

Moderator's Report Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
In D&T: Textiles (5TT01/01)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2018

Publications Code 5TT01_01_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

Within this unit candidates are expected to Design & Make a textile product. This activity can either be two separate projects or a combined design and make activity.

The most popular task title this year was Designer Dressing with some using Natural Forms and Child's Play, and odd examples of Sustainability. It was popular for candidates to design and make the same product. However, some centres used the separate design and make activity to enable candidates to respond more creatively to the design brief, without having to worry about the complexity of potentially making their product.

Analysing the Brief:

Confidence among the centres appears to have grown concerning what was expected in this criterion this year. However, candidates did continue to be a little generic about 'visiting shops' and 'analysing a product', struggling to communicate the benefit of these tasks. This limited access to highest mark levels.

Research:

This criterion continued to improve in value to the candidates' design process. The strongest candidates generally included an in-depth product analysis which explored not only the aesthetic values of the product, but also the functional and practical aspects of the item. Candidates continued to demonstrate a centre format for what they should include, rather than considering what would be valuable to their own brief. A degree of individual insight at this stage will assist candidates in achieving the highest available marks.

Specification:

Candidates frequently justified their points, often making recourse to their research in the process. Points continued to favour aesthetic values which could be observed as being included, rather than being physically tested. This could be suggestive of a tendency towards immaturity in the design process, the more well rounded and fully developed the design the more practical and objective testing points should be available.

Initial Ideas:

Candidates presented some interesting and practical design ideas, with thought out construction and fabric choices that demonstrated understanding of textiles. Those candidates that communicated well visually, with strong annotations, generally met high mark band criteria. Candidates were clearly able to demonstrate some knowledge of decorative choices and fabric choices but candidates tended to struggle to communicate suitable construction options.

Review:

Candidates subjectively praised their own work, and demonstrated they could seek the views of others'. However, it was not always valuable to the developing their design ideas. Candidates should be encouraged to critically reflect upon their own work, this is in addition to making full use of the objective feedback provided through third party

review. High marks are available to candidates that are able to engage fully and successfully with the review process.

Development:

A good range of different development techniques were employed to refine design ideas. Many candidates sampled technical techniques and decorative options, as well as considering how their design might aesthetically change with colour and shape. Those candidates that achieved in the high band marks were selecting important aspects of their design to explore, and presenting a range of solutions, before making decisions based on user feedback.

Final Design:

This criterion was generally accessible across the grade bands. This criterion clearly reflected the candidates ability to communicate design ideas.

Quality of Manufacture/Quality of Outcome:

A wide range of different textile products were presented, from soft toys, to cushions, and evening wear, to children's pinafore dresses. Centres continue to demonstrate skill in this area. The variety items produced provides a platform upon which to engage and challenge candidates across the capability spectrum, through allowing a degree of freedom to pursue ideas in which they have a personal interest or engagement.

Test & Evaluate:

Candidates often demonstrated good evaluative skills but there is still reliance on simple observational 'tests' and 'wash and wear' for practical testing. Those candidates that did really well often objectively considered the functionality of the product and what it was designed to 'do', beyond look pretty and be worn at a party.