

## Principal Assessor Report 2003

**Assessment Panel:**

Home Economics

**Qualification area:**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
Included in this report**

Intermediate 2:

Health & Food Technology  
Lifestyle & Consumer Technology  
Fashion & Textile Technology

---

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	271

<b>Number of entries in 2003</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	219

### **Fashion & Textile Technology**

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	58

<b>Number of entries in 2003</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	106

### **Lifestyle & Consumer Technology**

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	86

<b>Number of entries in 2003</b>	
<b>Pre appeal</b>	87

### **General comments re entry numbers**

Encouraging increase in numbers of candidates on Fashion & Textile Technology

Composition of candidate group was similar to that of 2002

## Grade boundaries at C, B and A for each subject area included in the report

<b>Health &amp; Food Technology</b>		<b>Maximum mark: 150</b>
Grade	Minimum mark	
C	55	
B	66	
A	77	

<b>Lifestyle &amp; Consumer Technology</b>		<b>Maximum mark: 150</b>
Grade	Minimum mark	
C	55	
B	66	
A	77	

<b>Fashion &amp; Textile Technology</b>		<b>Maximum mark: 150</b>
Grade	Minimum mark	
C	55	
B	66	
A	77	

### General commentary on passmarks and grade boundaries

- While SQA aims to set examinations and create mark schemes which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum 50% of the available marks (notional passmark) and a very well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70%, it is almost impossible to get the standard absolutely on target every year, in every subject and level
- Each year we therefore hold a passmark meeting for each subject at each level where we bring together all the information available (statistical and judgmental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the senior management team at SQA
- We adjust the passmark downwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly more demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- We adjust the passmark upwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly less demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- Where the standard appears to be very similar to previous years, we maintain similar grade boundaries
- An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. And just because SQA has altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions
- Our main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain standards across the years, even as syllabuses evolve and change

### Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

The grade boundaries for Health & Food Technology were changed to bring them into line with the other contexts. All contexts are now *a priori* grades.

## Comments on candidate performance

### General comments

#### **Technological Project — all contexts**

Some centres are still using 2002 proforma.

Candidates who have dropped down from Higher should be given the Intermediate 2 proforma particularly for section 4.1.

Overall standard has improved.

See detailed comments below.

#### **Papers — all contexts**

Candidates are still not writing evaluative comments.

Candidates are still not linking Evaluation/Drawing Conclusions answers to the questions.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

#### **Technological Project — all contexts**

- Step 1.1 - Most candidates identified all the key points and explanations were in general of appropriate depth.
- Step 1.2 - Candidates, in general, were listing fewer and more appropriate specification points this year and were gaining more marks
- Step 1.3 - Most candidates identified a good range of investigations with appropriate techniques
- Step 2.2 - Most candidates provided a solution which was relevant to the brief
- Step 3.1 - Less retrospective plans than in previous years
- Step 3.2 - Most candidates identified appropriate tests
- Step 4.1 - Most candidates transferred specification points correctly

#### **H & FT — Paper**

In general the majority of candidates made the correct choice in the Drawing Conclusions questions

Question 1 a) Good knowledge of the sources and at least one function of calcium and iron

Question 2 d) Good understanding of why manufacturers modify their products

Question 3 b) Most candidates could correctly identify the date mark required for sandwiches

Question 4 b) Good knowledge of the sources of ideas for new products

Question 4 d) The majority of candidates who chose the 'recycling label' gave a correct explanation of its meaning

**L & CT — Paper**

In general the majority of candidates made the correct choice in the Drawing Conclusions questions.

- Question 1 a) Candidates knew how to increase the intake of fruit and vegetables
- Question 1 d) Good understanding of the benefits of eating breakfast
- Question 2 c) Most candidates could correctly identify the developmental checks carried out on a child
- Question 3 a) Good understanding of the benefits of regular exercise
- Question 4 c) Good understanding of reasons for producing a high quality product.
- Question 4 e) Most candidates could identify the statutory labelling information
- Question 5 b) Most candidates could successfully substitute ingredients which would contribute to current dietary advice

**F & TT — Paper**

In general the majority of candidates made the correct choice in the Drawing Conclusions questions.

- Question 2 c) Good understanding of the reasons for adding logos to garments
- Question 2 e) Most candidates could successfully identify one Act which protects consumers' rights
- Question 3 e) Most candidates chose the 'Kitemark ' and gave the correct explanation of its meaning
- Question 4 d) Good understanding of the methods of adding colour/surface decoration
- Question 5 d) Most candidates could give at least one explanation of how the Citizens Advice Bureau can help the consumer

## Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

### Technological Project — all contexts

- Step 1.1 - Some candidates gave dictionary definitions of the 'key points' and did not explain their relevance to the brief.
- Step 1.2 - Some candidates are still unsure of the meaning of the term 'how it can be measured'
- Step 1.3 - There was a significant number of 'obvious omissions' in the investigations selected  
Many candidates did not identify group/person being interviewed/surveyed
- Step 2.1 - Candidates who state multiple aims for investigations often failed to achieve these aims and so lost marks.  
A significant number of candidates did not give results in full but provided only a summary and so lost marks.  
Many candidates are not drawing valid conclusions from the investigations, in many cases the conclusions are a summary of the results and do not show progression
- Step 2.2 - Many solutions were not based on the results of investigations.  
There were a number of retrospective solutions.
- Step 3.1 - Some candidates are still using imperial measurements  
Many candidates' 'planned sequence of work' did not have dates or detailed breakdowns of times  
Some candidates omitted major pieces of equipment and failed to requisition all the required resources  
Some candidates did not give quantities for resources, in particular those candidates sitting the Fashion & Textile context.  
In some cases candidates did not requisition resources given in their 'description of solution' or in their 'sequence of work'
- Step 3.2 - Many candidates did not identify group/person being interviewed/surveyed  
Many candidates are not drawing valid conclusions from the test  
Some tests were written retrospectively
- Step 4.1 - Poor standard of evaluative comments  
Even candidates who did write evaluative comments, in many cases, based them on prior knowledge/opinions and not on the results of testing/investigations.

### H & FT — Paper

Generally answers in paper lacked depth of knowledge and reasoning in explanations and evaluation skills.

Although candidates made the correct choice in Drawing Conclusions questions, they failed to link their answers to the case study and failed to show enough depth of reasoning.

- Question 1 b) Few candidates showed any knowledge of the terms 'intrinsic'/'extrinsic' sugars
- Question 2 a) Poor understanding of the importance of the design principles when developing food products
- Question 2 c) Few candidates showed any knowledge of the terms 'concept generation', 'test marketing' or 'marketing plan'
- Question 3 a) Although candidates could select the correct sandwich they did not link their answers to the relevant Scottish Dietary Target.
- Question 3 b) Although the majority of candidates identified the correct date mark, most failed to explain why it should be used
- Question 3c) Many candidates mis-read the question and gave nutritional benefits
- Question 3 d) Candidates concentrated on working conditions/hygiene systems and gave the same answer in three different ways  
Few candidates could give more than one explanation of why a Trading Standards Officer would visit a food company's premises
- Question 4 a) Few candidates showed any knowledge of the terms 'intense' and 'bulk' sweeteners

- Question 4 d) Of those candidates who chose the 'e' mark, very few gave the correct explanation of the information given by this label
- Question 5 a) Candidates confused food processing with the use of a food processor and so their response to this question was poor.
- Question 5 d) Poor knowledge of the terms 'caramelisation', 'gelatinisation' or 'coagulation'

### **L & CT — Paper**

Generally answers in paper lacked depth of knowledge and reasoning in explanations and evaluation skills.

Although candidates made the correct choice in Drawing Conclusions questions, they failed to link their answers to the case study and failed to show enough depth of reasoning.

- Question 1 a) Poor knowledge of how to increase intake of total complex carbohydrates
- Question 1 b) Candidates could not quantify these factors beyond 'lack of exercise' and many referred to 'dietary factors' in their answer
- Question 2 c) Although candidates could identify the developmental checks the explanations of their importance lacked depth and detail
- Question 3 d) Poor understanding of the functions of water
- Question 5 c) Many answers did not refer to cross-contamination
- Question 5 d) Poor knowledge of the functions of the Food Standards Agency

### **F & TT — Paper**

Generally answers in paper lacked depth of knowledge and reasoning in explanations and evaluation skills.

Although candidates made the correct choice in Drawing Conclusions questions, they failed to link their answers to the case study and failed to show enough depth of reasoning.

- Question 1 a) Very poor knowledge of basic methods of construction from a significant number of candidates
- Question 1 d) Some candidates should a lack of basic knowledge of the properties of cotton
- Question 2 e) Poor knowledge of the Consumer Protection Act
- Question 3 b) Candidates linked their answers to tests/investigations they had carried out in the Technological Project not to tests carried out on finished shoes
- Question 4 a) Poor explanations of the how the areas from the pattern envelope would help consumers
- Question 5 c) Poor knowledge of the information in fabric care labels

## Recommendations

### Feedback to centres

#### Technological Project

This should be a final assessment piece of work and should not have evidence of teachers' corrections.

Candidates who word-process their work should be encouraged to use the spell check.

They should not alter the font size to include extra data in the space provided.

There is no need to include extra pages when they have not been used.

Centres are reminded that there is no compulsion for candidates to word process their projects. No marks are awarded for presentation of the project. The nominal time allocation for the project is 20 hours and this time allocation is linked to candidates undertaking the technological process, and not to undertaking word processing activity. There is some evidence to suggest that the word processing aspect of some projects is becoming more important than the actual processes which are being assessed.

Candidates have to be trained in investigative techniques, how to present their results and evaluation skills prior to starting on the technological project.

Candidates should display the results obtained from an investigation, not just a summary of these results.

Conclusions from investigations should be based on results displayed.

Final solutions should be based on the results of investigations and not chosen prior to starting.

Final solutions should demonstrate subject specific skills.

Candidates should be using metric measurements throughout.

Candidates should be working on Int 2 proforma, as candidates who had dropped down from Higher have difficulties when using the Higher proforma, particularly in section 4.

Centres should use all published exemplification material which gives guidance on completion of TP/ evaluation skills

#### Papers

Candidates must provide greater depth of answers, particularly in the Drawing Conclusions/ Evaluation questions.

Candidates should be trained to link their answers back to the question in Drawing Conclusions/ Evaluation questions.

Centres should use all published exemplification material which gives guidance on evaluation skills.