

GCSE



**Chief Examiner's and
Principal Moderator's Report**
**Home Economics:
Child Development**

Summer Series 2023



Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of this specification for the Summer 2023 series.

CCEA hopes that the Chief Examiner's and/or Principal Moderator's report(s) will be viewed as a helpful and constructive medium to further support teachers and the learning process.

This booklet forms part of the suite of support materials for the specification. Further materials are available from the specification's microsite on our website at www.ccea.org.uk.

Contents

Assessment Unit 1	Parenthood, Pregnancy and the Newborn Baby	3
Assessment Unit 2	The Development of the Child (0-5 years)	6
Assessment Unit 3	Investigation Task (Controlled Assessment)	10
Contact details		12

GCSE HOME ECONOMICS: CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Chief Examiner's and Principal Moderator's Report

Subject Overview

This was the fourth externally assessed examination paper for Unit 1 in the revised GCSE Child Development Specification (due to the Covid-19 pandemic there were no public examinations in 2020 and 2021). The format was in line with the published Specimen Assessment Material (SAM) and the three previous papers with a total of eight questions with the first question being multiple choice and the second, labelling a diagram. The examination paper time was one hour and fifteen minutes and all questions were taken directly from the subject specification enabling variety and rigor. To support candidates in Summer 2023, Advanced Information was produced to enable more focused revision.

Assessment Unit 1: **Parenthood, Pregnancy and the Newborn Baby**

Overview

It was evident that some of the candidates had used the Advanced Information to prepare for this examination as their understanding was clear, detailed and they used subject specific language throughout a range of questions. There was no evidence of candidates having insufficient time to complete this examination paper. For most candidates, all questions were attempted.

- Q1**
- (a)** Very well answered.
 - (b)** This question was not well answered as many candidates confused it with vitamin D.
 - (c)** Well answered.
 - (d)** This question was not well answered as candidates did not know the specific measurement of the head circumference therefore all options were used as an answer.
 - (e)** The majority of candidates answered this question incorrectly and all options were used.
- Q2**
- (a)**
 - (i)** Well answered.
 - (ii)** Well answered.
 - (iii)** Some candidates confused scrotum with testes.
 - (iv)** Some candidates confused testes with scrotum.
 - (b)** Most candidates obtained one mark for stating “the loss of pregnancy” in their response but there was confusion over the number of weeks a miscarriage occurred at with some stating up to 28. Some candidates also confused a miscarriage as a stillbirth. Candidates were awarded marks for including the symptoms of a miscarriage as part of their description, but no marks were awarded for the reasons why it would occur as often the cause is unknown.

- (c) (i) Most candidates answered this question well and understood that the placenta provided food and oxygen to the baby.
- (ii) Cervix was not as well answered. Most candidates were able to access one mark for stating keeping the baby in place during pregnancy/protects from infection/widens to 10cm but many of the explanations were very vague.
- (d) Most candidates were able to access one mark for their response as they listed a number of roles a partner could do rather than discussion of one role specifically for example, compliment her throughout her pregnancy as her body shape changes to boost her confidence; or prepare meals for the mother if she is feeling nauseous and unable to handle meat. Furthermore, some candidates focused their discussion on 'during labour', therefore no marks could be awarded.
- Q3** (a) This question was generally well answered, and most candidates were able to obtain at least two marks. Common answers included: touch the baby in response to movement and talking to the baby so the baby could recognize the mother's voice. When candidates chose to include dietary advice e.g. including vitamin B, iodine, folic acid, they did not discuss why this was important to brain development.
- (b) Most candidates had a very good understanding of the differences between non identical twins in the womb.
- (c) This question was answered well by those candidates who had learnt the development of the fetus at 28 weeks. Many candidates were only able to access one mark for stating that the baby was fully formed as the rest of their description focused on a fetus at 14 weeks. Some candidates specified measurements and weights in their response which were inaccurate and therefore could not be credited. It may be useful for candidates to learn specific features that are only relevant to a fetus at 28 weeks for example, lanugo begins to fall off, baby is covered in vernix and milk teeth are developed under their gums.
- (d) (i) This was well answered, and most candidates identified the sucking reflex.
- (ii) This reflex was confused with the grasp reflex and not as well answered.
- Q4** (a) This question was well answered displaying good knowledge of the possible signs of pregnancy. Some candidates' responses were vague e.g., sickness, weight gain and these responses were not credited.
- (b) Candidates generally understood the factors a couple needed to consider when planning a baby and were able to access at least two marks. The discussion of some factors was quite vague e.g., changes to the home and financial implications as they did not state why this would influence their decision to have a baby.
- (c) (i) The majority of candidates were able to identify two reasons why a blood test was needed e.g., anaemia and blood group and were able to access two marks. The explanations could have been more specific e.g., the cause of anaemia and how it could be treated if it was detected.
- (ii) This question was not very well answered as responses were quite vague. Most candidates were able to gain one mark for identifying that excess weight gain could cause complications in pregnancy but they did not stipulate these.

- Q5 (a)** Candidates generally understood that conception takes place in the fallopian tube and most were able to access two marks. Some key information was lacking within the response e.g., an egg is released from the ovary or that the fertilised egg travels to the uterus to embed.
- (b)** Candidates were familiar with the hormones associated with pregnancy and childbirth. The explanation of their chosen hormone varied in success with some candidates displaying detailed knowledge and others simply identifying a key role e.g., prolactin controls milk production.
- Q6** Most candidates were able to access Level 2 marks in this question. Failure to access Level 3 marks was for one of the following reasons:
- Discussing the effects of alcohol and drug taking together;
 - Completing the response in bullet points;
 - Identifying a key phrase but not explaining it fully. For example, when discussing drugs, candidates stated that the baby could be born addicted but often did not elaborate to include the symptoms associated with this.
- Q7** Whilst it was encouraging that candidates knew the advantages of a home birth, many candidates struggled to explain the disadvantages with specialist terminology. Instead, they compared the home birth to a hospital birth which was not the focus of the question. For example, whilst they understood that there was no specialist equipment available, they did not state what this equipment would be or why it would be needed. In addition, when discussing limited access to pain relief, there was limited reference to an anaesthetist for an epidural.
- Q8** The structure of this question enabled candidates to focus their response to both the IUD and the male condom. Many candidates focused on a description of the family planning method which was not necessary. It was noted that candidates also confused the IUD with the contraceptive implant which greatly impacted the marks that could be awarded. Candidates were able to identify strengths and weaknesses of both methods, but their discussion was not always detailed to gain access into Level 3 marks.

General points

It was noted that whilst candidates understood the command word of the question and the specification content, many candidates did not develop their answer fully to include an explanation. This did impact the marks awarded especially in Questions 3 (a), 4 (c), 5 (b) and 6.

Many candidates are including an introduction and conclusion to Questions 7 and 8 which is not necessary and should be discouraged.

To facilitate teaching, content within the Child Development specification has been supported by the production of fact files which can be found on the CCEA Child Development subject webpages. These can help to provide a useful structure for teaching on topics that may not be covered within the textbooks.

Additionally, adjustments were made to the mark scheme to increase accessibility and fairness.

Assessment Unit 2: The Development of the Child (0-5 years)

Subject Overview

This was the third externally assessed examination paper for Unit 2 in the revised GCSE Child Development specification (due to the Covid-19 pandemic there were no public examinations in 2020 and 2021). The format was in line with the published Specimen Assessment Material (SAM) and previous examination papers available. In line with the Unit 1 layout, there were eight questions including two level of response questions at the end of the paper which also assess quality of written communication. The examination paper time was one hour and fifteen minutes. To support candidates in Summer 2023, Advanced Information was produced to enable more focused revision.

It was evident that some of the candidates had used the Advanced Information to prepare for this examination as their understanding was clear, detailed and used subject specific language throughout a range of questions. There was no evidence of candidates having insufficient time to complete this examination paper.

- Q1**
- (a) Very well answered.
 - (b) Mostly well answered.
 - (c) Poorly answered – all possible responses were used here.
 - (d) Poorly answered – most candidates thought the prone position was lying on the back.
 - (e) Very well answered.
- Q2**
- (a) Candidates generally knew two different types of thermometers used by parents or carers. Some candidates included vague descriptions rather than the specific name and were unable to be awarded marks.
 - (b) Most candidates were able to access full marks in this response.
 - (c) Most candidates were able access at least one mark for the symptoms of meningitis for stating high temperature or fever, vomiting or a headache. Interestingly, a rash or sensitivity to light were not the most popular responses.
 - (d) This response was answered with varying success. Most candidates were able to access one mark. The focus of the question was on “administering medication” yet instructions for use, storage and course completion was often not explained.
- Q3**
- (a) Many candidates answered this question as if Ava was a newborn baby rather than a 3-year-old child which impacted the number of marks that could be awarded. For example, many candidates focused on “loose strings” rather than the features that would make independent dressing or toileting easier. Furthermore, the practicality of clothes for a 3-year-old was not always evident e.g., pockets, durability and fastenings. Some candidates discussed footwear which was not awarded.
 - (b) (i) Most candidates were able to access one mark here for stating “food allergy” or “vegan” but candidates often did not explain these issues in relation to meal planning e.g., the need to look at ingredients on food labels or look for substitute items. It was also noted that candidates focused on the nutritional needs of children here which was not relevant to the question unless diabetes was being discussed.

- (ii) This question was not answered well. Many candidates simply reworded the question. When the question was answered accurately, candidates understood that frozen vegetables were a more cost effective alternative and that convenience foods that were often on special offer, often contained high levels of fat, sugar and salt.
 - (iii) Understanding food labels was answered quite well and candidates were able to access marks, but it was often limited to two marks due to the depth of discussion.
- (c) This question was not well answered as many candidates did not discuss two ways parents could prepare Ava for starting nursery. It was common for candidates to only obtain one or two marks as there was little development of the response. Common answers did include visiting the nursery, positive reinforcement from parents and encouraging Ava to socialise with others. In order to obtain more marks, candidates would need to develop why these suggestions help e.g., arranging a visit (one mark) to help relieve Ava’s anxiety about starting as she will be familiar with her teacher.
- Q4** (a) This question was not well answered as many candidates did not know the two types of social play.
- (b) Most candidates were able to access two marks by either identifying two possible strategies that parents could use to promote positive behaviour or they only discussed one strategy fully.
- (c) This question ranged in success. The mark scheme was adapted to promote fairness amongst candidates. It was encouraging to see that some candidates referred to specific initiatives implanted by Early Years for example, “Eager and Able to Learn”, “The Toy Box” programme and the “Family Health Initiative”. This demonstrated a clear understanding of the organisation. Some candidates confused Early Years with the Northern Ireland Childminding Association.
- Q5** (a) This question was not well answered, and understanding was limited. The mark scheme was adapted to promote accessibility and fairness but many candidates did not demonstrate knowledge of the health visitor visiting the home 10 days after the birth of baby. Common answers focused on advice but these were not well explained.
- (b) It was notable in this response that candidates focused on all aspects of development rather than intellectual development. This impacted the number of marks that could be awarded as some of the points were not relevant. Furthermore, if a candidate identified an intellectual concept e.g. learning new words, developing listening skills, developing memory or improving concentration, but they did not explain it, it restricted the number of marks that could be awarded.
- Q6** This question was not well answered by candidates with many focusing their response simply on making friends. Specific social skills were not always evident within their response e.g., learning to become socially acceptable, sharing, taking turns and following instructions. Discussion did include having an opportunity to build bonds with their parent which was not relevant.

Q7 This question was answered poorly by some candidates which restricted the marks available to a low Level 2. This was because of the following reasons:

- Not including both advantages and disadvantages within their response;
- Identifying a nutrient from the breakfast but not explaining the role e.g., the orange juice contains vitamin C;
- Inaccurate discussion of nutrients including sources and functions;
- Suggesting alternative foods to include as a breakfast and their nutritional role;
- Presenting their response in bullet points rather than paragraphs;

However, those candidates who did answer correctly also accurately displayed subject specific content in detail which was encouraging to see.

Q8 This question highlighted those candidates who understood how to promote emotional well-being in children. These responses were structured into paragraphs and discussed four or five strategies that could be implemented by parents/carers and discussed the potential impact this would have on a three-year-old child which was very encouraging. However, this was only a minority of candidates. Many candidates misinterpreted the question and answered it as to how parents/carers could prepare a child for pre school and repeated similar strategies used within Question 3 (c). Furthermore, behaviour was also referred to throughout the response which was also not relevant.

General points

It was noted by the examining team that whilst candidates did understand the command word of the question and the specification content, many candidates did not develop their answer fully to include an explanation. This did impact the marks awarded throughout the paper.

In addition, adjustments were made to the mark scheme to increase accessibility for candidates, but it was disappointing to note how many basic concepts were not known e.g., prone position, types of thermometer, nutrients and the role of a health visitor.

It was evident that candidates had learnt information from previous mark schemes, but this was not applied correctly to the question and consequently fewer marks could be awarded.

To facilitate teaching, content within the Child Development specification has been supported by the production of fact files which can be found on the CCEA Child Development subject webpages. These can help to provide a useful structure for teaching on topics that may not be covered within the textbooks e.g., emotional well-being, roles of professionals and meal planning.

Finally, it was noted that candidates are including an introduction and conclusion in Questions 7 and 8 and this is not necessary and should be discouraged.

Principal Moderator's Report

Marking was in line with the agreed standard for the majority of centres. Where a centre's marks were not within the agreed standard, they were reviewed at post moderation. This will have been indicated on the TAC6 report forwarded to the centre and the advice given must be considered for future series.

The samples moderated illustrated a range of competence.

Teachers are reminded to check the CCEA Child Development subject pages on the CCEA website for any changes to controlled assessment task. New titles will be issued on 1 September for the next series.

Administration

The majority of centres adhered to all of the administrative procedures. All centres submitted their marks through E-Moderation and this was successfully completed.

With the new sampling procedures this year all samples sent for moderation were **in rank order** starting with the candidate who has the highest mark at the top and the lowest mark at the bottom.

The candidate eCRS sheet provided online by CCEA needs to be completed accurately as a number of errors (which could have disadvantaged the candidates) were highlighted when moderators checked the details.

Reports should be presented in a soft backed plastic folder, which holds the pages securely, and not in polypockets.

Annotation should be clear, unambiguous and relevant to the assessment criteria. Annotation on the candidate's work provides a means of communication to show the moderator where marks have been awarded and why. **Teachers should continue to indicate the level of guidance given** to each candidate in the annotation. Where no level of guidance is noted in the annotation, the moderator will assume the teacher is indicating this through the marks awarded.

The TAC2 form is completed online as part of the E-Moderation. Internal standardisation must take place before the final marks are submitted to CCEA. Evidence suggests this was successfully completed for the majority of centres and where unsuccessful this has been noted on the TAC6 form returned to the centres.

Assessment Unit 3: Investigation Task (Controlled Assessment)

The submission for this series required candidates to choose one of two controlled assessment tasks set by CCEA. Task option 'Current Government Nutritional Advice' was the most popular topic.

Part A: Analysis & Justification (300 Words)

Most candidates identified a range of issues relating to the title. They selected one issue for further research and the majority of candidates gave a justification for choosing this issue. A small number of centres chose the issue 'Foods to avoid' however this was not this year's title, so this was noted on the TAC6 (though candidates were not penalised). **It is imperative if a student is going in the wrong direction that they are advised by their teacher to consider a suitable issue.** The majority of selected issues allowed scope for further research.

To achieve Mark Band 4, candidates should state the chosen issue, explain why the issue is important, outline current knowledge and give a brief account of forward planning, i.e., what information will be researched and the possible sources to be used for research. The word count for this section is 300 words and this includes both the issues and the justification for the one issue chosen. If a candidate is over the 10% tolerance, they should not be awarded Mark Band 4.

Part B: Secondary Research and Analysis of Own Viewpoint (1200 Words)

When researching the chosen issue higher band candidates used a range of secondary sources and acknowledged them in the body of the text. Candidates must keep a note of all the details (title, author, publisher and date of publication) for their detailed bibliography which should be placed at the end of the report. This is a clear indication of the range of sources used. **To achieve Mark Band 4, more than four different types of sources should be used.** Candidates should be encouraged to include sources from books, leaflets, TV programmes, the internet, DVDs etc. and not rely solely on the internet for information. For this reason, marking for some candidates was lenient in this section. **In some cases, candidates were taken from Mark Band 4 to Mark Band 1.** The date of accessing information must be included in the body of the text when referencing websites. Some candidates presented information that had been taken from a variety of sources with little attempt made to apply the information to the chosen issue.

Candidates must include their own viewpoint about the chosen issue. Their viewpoint should be analysed. Some candidates stated their viewpoints with little or no attempt to analyse the information gathered. In this instance full marks cannot be awarded in this section. Marking for some candidates was lenient in this section.

Part C: Conclusions and Evaluations of Parts A & B (750 words)

Candidates must present their conclusions based on a comprehensive review of their findings from parts A & B. The evaluation must focus on both parts A & B of the task identifying strengths, weaknesses and suggesting perceptive improvements.

Conclusions and evaluation in the competent scripts were detailed and well-reasoned, taking into account all aspects of Parts A & B. Some candidates found this section difficult, completing a description of what they did, rather than a critical or analytical evaluation of their strengths, weaknesses and perceptive improvements which resulted in the marking being lenient for some candidates in this section.

Part D: Planning and Outcome (375 Words)

Planning

Most candidates presented their planning with priorities and resources identified. They should include a draft of the final outcome with evidence of the evaluation for the draft copy. All improvements made to the draft outcome should be clearly identified in this section. This was successfully completed by most centres. For a few centres, some candidates included the evaluation of their draft outcome in the final evaluation, this should be included as part of the planning section and arriving at their final outcome. Planning should only focus on producing the final outcome and not all aspects of the task. Candidates should be reminded when completing the plan of action this should be completed before the final outcome is made. It should be noted that it is not necessary to explain how resources will be used.

Outcome

For most centres this section was completed with varying levels of success and this was reflected in the marking. Most candidates achieved Mark Band 3 or 4 for this section and marking for some centres was lenient. **If the final outcome has split words, text cut off or blurry images this should not be allocated Mark Band 4.** The content of the final outcome must be as a result of the research and planning completed unless an explanation is given by the candidate for any changes. Candidates must include both the draft outcome and final outcome either in an appendix section at the end of the task or within the individual section (i.e., draft outcome and final outcome within Part D). Evidence of final outcomes aided the moderation process. PowerPoint presentations should consist of **no more than 10–12 slides**. Candidates should be encouraged to print out a copy of their PowerPoint presentation, **two slides per page** rather than one slide per page. The final outcome must be securely attached in the candidate's folder and easy for the moderator to assess its contents. It is not necessary to laminate the final outcome or to insert it in a polypocket.

Part E: Evaluation of Planning and Outcome (375 words)

For most candidates, evaluations focused on both planning and final outcome with a range of strengths, weaknesses and perceptive improvements suggested. Some candidates found it challenging to identify weaknesses and perceptive improvements and gave a descriptive account of what they did. This section was completed to a competent or highly competent level by many candidates.

Presentation

The word count must be indicated by the candidate at the beginning of each section completed. When a candidate does not include their word count for all sections and a detailed bibliography, they cannot obtain full marks for presentation. Marks are awarded for including a **detailed bibliography** (title, author, publisher and date of publication) (one mark), **stating all word counts** (two marks) and for **successfully arranging the report** (one mark). If a candidate does not adhere to the word limit for a section, this should be taken into consideration when awarding marks for that particular section. The candidate should not then be penalised again in the presentation section provided the word count is stated. **Some candidates did not get the mark for their bibliography as they were incomplete or lacked detail.**

Contact details

The following information provides contact details for key staff members:

- **Specification Support Officer: Louise Millar**
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2610, email: lmillar@ccea.org.uk)
- **Officer with Subject Responsibility: Dorothee Wagner**
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2218, email: dwagner@ccea.org.uk)



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

