

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Paper 0637/01
Theory Paper

Key Messages

- Accurate, factual information was required for the majority of questions in **Section A**.
- **Section B** required candidates to give more detail in their answers. In particular, **Question 8 (b)** and **Question 9 (a)** necessitated candidates giving a fuller response.
- Development of ideas rather than listing in **Section C** were needed to answer the question well and achieve the highest marks.

General Comments

- Candidates demonstrated a good all round knowledge of all areas within the paper. Very few learners did not attempt to answer all questions.
- In **Section C** candidates selected the question they felt most confident in answering and as a result, responses were good. Candidates achieved the best marks where they showed wide knowledge and developed their answers. Some candidates gave many correct responses but did not develop their answers, as a result their response read as a list.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Few candidates correctly answered this question. The majority stated that the placenta is formed at conception, rather than the correct answer, 12 weeks.
- (b) Many candidates answered this question well. The focus was upon the *function* of the placenta and therefore, where candidates answered that it provides oxygen did not receive a mark. Answers that stated it provided the baby with oxygenated blood or simply helped the baby breathe received a mark.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to identify that XY sex chromosomes determined a male. Here, to achieve maximum marks it was important for candidates to also mention that the female sex chromosome is an X and this will need to be fertilised by a sperm containing Y. Many learners did this.
- (b) As with (a) it was important to state that the female X chromosome egg is fertilised by a X sperm, along with XX for a female.

Question 3

- (a) It was important that candidates demonstrated that they were aware of the ideal temperature. Although a mark was awarded for answers that fell between 16 and 20 degrees, where the maximum temperature was exceeded no mark was awarded. Many candidates stated that the ideal temperature was that of body temperature.
- (b) Marks were awarded where candidates correctly identified that hypothermia relates to low body temperature. Many candidates stated the correct temperature of the body and used this as an explanation. Some candidates stated the opposite and felt it was high body temperature.
- (c) Candidates needed to state the benefits of fresh air and sunlight. It is important when responding to this question that learners gave enough detail to make their response accurate. Therefore, answers that it was good for the skin did not receive a mark as very hot weather is not good for the skin. Many candidates stated of the benefit of sun to produce vitamin D in the body. Fewer identified the benefits of improving appetite, helping them to sleep and ultraviolet rays killing bacteria.

Question 4

Very few candidates gave the expected responses for this question. Responses were often limited and did not state how adults help children to learn or focused upon general parenting rather than learning.

Question 5

- (a) Correct answers identified that Sudden Infant Death is unexplained, or death without an obvious cause. Some candidates suggested that this was preventable or in some way related to bad parenting. No marks were awarded for such responses. Some candidates reworded the question as their response, for example, 'the sudden death of an infant'. This would not achieve a mark. In addition some learners explained the term as stillbirth.
- (b) Responses were varied to this question. Many candidates discussed the importance of not allowing the baby to get too hot. Where candidates had simply stated maintain the correct temperature, no mark was awarded. One word responses without explanation such as, 'smoking' were not awarded a mark. Many candidates discussed pre-natal factors.

Question 6

The question was answered well by candidates. Some learners stated conventional methods and no marks were awarded for these. Description of the TENS machine did not receive a mark.

Question 7

- (a) Almost all candidates attempted this question. Many gave an outline of how to treat choking. It is important that candidates demonstrated that they were aware that treatment for choking differs from general care. Responses that suggested that the baby should be 'gently or lightly' rubbed or patted did not receive a mark. Many candidates outlined holding the baby upside by its feet. This did not receive a mark.
- (b) Some candidates gave clear responses for this question. Many candidates attempted to describe the Heimlich manoeuvre, this is not appropriate in young children and no marks were awarded for this response.

Section B

Question 8

(a)

- (i) Candidates gave correct answers explaining that this is use of the large muscles such as the legs and arms. Explanation was asked for therefore responses needed to expand upon this to achieve the full mark.
- (ii) As with (a) full marks were awarded where there was development of answer and identification of small muscles in hand and fingers used for writing and drawing etc.

(b) It was important that candidates gave descriptive answers. This needed to focus upon the fact that each reflex was involuntary. Therefore, candidates needed to focus upon the adult action such as, 'walking reflex- when the baby is held in the upright position on a firm surface, it will make stepping motions with its feet.'

Some candidates suggested that grasping reflex is when babies grab things that are near them. No marks would be awarded for this as this describes a purposeful action.

- (c) Many candidates explained that each reflex was needed to swallow, feed etc. The expected response was to survive.
- (d) Few candidates identified the correct age. Some candidates gave an age range, no marks were awarded for this. Many learners suggested 1 year.
- (e) Few candidates identified that reflexes are replaced by actions that need to be learnt. Some suggested that fine and gross motor skills replace these or described actions such as walking.
- (f) (i) It was important that candidates identified the stage when babies teeth need to be cleaned. Some learners suggested that this was at the weaning stage. As some babies do not have teeth at this stage this was not awarded a mark. Ages could not be accurate in determining when teeth should be cleaned and so no mark was awarded for this.
- (ii) The only correct answer awarded was specifically, in order to remove plaque from teeth as this is the reason why cleaning teeth is necessary. No other response was awarded a mark.
- (iii) It was important to explain how a good diet helps babies' teeth to stay healthy. Therefore, responses needed to give suggestions of foods and the benefits. Stating 'avoid foods high in sugar' does not explain how this keeps teeth healthy, while a response such as 'limiting sugary foods that can cause teeth to decay' may have been awarded a mark.

Question 9

- (a) This question prompted a wide of responses. Some candidates may have suggested items used for the treatment of minor injuries by medical professionals; these were not suitable for use within the home. It was important when discussing the use of each item, that candidates gave clear and relevant responses. For example, 'plasters- *for cuts*' would not receive two marks; however 'plasters - *to cover a small cut to prevent infection*', would achieve two marks. Local terms such as 'band-aids, bands' were acceptable where the intention was to describe plasters. Candidates should avoid using general terms such as *a bandage covers injury* or *a plaster covers injury*. Where multiple same responses were given this would not have received a mark because understanding was not demonstrated.
- (b) Candidates generally completed the question well. The major reasons for emergency treatment were identified. There were some circumstances where marks were not awarded. For example some candidates discussed hypothermia or other medical conditions. These are diagnosis of a condition and not a reason. It would not be probable that hypothermia could be determined before medical treatment therefore a mark was not awarded. Where candidates suggested a deep cut, this was linked to heavy bleeding as there would not be a deep cut without heavy bleeding and so one mark was awarded. Some candidates suggested that high temperature would require urgent

medical attention. This was not awarded a mark unless the candidate had developed this to indicate a high temperature that does not respond to treatment or reduce after medication. Similarly, where candidates had suggested sickness and diarrhoea, this needed to be described as severe or constant to achieve a mark.

- (c) Many candidates gave responses to this question that discussed parents' actions rather than *features* as the question asked. Where learners described parent actions such as *turning plan handles round, not using a table cloth*, no marks were given. The responses needed to discuss safety features that are put into place such as locks on cupboards. It was important where these were correctly identified that candidates gave appropriate reasons. Therefore, stating that *locks on drawers with knives in so children do not cut themselves*, was not awarded a mark. A response that stated that *locks on drawers stop children being able to open them and get the knives that might cut them* would be an acceptable response.

Section C

- (a) (i) Responses to this questions tended to be well thought out and discussed. There was good understanding of the considerations needed before starting a family. Some candidates tended to focus more upon the social aspects rather than practical, emotional and medical reasons too. The best responses included explanation that age of parents is relevant along with any genetic illnesses that may be passed on. This demonstrated that learners had a very broad understanding of the wide issues affecting starting a family.
- (ii) This question was answered well with most candidates giving relevant changes that happen when becoming parents. It was important that candidates did not simply repeat the responses given in i) for example, *considering having enough finances*, then merely repeating *not having enough finances*, or *consider moving to a bigger house*, then *moving to a bigger house*. All candidates attempted both parts of the question and an additional mark was awarded for such where responses were logical, not repetitive, accurate and demonstrated understanding.
- (b) (i) It was pleasing to see so many candidates answering this question very well. Good consideration was given to the benefits of breastfeeding for mother and baby. Along with this, there was evidence that candidates knew and understood wider issues such as the benefits of breastfeeding in relation to childhood obesity, reduction of female cancers and development of maternal bonding. It was also good to see that candidates understood the reasons why mothers decide not to breastfeed, although the question did not demand it, many learners introduced **Section (ii)** by stating this.
- (ii) This response was generally well answered. There were a few areas where candidates could have developed their responses further. For example, where methods of sterilisation were discussed, it was important to discuss how these killed bacteria, not how they are used. Some candidates also lost focus and discussed safety issues rather than preventing the risk of infection as the question asked. Some candidates gave very good explanations of why boiling plastic bottles should be avoided.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Paper 0637/02
Coursework (Child Study)

Key Messages

- As previously reported, candidates need to be explicit about using a pseudonym for their child to protect true identities and this needs repeating.
- It is good to see fewer plastic wallets being used for each page of a project. Work needs to be secured in a simple project wallet that is strong enough to hold the study. The use of thick card and lots of pictures which do not contribute to the analysis are not very helpful and should be discouraged. However, illustrations which support the context of the child's life and the area of development are useful.

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, the degree of over-marking was less marked than previously. More candidates than previously appear to be using the mark scheme to organise the presentation of their studies, providing a logical path, including all the relevant parts. Candidates vary in choosing to observe one child aged up to 5 and compare with the norm, or 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. Some candidates are still choosing to observe family members, which does compromise the anonymity for children. Where candidates do choose this option, they need to analyse the advantages and disadvantages of this in more detail than they are generally doing. It is good to see the candidates' now recording the age of the child in years and months for each observation in some Centres – an action from previous moderating.

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. The weaker projects provided a shallow comparison with a few key norms. A consideration of the context of the child's life and a 'picture' of the cultural and familial life would be useful as these factors can have an impact on child development.

Comments on specific questions

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. There are still some candidates writing their plan at the end of the process and using the past tense in doing so.
- (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/ cultural background. From the candidates' 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. The 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. The advice is that candidates observe a child over a period of six months and this is not always followed. Those who try to squeeze the process into a reduced time-span, tend to offer less than the suggested six observations, which limits possibilities for analysis.
- (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 – 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 was, as usual quite a wide variation in candidates' ability to identify their own strengths and weaknesses – not an easy aspect of the study for Level 2 candidates who may only just be beginning to develop reflective practices. However some honesty about what aspects of the study went well and what areas were more problematic was evident in the stronger candidates' work.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Paper 0637/03
Coursework (Practical Investigation)

Key Messages

- When giving reasons for the choice of the investigation there should ideally be at least two or three fully discussed reasons.
- The plan of the investigation 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.

Introduction

Most candidates chose areas of study which were easy to research and which would allow a full range of investigative procedures to be undertaken.

Whilst most candidates are discussing their reasons for choice, there are still a few who just give a list or state 'because it is interesting'.

Some candidates did submit quite detailed plans; however, most candidates just gave a brief outline of the content of the investigation. 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. However, a few candidates are relying on only secondary sources of information – in these cases high marks should not be awarded. 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.

Leaflets and posters are generally of a good standard, some of them looking very professional. However, leaflets should be 'leaflet style' and not just two or three pages of A4 paper.

Analysis

Some candidates do 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 and to ensure that their work is fully analysed and evaluated.

Appropriateness of methods used

Some candidates tended to discuss their own study skills and did not discuss the effectiveness of their methods. The candidates need to comment on why the questionnaires, surveys, books, use of the Internet and so on helped them e.g. 'my questionnaires helped me because I was able to note similarities and/or differences' in whichever area that they are researching. 'This in turn has helped me to plot graphs etc. which I could then analyse and draw conclusions'.

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

Strengths and Weaknesses

Some candidates completed this section well, but some are still saying that a lack of time or other exam commitments stops them from producing an Investigation of a high standard. Candidates need to be organized so that lack of time is not an issue.

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.

Some of the marking was very inconsistent and on occasions it was necessary to adjust the marks accordingly. Again there must be written evidence to support marks awarded at all times.