

Health & Social Care (Double Award)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1493**

Report on the Units

January 2008

1493/MS/R/08J

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 candidates 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 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

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

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
4869/4870 Health and Social Care (Coursework)	2
4869 Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision	3
4870 Promoting Health and Well-being	6
4871 Understanding Personal Development and Relationships	10
Grade Thresholds	15

Chief Examiner's Report

GCSE: 1493: HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

CHIEF EXAMINER: ANGELA FISHER

JANUARY 2008

Most 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. Some Centres did not give sufficient attention to the 'exemplification' when marking units. For the written paper results did not achieve quite the same outcomes as in previous testing opportunities. Candidates failed to respond to the 'effects on development' in questions that required this focus. Also in question 6 (c) candidates did not appear to know what was actually involved in the work of an occupational therapist and a health care assistant.

Further details are given in the Principal Examiner's report

Specific factual knowledge is required for Unit 4869: Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision. Some candidates have given the facts for one service, but failed to provide sufficient detail for the second service, suggesting possible poor time management or lack of attention to the 'Banner'. A few Centres concentrated on 'professionals' rather than 'settings' for the 'a' strand.

For Unit 4870, where results have been disappointing and assessment decisions in some instances are considered to be lenient, it is often because of a lack of factual evidence within the unit. Candidates must produce a plan for the person chosen and must give facts within the plan. It must be remembered that this unit is often the first to be completed and candidates may lack maturity and knowledge to meet the full requirements of the unit. It is necessary to ensure that full guidance is provided when teaching the unit to provide candidates with the opportunity to achieve their full potential.

Overall the achievement of candidates in both the written paper and the portfolio evidence is satisfactory and meets the national requirements of the specification.

4869/4870 Health and Social Care (Coursework)

General Comments

Thank you to the centres that were co-operative and undertook the correct administration procedures. It was pleasing to find that the majority of centres included the CCS160 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.

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 series showed a gradual improvement.

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.

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. It is important that writing frames are not used for candidates able to gain higher grades as this inhibits the opportunity for the candidates to show original thought and research.

4869 Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision

There were not so many entries for this unit in this examination session. 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, eg an outpatients department at a hospital providing health care to the local community, and an Infant School 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, used video footage, and also invited speakers to classes for candidates to interview.

Centres continue to direct their candidates to base the portfolio on care workers rather than the services. 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.

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. Candidates need to produce work of equal standard for both services if they are to achieve a particular mark

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. 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.

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 continues to be 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 ie 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 text book/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 – Centre should ensure that candidates do not describe the day to day programme for the service users. A high level response would include a detailed breakdown of the day-day tasks undertaken by 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 were 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

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 candidates 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. It is most pleasing to see that candidates are understanding the importance of care values in the health, social care and early years work place

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.

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 indicated how they had carried out a survey and they were then able to address Strand D2 and D3, they used, in detail using 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.

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.

D2/3 – 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.

E1/2 – Candidates showed a clear understanding of at least three 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 – 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. A high level response included evidence of synthesis of knowledge ie 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.

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

4870 Promoting Health and Well-being

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. 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. It is apparent that this area (Strand E) was frequently rushed by candidates.

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 and show how the questionnaire and physical measurements of health contributed to the reasons behind their planning. It is important for candidates to realise that the plan should be in a form that the individual could use.

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. It should be remembered that the individual does not have to have huge health needs that need addressing, but need to be provided with a plan to maintain their present state of health.

Confidentiality continues to be a problem with some candidates as they do not understand that they should not use the name of their client or 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' 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. A risk factor eg smoking, cannot be turned into a positive factor unless there is justification that because the individual has given up smoking this has resulted in an improvement in the person's health.

Candidates often did not make a link to the questionnaire and just gave generic information with no reference being made to the client. Showing how the positive factors linked together was 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 it in Strand C as being a factor that caused a risk eg 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 three 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

Candidates again needed to refer back to the questionnaire so that the risks specifically applied to the individual. 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. Generally this section continued to be well done

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

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, eg peak flow or pulse rate, this provided them with a greater opportunity to analyse and interpret results.

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.

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

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

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 eg A4 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.

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:

- Support candidates with time management to ensure that all Strands met the same depth of understanding.
- Encourage candidates that use ICT skills to present their portfolio in a maximum size 12 font.
- 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 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 January 2008

- Avoid excess material in the portfolio: eg 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.
- Encourage candidates to set out their work clearly with appropriate headings that link to the assessment criteria as this helps with assessment.
- 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
- 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
- Annotate work clearly throughout the text and on the (URS) front mark sheet, this supports and justifies the marks awarded.
- Ensure that marking is consistent between members of a department by undertaking internal standardisation.

Good Practice within Coursework Administration

- 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.
- 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. .
- 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* entered. ***Note: from the June 2008 series, if a CCS160 form is not submitted to the Moderator with the work, results cannot be issued.***
- 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 and particularly individual Strands 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

General Comment

The response to the question paper was not as high as in previous test series, with candidates giving mid-range to low responses. A minority of candidates, compared to the numbers entered, achieved fairly high responses. 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 large number of candidates left large sections of the answer paper blank, for example, questions 2 (a) and 6 (b), indicating that perhaps there was a lack of knowledge.

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. Scenarios 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 characteristics of growth and development focussing on the different life stages and the characteristics associated with each life stage, 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:

- Making candidates aware that their answers will need to be read by a marker! many answers were extremely difficult to read.
- 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 'emotional' or 'social' aspects of each life stage or 'how factors could inter-relate'. Also they need to understand the term 'professional' care workers' and know what tasks professional care workers would carry out.
- Making sure that candidates know the difference between command words such as 'describe', 'explain' and 'compare'.
- Helping candidates to differentiate between vague responses and factual answers. For example, for question 3(c) and 6 (c) where actual specific facts were required rather than vague statements such as 'she could get her legs moving again'.
- Encouraging candidates to notice where the word 'different' was included in the questions, so that they did not repeat the same answers for all three sections of the question, eg 2(b).

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a) This question addressed the first part of the WYNTL section of the specifications relating to life stages and emotional characteristics of development. Many candidates did not note that the question asked for 'different' emotional characteristics for each life stage. Additionally words that indicated understanding of the word 'emotional' were not included.

An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

'Older adult'

Emotional 1: lonely as friends had died

Emotional 2: isolated as she may not be able to get out very often

An example of an inaccurate answer could have been:

Emotional 1: coping with death

This answer does not give a word that indicates an 'emotional' characteristic.

Additionally the question required candidates to 'describe'. Many gave one word answers which did not meet the requirement of the question.

- (b) Candidates were required to give three ways that positive relationships could be promoted in the life of a five year old. The command word was 'describe'. The question looked for responses that stated what could actually be done to promote good relationships eg:

- listening
- reading
- spending time with Emma
- taking Emma to play with other children

The question was very poorly answered.

- 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.

Examples of accurate responses are:

Ben's partner: they love one another

Ben's employer: The employer has power over an employee as the employee depends on the employer for the wage that is paid.

- (b) Candidates were asked to explain three relationship changes in Matthew's life. A large number of candidates were successful in gaining at least two of the six available marks. There must be two parts to a sentence that asks for 'explain', a 'subject' and an 'effect'. For example:

Matthew is not accepting the advice given by his parents because he is influenced by his friends.

- 3 (a) Most candidates answered the question quite poorly. They were able to identify, in the main, the three different types of factors. They could not describe two ways in which that factor would effect development. An example of an acceptable answer would be:

Pollution from cars: 1 could make his asthma worse/cause an asthma attack
2 noise could prevent him from sleeping

Candidates must give full attention to 'the effect' a factor would have on an individual.

- (b) The command word for this question was 'compare' and the 'effect' on the development of each person. Candidates were, therefore, required to consider similarities and/or differences. Most managed to gain some of the five marks for this question while some achieved the full five marks. An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

Sid has a well paid job while Angus is poorly paid as he works on a building site. This means that Angus could be envious of Sid because he can afford to buy the things he wants, such as a motorbike.

In this answer one person is being 'compared' to another. Also an 'effect' on development has been given.

This was a quality response answer and marks were awarded for the quality of the answer rather than the number of comparisons made.

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

- 4 (a) Most candidates were successfully able to 'identify' three life events that had occurred in Niro's life.

- (b) There was a mixed response to this question which asked for the possible 'effects' of the life events on Niro. Some candidates successfully selected a subject and then gave the effect on development. This question required candidates to think about what the possible 'effects' could be. In other words how would Niro be influenced by a specific event? An examples of an acceptable answer would have been:

Niro will be able to socialise with new people this will help him to build new relationships/make new friends

One again two parts to the sentence is required – a subject and an effect.

- (c) Most candidates were able to score one of the four possible marks. The question asked for different ways that a voluntary group could provide support. Examples of acceptable answers could have included:

- talking to Niro about his worries
- providing Nero with information
- giving him the chance to practice his English
- taking Niro out on visits/trips

5 (a) 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:

- Niro could feel happy because his wife and son are now with him
- Niro may now feel guilty because his son is being bullied and feel it was his fault
- Niro could feel proud that he can provide for his wife and son as he is now buying a house for them all to live in

A 'subject' and an 'effect' was required in the answer. The question received a mixed response.

(b) Candidates were required to focus on the 'effects' on Amir if he was to be bullied. The command word was 'explain' so two parts to a sentence were required. In the first part, the 'subject', the candidates needed to describe what was actually happening to Amir. In the second part they needed to give an explanation about the 'effect' this would have on him. An acceptable answer could have been:

Amir may start to bully others because he feels angry about being bullied himself.

OR

Amir is unable to form friendships with others and may become isolated/withdrawn because he is being bullied.

6 (a) The question required candidates to think about the features that promoted a positive family relationship. The command word was 'describe' and, therefore, a complete sentence was required.

There was a mixed response to this question. Many identified the features but gave one word answers.

Examples of acceptable answers are:

- they are able to share problems
- the family can do activities together
- they protect one another in times of danger
- love is shown to one another

(b) The focus of the question was on the affect of training and education on Niro's self concept. In other words what difference would the training make to Niro? A 'subject' and an 'effect' was required in the sentence given by the candidate. For example:

Niro would have improved confidence as he knows more about his subject.

OR

Niro may feel proud to have succeeded in learning a new skill/language/job.

(c) Lack of specificity resulted in candidates achieving fewer marks than expected for this question. Three different types of professional carers were specified and answers required the candidates to:

Report on the Units taken in January 2008

- give specific examples of what each would do in their daily tasks
- AND
- *explain* how each would help Farah to cope

Responses demonstrated:

- lack of factual knowledge eg what each professional carer given would do.
- lack of specificity over how it would help Farah to cope. An example of a partial answer could have been:

A physiotherapist could provide exercises (1) for Farah to do to help her regain movement in her legs. She could also give massage to help her to be more comfortable (1). This would help Farah to cope because it would increase her mobility (1).

Where answers were vague and did not specifically identify what the professional carer would do, marks were not awarded. An example of an unacceptable answer was:

'They could go round to her place and give her support'.

What type of support was being provided? How did the support help Farah to cope?

Marks were awarded for the quality of the response.

Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education
GCSE Health & Social Care (Double Award) (Specification Code 1493)
January 2008 Examination 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	86	73	60	48	39	30	21	12	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A*A*	AA	BB	CC	DD	EE	FF	GG	U
1493	300	270	240	210	180	150	120	90	60	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A*A*	AA	BB	CC	DD	EE	FF	GG	U	Total No. of Cands
1493	0.00	0.00	18.75	50.0	65.63	65.63	75.00	81.25	100.0	32

32 candidates were entered for aggregation this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.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

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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

© OCR 2008

