



# CONTENTS

---

<b>CHILD DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>2</b>
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

Generally, this year's Paper was well attempted by the majority of candidates and the Paper was accessible to all levels of ability. There were a few candidates who had answered all the questions in **Section B**, therefore penalising themselves in terms of using their time wisely. Centres should advise all candidates to read instructions carefully on the front page of the Paper, prior to carrying out the examination. Candidates must avoid using repetition in their answers. Careful reading of the questions is vital before answering the question.

Candidates lost marks by misreading the question, for example giving an answer about older children, when the question specifically referred to a *young baby*. Candidates would also benefit from instruction on exam techniques. This would help them identify how many marks are allocated to a question and therefore, how much detail or explanation is required. Time planning for **Section C** would help candidates to cover all parts of the question. The better candidates were able to provide a plan for their responses in **Section C**, and so were able to focus on the requirements.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

Very well answered by all candidates.

#### **Question 2**

Well answered.

#### **Question 3**

Some accurate answers, but some candidates gave the incorrect answer of couples having had sterilisation and vasectomy operations.

#### **Question 4**

Generally well answered, although some candidates labelled the cervix as the vagina.

#### **Question 5**

- (a) Only correctly answered by a few candidates.
- (b) Very poorly answered by the majority. Polio was often given as the incorrect answer for the P in the question.

#### **Question 6**

- (a)(b)(c) Very few candidates had good first aid knowledge. Cold water was mentioned for the burn, but not for 10mins under running water. Many said that for the poison, to make the child sick and several gave the instruction to hold the child upside down by the legs before beating on the back for the choking. These are inappropriate, and possibly dangerous, and Centres should be careful to provide the correct instructions for emergency first aid.

**Question 7**

Fairly well answered by the majority, but many said sucking or biting instead of chewing.

**Question 8**

Poorly answered. A few candidates mentioned pencil control.

**Question 9**

Many scored one mark for saying read to the child, but could think of no other correct answer.

**Section B****Question 10**

- (a) Well answered.
- (b) Many candidates gained some marks, but some gave the incorrect answer ultrasound scan, which is not a regular test.
- (c) Fairly accurate answers provided, but candidates often said 'to look to see if the baby is okay' stopping short of saying 'to check for abnormalities' which would have been credited.
- (d)(i) Reasonably well attempted.
  - (ii) Some candidates gave accurate descriptions, but some often said the needle went into the stomach.
- (e)(i) Most candidates were credited for some marks, and a few gained full marks. However, some answers were incorrect and the most common was 'remembering to breathe in labour'.
  - (ii) Most candidates gained half marks with accurate answers.
- (f) Some correct answers given here, although some candidates did mention that the baby would be addicted to smoking once it was born.

**Question 11**

- (a) Well answered.
- (b) Some answered this accurately, but some misread the question and did not give answers specific to a *young baby*, but to an older child.
- (c) Generally well answered.
- (d) Again, well answered by the majority.
- (e) Poorly answered by many candidates. Answers that were common, but incorrect, were 'comfortable, so the baby can see out and be warm'.
- (f) Reasonably well answered, but some candidates were giving repetitive answers and therefore penalised themselves. Credit is only awarded once.
- (g)(i)(ii) Many gave one correct answer, some misread *young baby* and gave answers more appropriate to older children e.g./Lego and books
- (h) Very poorly answered by many candidates. Many misread the question and gave answers for the older child that were incorrect e.g. 'going to play at a friend's house'.

**Question 12**

- (a) Well answered.
- (b) Fairly well answered by many.
- (c) Again, many candidates gave accurate answers, those that gave incorrect answers had misread the *first year*.
- (d) Some candidates scored high marks here, but once again the word *hinder* was ignored by some therefore giving incorrect answers.
- (e) Poorly answered by the majority of candidates. Examples of incorrect answers include 'holding the book the right way up' and 'being able to read'.
- (f) Some accurate answers were given, but a few candidates missed out the vital word in the question, which was *number*.
- (g)(i)(ii) Fairly well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (h) Well attempted by most candidates, although few scored full marks. A lot of repetition was evident therefore candidates penalised themselves, as credit can only be given once for a valid answer.

**Question 13**

- (a) Well answered.
  - (ii) Poorly answered. Many candidates did not know what this type of communication was called.
- (b) Well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (c) Very poorly answered by most candidates.
- (d) Most candidates gave accurate answers to this question.
- (e)(i)(ii) Both parts of this question were reasonably attempted by the majority of candidates.
- (f)(i)(ii) The first part to this question was well answered, but in the second part most candidates did not know this information.
- (g)(i)(ii) Some candidates scored highly giving the correct answers. However, many candidates were unaware of the correct information.

**Section C****Question 14**

Candidates who answered this question answered the first part reasonably well and mentioned a variety of foods that could be given to a baby during weaning. Some also gave correct answers in the second part, but many mentioned playing games with the food and bribing the child to eat. Neither of these was correct and candidates should be discouraged from thinking that these are correct. Many candidates were repetitive in their answers and did not gain many marks because of this. Those that had done a plan beforehand were more focused on the question and gave accurate answers.

**Question 15**

This question was not as popular as the previous one, but generally those candidates who had answered it gave much more accurate responses. Detailed answers for the stages of labour were provided by most candidates and in the correct order. In the methods of pain relief, some candidates gave four or five different methods and achieved high marks. However, other candidates only mentioned breathing exercises and gas which was not enough or altogether accurate. The division of time is important when writing the responses. An equal amount of time should be spent on the two parts of the question. A few candidates had spent all the time addressing the first part and not enough time on the second part.

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

**General comments**

The overall standard of work seen this year was very good. 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 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. A few Centres are awarding high marks for very little evidence of research.
- Most 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 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 many candidates. Those 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, 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.

<p><b>Paper 0637/03</b> <b>Coursework (Practical Investigation)</b></p>
---

**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 a few 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.