their importance of meeting the design brief. The following justifications were not awarded marks: durable and ease of care as these were statements and not accurate.

The candidate provided two accurate justifications for their construction techniques (poppers/bias binding). These justifications were linked to the evidence in the investigations and gave an explanation to their importance of meeting the design brief.

The justification for seam was linked to quality rather than function and hand stitching and there was no mention of embroidery within the response therefore not linked to construction technique.

Stage 2: evaluation

Testing

The candidate was awarded **3 marks out of a possible 3 marks** because they provided their techniques and source (sensory analysis with named source). The test was well laid out and easy to interpret and had ratings which made the test valid.

Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **2 marks out of a possible 3 marks**.

Evaluation 1 - The candidate provided a fact (fabric), an opinion and an impact (suitability/comfort) therefore 1 mark is awarded.

Evaluation 2 - The candidate provided a fact (poppers), an opinion and an impact (functional) therefore 1 mark is awarded.

Evaluation 3 - The candidate provided a fact (colour) and an opinion however did not provide an impact therefore 0 marks awarded.

Amending the solution

The candidate was awarded **0 marks out of a possible 2 marks**.

Amendment and justification 1 - The candidate provided an amendment (fish design) generated from the evidence in the test however the justification was a lift of evidence from the test and not an explanation therefore 0 marks awarded.

Amendment and justification 2 - The candidate did not provide a second amendment therefore 0 marks awarded.

Candidate 3 was awarded 29 marks out of a possible 46 marks.