

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Paper 0637/01

Theory Paper

General comments

This is the first year of the new format for the Child Development paper and candidates of all abilities appeared to have better access to the paper. The main concerns are that candidates are not reading the questions carefully and this leads to the incorrect answers being given and as a result, candidates lost marks. In **Section B** there were still a few candidates who answered all the questions as the instructions on the paper had been ignored. In **Section C** candidates are advised to plan their work prior to writing the answer as this enables candidates to remain focused on the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Generally well answered except for some candidates who mis-read 'young children' and gave answers for baby clothes.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates gave the correct answer.

(b) Some candidates gave the incorrect answer referring to giving a bottle feed.

Question 3

Majority of candidates gave the correct answer.

Question 4

Answered well.

Question 5

Several candidates did not answer this correctly. Pre-conceptual care was ignored and answers related to the fact that the woman was already pregnant.

Question 6

(a)(b) These were generally well answered.

Question 7

(a) Most candidates were not accurate in their answers e.g. something to do with inherited genes.

(b) Well answered.

Question 8

Well answered by most candidates although some answers were referring to the older child.

Question 9

(a)(b) These were well answered.

Question 10

Poorly answered by most candidates. Very few candidates actually mentioned textures and sounds etc.

Question 11

(a) Well answered.

(b) Generally poorly answered. Some candidates referred to stopping the children from climbing out of the window instead of talking about the glass.

Section B

Question 12

(a) Well answered by all candidates.

(b)(i) Majority answered correctly. Some gave extended family as the answer.

(ii) Well answered by most candidates.

(c) Generally well answered.

(d) Some candidates mis-read the question and gave the incorrect answer e.g. nuclear which had been mentioned in an earlier question. The question was looking for *other* types of families.

(e)(i) Most candidates achieved half marks here.

(ii) Poorly answered by most candidates.

(f) Well answered by many candidates.

(g) Many candidates achieved half marks.

Question 13

(a) Well answered.

(b) Generally well answered by most candidates.

(c) Well answered.

(d) Some confusing answers were given. Many candidates talked about the effect of folic acid on the mother instead of the baby.

(e)(i) Well answered by most although some candidates gave chicken pox or mumps as the answer.

(ii) Some described the effect the disease would have on the mother instead of the baby.

(f) Fairly well answered but some gave answers relating to the babies clothing.

(g) Many candidates achieved half marks. Regular tests do not include blood tests which was the answer some candidates mentioned. Blood tests are only carried out once or twice during pregnancy.

(h) Well answered by most candidates.

(i) Well answered by most candidates.

- (j) Mostly candidates achieved half marks here failing to provide enough detail to be awarded full marks.

Question 14

- (a) Fairly well answered by many candidates.
- (b) Well answered.
- (c) Some candidates gave the correct answer but there was confusion over the symptoms for mumps.
- (d)(i) Generally poorly answered by many candidates.
- (ii) Most candidates gained half marks.
- (e) Poorly answered as candidates had not read the word 'severe' in the question.
- (f) Several candidates gained half marks here but answers lacked detail.
- (g) Most candidates gained half marks for this question.

Question 15

- (a) Some confusion in the answer but most gained half marks.
- (b) Well answered.
- (c) Many related the answers to an older child therefore not gaining any marks.
- (d) Some candidates gave the correct answer, others missed the word 'play' and answers were given as smiling, gurgling etc as for a young baby.
- (e) Well answered.
- (f) Well answered.
- (g)(i) Some gave three safety points here, only one safety point allowed as the question did not refer to just safety.
- (ii) Poorly answered by some candidates. Some answers given did not refer to building bricks but shape sorters.
- (h)(i)(ii) This question was not well answered by many candidates. Some gave the answers for the advantages and for the disadvantages repeated the answers by giving the opposites.

Section C

Question 16

This was the most popular question in this section. The candidates that answered this section gave very muddled answers for the first part of the question but gave accurate answers for the second part of the question. Some mentioned smacking the child for punishment and this is an inappropriate answer. Very few candidates had many ideas as to why children need to be disciplined, but some good answers were given as to how children should be disciplined.

Question 17

This was not such a popular question and generally it was not so well answered as the previous question. Few reasons were given as to why parents may need day care for their children. Some mentioned going to work but little more. The second part of the question was also poorly answered in general. Answers given only included child minders and relatives/babysitters. Some candidates did not understand the term day care and gave answers that day care meant that parents should look after their children properly and provide food, toys, safety in the home environment.

<p>Paper 0637/02 Coursework (Child Study)</p>

General comments

This is the first year that the marking criteria had been altered and all Centres had applied it with reasonable accuracy. Any adjustments that had been made were relatively small.

The overall standard of work seen this year was good with some 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.

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.

Key issues

Background information was covered with reasonable detail in most Centres. This area must relate to the background of the child being studied. Surnames of the child should not be included to ensure the confidentiality of the child and their parents.

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. For reasons for choice, Centres must encourage candidates to give relevant reasons in order to justify the marks awarded.

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. Candidates should be selective in the research and copying from textbooks should be discouraged.

Many 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. Some Centres seemed to be satisfied with only one observation in this section and this is not sufficient for full marks.

Candidates who had produced relevant observations also produced satisfactory evidence of comparisons of accepted norms and other children. Many 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 generally well documented. Candidates had researched well for this assessment area by including relevant information taken from local newspapers and journals on Child Development.

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, 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 good 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.

Key issues

Background information was 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 some Centres, there was no written evidence of any planning and organisation. Candidates must be encouraged to plan ahead before carrying out the investigation and to consider techniques and equipment that are likely to be used. When carrying out a survey, it is important to record results clearly.

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. The majority 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.