



## Course report 2022

Subject	Fashion and Textile Technology
Level	Higher

This report provides information on candidates' performance. Teachers, lecturers and assessors may find it useful when preparing candidates for future assessment. The report is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published assessment documents and marking instructions.

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any appeals.

# Grade boundary and statistical information

## Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2022	360
------------------------------------	-----

## Statistical information: performance of candidates

### Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

<b>A</b>	Percentage	19.4	Cumulative percentage	20.0	Number of candidates	70	Minimum mark required	89
<b>B</b>	Percentage	24.5	Cumulative percentage	43.9	Number of candidates	90	Minimum mark required	76
<b>C</b>	Percentage	27.8	Cumulative percentage	71.7	Number of candidates	100	Minimum mark required	63
<b>D</b>	Percentage	17.5	Cumulative percentage	89.2	Number of candidates	60	Minimum mark required	50
<b>No award</b>	Percentage	10.8	Cumulative percentage	N/A	Number of candidates	40	Minimum mark required	N/A

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in appendix 1 of this report.

In this report:

- ◆ 'most' means greater than 70%
- ◆ 'many' means 50% to 69%
- ◆ 'some' means 25% to 49%
- ◆ 'a few' means less than 25%

You can find more statistical reports on the statistics page of [SQA's website](#).

## **Section 1: comments on the assessment**

In general, the assessments performed as expected. Feedback from the marking team and the statistical data indicates that the assessment components differentiated effectively between candidates of different abilities and levels of understanding.

Overall, performance in the both the assignment and question paper dipped slightly.

### **Question paper**

There was no new content in the question paper. The decision to restructure the format of answers for question 2 (construction techniques) appears to have helped make the available marks more accessible to all candidates.

Feedback from the marking team and centres indicated that it was fair and accessible for candidates in terms of coverage and overall level of demand. Most candidates were able to complete all four questions within the time allocated. However, it was commented by markers that there was a noticeable increase in the number of candidates that provided no response for some questions but there was no evident pattern linking this to specific question/s.

It was highlighted that candidate responses demonstrated good subject knowledge, however they did not make reference to the person/item within the question. This prevented candidates from accessing the full range of marks. Candidates must make reference to the item/target group, ie the child, nursery, running top/runner otherwise their response is deemed generic.

More candidates this session struggled to answer discuss, describe and explain questions correctly. They did not appear to know how to apply their knowledge to the format of the answer. Evaluative responses were written to a much better standard and were generally well laid out.

### **Assignment**

Most assignments met the assessment requirements for this level. It was evident that candidates had a better understanding of the assignment process this session.

Due to the removal of the practical activity from the assignment, it was commented that candidates were using their findings from the investigations more effectively to create their design solution. However, markers commented that, in general, performance was less strong than in previous years and the marks awarded for the assignment were lower. It was also highlighted that some candidate's written responses were vague and not progressive and therefore not in line with national standards.

### **Practical activity**

Overall, candidates performed well in the practical activity and marks remained high. A wide range of items were observed, many showing a high level of skill, and a good level of finish.

## **Section 2: comments on candidate performance**

### **Areas that candidates performed well in**

#### **Question paper**

Question 1(b): most candidates were able to provide responses linked to environmental issues and made reference to the designer in their answers.

Question 2: the marking team commented that responses were far better this session. Candidates demonstrated good knowledge of fabric properties/characteristics and construction techniques. The majority of responses were accurate, and the analysis linked to the nursery or child within their response. Some candidates demonstrated a very good understanding of the requirements for a nursery age child, ie independent dressing, comfort, safety.

Question 3(a): most candidates were able to provide two principles of design and explain them correctly in context to the question.

Question 3(c): most candidates demonstrated good subject knowledge of knitted fabrics and applied it correctly to the question. The evaluative responses were of a good standard.

Question 4(a): most candidates identified two suitable fabric finishes and made good evaluative responses linked to a teenager. Candidates were able to access full marks for this section, as they made accurate links to the requirements of a teenager.

Candidates who made the link clear between the item/target group within their response were able to access the full range of available marks.

#### **Assignment**

##### **Section 1**

###### **Design**

Most candidates correctly identified the two key themes.

###### **Research**

Most candidates carried out investigations to a good standard. A large proportion of candidates completed their research, using a variety of techniques, to gain information to derive a solution. Most of the research conducted was easy to interpret, concise and factual, and contained an appropriate source.

Most of the investigations were progressive, allowing candidates to effectively gather information, enabling them to create an appropriate final solution. Many candidates used the findings from one investigation to help identify what they needed to research in their next investigation, demonstrating a high level of planning by the candidate.

###### **Solution**

It was highlighted that most candidates had used their investigations to better effect this session. There was evidence that the design features, properties/characteristics of the fabric and construction techniques were from the evidence generated within the investigations.

## **Section 2**

### **Testing**

Most candidates carried out a suitable test that provided them with the necessary information for evaluations and amendments and overall, were clear and concise.

## **Areas that candidates found demanding**

### **Question paper**

Question 1(a): Overall performance was poor for this question. Most candidate responses were very vague, lacked detail and did not link or make reference to the tourist.

Most candidates identified three key features however the discussion points were basic and most candidates simply stated a design feature and applied it to an item. Most C-level candidates did not discuss the impact of the design feature in any detail or expand their response and most responses were repetitive.

Question 1(c): many candidates did not make reference to the tourist within their answer. Responses were predominantly generic linked to bespoke manufacturing. Candidates must make reference to the tourist in their answer to be awarded the marks.

Question 3(b): most candidates did not perform well in this question. Most attempted the question however their responses indicated a lack of subject knowledge regarding performance of fabrics and they struggled to answer the question because of this.

Question 4(b): most candidates lacked the subject knowledge of prototypes to successfully answer this question. Many candidate's responses were generic and did not refer to the manufacturer.

Question 4(c): most candidates evaluated celebrity endorsements effectively however, they did not make reference to the teenager or the manufacturer/designer and provided generic responses instead.

## **Assignment**

### **Section 1**

#### Design

Many candidates identified the key themes correctly however they did not explain the theme. They provided bullet points or statements which is not sufficient to meet the national standard required for this level.

#### Research

Most candidates did not provide an explanation for the purpose of their investigations. They provided an aim or a statement which did not detail why and what they aimed to get from the investigation or how it would help them with their solution.

Most candidates used a textile expert as their source for the interview. Many candidates asked questions which were not valid for their chosen expert. For example, it would not be appropriate to ask a textile expert or a teacher questions relating to fashion trends (colours/design features etc) as this is not their area of expertise.

Many candidates used the word 'popular' when summarising their investigation(s). The word was generally used inaccurately as the evidence within the investigation did not support their summary point.

The summary points were generally statements of evidence, lifted directly from their investigation and did not demonstrate the candidate's ability to discuss the importance of the point identified and how they intended to use it.

#### Solution

The design illustrations lacked detail this session. The following information was frequently omitted: details of fabric, colours, design features, possible size of the item, and fastenings. In addition, there was a lack of clear annotation within the illustrations.

Most candidates did not provide sufficient detail in their justifications of the design features, properties/characteristics of the fabric and the construction techniques. The justifications were statements of information lifted from investigations and did not demonstrate the candidates' higher order thinking skills.

### **Section 2**

#### Evaluations

A large proportion of candidates did not provide evaluative responses. Markers commented that many evaluations did not gain full marks as they tended to be very descriptive rather than evaluative. Evaluations read more like a story about what the candidate did rather than why they did it, and the effect their decisions had on the development of the item.

#### Amending the solution

Markers noted that many candidates did not provide evidence to justify the amendment to the solution. Instead, candidates provided changes from their personal opinion and were therefore not awarded the mark.

### **Practical activity**

Overall, candidates performed well in the practical activity. However, a few candidates had chosen items which only just met the requirements for the eight construction techniques, which then made it difficult for them to access the full range of marks.

## **Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment**

### **Question paper**

Candidates should be given more experience of answering exam-style questions, specifically 'discuss' (question 1), 'describe' and 'explain' type questions, which candidates did not answer well this session.

Candidates should be encouraged to read and use the scenario information from the question. This will ensure they effectively relate their responses back to the context of the question and make reference to the item or person. This is essential to allow them to be awarded the maximum number of marks. If no reference is made to the scenario, ie teenager, running top, manufacture by the candidate then the answer is considered generic.

Candidates should be aware of the course content for the subject. This information is in the course specification and highlights the main areas of study in preparation for the examination. This is a key document to refer to and will help centres ensure all course content is covered throughout the session.

Exposure to a diverse range of imagery linked to question 1 would be beneficial for all candidates throughout the course. Support with exam technique is also essential. Practice in selecting appropriate questions, structuring responses and managing their time will help candidates respond effectively to the question paper.

Understanding Standards materials containing candidate responses and commentaries are available on SQA's website. Centres can use these to help teachers and candidates to understand how the question paper is marked and the level of response required. Centres and candidates can access the specimen question paper, past papers and marking instructions on SQA's website.

### **Assignment**

All investigations should have at least four points of summary or conclusion that show progression. Candidates should not simply repeat information found in the investigation; they should indicate how the point highlighted will assist them with their selection of the final fashion/textile item.

A large proportion of candidates are not providing an explanation of the purpose of the investigation. They are writing a statement or aim rather than considering the outcome and purpose. They must provide a fuller response to allow them to be awarded maximum marks in this section.

To ensure candidates are meeting the standards in the solution section, it would be beneficial if one investigation is linked to the properties and/or characteristics of textiles/components and the suitable construction techniques to be used in their solution.

This will assist candidates when they come to justify their chosen textile's properties and characteristics and the construction techniques that they will use to manufacture their design solution.



Recommendations for investigations:

- ◆ interview — minimum five questions, clearly stating the source/expert, consider the questions in relation to the 'expert', explanation of purpose of investigation, progressive summary points, not statements of results
- ◆ questionnaire — approximately 20 respondents, clearly stating the target group, clear explanation of purpose for the investigation, with progressive summary points
- ◆ internet research — minimum three different sources, clearly identified with the URL

Candidates can use a number of techniques to present their solutions; most popular is an annotated illustration or an image of the item. Any format selected by the candidate must include detailed information on the solution. This could include design features, colours, textiles, components, construction techniques etc. The illustration should be clear and easily visualised.

When candidates are justifying their solution, they must ensure that there are a minimum of four points, with justifications, for design features, properties and characteristics and construction techniques. If there are less than four points in a particular section, for example, design features, the candidate will be unable to obtain full marks for that section as it has not met the standards for the solution.

Candidates should ensure that they link design features, properties and characteristics of their chosen textile, and construction techniques from evidence derived from the investigations.

Candidates are required to fully justify the reasons for the design features, properties and characteristics of the textile, and the construction techniques. This was not completed to a good standard this session as candidates provided statements of results from the investigations rather than explanations.

When evaluating their items, candidates need to be encouraged to make use of, and refer to, the evidence from their test in order to support their evaluative comments. The use of expressions such as 'therefore' or 'and so' may be useful triggers for candidates to develop their results into evaluative points.

Candidates should justify all amendments or adaptations that they highlight. These points should reflect evidence gathered in either the investigations or the test.

### **Practical activity**

Centres should refer to the 'Textile construction Techniques' document published on the Understanding Standards website to ensure the item they produce meets the requirements.

Centres are also advised that when marking a technique, it must be a 'standalone' technique and not connected to any other. For example, if an embroidery technique is being used and marks are awarded for multiple colours, stitches, beads then separate marks should not be awarded for herringbone stitch or a second set of embroidery stitches in the pattern.

Similarly, centres must ensure that bias binding is on a curve in order to be awarded marks and that the bias binding goes around enough of a curve to provide adequate easing in, for example on an armhole.

## Appendix 1: general commentary on grade boundaries

SQA's main aim when setting grade boundaries is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

For most National Courses, SQA aims to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

- ◆ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
- ◆ a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade A boundary)

It is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level. Therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and to make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Members of SQA's Executive Management Team normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors utilise their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
- ◆ Where levels of difficulty are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Grade boundaries from question papers in the same subject at the same level tend to be marginally different year on year. This is because the specific questions, and the mix of questions, are different and this has an impact on candidate performance.

This year, a package of support measures including assessment modifications and revision support, was introduced to support candidates as they returned to formal national exams and other forms of external assessment. This was designed to address the ongoing disruption to learning and teaching that young people have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, SQA adopted a more generous approach to grading for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses than it would do in a normal exam year, to help ensure fairness for candidates while maintaining standards. This is in recognition of the fact that those preparing for and sitting exams have done so in very different circumstances from those who sat exams in 2019.

The key difference this year is that decisions about where the grade boundaries have been set have also been influenced, where necessary and where appropriate, by the unique circumstances in 2022. On a course-by-course basis, SQA has determined grade boundaries in a way that is fair to candidates, taking into account how the assessment (exams and coursework) has functioned and the impact of assessment modifications and revision support.

The grade boundaries used in 2022 relate to the specific experience of this year's cohort and should not be used by centres if these assessments are used in the future for exam preparation.

For full details of the approach please refer to the [National Qualifications 2022 Awarding—Methodology Report](#).