



## External Assessment Report 2015

Subject(s)	Lifestyle and Consumer Technology
Level(s)	Higher

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the Examination.

# Comments on candidate performance

## General comments

The numbers presented for Lifestyle and Consumer Technology showed a dramatic decrease. 42% of candidates embarked on the Higher Lifestyle and Consumer Technology course having studied Standard Grade Home Economics, but almost 52% were direct entries with no previous experience.

As the specification for the Higher Lifestyle and Consumer Technology paper remained the same as previous years and appropriate for SCQF 6, the grade boundaries stayed the same.

The average mark for the question paper showed a slight increase from the last three years. The average mark for the technological project showed a slight increase.

## Technological project

### Step

- 1.1 Most candidates provided good explanations of the key wording of the brief. Those candidates that provided more detail in their explanations of the key points tended to demonstrate better understanding of the brief which benefitted them at later stages of the technological project.

Candidates mainly opted for brief 2 — the charity event. There were instances of candidates incorrectly copying the brief.

Some candidates are still failing to explain both food and textiles. Dictionary definitions are being given rather than explanations of the key points in many instances.

- 1.2 Specification points were usually acceptable on the whole. The candidates who developed specification points that clearly linked to the wording of the brief tended to produce better solutions in step 2.2, as their work was more focused.

Those candidates who gave double spec points were disadvantaged in a number of areas as they would not fully explain or evaluate the whole specification point.

Some candidates did not make the link to food / textiles.

However some candidates failed to earn the marks as they did not use the correct terminology (eg ask, talk to, get feedback, get an opinion, consult, visit, gather menus). The candidates should make reference to the Candidate Guide and use the correct terminology for investigations or tests.

- 1.3 Those candidates who did state the type of charity event were able to link more closely to a specific target group and the type of food / textile that was already

available.

Key words which were missed in the specifications and omitted from investigations were encourage, food / textile. This may have been because these key words were omitted from their specification.

- 2.1 Centres which made good use of the guidance provided in the candidate guide provided strong investigations which provided valuable data to use when drawing up a solution.

Three literary / internet sources are required for a valid investigation.

Some candidates provided minimal investigations which did not allow sufficient data to be collected to allow the creation of interesting solutions.

- 2.2 Some candidates came up with some original solutions based on good research from the investigations. The solutions were clearly linked to wording of the brief and described in detail.

It is essential that a textile solution be manufactured using textiles.

Some candidates failed to develop or create new food/textile products. This fails to meet the wording of the brief where the candidates were asked to 'develop' a new dish or food product. Candidates should be reminded that they should use metric measurements.

- 3.1 Most candidates provided sufficient detail about how to manufacture their chosen solution to allow it to be produced by another person.

Candidates are reminded they should include the date. Some candidates failed to provide sufficient detail to allow the preparation of the solution.

Pressing / hand-washing should be included for textile solutions. Hygiene throughout food preparation is critical in particular after handling raw meat and washing fruit and vegetables.

- 3.2 When candidates prepared tests which covered all of the specifications points this provided lots of data for evaluation against the spec in 4.1.

Testing was still confused in a few cases with technique sometimes questions or tests did not focus on the specification points which then of course did not allow an evaluation in the next stage to be based on evidence.

- 3.3 Candidates who made good use of the guidance in the Candidate Guide provided strong valid testing which yielded valuable data to use in the evaluation section particularly step 4.1.

Some candidates failed to identify the details of the expert they were interviewing

and so lost marks.

- 4.1 Candidates who conducted strong testing against each of the specification points gave themselves data on which to base their evaluations.

Some candidates quoted from the answers in the tests instead of evaluating the information.

Evaluations were not always backed up by testing etc and often included personal opinions and inaccurate interpretation of results. There was no evidence of costing to back up evaluation in some projects.

- 4.2 Candidates are advised to complete their evaluation for each step when they have completed the step. See Candidate Guide.

Many candidates gave unsupported, personal comments/statements. Many candidates spoke about previous experience. This is not evidence that can be used as the basis of the evaluation. The evaluative comment in this section must make reference to the impact for the final solution.

## Candidate Performance in Written Paper

### Section A

#### Question

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 1  | Well answered.  |
| 2  | Well answered.  |
| 3  | Well answered.  |
| 4  | Mostly well answered – some did not understand <i>property</i> of wool.   |
| 5  | Poorly answered.  |
| 6  | Good knowledge of this abbreviation.  |
| 7  | Some confusion about this act.  |
| 8  | Mixed responses on benefits of breakfast clubs.   |
| 9  | Most candidates answered well.  |
| 10 | Fairly well answered.   |
| 11 | Well answered.  |
| 12 | Fairly well answered — some lack of knowledge of Environmental Health Officer.  |
| 13 | Fairly well answered.   |
| 14 | Fairly well answered — candidates must make it clear which answer is the advantage and which the disadvantage of online shopping. |

## Section B

### Compulsory question

- 1a Most candidates gained full marks for identifying responsibilities of a parent.
- Candidates must ensure they provide explanations which refer to parents. Some candidates lost marks if they failed to do this or their explanations were too vague.
- 1b Some candidates failed to gain full marks for this question as they did not use the evaluation technique (OFC). Candidates should be given opportunity to practice and develop skills of evaluation.
- 1c Answers well explained linked to choosing clothing for a child.
- Practice question linked to other groups and factors affecting choice of food or textiles.
- 1d Well answered by most candidates with good knowledge of divorce and disability.
- Candidates should be given opportunity to practise and develop skills of evaluation.

### Choice questions

- 2a Most candidates who referred to the overweight teenage boy and used evaluation technique earned full marks. Candidates who have not been taught to follow the answering technique often fail to score marks. Some candidates fail to provide the consequence for health in the evaluation.
- Candidates must provide all stages of the answer — an opinion based on the data on the table linked to the person in the wording of the question. They must then demonstrate their knowledge of the function of the nutrient, and then provide a consequence in relation to the impact on this person's health.
- 2b Candidates answered this question well, showing a good understanding of factors affecting health of teenagers.
- Centres can repeat this question for other factors which affect the health of individuals.
- 2c Generally good knowledge of the use of additives in food.
- 2d Candidates showed good knowledge of labels with the exception of energy rating.
- Centres can practise questions for other labels as identified in the course

content grids.

- 2e Candidates had good knowledge of the role of the Samaritans.
- 3a Candidates who made reference to the sports bag were able to focus their answers on the product and link answers to the product development strategy.
- 3b Well answered — candidates demonstrated good evaluation skills by showing an understanding of fabric for a **sports bag** in relation to the criteria shown on the star profile.
- Candidates could practise food or textile focused questions which appear frequently in previous papers. It is essential that candidates differentiate between the ratings for 5 very high and 4 high, also for 2 low and 1 very low. Some candidates are simply grouping these as high or low, the answer needs to be more specific to the interpretation of the rating.
- 3c Candidates answered question on breathable membranes and elastomeric fibres well.
- 3d This question was well answered and showed good understanding of **family structures**.
- 3e Candidates demonstrated good knowledge of services available to the family.
- 4a Well answered with candidates able to identify and explain causes of dental caries.
- 4b Some difficulty with this question in demonstrating evaluation technique in relation to the dietary advice.
- 4c Candidates demonstrated good knowledge of **housing and social services**.
- Candidates should use the mark allocation and the wording of the question to make sure they provide all stages of the evaluation answer (OFC). This question can be repeated for different services.
- 4d Candidates demonstrated good knowledge of methods of payment. Most candidates answered well and evaluated using OFC.
- 4e Candidates lacked some knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of both of these organisations.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	316
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2015	63
------------------------------------	----

## Statistical information: Performance of candidates

### Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 150				
A	49.2%	49.2%	31	105
B	27.0%	76.2%	17	90
C	17.5%	93.7%	11	75
D	4.8%	98.4%	3	67
No award	1.6%	-	1	-

The course assessment functioned as intended therefore no adjustment to grade boundaries was required.

## General commentary on grade boundaries

- ◆ While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary), it is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.
- ◆ Each year, SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). 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 management team at SQA.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.
- ◆ 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, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in, say, Higher Chemistry, this 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.
- ◆ SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.