

Home Economics (Child Development)

General Certificate of Secondary Education J441

OCR Report to Centres

June 2013

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 203

CONTENTS

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
Home Economics (Child Development) (J441)**

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Overview	1
B011 Controlled Assessment – Short Tasks	2
B012 Controlled Assessment – Child Study	5
B013 Principles of Child Development Written Paper	7

Overview

The cohort taking the specification was wide and varied. From the evidence seen, both the controlled assessment and the examination paper proved accessible to all the candidates and provided opportunities for a wide range of abilities to demonstrate their achievement. At the same time it provided differentiation. It was apparent that where teachers had a clear understanding of the specification the appropriate guidance and support was given to their candidates.

B011 Controlled Assessment – Short Tasks

The majority of candidates had followed the OCR practical and investigative tasks with very few adaptations. Candidates are required to complete three short tasks which must be taken from the board set titles found on OCR Interchange, these tasks cannot be adapted or changed. Candidates need to undertake tasks that will illustrate a range of skills and that are not repetitive; for example, two practical food outcomes are not acceptable.

The investigative task should be undertaken with a different approach from the practical tasks, the use of questionnaires, interviews with resultant written data, is recommended. Nutritional analysis with relevant conclusions can also be used to good effect. Centres can contact OCR for further advice prior to candidates embarking on their task.

Most candidates submitted short tasks of an appropriate length following the recommended allocated time of 7 hours per task. However, a few candidates submitted work that appeared to have taken considerably longer. A small number of candidates included large quantities of research, (this does not form part of the planning section). This research was incorrectly given credit.

Planning

Good practice was evident by those candidates undertaking a leaflet, poster or magazine article including an annotated draft layout of how their outcome may be constructed. This included different fonts, colour, relevant layout and content. Accurate plans demonstrated progression through the stages of working and were an effective tool for delivering this part of the planning section.

Safety aspects were considered by many candidates when carrying out their outcomes, this was especially evident in the comparisons of bought/home-made baby food and investigating baby changing facilities. Photographic evidence supported these tasks. Candidates often spent insufficient time on planning as resultant plans were often brief. Some candidates were unable to explain their aims and objectives or provide any detailed indication of the resources and how they were going to be utilised throughout the task.

There were a range of teacher based proformas that did not enable the candidates to achieve and show originality. Although relevant to the task many candidates used them to give bullet pointed responses. It is important that any proformas used only reiterate the assessment objectives and do not guide candidates in their response to the task. In addition many candidates gave website addresses with little or no explanation of use or relevance.

Candidates were required to carry out a plan of action that was logical, concise, and which clearly identified the key priorities required to carry out the chosen task. This could have taken the form of a flow chart or step by step account and should have had sufficient detail for the candidate to carry out the planned work. This was vital for high marks to be achieved.

Carrying Out – Organisation

Good practice saw the use of diary logs, tabulated charts, annotated photographs or written accounts of the work undertaken or a section linked to the plan of action. However, many candidates were unable to provide evidence that they had followed their plans.

In this section there was some over marking of the written evidence to show that the work had been carried out. Some candidates had been given credit for work being carried out based only on evidence of the research. Candidates must provide a written account with confirmation of the results of their practical outcome or investigations; together with clear annotation and/or photographic evidence.

In a number of centres there was a lack of detailed written evidence undertaken by candidates to support the work carried out. This is in addition to and separate from the evaluation section. Evidence is credited to the carrying out 'Organisation' section of the assessment criteria.

Candidates must follow their plans making good use of the time available and should organise their resources effectively using any equipment safely and independently. Several candidates provided outcomes of leaflets (healthy pregnancy and breast v bottle) and there was a range of styles as to how the candidate undertook the task, together with a wide and diverse level of success.

Many candidates presented the data they had researched from surveys with varying levels of competency. Carrying out work to a 'high standard' led to a wide range of interpretations. Some work lacked a range of techniques across the three tasks. Candidates should undertake a variety of tasks to fulfil a range of different skills and techniques.

Practical Outcomes

Many candidates made full use of ICT skills to produce leaflets and magazine articles. There was evidence of some excellent booklets and meals. However, many outcomes were not worthy of the full marks given by centres as there was insufficient relevant content, and the presentation lacked visual quality stimulus. Many teachers accepted poor quality content and finish, and often gave high or even full marks.

Investigative Outcomes

The outcome in the investigations did not show a range of detailed results and a significant number of candidates were unable to produce evidence of any investigative techniques, or meaningful results. A number had simply produced a leaflet, with no evidence of an investigation. It is important that the investigative task should include a range of detailed and accurate results. This can be through testing with comparisons, cumulating in a survey with appropriate conclusions. The aim of a survey must be included in the planning section of the task. Some surveys were excellent with detailed questions however; many were too brief and contained only closed questions. The use of ICT for this section of the short task is strongly encouraged, particularly for resultant data. Where questionnaires were used they were not always relevant to the topic. In addition some candidates included multiple copies which were not required.

Evaluation

Many candidates were able to evaluate all sections of their work and most gave some strengths and weaknesses with suggested ways to improve the task. However, some candidates did not review the whole task. Evaluations were sometimes descriptive but not evaluative and some centres were over-generous when crediting marks in this section.

Candidates who had used written evidence effectively as part of the execution section had also grasped the concept of the overview of the whole task response in the evaluation. Weaker candidates tended to explain why they had carried out the outcome in the evaluation, rather than addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the task. Marks should only be awarded for the quality of the response and not the quantity.

Candidates were required to identify their strengths and weaknesses in all areas of the task, not just the practical outcomes. They were also required to suggest ways of how to improve on their strengths and weaknesses, and draw conclusions from their work. It was expected that any results should be collated, interpreted and linked back to the task title. All the aforementioned work had to have been undertaken independently for full marks to be given.

Administration

The use of OCR Interchange for the submission of marks by centres, the auto checking and updating of arithmetical errors and feedback reports greatly assist in the administration of the moderation process. However, there were a large number of clerical errors. There was good use of secured cover sheets to each of the three short tasks. Detailed annotation on the front cover sheet was usually relevant and justified the marks being awarded. In some centres the task being used had not been identified or numbered and the investigation had not been highlighted. The centre name and number together with the candidate name and number should be completed in the appropriate sections for each of the three short tasks.

B012 Controlled Assessment – Child Study

In order to fulfil this unit candidates are required to complete one Child Study. Candidates are required to select one of the board set themes on which to then base the focus of their study. It is recommended that approximately 22 hours are allocated for the completion of the task. The themes can be found on the OCR website and in the specification if further guidance is required. It should be noted that emotional development is not a board set theme and in consequence must not be used.

Research

Candidates should construct task titles that enable them to address all the assessment criteria. They need to include a clear rationale as to why they have chosen their topic. The majority of candidates supported their task title by including several reasons for choice. Most candidates had produced their own focused task title that was written as a question and only covered one area of development.

Candidates provided a range of appropriate sources of information, which included both primary and secondary to use for their research. However, this could have been supported by candidates referencing their sources of information.

Initial research to explore the child's background and other relevant information was frequently undertaken through an interview and/or questionnaire with the parents of the child that is going to be studied. Most candidates carried out detailed research on the development area chosen using a range of suitable secondary sources of information. Most popular resources were books, internet and interviews. Some candidates used a good variety of sources of information, relevant specifically to the age and area of development. It is important that candidates do not just include photocopies or printouts, without highlighting and explaining the relevant information. Very few candidates were able to demonstrate an understanding of the information gathered by providing a comprehensive summary. In the work of many candidates there was little to connect the suggestions of ideas to the research.

Numerous letters of permission were included in candidate's work which is not required. These do not constitute background information and often breach confidentiality as they include surnames. Full-frontal photographs showing the child's face should also be avoided. Good practice was evident where candidates produced a clear outline of the steps to be carried out in the task at the end of the research section. Candidates must undertake the majority of this work independently and show a high level of understanding if they are awarded marks in the top band.

Selecting and Planning the Observations

The minority of candidates used the research previously undertaken in the planning section to identify and produce a range of possible ideas for their observations. Research had not been collated and assessed as to its suitability. Some candidates fully considered and justified the range of methods for their observations and there were some links to the task title and area of development. The majority of candidates constructed accurate and detailed plans; however, there was a propensity for these to be over marked. Best practice was identified when a variety of methods to record the results of the observations were included together with clear reasons for choice.

Practical observations

It is suggested that five to six observations are undertaken. In some cases there was good practice seen with each observation having a different focus that related clearly to the area of development chosen. Visits were recorded accurately using the sheets constructed in the previous section. Candidates achieved higher marks when they included strong evidence of each observation supported by teacher annotation to justify the marks awarded. Where candidates had written up each observation after the visit the evidence showed that they were able to remember what had been seen and relate their understanding to the development area being studied, including their own judgements and views. This was then credited in the 'Applying Understanding to Observations' in the 'Outcomes' section of the assessment criteria.

Outcomes

Some candidates were able to demonstrate that they had understood and applied their gained knowledge to what they had observed and how it related to their child and the area of development. Less able candidates had not included original thoughts and opinions about their observations but written a descriptive account. They had not always taken every opportunity to compare the child with others/norms, this could have been demonstrated by sharing their understanding that with other peers, group work in class, or using text book norms for reference.

Conclusion and Evaluation

In the best work seen candidates produced a high quality evaluation that included all aspects of the task. They drew logical and relevant conclusions that related back to their task title. Most candidates were able to identify and explain their strengths and weaknesses in their work and recommend improvements. However, the weaker candidates gave a descriptive rather than an evaluative account. To achieve high marks candidates are expected to use a good standard of written communication throughout the whole task using specialist terms/terminology in a structured format.

Administration

Centres must provide clear annotation in the study to support the marks awarded. Centres are advised to have dividers or clear headings between each assessment criteria. Centres must securely attach the child study and clearly identify the candidate number and name to the cover sheet with the task title being clearly written on the cover sheet. These can be located on the OCR website under the forms heading.

B013 Principles of Child Development Written Paper

The paper proved accessible to all candidates and gave plenty of opportunities for differentiation throughout. Examiners noted that there were few questions which had not been attempted; Questions throughout the paper were well attempted by all.

Most candidates appeared to have prepared well for the examination but where marks were lost, it was generally through a lack of basic subject knowledge, failing to read the question carefully or to explain the points identified.

For the extended response question, candidates who planned their responses were able to give detailed factual information demonstrating their literacy skills, good use of terminology and depth and breadth of knowledge.

Comments on individual questions

- 1(a)** Most candidates answered all four parts of this question correctly. A few candidates confused 'implant' with 'IUD'.
- 1(b)** Many candidates gained one mark and a range of answers from the mark scheme was seen. The most common correct answers related to "no side effects", "not needing to see a GP" and "acceptable to all religions". Some candidates gave NFP as a method of getting pregnant and not as a method of contraception.
- 1(c)** The most common correct answers related to "GP having to fit it" and "does not protect against STI's". Common incorrect answers included "stays for x years" and "bleed more" with no qualification.
- 1(d)** Most candidates answered this question correctly with good use of terminology. Incorrect answers provided were other methods of contraception.
- 1(e)** Common correct answers include "increase in divorces", "increase in teen pregnancies" and "divorce being more socially acceptable". Many candidates gave answers relating to why someone may be a lone parent rather than why there has been an increase. Examples of incorrect responses included "parents split up", "one parent has died" and "one parent works away/in the forces/in prison".
- 1(fi)** Most correct answers referred to the separation of parents who had their children living with them part time. Some candidates incorrectly identified shared care families as families with grandparents who looked after the children or different families that came together to look after the children and shared the care.
- 1(fii)** Candidates had a clear understanding of role reversal and gave accurate answers achieving full marks. Some candidates thought that role reversal was "the children looking after their parents in old age".
- 1(fiii)** Many candidates understood the concept of cohabiting. One common incorrect response was confusion with reconstituted families.
- 1(g)** The data was accurately given with the majority of candidates gaining all three marks for these questions.

- 2(a)** The common correct answer was “transfer of bacteria from one food to another”. An incorrect response was when candidates knew how cross-contamination occurred and as such gave examples of this rather than a definition.
- 2(b)** This question was generally well answered by all candidates. The concept of “raw meats dripping” and “not washing hands or equipment” between uses were clearly explained.
- 2(c)** Most candidates gained at least one mark with the most popular answers being ‘moisture’ and ‘warmth.’ A common mistake was students writing ‘heat’ or ‘dark’.
- 2(d)** Many students found ‘chicken pox’ easier to identify than mumps.
- 2(e)** A wide range of correct mix and match answers was given. Some candidates who made a correct point were not able to get full marks due to not adding any further description to their point(s).
- 3** A range of marks was seen across this question which also clearly demonstrated differentiation. Most candidates answered the first section well using a wide range of possible answers with clear descriptions. Correct answers given for buying baby clothes were “being soft”, “non irritant” “the right size”, “washable” and “easy to put on and take off”. Some candidates were confused over the roles of the midwife and health visitor, talking generally about their work and not clearly defining their individual roles or writing that they did the same tasks. Another incorrect answer included the care given during pregnancy and the birth. All students made an attempt at answering both sections of the question.
- 4(a)** Most candidates were able to mention two ways of supporting families with a special needs child. To gain full marks the points identified needed further expansion. Some candidates confused the voluntary organisations with care provided by local authority services.
- 4(b)** Many candidates correctly identified ‘meeting other children’ or detailed the benefits of trained staff and specialist toys.
- 4(c)** The most used correct answer was ‘child benefit’. “Maternity pay” and “child income support” were common incorrect responses.
- 4(d)** This question was well answered. Some incorrect answers included “brain development” and “growth”.
- 4(ei)** Most candidates gained at least one or two correct answers, “dominoes”, snakes and ladders”, and “ludo”. It was important to note that the question asked ‘what games could be bought’ rather than just an activity.
- 4(eii)** Many candidates gained at least one mark. There was some repetition of points especially when counting items.
- 5(a)** Most candidates got two marks for this question. The first two answers were sometimes transposed, but the second two were nearly always correct.
- 5(b)** This question was well answered with the most popular answers being ‘running,’ ‘kicking’ and ‘jumping.’ Others had incorrectly included ‘walking’ and ‘crawling’. Other answers given which gained no marks were related to fine motor skills rather than gross motor skills.
- 5(c)** Well answered with candidates gaining all three marks. A good range of answers was used and clearly explained.

- 5(cii)** Most candidates had a clear understanding of the question and used a wide variety of answers.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2013

