



Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback
Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
In Design & Technology (1DT0)
1E: Textiles

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 2025

Publications Code 1DT0_1E_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

In this suite of examinations there are six different material specialist papers on offer, each with a common core in Section A which was worth 40 marks and a Section B worth 60 marks based on one of the six material areas: Metals; Papers and Boards; Polymers; Systems; Textiles and Timbers.

Question 1 (a)(i) The most common answer was soft alongside insulator of heat. The occasional answer of “insulator” on its own was seen but was not acceptable since it was not qualified as being a thermal insulator- this has been common practise seen for multiple series now.

It is important to stress here that these opening four small questions are about the properties of materials in the context of the product or component given in the table and therefore generic properties will not be accepted. Candidates often stated characteristics of materials or products instead of properties. A clearer understanding of the difference between these is needed.

Question 1 (a)(ii) This question was fairly well answered with a large proportion of candidates referring to the material being lightweight, food safe and waterproof.

Question 1 (a)(iii) Was generally well answered with ‘impact resistance’ and ‘heat insulator’ being seen as the most common correct answers. It was clear that many centres had covered this material area in their core teaching. Some candidates did write ‘recyclable’ which was not accepted as it was too generic.

Question 1 (a)(iv) This question was generally not well answered. If a candidate did score a mark here it was usually for ‘rust or corrosion resistance’.

Question 1 (b)(i) This was a generally well answered question with most 2 mark responses being awarded for discussing durability with some good justifications given about being walked over / furniture being placed on top. Where a candidate did not score well it was usually because they discussed the aesthetics of oak floorboards as opposed to a physical property.

Question 1 (b)(ii) This was the first of the maths-based questions. Many candidates were able to calculate the correct answer. When answered incorrectly it was mainly because candidates had got their numbers the wrong way around in their division calculation.

Question 2 (a) The majority of candidates were able to state flexible/or easy to bend / fold. Some candidates wrote ‘foldable’ or ‘folded’ which was not enough for them to obtain a mark here.

Question 2 (b) This was generally a well answered question, and many candidates managed to obtain two marks. Reducing environmental impact, reducing deforestation and reducing waste were all common answers. Many candidates were able to explain and justify their points well.

Question 2 (c) There were very mixed responses to this question. Some candidates described what an SMA was which was not what the question was asking for. Where candidates were successful, they were able to name a feature of the origami rabbit and say how the SMA would be able to make that feature move. Some candidates also reference that SMAs will change shape when heated / cooled which was also credited.

Question 2 (d) A wide range of responses were seen for this 4 mark maths question. Many candidates did obtain full marks here and it was clear that calculating area was taught in many centres. Some candidates did not round their answer correctly and so a mark may have been lost for this. Some candidates worked out the percentage of paper used rather than wasted so again some marks may have been lost there.

Question 3 (a) This question proved challenging to many candidates, relatively few could name the component as being a resistor.

Question 3 (b) There were mixed responses seen for this question about batch production. When candidates did obtain marks it was often for responses linked to bulk buying or minimising waste. There was quite a lot of low-level responses here where candidates would mention things like 'cheaper' and 'faster' but without and justification.

Question 3 (c) This was another maths question that was generally completed very well by many candidates. Most candidates could calculate the total number of circuit boards that could be cut from the whole sheet. Sometimes a candidate did put an incorrect answer and not show any working out - it is important to note that working out should be shown as sometimes marks can be awarded for parts of the calculation.

Question 3 (d) This was generally a very well answered question, with most referring to the portability / no need for a mains power source.

Question 3 (e) Candidates generally performed well on this question, particularly when discussing how the HIPS could make the sing along box more lightweight or impact resistance. There were some well justified answers here and many candidates did achieve two marks. If a candidate did not score here, it was often because they discussed the aesthetics / colours of HIPs as opposed to a physical characteristic.

Question 4 (a) This question gave mixed results. Some candidates did score well and this was often because they discussed that stainless steel is corrosion resistant. Those that scored well would also link this point to the fact that the salt pot would remain food safe. Some candidates also discussed how stainless steel is hard. Common incorrect answers were often centred around durability and strength which would be incorrect in this product's context.

Question 4 (b) This was a generally well answered question with many candidates offering 54g without any working out shown but some different versions of calculations were also seen, still arriving at the correct answer. Some candidates

did work out the percentage of materials that could be recycled i.e. 216g and were subsequently awarded one mark for this.

Question 4 (c) Although a mixed range of marks were awarded for this question candidates did tend to do better than they had on this extended response question on previous papers. Candidates frequently talked about disassembly giving them a better idea of inner workings, materials and product flaws. Some could then go on to give specific examples of these points that they had made. Many referenced the salt pot in their answer, which was fine, although they weren't asked to do this specifically. Some also made this question specifically about garment disassembly which again wasn't asked for but seemed a good way for some to focus their answer.

Question 5 (a) Candidates generally answered this question well, with many achieving over half marks by including details such as additional linings to give warmth and adjustable fastenings. A significant number of responses included detailed notes and sketches that addressed these specification points, often warranting full marks. The most difficult mark to achieve on this question was 'to be easy to care for' - here candidates may have just written 'easy care finish' without naming a specific fibre, fabric or finish that is considered easy care. Some candidates also lost marks on the 'provides extra warmth' specification point and they lined the vest but did not specify with which fabric or they used an inappropriate fibre or fabric e.g. cotton.

It was good to see that candidates separated out 'fit children of different ages' and 'include a method of fastening' - sometimes in the past candidates would merge points like this together and would therefore not be credited with two separate marks.

Question 5 (b) Candidates provided some mixed responses to this question with some not achieving particularly highly here. Many candidates did discuss the amount of numbers and symbols provided would be suitable for making many different sums. It was also common for candidates to discuss how the small counters could get lost. There were a large number of the same incorrect answers about the counters being too small so there could be a danger of being swallowed. Many candidates also discussed that they thought this toy was 'boring' and would not hold a child's interest.

Question 6 (a) This was generally a well answered question with many candidates displaying good textiles knowledge here. Durability, lightweight and water resistant were commonly seen correct answers with many candidates going on to develop their point and link it well to the walking trousers in use.

Question 6 (b) This question scored more highly in many cases than in previous years. It was clear in many cases that centres had taught candidates how to make an elasticated waist. There were some excellent answers seen here with candidates using a mixture of sketches and notes to explain the process. Some candidates showed how to make a separate waistband but by using the correct process and so were also credited. Centres should be reminded here that for a

candidate to receive full marks notes and sketches need to be used as stated in the question.

Question 6 (c) In general this was not a well answered question - many candidates had little understanding about what a plain weave was or of its physical characteristics.

Question 6 (d) This was generally a low scoring question. Most candidates could not name a correct method for waterproofing the side seams of the trousers as listed in the specification.

Question 7 (a) Many candidates gave the correct answer of overlocker to this question. There were quite a few incorrect answers of 'embroidery machine' as well.

Question 7 (b) There was generally a mixed response to this question. Where candidates did score it was often for knowing that stock materials are widely available, reducing manufacturing costs or reducing wastage. It was rare to see a well developed answer worth more than two marks here.

Question 7 (c) Most candidates engaged with this question, resulting in a large number of candidates scoring well. In many instances where the question was answered incorrectly, candidates were still able to secure 1 or 2 marks for showing correct working out. Where they did not get full marks, candidates generally picked up marks for identifying that $0.3\text{m} \times 2.80 = \text{£}0.84$. Some candidates did not convert their units and so therefore lost marks. Most candidates scored something on this question, even if it was just for part of the calculation.

Question 7 (d) This was generally a very well answered question with many candidates obtaining 4-6 marks. There were some really well-developed responses linked to the laminated finish creating water resistance, improved durability and improved stain resistance. Many candidates linked these factors well to the product in context.

Question 8 (a) This question was generally not well answered. Many candidates discussed absorbency but this was thought to link more to the cotton fibres than the denim fabric. Some marks were awarded for the fabric being tightly woven or durable.

Question 8 (b) This question provided mixed results although many candidates gave good explanations linked to the ecological issues caused by growing cotton. It was encouraging to see how many candidates could discuss how lots of water is needed for growing cotton and many could link this to issues for the local community.

Question 8 (c) It was clear the vast majority of candidates did not understand what manufacturing to a tolerance means. Where marks were occasionally awarded it was often for the point that the jackets have to be manufactured to the correct size. It would be good to see candidates giving more specific answers

to questions like this - thinking about the product in question and using that in their answers.

Question 8 (d) Candidates in general tended to ignore the part of the question which clearly states 'cost factors' and instead explained the table shown at the start of the question more generally.

It was rare to see answers which referenced the quality of the material, manufacturing processes and treatments. Where all three of these factors were discussed, candidates normally made environmental points rather than those relating to cost factors e.g. many candidates referenced transport pollution as the fibre had to travel to the UK from Pakistan.

Overall, a very varied and poor set of responses and sadly many candidates who attempted the question did not make clear reference to the cost factors included in the question.

Paper Summary

Overall, the paper provided questions that gave candidates the opportunities to demonstrate their knowledge of Design and Technology via a range different context based questions, including several maths based questions but in a DT context. The paper offered a range of differentiated questions that candidates could answer in differing degrees and a full range of marks were observed across the whole cohort.