



**General Certificate of Secondary Education
June 2012**

Health and Social Care

48201

(Specification 4820)

**Unit 1: Understanding Personal Development
and Relationships**

Report on the Examination

Further copies of this Report on **the Examination** are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

Overall candidate performance on this paper continues to improve and the pattern of candidates' strengths and weaknesses was similar to that of previous papers. The more-able candidates generally demonstrated a good command of technical language, producing accurate and detailed responses in those questions which required explanations and evaluation. Less-able candidates tended to be far less secure in their use of technical terminology and produced answers which were much less detailed, vague and/or repetitive. All of the questions appeared to be accessible to the majority of candidates and there was little, if any, evidence of candidates having insufficient time to complete this paper.

Question 1

The majority of candidates successfully identified the appropriate life stages and age ranges. When errors did occur, these tended to be with the age ranges for later adulthood or Infancy.

Question 2

Less-able candidates sometimes confused fine motor skills with gross motor skills in part (a), but just over a third gained at least two of the three marks available. In part (b) relatively few candidates gained more than half marks for the likely intellectual development between four and ten years of age.

Question 3

Many candidates drifted away from the social benefits required in part (a) of the question by including emotional effects in their responses. Just fewer than half the candidates gained one of the three marks available, but usually for answers referring to avoiding social isolation. Part (b) also proved challenging for many candidates with relatively few offering answers relating to emotional stability, self-confidence, self-esteem and/or vulnerability.

Question 4

The evaluation of the positive and negative factors in Warren's life was generally limited in the work of less-able candidates who often gained only one or two of the six marks available. More-able candidates tended to give specific details of how not eating enough food and lacking in vitamins and minerals may affect Warren, together with reasoned positive effects of regular exercise.

Question 5

The majority of candidates successfully identified the 'needs' and 'wants' in Ali's spending in parts (a) and (b). Part (c) proved to be more challenging for many candidates with very few gaining all three marks. The better responses suggested that Ali could access private healthcare services and avoid having to wait for NHS treatment. Common errors were suggesting that Ali would not be entitled to NHS services as he had too much money and that private services are better than state-funded services.

Question 6

This type of question is used as a high level differentiator. Less-able candidates often use the factors separately in their responses or are restricted when attempting to link factors by giving the effects of the factors separately, rather than holistically. More-able candidates gain marks by linking together the factors and giving the combined effects with appropriate PIES identification. The most-able are able to do this and also explain how the combined effect is achieved. As expected this was a very small minority of candidates. Less-able candidates

sometimes ignored the self-esteem part of the question and gave general health and well-being effects.

Question 7

Neglect was generally understood by the majority of candidates and there were many responses with high marks in part (b) explaining how a five-year-old may be affected.

Question 8

The majority gained the marks for relationship identifications with peer friendship in part (b) being marginally more challenging than the other types of relationship.

Question 9

The self-concept questions proved challenging to many candidates as they have done on previous papers. Candidates found part (a) dealing with maturity a little more accessible than parts (b) and (c) dealing with gender and age respectively.

Question 10

Candidates were far more successful when selecting unexpected life events with a large majority gaining three or four marks.

Question 11

Candidates generally found part (b) dealing with non-professional carers less challenging than in part (a) dealing with professional carers. In part (a) just over a third gained three or four marks while over half gained similar marks in part (b). A number of candidates gave answers which were repetitive, in that they were examples of the same type of carer, e.g. types of teacher in part (a) and/or different family members in part (b). This repetition meant they could gain no more than half marks in the part or parts affected.