

# CHILD DEVELOPMENT

---

**Paper 0637/01**  
**Theory Paper**

## Key messages

- To score the available marks for each question it is important to attempt to answer each part.
- Apart from puberty in relation to the body's development for conception, the syllabus is to study the development of children up to the age of five years. Therefore answers that relate to older children are not relevant.
- Questions relating to specific groups i.e. babies or young children require only facts suitable for that age group.

## General comments

It was good to see that in **Section C** which produced higher than usual responses, that candidates could show that they could 'discuss and explain' their answers rather than just listing factual information.

## Comments on specific questions

### Section A

#### **Question 1**

There were excellent responses to this question, the majority gaining full marks.

#### **Question 2**

Where errors were made, they were due to some confusion as to which checks were carried out on blood and the reasons why urine tests were necessary. Many answers were excellent.

#### **Question 3**

There was a mixture of responses to identifying 'The stages of labour' and 'three ways the mother will know when stage 1 has started'.

An incorrect response included how conception and menstruation occurred.

#### **Question 4**

Many candidates could identify some methods of pain relief during labour, some gave totally correct answers.

#### **Question 5**

- (a) The four ways cows' milk was less well known. However, the majority could identify one or two differences.

### Question 6

Safety features on a cot were explained in some answers. For example: - "The bars should be close together so the baby's head cannot get caught". To obtain full marks the answer should have included the size of the gaps i.e. 45-65 mm apart.

### Section B

#### Question 7

Emotional development was generally not well known, however the description of how to help a child overcome shyness produced some excellent responses.

(c) The question referred to a baby. The common error was that many candidates gave answers obviously relating to older children.

(d) (e) and (f) These questions were understood and usually answered fully.

#### Question 8

(a) There were a few excellent responses with well explained symptoms. The least well known were mumps and rubella (the later explaining what could happen to an unborn baby).

(b) The answers required were explanations of diseases spread by contact and by droplet infection. Incorrect ways were by intercourse and sharing needles. This is an example when candidates should remember that the 'children' referred to in **Question 8 (a)** were under fives.

(c) Incorrect responses to immunisation (vaccination) were usually because "anti-bodies were injected into the body", when it is a small amount of bacteria virus or toxin which stimulates the body's immune system to produce anti-bodies.

(d) A common error was to state that babies of up to about two months do not catch infectious diseases because they do not go out or are not in contact with other people. Correct responses should have included: antibodies provided in the uterus; through the placenta; blood to blood. For example a baby will receive any immunity that a mother has, and so breast-fed babies will continue to get antibodies.

(e) (i) The signs of dehydration in a baby were not well known. The ways should include: dry nappies; sunken fontanelle; listlessness.

(ii) Answers to this section explaining the importance of preventing dehydration in a sick child should have included:

- To keep temperature control.
- To prevent constipation.
- To promote recovery.

### Section C

There was much improvement in evidence in the responses to this section. Answers usually covered all parts of the questions and generally candidates discussed and explained as required, and so were able to access the full range of marks..

# CHILD DEVELOPMENT

---

Paper 0637/02

Coursework (Child Study)

## Key messages

- Candidates would do well to be advised to use the mark scheme to organise the presentation of their studies, as this offers a logical path and makes sure that they include all the relevant parts.
- It was mentioned in a previous Examiner report (June and Nov 2010) that candidates need to be explicit about using a pseudonym for their child to protect true identities and this needs repeating.
- Excessive use of plastic wallets should be firmly discouraged – it makes the work cumbersome to examine and expensive to send between Centre, CIE and Examiner. Work needs to be secured in a simple project wallet that is strong enough to hold the study.

## General comments

Much of what was said in previous reports applies for this set of papers too. The child studies were on the whole a pleasure to read and many of reasonable quality, although generally over-marked by Centre teachers with one or two notable exceptions. Candidates vary in choosing to observe one child aged up to five and to compare with the norm or to compare with another child. Centres obviously offer advice on this and it varies according to the availability of opportunities to observe other children of a similar age. Many candidates are choosing to observe family members, which does compromise the anonymity for children. Where candidates do choose this option, they need to analyse the pros and cons of this in more detail than they are generally doing. It would be useful for the candidates' analytical skills if they recorded the age of the child in years and months for each observation.

The approach to current theories of child development varied considerably between Centres. The most in-depth responses compared what they had observed with what current literature says on the aspect of development and again used a compare and contrast method to look at two or more theories.

## Comments on specific assessment criteria

### Section A – Introduction and Planning

All of this has been said before and is equally relevant for this entry.

- (a) Candidates at this level appeared to find this a real challenge, but the best studies provided a good introduction in which the candidate discussed what they **intended** to do and why, sometimes introducing a personal link to explain their choice of focus, whether they were looking at physical, cognitive, social, language or emotional development. Whilst some candidates are clearly writing their plan at the end of the process and using the past tense in doing so, this was less common than previously.
- (b) Background information in the child/children was generally well presented. The better candidates were able to give a well-rounded context, including physical, intellectual, emotional and language development, as well as family situation and social/ environmental background. From the candidate's point of view, this was what the study was all about and the relevance of the task was clear.
- (c) The explanation, with the relevant theoretical information, of the development area chosen with reasons for choice, is an area where many candidates could improve. Firstly, a clear statement of the developmental area chosen is required and although this seems obvious, it was not

consistently provided by the candidates. The reasons for the choice could easily be linked to the interesting aspects of the relevant theories.

### **Section B – Application**

- (a) The written report of each observation made was approached by candidates in different ways. The most logical was an observation report clearly dated and with a clear intention of what was to be observed and why, followed by the actual observation. Use of dates and times helps the analysis of the information gleaned through observation as would the exact age of the child/children in years and months.
- (b) Application of knowledge and understanding of accepted child development theories to the observations is obviously a higher level skill than the simpler description of what happened, but a natural corollary. As you would expect, stronger candidates did well and weaker candidates needed more guidance on what are the relevant theories for their studies.
- (c) Comparing the evidence of their observations with the norms or other children of a similar age was generally well covered by candidates

### **Section C – Analysis and Evaluation**

This is generally the area where candidates need the most direction and support. It is also the section where it becomes obvious if the time frame for the study is limited, mostly because the development observed was also limited and therefore less to analyse and discuss.

Again, if the original plan was unclear about what aspect of child development was to be observed, then the conclusion in this section is also necessarily weak. Candidates need encouragement to be concise about what it is they are going to observe – to narrow the field right down and make it specific to one aspect of intellectual development, rather than intellectual development as a whole, for instance. This would also help with the final section which asks candidates to identify areas for further development and improvement of a child study.

Some candidates were able to discuss the holistic nature of development whilst at the same time drawing on specific examples from their observations. Some were able to comment on the historical development of the theories to show how our understanding of child development is advancing, although these were in the minority.

There is quite a wide variation in candidates' ability to identify their own strengths and weaknesses – this is not an easy aspect of the study for Level 2 candidates, who may only just be beginning to develop reflective practices.

# CHILD DEVELOPMENT

---

**Paper 0637/03**  
**Coursework (Practical Investigation)**

## **Key messages**

- Candidates must carry out research relating to children under the age of five. Some candidates are still researching areas such as puberty in adolescents.
- A detailed plan is required. The plan would ideally be a week by week plan of the work to be carried out along with an explanation of the procedures used and the equipment necessary to complete the tasks.
- Most candidates analyse their results and form conclusions but too many candidates still do not discuss their findings. There needs to be documentary evidence in this section to support any marks awarded.

## **Introduction**

Most candidates are choosing investigations that can be researched easily e.g. breast feeding versus bottle feeding, nappies etc. However, there are still some candidates who choose difficult areas to study e.g. genetic disorders. Candidates are limiting themselves with these areas as they may have to rely mainly on secondary information because understandably people are not always willing to talk about such personal issues.

Candidates are discussing their reasons for choice and are also discussing why they are choosing their methods of acquiring information. This is good practice.

Again many candidates did not submit a plan although some did give a brief outline of the content of the investigation. This plan would form a basic framework for the candidates to work to. On the whole the organisation of the work was very good and usually followed a natural progression

## **Application**

Candidates are using a variety of ways to gain information. Questionnaires, surveys and interviews are the most popular ways. Candidates are also using experiments and comparisons. Graphs are the most popular ways of illustrating the results and these are usually of a high standard. Most candidates are analysing their results and are forming conclusions but too many candidates are still not discussing their findings. There must be documentary evidence in this section to support marks awarded.

Generally leaflets and posters are usually of a good standard with some excellent graphics, but again, some of the subjects chosen do not lend themselves to the production of successful posters and leaflets. Leaflets and posters should also contain information that the candidates have found out from their investigatory procedures. There were one or two instances where marks were awarded for this section but there was no evidence of a poster or a leaflet. Again there must be written evidence to support marks awarded at all times.

## **Analysis**

Some candidates analyse their work thoroughly whilst others just give a brief review and all too often this section is mixed up with no sub headings used. Candidates need to discuss their work thoroughly to justify high marks. The candidates need to comment on why the questionnaires, surveys, books, use of the Internet etc. helped them e.g. 'my questionnaires helped me because I was able to note similarities and/or differences. This in turn has helped me to plot graphs etc, which I could then analyse and conclusions could then be drawn'.

Another point could mention the use of the Internet and how easy it is to access a lot of information quickly.

### **Strengths and weaknesses**

Strengths could focus on an interview that went well or how much information was gleaned from questionnaires. Candidates could also mention how well a computer programme helped them to make their leaflet or how well they thought their graphs helped them to analyse their work.

Weaknesses should not be about lack of time or other exam commitments. The focus should be on how well or not people responded to questionnaires. For example, perhaps it was difficult to arrange interviews or perhaps it was difficult to access information.

### **Further developments**

This is still a weak area as candidates tend to go off on a totally different tangent or just state that the investigation will help them in their future career.

Examples of further developments could be:-

Safety in the home could be extended to cover safety in the garden or candidates could further develop information on safety labels if this is not included in the study also they could develop what could happen if safety equipment was not in place bath-time equipment could be extended to cover bath-time toys.

Some of the marking was very inconsistent and on occasions it was necessary to adjust the marks accordingly. The marks of some Centres are just within tolerance. Where this is the case a note has been made on the Individual Reports to Centres to ensure that the marking is kept at a satisfactory standard in future. There must be written evidence to support marks awarded at all times.