

C A R I B B E A N E X A M I N A T I O N S C O U N C I L

**REPORT ON CANDIDATES' WORK IN THE
SECONDARY EDUCATION CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION**

JUNE 2006

HOME ECONOMICS: – MANAGEMENT

**HOME ECONOMICS: MANAGEMENT
GENERAL PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION**

JUNE 2006

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Caribbean Examinations Council administered its twenty-fifth examination of the Caribbean Secondary Examination Certificate of Home Economics: Management in May 2006. The General Proficiency included three components: Paper 01 – Multiple Choice, Paper 02 – Structured Essays and Paper 03 – School Based Assessment.

Paper 01 – Multiple Choice

This paper consisted of sixty items, thirty of which tested the candidates' knowledge. Thirty items tested the use of knowledge. Candidates' performance was satisfactory. The mean mark was 38.9 out of a possible maximum of 60. The marks ranged from 1 to 57.

Paper 02 – Structured Essay Questions

This paper consisted of two parts. Part A comprised three compulsory questions while Part B comprised four questions from which candidates were required to choose two. Candidates were required to answer a total of five questions. Questions in both parts were each worth sixteen marks: 6 marks were awarded to the Knowledge profile while 10 marks were awarded to the Use of Knowledge profile.

The mean mark was 34.5. The maximum possible mark was 80 and the marks obtained ranged from 0 to 70.

Paper 03 – School Based-Assessment

This paper was the School-Based Assessment and consisted of three practical assignments. The first and third assignments were set and assessed by the teachers. The second practical assignment was set by the teacher and assessed jointly by the teacher and an external examiner.

The mean mark on Paper 03 (SBA) was 46.1 out of a maximum of 60 with marks ranging from 0 to 60.

DETAILED COMMENTS

Paper 02

Question 1

This was a compulsory question and was attempted by approximately all candidates. Section (a) of the question required candidates to list three benefits that an employee may derive from working in a family business. This section was poorly done. Most of the candidates either did not respond or gave negative and unethical responses such as: *you could do anything you want; you will get plenty money; one will not be fired easily; one can take long lunch breaks and leave work early; you could go to work when you want*. Such responses were counter-productive in any business organization. Few candidates were able to give three sensible responses such as *obtain work experience, become marketable, and develop good work attitudes*.

Section (b) was less challenging than (a). This section asked for three reasons, other than satisfying the basic needs of food, clothing, shelter and health, why it was important to be gainfully employed. Several candidates gave reasons that included the basic needs which they were asked to exclude. A few cited unusual reasons such as *procreation* and *reproduction*.

Section (c) required candidates to explain how performance in the workplace may be affected by poor physical health and good mental health. This question was fairly well done by the majority of candidates. Some, however, misinterpreted the question and included poor sanitary practice, physical disability, and insanity.

Section (d) presented a situation where Jane wanted to attain good physical, mental and social health. Candidates were asked to describe three different practices in which Jane must engage in order to achieve this quality of life. It was heartening to note the satisfactory responses from most candidates, many of whom made a concerted effort to describe the practices; whereas, others just listed the practices without any discussion and so lost valuable marks.

Question 2

This was a compulsory question and was attempted by the majority of the candidates. Section (a) was fairly well done. Candidates were required to state two functions of money. A few candidates gave unacceptable responses such as, *durable, portable and root of all evil*, for which they lost valuable marks. In section (b) candidates were asked to give four major guidelines to follow when preparing a budget. Many candidates failed to gain marks, as they focused on guidelines for shopping such as, *the size of the family and the health of family members*, while ignoring correct responses for preparing a budget such as, *set priorities* and *consider your goals*. Few candidates gained full marks in this section.

Section (c) required candidates to develop five arguments that would be presented in a debate on Money Management to address the topic, *Budgeting for low income families is useful*. This section was unsatisfactorily done. Many candidates engaged in long introductions and extensive comparisons between high/low families. Some were very defensive in the cause of the poor for whom they perceived a budget was not necessary. Other candidates posed negative and positive questions instead of proving supporting arguments that the section required. For example: *Is a budget necessary? Why budget on a small income?* A few candidates, however, did an excellent job and proved that the question was not beyond their ability. They gave responses such as *helps low income families to live within their income* and *prevents unnecessary spending*.

Question 3

This was a compulsory question and tested candidates' ability to

- (a) explain two major causes of the following accidents that occur in the home
 - (i) choking
 - (ii) electric shock
- (b) describe the first aid procedure for treating a child who has a nosebleed

- (c) formulate safety guidelines for the following accident prone areas of the home based on a scenario (involving a family comprising the mother, father, two teenagers and two adults)
- (i) preventing burns in the kitchen
 - (ii) preventing falls on the staircase
 - (iii) preventing drowning in the bath
 - (iv) preventing poisoning in the laundry room

Section (a) of the question was generally well done. A few candidates had difficulty explaining two distinctly different causes of choking hence they wrote *eating too fast* or *eating while talking* all amounting to careless eating. Other candidates confused choking with strangling or suffocating. Most candidates were able to give two distinctly correct causes of electric shock. In the case of the *nosebleed*, there were too many dangerous suggestions such as: *the head should be tilted back so the blood would stop flowing; cotton placed in the nose; or alcohol be applied to the area*. A few candidates did not respond at all to this section.

Section (c) was attempted by most candidates and was fairly well done. A large number of candidates responded correctly to c (i) and c (ii). A few confused *burn* with *fire* hence there were responses like do not leave curtains hanging over the stove. A few candidates advised that *towels* be used to remove hot pots instead of using pot holders. Most candidates were able to identify ways of preventing falls on the steps. Some candidates had difficulty outlining fully the guidelines for preventing drowning and poisoning.

For (c) (iii), candidates gave responses such as use non-skid mats or non-skid tiles indicating that they confused drowning with falling. For (c) (iv), many candidates wrote about ways to avoid poisoning generally, for example, keep poison away from children, and so did not relate their answers to prevention of poisoning in the “laundry room” as requested.

Overall, candidates gave general safety practices rather than relate responses specifically to the selected areas. Similarly, safety practices were not designed for posters, as was requested in the question.

Question 4

This was an optional question which outlined a problem and required candidates to (a) define the problem faced by the Benn family; (b) list four steps in the decision-making process, apart from defining the problem; (c) (i) describe three benefits that the elderly couple may gain from the new arrangement; and (ii) outline two problems that Mrs. Benn may encounter.

The question was not well done as candidates had difficulty with sections (a) and (b) and scored very few marks in most instances. Some candidates lost marks because they misinterpreted the problem and made assumptions that were not indicated in the case. For section (a), candidates did poorly as most of them were unable to define the problem faced by the Benn family. Instead of defining the problem some candidates wrote a paragraph discussing possible solutions to the problem. The majority of candidates latched onto the given fact that Mrs. Benn was unemployed and could not provide for her basic needs. Candidates exhibited very limited knowledge of the decision making processes and gave the management processes instead. A large percentage of candidates scored very few marks in this section.

Section (c) (i) was fairly well done as the majority of candidates were able to give satisfactory responses. However, some candidates lost marks because they failed to describe the benefits adequately, and instead they gave phrases or one-word responses. Others responded with benefits to Mrs. Benn and not to the elderly couple as requested. In many instances, candidates indicated that the elderly couple would be cared for but did not explain how this would be done.

For section (c) (ii), a moderate number of candidates were able to score full marks but others had difficulty outlining problems that Mrs. Benn may encounter. Several candidates indicated that Mrs. Benn would have a lot of work to do without stating the effects of excess work or the problems that arose because of the excess work. Many candidates indicated problems that Mrs. Benn's son could face instead of Mrs. Benn.

Question 5

Section (a) tested candidates understanding of the roles of parents and children in fostering family relationships. In most cases functions, were given instead of examples of parents' roles such as : providers, care givers and nurturers. However, functions such as procreation, socialization, conferring status, transmitting culture and values and sexual relationships were quite popular responses. Some candidates fabricated their own roles of the children such as children must go to school instead of responses such as helpers, companions or assistants.

Section (b), which tested application of the management processes, was poorly done. Most candidates knew the processes but not in the correct order, and whereas they were able to differentiate between them, candidates were unable to apply the processes in acquiring the house. In some cases, candidates ignored the word *purchase* and focused on *renting* and *building* a house. Some candidates wrote on the advantages of renting versus buying. For the implementing process some candidates' explanation was, *this is the action stage*, but did not make reference to purchasing of the house. Some candidates demonstrated knowledge of the evaluation process and gave good responses while others wrote only one word or phrase.

Question 6

This was a popular optional question and was answered by most of the candidates. Candidates were required to study an advertisement and to answer sections (a), (b), and (c). For section (a) candidates were to identify three persuasive statements in the advertisement which they identified correctly. Section (b) required candidates to state three benefits that the company will gain from displaying the advertisement. Most of the candidates listed two benefits, namely, increased sales and increased customers.

For section (c) (i), candidates were asked to state three important pieces of information that were omitted from the advertisement. This section was also well answered though a few candidates misinterpreted the question. Section (c) (ii) required candidates to name the consumer right that was violated by the omission. The majority of candidates recognized *the right to be informed* or *the right to know*.

In section (d), candidates were asked to suggest six important factors that homemakers should consider before purchasing the item advertised. The responses for this section were most disappointing. Candidates did not link question (d) with sections (a), (b), and (c) thus responses given were not related to the case, for example, *rent, bills*. Many candidates gave general factors for comparative shopping, for example, *avoid impulsive buying*.

Question 7

This question was the least popular choice among candidates. However, those candidates who attempted it scored average marks.

For section (a) (i), many candidates were unable to define the term "etiquette" and saw it as being just table manners. In section (a) (ii), where candidates were asked to list four rules of etiquette to be observed while having dinner, they gained the maximum marks. In section (b) (i), ideas for decorating the back porch for the cocktail party were limited to the use of banners and balloons. Many candidates

gave reasons why the porch should be decorated instead of giving suggestions for decorating it as requested.

For section (b) (ii), candidates were required to study the layout of the porch and describe three ways in which the layout could be rearranged to make the porch more suitable for the cocktail party. A number of candidates were able to give adequate suggestions for rearranging the porch but did not give the reasons for their suggestions and did not score maximum marks.

SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

The School-Based Assessment comprised three practical assignments. It was the third year that the second practical assignment, worth 20 marks, was assessed by the teacher and an external examiner. However it was the first year that those assignments were not requested for moderation by CXC. Teachers were required to write assignments using the Guidelines for setting and marking assignments which were developed and issued by CXC.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Teachers are reminded that:

1. Both visiting assessor and class teacher must complete and endorse the Record of Marks for School-Based Assessment.
2. Workbooks and other materials must be sent only when requested by CXC.
3. Candidates need practice in Time Management and Tray setting.
4. Candidates must be able to interpret instructional terms such as: define, explain, describe, illustrate, outline, and justify.
5. Candidates must be able to use prior knowledge to analyse information and form conclusions in keeping with the discipline.