

# **Health & Social Care (Double Award)**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1493**

## **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2007**

**1493/MS/R/07**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### General Certificate of Secondary Education GCSE Health and Social Care (Double Award) 1493

#### REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
4870	Promoting health and well-being	7
4869/4871	Principal Moderator's Report	3
*	Grade Thresholds	17



### **Chief Examiner's Report – June 2007**

The results for the written paper Understanding Personal Development and Relationships (4871), for Health and Social Care (Double Award), have been very pleasing for most candidates. The responses showed that candidates have been well prepared and that delivery has strictly followed the requirements of the specifications. Where candidates did less well their answers reflected a lack of specificity and factual knowledge. Details are given in the Principal Examiner's report.

Evidence has been submitted for both portfolio units. For both units Assessors must make sure that they consider the 'exemplification' within the specifications and the general grading descriptors when assessing portfolio evidence.

For Unit 4869: Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision candidates who achieved the higher grades have given specific factual knowledge about the two services chosen. Where candidates have not been quite so successful, they have given the facts for one service but failed to provide sufficient detail for the second service.

Some results for Unit 4870 are disappointing and assessment decisions in some instances were considered to be lenient. This is because of a lack of factual evidence within the unit. Some candidates did not apply knowledge to the person chosen, giving instead generic information which was irrelevant. In other instances candidates gave insufficient information within the 'plan'.

For both portfolio units it is essential that the requirements of the 'banner' are followed and that all the evidence for the criteria is applied to the person or services chosen. Evidence should not be generic. Centres must follow the exemplification when teaching and assessing the units.

## **4869 / 4870 Health and Social Care (Coursework)**

### **General Comments**

There was evidence that Centres had generally guided their candidates well and there was evidence to show that they clearly understood the organisation of Health, Social Care and Early Years services and also showed understanding of how to promote the health and well being of a specific individual.

As Centres become more adept at being able to recognise the requirements of the specifications, the assessment of the candidates work for this examination session showed a gradual improvement. It was helpful when teachers took the time to annotate candidates' work, as this made the moderation process run smoothly and assisted moderators when agreeing with. Assessors that have attended training used their increased knowledge and understanding to ensure that candidates followed the Banner requirements and accurately assessed their candidates' work. There will be further training in the Autumn Term which some Centres would be advised to undertake.

A well constructed assignment task written by the Centre that enabled understanding of the 'banner evidence' ensured that candidates gained marks and this supported candidates. It is important that Centres use the exemplification notes in the specification where the assessment criteria are described in more detail; most centres had clearly read these. Many centres had written clear task sheets for candidates which included the depth and breadth of knowledge, understanding, and skills required.

Thanks you to the Centres who were co-operative and undertook the correct administration procedures. It was pleasing to find that the majority of centres included the CCS 160 form with the work for moderation and that they sent their work promptly when requested. Centres with 10 or fewer candidates entered sent all their work once the Moderator was known to them. Unfortunately, in some Centres poor administrative practice held up the moderating process.

Many Centres annotated work clearly throughout the portfolio(s) and on the Unit Recording Sheet (URS). When this was done, it was supportive to the candidate and the moderation process as it showed how the Centre had applied the assessment criteria. In cases where the criteria had not been met, the Moderator could see how 'the judgements had been made' and could highlight specific aspects within the report to the Centre.

## **4869 - Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision**

Candidates continue to find this unit harder to complete but there was evidence of some very interesting and excellent practice. It is important that centres ensure that the banner requirements are met. Where Centres had guided candidates to select two different services, e.g. a day care centre providing social care to the local community and a nursery providing early years education for pre-school children, primary data could be collected. Those candidates who selected two local settings tended to produce work of a higher standard than those candidates who worked from written case studies. Whilst access to settings can be difficult, some Centres were creative, using video footage and also invited speakers to classes for students to interview.

It should be noted that the banner requirement for this unit is for candidates to produce a portfolio based on the study of two different health and/or social and and/or early years **services**. There still appeared to be portfolios based on the care workers rather than the services.

Candidates need to produce work of equal standard for both services if they are to achieve a particular mark. Some candidates produced a very good standard of work for one of the services chosen but were not as consistently good for the other service. This tended to mean an adjustment to the marks was necessary.

There was evidence that Centres had supported candidates organising their portfolios because many were presented in a logical way, favouring combining the two settings for each of the respective strands. However some candidates work was totally illogical and did not appear to have been given any direction at all. Inclusion of class notes should be discouraged as this is generic information and not relevant to the two services being studied. It is important that candidates do not copy text from books or the internet into their portfolio work.

Candidates should be encouraged to choose carefully the services that they wish to investigate. Poor choices meant that the candidate could not achieve all of the assessment criteria and so this limited the number of marks that could be awarded.

### **Application of Assessment Criteria**

#### **Achievement within Strand A**

This strand was often the weakest area – candidates appear to lack understanding of the structures of health, social care and early years at national and local levels. Many candidates spent time describing the whole of the care services i.e. statutory/non-statutory and informal carers, and were too generalised in their comments. The funding issue is still challenging for some candidates. The evidence submitted must be related to the two services chosen.

**A1** – Candidates need to show the care sectors to which the services belong, this can be done by using a map of the organisation, but there was often a lack of notes to clarify the diagram. In addition there needs to be a basic statement describing how services are funded at a local and national level. Centres are advised that a diagram alone, copied from a textbook/Internet source is insufficient evidence.

**A2** – Candidates need to give a detailed description of the funding of the two services, both locally and nationally with examples to illustrate the points being made. Use of relevant data, which was explained, gave candidates the opportunity of achieving the highest marks in this strand.

**A3** - This strand was often over marked; marks were wrongly awarded on the basis of generalised statements with no supporting evidence. Careful selection of appropriate services was important to achieve marks at the higher level. Candidates often found this difficult and clearly need guidance on the effect of funding on services. Candidates need to show how funding at national and local levels affects the provision of the services with reference to the theory or models or the opinion of others

### **Achievement within Strand B**

**B1** - This was generally very well done and most candidates had obviously been well prepared. A high level response would include a detailed breakdown of the day-day tasks of the direct care workers chosen; this was evident when candidates had access to primary data, many who had undertaken work shadowing.

Candidates needed to be aware that caring for some service users requires 24 hour cover and shift work may be involved. Some candidates did not select two direct care workers, (one from each service) nor give a detailed breakdown of the day- to-day tasks instead there was a brief description of persons job role often taken from a text book or internet resource.

**B2** – Most candidates were well aware of the requirements, of the care workers they had studied, with examples to illustrate their points. Marks were lost when there was not specific reference, description, and understanding of the qualities and the skills that each care worker required to complete their job. For a high level response candidates also showed awareness of the specific qualifications needed for a job or career. A low level response resulted in candidates simply stating that the person would need a degree, rather than being specific. Full marks for this Strand would be awarded when the qualities and skills were described and examples given of their use in the job role, a list of skills or qualities is insufficient evidence. .

**B3** – Many candidates did not give alternative career routes for their chosen jobs or professions and therefore did not gain marks for this strand. For a high level response, candidates needed to actually discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the different career routes giving opinions.

### **Achievement within Strand C**

It is most pleasing to see that candidates understand the importance of care values in the health, social care and early years work place. This strand was done well when candidates were able to apply the care values to their chosen workers. Candidates who gave a lot of generic information and those who did not realise that the care values in health and social care services differ from those in Early Years settings did not score highly in this strand.

To support candidates centres had given students a framework to complete, it is important that when filling out such a framework the candidates insert the depth of understanding required for this strand.

**C1**- Candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of at least three care values and could apply these to the day to day tasks of the two direct care workers studied.

**C2** – Candidates were able to demonstrate how at least four care values could be applied to the work of their chosen care workers. In some cases the care values were applied to each day-to-day task and this was presented clearly in a chart.



**C3** – A high level response to this included, comparing the care values of the two care workers, examining the similarities and differences between the two job roles, with a conclusion statement at the end. In some Centres a chart was drawn listing the care values in one column and noting the similarities and differences in two subsequent columns. This helped candidates to provide a clear and detailed response and they then could draw a conclusive statement.

### **Achievement within Strand D**

This strand continues to be disappointing as many Centres do not guide candidates to conduct a survey to find out which clients use the services, what the clients needs are and how the service provided for the needs of clients. This results in generic information being generated for this strand.

Where this Strand was done well, candidates had carried out a survey and were then able to address Strand D2 and D3, they used, in detail the primary evidence they had collected.

The survey work can be undertaken in many different ways: in the form of observations, questioning clients that use the services or interviewing care workers; however, the emphasis must be on client needs and not from a practitioner's point of view. It is good practice for candidates to explain how they have conducted their survey.

**D1** - Candidates were generally able to list client needs and to observe how these were met. Those candidates who actually carried out surveys had the opportunity to extend the evidence to D2 – showing how well the services met client needs.

**D2 and D3** – Where candidates had identified needs carefully, had surveyed clients as well as care workers, they were then able to give a detailed response and a conclusion about how well the services met needs. The higher marks required a depth of understanding.

### **Achievement within Strand E**

When this Strand was well done, candidates applied the barriers to the chosen services and did not describe them generically.

**E1 and E2** - Candidates showed a clear understanding of at least 3 barriers to the services chosen and to the different types of barriers. They were also able to suggest how the barriers identified might affect the users of the services physically, intellectually, socially and emotionally across the two services.

**E3** – A high level response included evidence of synthesis of knowledge i.e. drawing together information from a range of sources. Candidates chose realistic solutions to overcome the barriers identified and in some cases had interviewed care workers or service users to gather ideas. Some excellent work was seen when candidates looked at the effect the barriers had on clients, there were some very thoughtful comments made with explanations how barriers could be or were overcome.

Candidates, who showed how service users are empowered, if barriers are removed, achieved the highest marks.



## **Unit 4870 – Promoting Health and Well-being**

Centres are advised to guide Candidates in organising their time to ensure that the work in Strand E is completed to the same standard as Strand A.

There was some good evidence presented when Candidates had been guided on their choice of an individual. Those who had been able to access primary data, showed individuality and these candidates achieved the higher marks.

The development of the health plan continued to prove difficult with the lower end of the ability range, some candidates appeared unable to relate the plan to the individual under study. It is important for candidate to realise that the plan should be in a form that the individual could use. It is apparent that this area was frequently rushed by candidates.

Confidentiality continues to be a problem with some candidates as they did not understand the necessity to use another name for their client and also included photographic evidence.

### **Achievement within Strand A**

This strand was generally done very well, candidates paid great attention to detail when developing their questionnaire.

Some candidates did not use the information collected when completing the other strands of this portfolio.

**A1** – Some excellent questionnaires were seen. Candidates were able to show that they could relate to all areas of the person's development (physical, intellectual, emotional, and social health)

**A2** – Most candidates were able to describe the person's health and to draw conclusions from their findings.

**A3** – For a high level response, candidates needed to look back at the completed questionnaire and go through it in detail before drawing clear conclusions about the person's state of health. They also needed to compare the person's health with the 'norms', it should be noted that a chart without comments is insufficient evidence for a comparison.

### **Achievement within Strand B**

Centres are advised to refer to the What You Need to Learn found in OCR's Approved Specification and Assessment Materials for teaching from September 2002 where *seven* groups of positive factors are specified. Using these groups, candidates should only look at the factors that have positively affected the individual's health and well being.

Candidates often do not make a link to the questionnaire and just gave generic information with no reference being made to the client. How the positive factors linked together were often not explicit, some candidates linked two factors and then another two, whilst others attempted to make links through PIES. Some candidates described a factor in this strand as being positive and then described in Strand C that the factor was a risk e.g. diet.

**B1** – Candidates were able to identify and describe at least two positive factors. Candidates should be encouraged to describe factors affecting the health of the individual and avoid making lists without any real explanation.

**B2** – Most candidates were able to describe at least 3 positive factors. For a high level response they needed to describe how the factors chosen, linked and worked together, to enable the person chosen to maintain their health. In some cases this was not evident.

**B3** –Candidates need to draw upon knowledge from a range of sources in order to describe at least four positive factors, show synthesis within the evidence and clear conclusions about the person's health. In some portfolios, good use was made of the opinion of a theorist, and relevant links were made to their client.

It is good practice for centres to encourage candidates to record resources used in the text of the portfolio and include a bibliography.

### **Achievement within Strand C**

Generally this section continued to be well done. To have achieved full marks candidates needed to understand the verbs used in the assessment criteria. A list of effects was insufficient when asked to review and assess possible long-term risks to the health and well being of the individual. Candidates again needed to refer back to the questionnaire so that the risks specifically applied to the individual

**C1** - Candidates were able to clearly identify two risks for the person concerned and gave brief notes on how the risks might affect them

**C2** – Candidates were able to identify three risks and described short-term effects for the person concerned.

**C3** – Candidates were able to show why the short-term risks developed in several stages to have long-term effects on the person concerned. For a high level response this required candidates to show increase depth and breadth of understanding.

### **Achievement within Strand D**

In some portfolios candidates were not clear what constituted a measure of health. A small number of Centres guided candidates to describe the different measures without actually using them to record the results or identify the individual's health status.

Centres would be advised to use the indicators of physical health as set out in the 'What You Need To Learn' in *OCR's Approved Specification and Assessment materials for Teaching from September 2002* to guide candidates. Diet, smoking and alcohol consumption charts are not physical fitness measures.

BMI/Height and Weight were the most popular measures of fitness used. Candidates gaining higher marks showed the use of a height and weight chart and converted the measurements into BMI. Where candidates undertook another measurement, e.g. peak flow or pulse rate, this provided them with a greater opportunity to analyse and interpret results.

**D1** -Candidates were able to identify one health measure and to accurately record this. Some candidates needed to draw conclusions about the effects on the person concerned and show how this information could have been used when developing a health plan.

**D2** – Most candidates were able to identify two health measures and to accurately record these and draw conclusions (including their own opinions) about the effects on the person concerned.

**D3** – Candidates were able to produce a detailed examination of the above and compare results to the norms of development for the person concerned with a high level of understanding. Conclusions were drawn from the data collected and a full assessment of the person's physical fitness made for full marks.

### **Achievement within Strand E**

Some wonderful health plans were seen, which included SMART targets, aspects of motivation, analysis of relevant health promotion material and an excellent understanding of the effect of the plan on the PIES of the individual, the work was produced in a logical and progressive way. When portfolios were done well, candidates were imaginative in their presentation of plans e.g. wall charts for the kitchen. In portfolios achieving higher grades there was clear indication of targets that had been set and how these targets had been decided upon. Some candidates relied on down loading from the internet with no or little application of knowledge.

The focus of this Strand was ensuring that the plan developed would be able to be used by the individual. It was disappointing that some candidates did not clearly define at least two targets for their plan. Many plans did not contain factual information about how the individual could improve their health. Candidates did not recognise that having a purpose to do something can be one of the greatest motivators. There needed to be a greater depth of understanding showing how the individual could be supported to maintain or improve their health and how they could be motivated to achieve the targets.

**E1** – Candidates were able to produce a basic plan with two targets and helpful advice on how the person could be supported to achieve them. They were able to draw simple conclusions about the effect the plan would have on the health of the individual.

**E2** – Candidates were able to suggest at least three ways of motivating the person and referred to PIES when assessing the effects of the plan. Some candidates gave limited suggestions as to how to motivate and support the person. Centres should be aware that motivation and support can include a variety of ways for example: the use of leaflets, videos, websites, attending clubs or classes, the support of family and friends.

**E3** – Candidates produced a detailed plan with at least two suggestions for supporting the individual. For the high level response, they drew logical conclusions using information from a range of sources. They used the research within their assignment to support their suggestions and evaluated the plans in terms of how it might affect the person. When candidates compared alternative methods of support for the person, by suggesting advantages and disadvantages of different methods and then drew conclusions, they were awarded the highest marks. This comparison was effectively done by some candidates in the form of a chart.

Examples of good practice within teacher's preparation and marking of the portfolio:

#### **It is good practice to:**

- Ensure that marking is consistent between members of a department by undertaking internal standardization.
- Support candidates with time management to ensure that all Strands meet the same depth of understanding.
- Ensure that pupils number the pages of their assignment, once it is complete. The page references should be clearly shown on the URS form, as this allows for quick referral to each section when looking for assessment criteria.
- Annotate work clearly throughout the text and on the (URS) front mark sheet, this supports and justifies the marks awarded.
- Encourage candidates to refer to the information they gather from the Internet or from books/journals rather than just add it to their work without applying it.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2007

- Avoid excess material in the portfolio: e.g. only include one copy of a survey used; make reference to leaflets, internet research in a bibliography rather than include this in the portfolio evidence.
- Where writing frames are given to guide candidates to access the criteria, they must not be too prescriptive otherwise all candidates from the Centre produce similar work and this suggests a lack of independent learning skills being developed.
- Encourage candidates to set out their work clearly with appropriate headings that link to the assessment criteria as this helps with assessment.
- Encourage candidates that use ICT skills to present their portfolio in a maximum size 14 font.

### **Good practice within coursework administration**

- Complete the teacher mark column of the MS1 as well as shading in the lozenges clearly checking that the Moderators copy is clear to read. .
- All Candidates portfolios need to be kept in order. The use of treasury tags is a simple effective way and also assists the moderation process
- Check that the marks for each Strand have been added up correctly and all marks are out of 50.
- Send a signed CCS160 Centre Authentication Form (revised July 2005) for each Unit sampled.
- Include the Coursework Assessment Form (which gives a breakdown of marks given for each strand of each unit) with the copy of the MS1 that is sent to the moderator.
- Avoid sending portfolios in ring binders, plastic wallets or folder envelopes as these are bulky to store and to post.
- Avoid plastic wallets for individual pieces of work
- Ensure that Internal Moderation is evident.
- Send work promptly once the Moderator is known to the Centre – when there are 10 candidates or fewer, send work straight away, do not wait for the Moderator to make contact.

## **4871: Understanding Personal Development and Relationships**

### **1 General Comment**

There was a mixed response to this question paper with candidates either obtaining mid-range to high range responses or else achieving at a very low level. Those who were less successful appeared to struggle due to poor knowledge of the unit and as a result of not reading the questions correctly. This was reflected in poor responses that indicated that questions had been misunderstood. There was lack of specificity in many of the answers given. A small number of candidates left large sections of the answer paper blank, for example, questions 6 (b) and 6 (c).

Questions were based on the 'What You Need to Learn' section of the unit. A limited number of questions were based on recall but most required candidates to apply their knowledge to specific situations or contexts. The content of the paper was similar to previous GCSE question papers with knowledge being drawn from each section of the underpinning knowledge.

For Section A of the paper, questions mainly required candidates to respond to 'identify' or 'describe' command words, the predominance being 'describe'. 'Identify' questions required a one word or phrase response while questions which required candidates to 'describe' required a complete sentence answer. Scenario's and mini case studies were included in the paper to help motivate and stimulate candidate response.

Section B of the paper was accessible to F/G level candidates but was generally more demanding and provided the opportunity for candidates to give extended answers in order to demonstrate their depth and breadth of knowledge. Specificity was required when answering these questions.

Topics within the question paper included growth and development focussing on the different life stages and the characteristics associated with each life stage, factors that can affect growth and development, the effects of relationships on development, self-concept and the effects of life events and the different types of support that can be provided during expected and unexpected life events.

Centres could help to improve the quality of responses by candidates by:

- Ensuring that candidates have the underpinning knowledge for each section of the unit and have had practice in applying their knowledge.
- Helping candidates to understand technical terminology, for example, terms such as 'intellectual' or 'emotional' aspects of each life stage or 'how factors could interrelate'. Also they need to understand the terms 'professional' and 'informal care workers'.
- Making sure that candidates know the difference between command words such as 'describe' and 'explain'.
- Helping candidates to differentiate between vague responses and factual answers. For example, for question 6(b) and 6 (c), stating 'friend' for informal carer or 'physiotherapist' as an example of a professional carer, was required.
- Encouraging candidates to think specifically about issues that could be of a cultural nature and factors that can influence an individual's development.

### **2 Comments on Individual Questions**

- 1(a) This question addressed the first part of the WYNTL section of the specifications relating to life stages and intellectual characteristics of development. Many candidates were unable to differentiate between 'intellectual, emotional, social and physical' characteristics.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2007

An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

'Older adult'

**Intellectual 1:** doing crosswords, puzzles

**Intellectual 2:** some memory loss

An example of an inaccurate answer could have been:

'OAP'

**Intellectual 1:** difficulty walking

**Intellectual 2:** poor eye sight

This type of response indicates that some candidates may be confused and be unable to differentiate between the different characteristics.

1(b) Candidates were required to place the characteristics given in specific developmental order. Most candidates were successful in achieving all three correct answers.

2(a) The focus of the question was on 'describing' features of various types of relationships. Candidates were required to give 'different' types of features for each type of relationship, rather than repeating the same ones. Candidates did not respond well to this question. Many gave one word answers which indicated lack of attention to the command word 'describe'. A sentence answer was required but only a few candidates gave the correct type of response. Lack of knowledge of the 'features' of different types of relationship also appeared to contribute to low achievement. An example of an inaccurate response is:

Employer/employee: living together

An example of an accurate response is:

Employer/employee: The employer has power over an employee as the employee depends on the employer for the wage that is paid.

2(b) Candidates were asked to give a feature of three different situations. A large number of candidates were successful in gaining at least two of the three available marks, while others gained the full three marks. Section 2 was least well attempted. The second situation given was:

'Rob is afraid of some older boys at the youth club so Greg stays with him'

Correct features could have included: protection, feels safe, look out for each other, friendship, dependency, support etc.

2(c) The 'effect' on children when they have an effective social relationship with parents did not overall receive a very good response. An example of an acceptable answer would be:

'The child would have more confidence when meeting others/socialising with others as she/he would feel more secure'.

3(a) Most candidates answered the question successfully. Where they were less successful candidates were unable to differentiate between the various factors given. For example, they were unable to distinguish which was an environmental, physical, social and economic factor.

3(b) Candidates were required to link all three factors giving an explanation of how each would affect development. The question focussed on the 'interrelating' of factors as given



## Report on the Units taken in June 2007

in the specifications. Responses needed to show the links, how each would work together and how they would affect development. Responses varied and where candidates scored fewer marks they failed to make links or to explain how development would be affected. Some candidates repeated the same point several times while others left the page blank.

- 3(c) Most candidates were able to specifically 'explain' how neglect could affect growth and development. Most candidates scored some marks for this question but a few left a blank page. Answers needed to be specific, for example:

'The family may not have provided Abigail with nutritious food (H2) and as a consequence her growth could have been affected as she could have lost weight (D1). This could have left her without any energy and she would not have felt like joining in activities (H5) like other children of her age. This could have led to her having a low self-esteem (D11)'. Where achievement was low candidates were also repetitive or vague in their answers.

- 4 (a) There was a mixed response to this question which asked for three social characteristics that Bagicha was likely to experience in his life stage. Some candidates were confused as to which person was Bagicha and which was Kaz. As a consequence many did not score any marks. Others were unable to differentiate between a social or an intellectual or an emotional or a physical characteristic. Examples of acceptable answers were:

- Bagicha is more likely to be isolated through lack of mobility
- He has fewer friends as some will have died
- He could make new friends at the residential home

- 4(b) Most candidates were able to score one of the two available marks and some achieved the full marks. Candidates needed to state that self-concept is 'how the person perceives themselves **and** what we believe others think about us'.

- 4(c) Many candidates achieved a high score when answering this question. Candidates were required to give four factors other than culture that could influence development. Examples of correct answers were:

- age
- appearance
- gender
- education
- sexual orientation
- etc.

- 4(d) The command word for this question was 'explain', therefore, reasons were needed in the response. An example of an acceptable answer for 2 marks would be:

- Having a shared belief with others *can* give a sense of belonging
- Kaz may feel unimportant *because* his religious beliefs are not respected or provided for
- Kaz could *feel proud* about his work and that he is living in England.

The question received a mixed response.

- 5(a) Candidates were required to identify two 'effects' on self-concept and to show how each action should be changed. A large number of candidates scored all four of the available

## Report on the Units taken in June 2007

marks. Those that were less successful often failed to give an 'effect' the action would have on Bagicha. Candidates should be discouraged from stating:

He could feel '*stupid*'.

This was not considered to be acceptable.

Acceptable answers of 'effects' could have included:

- hurt/upset
- sense of guilt
- angry
- could feel useless
- not feel valued
- etc.

5 (b) Candidates were asked to 'explain' how Bagicha's self-concept was likely to be affected by having to rely on others. Examples of acceptable answer could be:

- he could feel useless *because* he is unable to do things for himself
- he may feel a burden as he has to rely on others
- he may feel that he is being looked after better *because* he is no longer being a burden to his family
- he may feel embarrassed *because* he has to be helped to the toilet.

Candidates were not awarded any marks for stating that 'he would feel *stupid*'. This was not considered to be an acceptable answer.

5(c) There was a mixed response to this question. Marks were given for specific actions that voluntary groups could take. Examples of acceptable answers were:

- talking to Bagicha about his worries
- helping him with the English language
- playing board games/doing activities with Bagicha
- keeping him company/socialising with Bagicha.

The question was poorly answered.

6(a) Candidates were asked to state whether the event was expected or unexpected and to give a reason for the decision. There was a mixed response to the question. Answers could have included:

Unexpected

- he had not previously been suffering from an illness
- the heart attack was not planned/predicted
- it happened suddenly.

6 (c) Lack of specificity resulted in candidates achieving fewer marks than expected for this question which asked for:

- three different types of informal carers
- one way *explaining how each* could provide support
- one way *explaining how each* would help Bagicha to cope.

## Report on the Units taken in June 2007

Responses demonstrated lack of factual knowledge e.g. not identifying the 'informal carer' **and** what they would do. Candidates were specifically asked to explain how it would help Bagicha to cope. An example of a partial answer could have been:

'Friends (I1) could come round and cook Bagicha lunch (s12) to make sure that he was having a balanced diet. This would help Bagicha to cope as it would help him to stay healthy (c16).

Where answers were vague and did not specifically identify the informal carer marks were not awarded. An example of an unacceptable answer was:

'They could go round to his place and give him support'.

Who are 'they' and what type of support was being provided? How did the support help Bagicha to cope?

Types of informal carers could have included:

- family
- extended family
- friends
- neighbours
- voluntary groups
- support groups
- faith groups
- etc.

6(b) Lack of specificity resulted in candidates achieving fewer marks for this question. Responses demonstrated:

- lack of factual knowledge e.g. not identifying the 'professional' **and** what they would do. Candidates were specifically asked for professional care workers'. These should have been appropriate for Bagicha's condition. They were not asked for voluntary groups or informal carers.
- three professional care workers were required.
- candidates were required to be specific about what the professional would do
- they should 'explain' how the action would help Bagicha to cope.

Marks were awarded for the quality of the response. For example, for giving explicitly the names of professionals that could help the Bagicha e.g. GP (1 mark) and then **explaining** what professionals would actually do to help and **how** it would help him to cope.

### **An example of a paragraph of an acceptable answer:**

A GP could visit a Bagicha (1 mark), who would monitor his condition and prescribe medication (1 mark). This would help Bagicha to cope as it would relieve him of pain (1mark). A physiotherapist could visit Bagicha (1 mark) and would show him some exercises he could do to help him keep fit (1mark). This would help him to cope by making him more mobile (1).

Note: an unacceptable answer, for which no marks would be given could be:

'Bagicha could have a care worker who would give him support and look after him'.

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

Answers had to be specific and factually correct.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education  
Health & Social Care (Double Award) 1493  
June 2007 Assessment Series**

**Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
4869	Raw	50	47	42	37	32	27	22	17	12	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4870	Raw	50	47	42	37	32	27	22	17	12	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4871	Raw	100	91	80	69	59	49	39	30	21	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0

**Entry Information**

Unit	Total Entry
4869	12 608
4870	12 703
4871	10 837

**Specification Aggregation Results**

GRADE	A*A*	AA	BB	CC	DD	EE	FF	GG	UU
UMS	270	240	210	180	150	120	90	60	0
Cum %	0.6	7.2	24.7	50.1	69.7	84.1	93.8	98.5	100

**13 195 candidates were entered for aggregation this series.**

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;  
[http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam\\_system/understand\\_ums.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553