

Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2013

GCE Health & Social Care (6949)
Unit 12 Understanding Human
Behaviour

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2013

Publications Code UA035362

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link: <http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

General Comments

The paper was similar in format to previous series and it allowed students to demonstrate their knowledge of the specification well. The questions discriminated well, with a wide range of marks being seen in each question.

The paper was deemed to be of a similar standard to previous series and the students' performance also appeared to be similar. Centres are to be congratulated for taking on board many of the comments in the previous reports.

However, there are still some students who do not appear to pay enough attention to the **case studies** and often provide generic responses to questions rather than responses applied to the case provided. To achieve higher marks the application of the approaches are essential to the student responses. Students would benefit from practising the application of approaches to a variety of client groups.

The use of **command verbs**, such as describe, explain, discuss and evaluate should direct the student to appropriate styles of response, there are still some students that appear not to be aware of the requirements of these. Performance would be greatly enhanced if these issues were addressed.

Students are reminded that for explain questions they should be giving reasons for their answers and developing their responses. For discuss questions they should be giving both advantages and disadvantages.

In addition, it is the case that evaluation questions require a **conclusion**, and students rarely provided a conclusion to their evaluations, limiting their marks. Centres are recommended to address the structure of longer answers for future exams.

Students are also reminded to take time in reading the questions to ensure their responses are fully relevant.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1

This question was based on a young child and his family context. It allowed the students to demonstrate skills in comprehension. It also enabled them to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of a cognitive approach and also of theoretical approaches to attachment.

Question (a) tested students' ability to extract relevant information from the case study. It was answered well and the majority of students gained the two marks here.

In question (b) most students gained two or three marks for demonstrating an understanding of early socialisation. Most made reference to the case study, although some tended to give rather generic answers.

In question (c)(i) students were asked to explain why Finlay may have dysfunctional beliefs. Definitions of dysfunctional beliefs were on the whole very clear. Most students scored three marks, as the example from the case study was not always explained well.

In question (c)(ii) students were required to evaluate the use of a cognitive (cognitive-behavioural) approach with children. Some students answered this question well. However, where questions were less well answered, many students appeared to confuse the approach with the behavioural approach, while others tended to give generic details of a cognitive approach and did not discuss application, advantages or disadvantages in relation to its appropriateness for children. For the higher mark band a conclusion is expected, but very few students concluded their response.

In question (d) the students were asked to examine the possible impact of early attachment on adulthood, both adult relationships and adult behaviour. Many students missed the requirement to address both relationships and behaviour, and many failed to make any theoretical connections, limiting themselves to mark band two. A number of students misread the question, and discussed how young children influence the adults around them. Those who did achieve mark band three addressed both parameters of the question and linked this well with theoretical concepts and the case study stem, however a conclusion is expected, and those students achieving mark band three were limited in marks as they rarely concluded their response.

Question 2

This question was based on an elderly man. It allowed the students to demonstrate skills in comprehension. It also enabled them to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of factors affecting human behaviour along with the humanistic (person centred) approach and also of the care value base and promoting quality care.

Question (a)(i) tested students' ability to extract relevant information from the case study and explain how it demonstrated a positive outlook. It was generally answered well and many of students gained three or four marks here. Those who remained in mark band one often repeated the text without the amplification as to why the chosen example illustrated Hugh's positive outlook on life.

Question (a)(ii) tested the students ability to expand on the case study and explain how Hugh may encourage his friends to have the same positive outlook on life. There were mixed responses to this question, and few students achieved the available six marks. Many demonstrated knowledge of social learning theory, suggesting Hugh became a role model, and these were credited. Many students failed to explain how or why Hugh's actions would result in his friends developing a positive outlook, and therefore limited themselves to mark band one.

Question (b) required students to apply the care value of dignity to an example based on a residential care setting. Many students gave generic,

basic definitions, often with an example focussing on intimate care. Many failed to encompass the ideas of service user choice, individuality, respect or valuing preferences in their responses.

Question (c) required students to draw upon data from a table provided to discuss the statement about quality of care in two settings. Many students repeated the data from the table without explaining how or why that data demonstrated better or worse care standards. A few students in the higher mark band made an overall conclusion that the claim was true or false.

Question (d) tested the evaluative skills of students and their ability to compare the application of the humanistic (person centred) approach to two separate service users. Mark band three was elusive in this question, often from students failing to address both service users in the case study. The approach was not well applied to the case, students often used generic statements that they had clearly learnt well, but the ability to link this to both service user needs was rarely evident. For the higher mark band a conclusion is expected, but very few students concluded their response.

Question 3

This question was based on a couple with relationship problems. It allowed the students to demonstrate skills in comprehension. It also enabled them to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of factors affecting human behaviour along with the psychodynamic approach and family therapy.

Question (a) was generally well answered, with good application to the case study and many students achieved three or four marks. Students were quick to pick up on the issue of bullying in early childhood and link this to adult relationships.

Question (b)(i) required the students to complete the table identifying the key features of the id, ego and super-ego. A vast proportion of students left this question blank, and those who attempted to complete it very rarely achieved four marks. The response to this indicates that student knowledge and understanding of the key principles of a psychodynamic approach is under developed.

Question (b)(ii) required an explanation of using transactional analysis to treat relationship problems. Some students demonstrated a basic knowledge of the model, including some key terms, and could apply this to relationship problems adequately. However, they were in the minority, with many students leaving this question blank or demonstrating a lack of knowledge in their responses.

Question (b)(iii) required students to evaluate the use of a psychodynamic approach and here they performed better. There was understanding of unconscious mind, childhood experiences and some advantages and disadvantages were given by students. However, many students failed to apply the approach to relationship problems, resulting in few achieving the

top of mark band two, or mark band three. For the higher mark band a conclusion is expected, but very few students concluded their response.

Question (c) asked students to evaluate the use of family therapy for people who have relationship problems. On the whole, this question demonstrated a good knowledge of family therapy, and students were able to give advantages and disadvantages. However, in line with other questions on this paper, students failed to apply their knowledge to the issue of relationships. Some tentative links to the case were made by some students, but overall there was a lack of application. For the higher mark band a conclusion is expected, but very few students concluded their response.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

