

CONTENTS

<p style="text-align: center;">Group V Creative, Technical and Vocational</p>

CHILD DEVELOPMENT	2
Paper 0637/01 Theory Paper	2
Paper 0637/02 Coursework – Child Study	5
Paper 0637/03 Coursework – Practical Investigation.....	6

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Paper 0637/01

Theory Paper

General comments

In general this year's Paper was well attempted by the majority of candidates, although some struggled because they did not understand what was required in some of the questions and were perhaps hindered by their lack of the English language. However all candidates did all the questions required and had a good attempt at the free response question in **Section C**. Some evidence of planning in these questions would have helped candidates to remain focused. Candidates should be encouraged to read questions carefully. In a few Centres candidates wasted time by answering all the questions in **Section B**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Very poorly answered by most candidates. Common answers included responses such as right size, not too big/small or easy to take off and put on.

Question 2

Reasonably well attempted but some gave the answer as test the temperature of the water, check the warmth of the room and collect jug, and bath.

Question 3

(a) Very few mentioned high blood pressure; many said test blood group or anaemia.

(b) Poorly answered by majority of candidates. Size of uterus and infections.

Question 4

(a) Most candidates answered this well.

(b) Well answered by the majority.

Question 5

Generally well answered although saying the right nutrients was incorrect.

Question 6

Very poorly answered by the majority of candidates. Answers given were often for a carrycot or pushchair. Enough space for the baby was also a popular answer.

Question 7

Generally well answered.

Question 8

(a) Reasonably well answered but some gave discovery, manipulative play as answers.

(b) Poorly answered- reading and writing given as answers.

Question 9

Very poorly answered. Some said that the child could copy the doll by dressing like her.

Section B

Question 10

- (a)(i) The majority of candidates gave the correct answer.
- (ii) Well answered by most although some gave the answer one year.
- (iii) This was reasonably well answered, but some gave biting or sucking.
- (iv) Many candidates thought that giving soft foods or powder was a good idea.
- (v) Fairly well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (b)(i) Again, this was reasonably well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (ii) Well answered giving the correct food sources for part (iii).
- (c) Most gave the correct vitamin but only offered fruits and vegetables for the food sources.
- (d)(i) Many candidates gained one mark for this question, but failed to complete the answer.
- (ii) Fairly well answered generally. Most candidates gained two or three marks for this; many said water and toothpaste.

Question 11

- (a)(i) Poorly answered in the main. Candidates gave substances but little else.
- (ii) Poorly answered. Most said ovaries or glands.
- (iii) Well done by the majority, although some gave the male hormone testosterone.
- (b) Many candidates answered this well, however some gave the answer in relation to conception or fertilisation.
- (c) Generally well attempted with some candidates gaining full marks. There was some confusion with ovary and egg.
- (d) Reasonably well answered by the majority.
- (e)(i) Well answered by most.
- (ii) Most answered this correctly, but some gave the answer relating to the length of the period i.e. 5-7 days.
- (f)(i) Poorly answered. Many did not read the word healthy and gave answers such as finance, housing, antenatal classes.
- (ii) Very poorly answered. Most candidates appeared to know nothing about hereditary factors/genetics.

Question 12

- (a) Generally this question was poorly answered, although some candidates did mention feelings.
- (b) Well answered by the majority.

- (c) Most candidates answered this correctly, but some did not read the word baby in the question and therefore gave incorrect answers.
- (d)(i) Most candidates answered this accurately.
 - (ii) Reasonably well answered by many candidates, although some misinterpreted smother and gave answers that implied the baby could not breathe.
 - (iii) Fairly well answered.
- (e)(i) Many candidates did not know what was meant by a comforter.
 - (ii) Some candidates could only say the child needed to be comforted.
- (f)(i) Fairly well answered, but some candidates did not understand the word regression and gave incorrect answers.
 - (ii) Generally answered well by the majority of candidates.
- (g) Well answered by most candidates.

Question 13

- (a)(i) Well answered.
 - (ii) Well answered by most candidates.
 - (iii) Many candidates gave muddled answers. The mini pill was thought to be the morning after pill and the differences given were confused.
 - (iv) Well answered.
 - (v) Very poorly answered by many candidates. They found it difficult to explain.
 - (vi) Many candidates did not know this and could only say 'give a pill'.
 - (vii) Very few gained full marks. Some candidates knew one of the correct words i.e. device.
 - (viii) Very poorly answered. Many thought it stopped the sperm and the egg meeting. Some said it was fitted into the vagina.
- (b)(i) Fairly well attempted by the majority of candidates.
 - (ii) A variety of answers mostly incorrect by the majority, and muddled in places.

Section C

Question 14

The most popular question, most knew basic differences between fostering and adopting; could say people adopt because they cannot have children. Adoption process was muddled. Often talked about why people gave up or people adopt for slaves/abused children. Some Centres answered this question reasonably well.

Question 15

This was not a popular choice. Many did not understand the first part of the question- many gave answers of how accidents happened rather than the circumstances in which accidents happen. The second part was done better but the answers were too vague and lacked detail. Keep away or out of sight were given. More detail is required in answers.

General comments

The overall standard of work seen this year was good with a few candidates producing very good work. Many candidates had demonstrated their use of I.T. skills, which was encouraging.

It must be stressed that only children up to the age of 5 years should be studied. This means that children above that age should not be included in the work. Confidentiality of the child being studied is very important and surnames and addresses should not be included.

A few candidates are writing far less than 3000 words and therefore limiting the available marks. Written evidence must be available to support marks awarded. More depth and detail is required to justify the marks awarded. Awarding one mark for each point leads to over-marking and this in turn, leads to an adjustment being made.

Key issues

- Background information was covered in detail in most Centres. This area must relate to the background of the child being studied.
- In the explanation of the development area chosen the candidate must provide a summary to show that they understand the chosen area and what it entails. Reasons for choice is an area where Centres must encourage candidates to give several reasons in order to justify the marks available.
- There is evidence to suggest that some Centres do not understand the application of theoretical information. This is where the candidate should research the area of development chosen in some detail. Providing a list of books is not sufficient. Research should be well documented and a variety of different sources used. The information should be related to the age of the child being studied. Very often this assessment area is ignored by Centres and therefore the candidates are being penalised needlessly.
- Some candidates had provided adequate accounts of their observations and evidence. The observations must relate to the area of development chosen and the quality of response is more important than the quantity. Many candidates had produced a variety of evidence as in the form of photographs, drawings, graphs etc. which is encouraging but this graphic evidence must be related, in written form, to the chosen area of development. Candidates who only produced brief observations cannot be awarded high marks in this section.
- Candidates who had produced relevant observations also produced satisfactory evidence of comparisons of accepted norms and other children. Some candidates had spent some considerable time and effort on this section and had been rewarded with good marks. Candidates who provided brief evidence in their observations were unable to address this criteria in sufficient detail.
- Awareness of current theories was well documented by some candidates. Those candidates had researched well for this assessment area by including relevant information taken from local newspapers and journals on Child Development. However, some Centres had missed this assessment area completely and candidates were once again penalised.
- In the evaluation, it is vital that in order to gain marks, candidates must provide written evidence to cover all areas. Methods of presentation should be considered, whether candidates had been successful or not and to state, in the critical approach, if the study as a whole had been suitable. This is often an area where candidates do not do themselves justice and often throw away marks because insufficient evidence is provided.

General comments

Investigations this year were of a reasonable standard but it is the area that candidates find the most difficult. It must be stressed, that only children up to the age of 5 years should be investigated and also any data collected should be relevant to children up to the age of 5 years. Marks cannot be given on any evidence about children who are older. Subjects of sensitive issues i.e. child abuse and abortion should be discouraged as this leads to material of a sensitive and offensive nature being included and this is not appropriate.

Key issues

- Background information generally answered well.
- Reasons for choice were well detailed and relevant in some Centres.
- Suggested methods for collecting information was generally well answered, if rather brief in some Centres. This is where candidates should say where the information is going to come from or where it may be found in detail.
- In some Centres, there was no written evidence of any planning and organisation. Candidates must be encouraged to plan ahead before carrying out the investigation or at least to indicate in the investigation that some ideas had been thought through. When carrying out a survey, it is important to record results clearly labelled.
- Observations and recordings were not always presented satisfactorily. In Centres where candidates understood the criteria, this area had been well documented. It was encouraging to see the use of I.T. skills in the production of graphs, pie charts etc. Some of the candidates wrote conclusions in a meaningful way. Others were brief and lacked depth and detail.
- In the evaluation, it is vital that the candidates produce written evidence about the investigation.
 - Were the methods and presentation appropriate?
 - Was the topic presented in a clear, meaningful way?
 - Did the candidate achieve what she/he set out to do?
 - Could the candidate have taken more care in planning?
 - How could the investigation be expanded upon in the future?

The candidate needs to consider these and other relevant questions in order to write a meaningful, relevant evaluation.

It is important to note that the current mark sheets and marking criteria are used. Centres should be referring to the current syllabus for Child Development.