

Health & Social Care (Double Award)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1493**

Report on the Units

June 2008

1493/MS/R/08

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 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	7
4871 – Understanding Personal Development and Relationships	12
Grade Thresholds	19

Chief Examiner's Report

Understanding Personal Development and Relationships (4871)

The results for the written paper Understanding Personal Development and Relationships (4871), for Health and Social Care (Double Award), have been quite pleasing for most candidates. The responses showed that, for the most part 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 as well as the inability to apply knowledge to given contexts. Knowing and understanding technical terminology relating to the unit is essential for successful results. Understanding is also tested through the application of knowledge to the contexts given in the various scenarios. Details are given in the Principal Examiner's report.

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

When assessing Unit 4869: Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision care must be taken to ensure that candidates who seek to achieve 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. Or they have not adhered to the assessment requirements and the exemplification.

Overall results for Unit 4870 were of a lower standard than 4869, with assessment decisions in some instances being too 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'. 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 Strand E was frequently rushed by candidates.

Evidence for portfolios should not be generic but should be 'applied'. Centres must follow the exemplification when delivering and assessing the units.

4869 / 4870 Health and Social Care (Coursework)

Principal Moderators Report

General Comments

During the moderation process some exceptional work has been seen. Those candidates that produced work of a high quality were well supported by their teachers having been given clear guidance and encouraged to produce work logically. Assessors that gave supportive comments within the portfolio showed not only good practice but also aided the moderation process.

It was disappointing given that this GCSE has been running for a number of years that in a number of Centres work was of a very poor quality or was incorrectly assessed. Some portfolios lacked coherence; they did not follow a logical sequence, and often contained class notes which were totally out of context. It was in these cases obvious that Centres had not used the exemplification guidance in conjunction with the assessment grid to clarify detail and their marks had to be altered.

Thank you to all the Centres who adhered to the administration requirements and deadlines as set out by OCR. Unfortunately there was some delay in the moderation process because some Centres had not paid attention to the detail required, especially on the MS1 and Unit Recording Sheet (URS) forms. Centres would be advised to check the moderator's copy of the MS1 to ensure that it is legible and fully completed before sending it off and also ensure that the URS sheet has been correctly calculated.

It is essential that Centres implement an internal moderation system to ensure that the application of assessment criteria is applied with consistency and accuracy. This is essential when there is more than one assessor at the Centre, in some cases work had to be returned to Centres for re-marking. There was evidence of Centres pushing marks up near the A and C grade boundaries when actually the evidence did not warrant the marks awarded. Scaling was recommended for a number of Centres especially for the top to middle mark band range.

4869 – Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision

The majority of Centres had fulfilled the criteria for this unit. Many Centres are now organising the work for 4869 in strands rather than by service, this makes the moderation process considerably easier.

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 health centre and a nursery, 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.

Some 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 require an adjustment to the marks. 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

Many candidates include a lot of descriptive work about their chosen care settings much of which was irrelevant. Centres would be advised to be more precise in their approach to this particular strand and focus on exactly what is required – funding national and local, the effect of funding on service provision and knowledge of where the two care settings fit into the national framework. The funding issue is still challenging for some candidates. The evidence submitted must be related to the two services chosen. It is good practice for candidates to include an introduction so that the portfolio is clearly focussed on the names of the two services and which sector each belongs.

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

Candidates do not always focus on the day-to-day task in sufficient detail; times may also not have been given. Candidates often lacked evidence of an explanation/description and were awarded too many marks for bullet points with little detail of understanding. For some reason some Centres thought that they should compare the two job roles, this is not a requirement of the assessment criteria.

B1 - Centres 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 had undertaken work shadowing. Candidates need 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 person's 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 Stand were awarded when candidates differentiated between qualities and skills in the description and gave examples of them 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 and 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

Many candidates, conducted surveys, collated the results and produced some very colourful charts but did not then analyse these results in relation to the effectiveness of the service meeting the client's needs. Where this Strand was done well, candidates had indicated how they had carried out a survey, they were then able to address Strand D2 and D3, as they used the primary evidence they had collected and gave a detailed analysis.

Candidates were put at a disadvantage in those Centres who did not encourage them to carry out primary research. 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 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

This strand was often over marked; a description of a barrier should constitute more than a few words and all work needs to be applied and described in relation to the services being studied. Candidates cannot be awarded marks for generic information copied from books. Those candidates who had either been on work experience or had had significant contact with the care settings fared better as their practical knowledge was used to good effect. Many candidates attempted how barriers could be overcome but often did not describe fully the effect on clients and therefore did not allow candidates to discuss empowerment.

E1 and E2 - Candidates showed a clear understanding of at least three barriers to the services chosen and to the different types. 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 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.

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

4870 – Promoting Health and Well-being

This unit was not completed to the standard of 4869, this was due partially to marks being awarded for evidence that could not be located. 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. Many candidates spent a long time on a food analysis however alone they are insufficient evidence.

Achievement within Strand B

This section was often generously marked, too much generic information was evident. 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 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 e.g. not taking drugs, can not be turned into a positive factor unless there is justification that because the individual has given up partaking in drugs this has resulted in an improvement in the person's health.

The ability to link the positive factors is still a weakness. Candidates often did not make a link to the questionnaire and just gave generic information with no reference being made to the client. 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 e.g. diet. It should be noted that credit can only be given for an explanation in one of the strands and not both.

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 Maslow's opinion as 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

This section also tended to be slightly over marked. To achieve full marks candidates need to understand the verbs used in the assessment criteria. A list / bullet points of effects was insufficient when asked to review and assess possible long-term risks to the health and well being of the individual. Candidates need to show and demonstrate their understanding of the short and long-term risks and how the client would be affected. Candidates again needed to refer back to the questionnaire so that the risks specifically apply 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 gave a detailed description of the 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. Temperature, diet, smoking, and alcohol consumption charts are not 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. Many candidates did not undertake or record the pulse rate recovery test correctly and marks had to be adjusted.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

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 - Few 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. Candidates need to draw conclusions from the data collected and a full assessment of the person's physical fitness made for full marks.

Achievement within Strand E

A wide range of plans were seen by moderators, some were detailed, well organised and thoughtful but others were brief and did not contain a realistic plan. Support, motivation and the effects of the plan were often omitted although marks were awarded by assessors. There was a varying amount of internet research, leaflets etc included without any reference to their content. Candidates need to show how the clients would use the researched information and give reasons why these would be beneficial.

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.

Those plans that were produced logically scored the highest these often 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. 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.

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.

Report on the Units taken in June 2008

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

Good Practice within Coursework Administration

- 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.
- Include the Coursework Assessment Form (CAF) (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 sampled.
- Avoid sending portfolios in ring binders, plastic wallets or folder envelopes as these are bulky to store and to post.

It is good practice to:

- 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 UBS form, as this allows for efficient moderation.
- 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 UBS front mark sheet, this supports and justifies the marks awarded.
- Ensure that marking is consistent between members of a department by undertaking internal standardization.
- 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 14 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.
- 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.

4871 – Understanding Personal Development and Relationships

Principal Examiners Report

1 General Comment

All questions were based on the specifications for the unit. Some candidates achieved fairly high responses. Quite a large number of candidates left sections of the answer paper blank. Some answers given by candidates lacked specificity with a large number of candidates either mis-reading questions or appeared not to have the knowledge required to answer the questions.

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, 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:

- Encouraging candidates to accurately read the questions
- 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 ‘cultural’ or ‘characteristics’ as applied to each life stage (8.2.1). Also they need to understand the roles and tasks that professional care workers do, for example, a Health Visitor or Counsellor.
- 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 1(a)(i), 1(a)(ii)(c) and 6(c) where actual specific facts were required rather than vague statements such as ‘she could see if they were OK’.

2 Comments on Individual Questions

1(a)(i) This question addressed the first part of the WYNTL section of the specifications relating to life stages and physical characteristics of development. Many candidates did not appear to know what a physical characteristic is, for example, for Brett they could have given:

- wrinkles or loss of elasticity of the skin
- grey hair
- reduction in height

Answers that gave specifically physical characteristics were required. An unacceptable answer was, 'loss of memory' or 'friends had died so he would be lonely'. The later is not a characteristic it is a social development.

Most were successful in giving the correct life stage, for example, older adult or elderly or later adult.

Some candidates confused Brett with Tony.

1(a)(ii) Some candidates did not give the correct life stage, which should have been adolescence.

Acceptable answers could have included:

- growth spurt
- spots
- body hair grows
- shoulders broaden
- penis enlarges etc

The question was poorly answered in the main. An example of an unacceptable answer was 'adult'. A large number of candidates gave developmental features such as 'he would need a job' or 'he would be able to take Brett out'. These were totally unacceptable

1(b)(i) Candidates were required to give **two** social changes that could occur in Brett's life. The command word was 'describe' which required a good phrase or sentence answer. The question looked for responses that stated what could actually be done e.g.

- time for hobbies
- more time to spend with his family
- able to meet more people
- will be able to take part in leisure activities.

A number of candidates assumed that Brett would be placed in a residential home!

The emphasis on the question was for responses that gave **positive** and **social changes**.

1(b)(ii) focus of the question required candidates to give **two negative social changes**. This required understanding of the words 'negative' and 'social'.

Acceptable answers were:

- could become isolated due to lack of mobility
- may not have enough money to join in leisure activities
- friends/ wife could die so he could feel lonely.

Marks were not awarded for physical, intellectual or emotional changes. Candidates obtained on average at least one mark for this question.

2(a)(i) The question asked 'what is meant by the term 'genetic'. Most candidates were successful in getting two correct answers. These could have included for example:

- genes that are passed down from parent/ grandparents
- genes that are inherited from parents/ grandparents
- shared features/ genes from parents / grandparents
- features that are inherited.

An example of an unacceptable answer was: 'things that made you look the same', such an answer was too vague.

2(b)(ii) A large number of candidates were successful in gaining both marks. For example they correctly gave:

- fair hair
- blue eyes

Examples of unacceptable answers were:

- both could play the piano
- both went for walks with their mum and dad.

2(b) The command word was 'explain' which indicates an increase in the depth of response required. Candidates were required to explain four factors, other than genetics that had influenced the development of the twins.

Some candidates included responses that were 'genetic' factors.

Each full answer was awarded two marks. For this candidates would include a factor **and** an effect on development. Example of a full acceptable answers would be:

- the twins went for walks with their parents and this would help them to keep fit and healthy
- their father taught them about computers and this helped them to get a job using computers.

Many candidates received one mark for each of the four parts of the question as they gave a factor but not an effect on development.

The question was answered fairly well.

2(c) This question was poorly answered by most candidates. It appeared that the candidates were unable to differentiate between 'emotional' and other P.I.E.S. Acceptable answers could have included:

- being loved could make the child more confident
- being protected could make the child feel more secure
- the twins were very close/ bonded well together.

Both positive and negative emotions could have been included.

3(a) Most candidates answered the question quite poorly. They were required to include a 'subject' and an 'effect' for the full two marks for each part of the question based on how Ali's development could be affected by educational experiences. Examples of acceptable answers were:

- educational experiences could give Ali more confidence **as** he would have more knowledge
- educational experiences could make Ali pleased with his success so his self esteem could be increased.

3(b) 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 a few left the page blank. Candidates were required, for example to:

- show the link e.g. eldest taking responsibility+ father being unemployed + not leaving time for Ali to spend with his friends
- give reasons why e.g. not enough money
- show how it would effect development e.g. worry/ have a lower self esteem

3(c) This question was not well answered in the main. There were two main groups of responses:

- those that answered well because they had knowledge of cultural matters and could show how culture could effect development
- those that did not score any marks because they appeared not to know the meaning of the term 'culture' and could not apply any knowledge to the effect on development.

For a full response two parts to an answer were required:

- a subject e.g. having shared beliefs with others
- an effect on development e.g. could give a sense of belonging.

Another acceptable answer could have been:

- may feel unimportant **because** they are not the main group/ or same culture in the area.

- 4(a)** Most candidates were successful in achieving quite a high mark for this question. The candidates were required to give the meaning of technical terms used in relationships and to give examples **based on Text 3**.

Some candidates did not give examples based on Text 3 and as a consequence did not receive any marks for the examples.

A large number of candidates successfully gave an accurate definition of the technical terms, for example:

Protection: preventing a person from coming to harm/ keeping a person safe/ free from danger.

- 4 (b)** There was a mixed response to this question which asked candidates to 'explain' how a loving and caring relationship could affect the development of the children.

For a full answer the response needed to give two parts. For example:

- a developmental characteristic
- an effect on development.

Examples of acceptable answers could have been:

- the children will learn how to trust **and** will be able to form good relationships with others
- the children are likely to be more confident **when** meeting new people.

A mark could be given for a part answer.

This was a quality response question and the answer was matched to the High, Mid-range and Low descriptors with most candidates achieving a Mid-range mark.

- 5(a)(i)** The command word for this question was 'explain', therefore, reasons were needed in the response. The focus of the question was on 'intellectual' development. The question was poorly answered mainly because candidates gave answers that effected social development. Also answers were not sufficiently specific or were incorrect.

Examples of acceptable answers were:

- talking with others will **help to develop** communication skills
- making puzzles with **help to develop** problem solving skills / co-ordination
- story time will **develop** imagination/ vocabulary/ creativity.

An 'action' and an 'effect' were required in the answer. Marks were awarded for a part answer.

- 5(a)(ii)** The command word for this question was 'explain', therefore, reasons were needed in the response. The focus of the question was on 'social' development. The question was reasonably well answered mainly because candidates appeared to be more familiar with social aspects of P.I.E.S. Occasionally answers were not sufficiently specific.

Examples of acceptable answers were:

- learning to play with other children **will build** a child's confidence
- learning to relate to other adults **will** increase independence
- playing with others **will help to develop** team work/ co-operation.

An 'action' and an 'effect' were required in the answer. Marks were awarded for a part answer.

- 5(b)** Candidates were required to focus on the 'effects' on Kevin of the nursery nurse shouting at him. The command word was 'explain' so two parts to a sentence were required. In the first part, the 'reason', the candidates needed to describe what was actually happening to Kevin. In the second part they needed to give an explanation about the 'effect' this would have on him. An acceptable answer could have been:

Kevin may start to bully/ hurt others **because** he feels angry because the nursery nurse shouts at him/ does not praise him.

OR

Kevin is unable to form friendships with others and may become isolated/ withdrawn **because** he is being shouted at

Most candidates achieved a mark within the Mid-range response.

- 6(a)** Many candidates achieved at least two of the three available marks for this question. They successfully identified the event as being 'unexpected' and gave at least one reason to support their decision.
- 6(b)** The question required candidates to think about how Christine's and Richard's development would be effected if their daughter died. A 'reason' and an 'effect' were required within answers.

Examples of acceptable answers within the quality response are:

- they are likely to feel sad **because** of the loss
- they could feel guilty **because** they do not think they did enough to help her
- they could argue and fall out **because** they blame each other
- they feel worried/ stressed **because** other people think they are bad parents.

This question was answered reasonably well.

6 (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:

- give specific examples of what each would do in their daily tasks

AND

- *explain* how each would help Christine and Richard to cope.

Responses demonstrated:

- lack of factual knowledge e.g. what each professional carer given would do, particularly for the health Visitor
-
- lack of specificity over how it would help Christine and Richard to cope. An example of a partial answer could have been:

A Health Visitor could provide information about a well balanced diet (1) for the family to do to help them remain healthy. She could also take measurements such as blood pressure or temperature to check that other members of the family were not infected with the disease (1). This would help the family to cope because it would **stop them from worrying/ being stressed** (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 the family to cope?

Alternatively an incorrect response often given was:

- **'The Health Visitor could clean the house and do the shopping.'** - Such a response indicated lack of knowledge of the role of a Health Visitor.

Marks were awarded for the quality of the response.

Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education Health & Social Care (Double Award) - (Specification Code 1493)

June 2008 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
4869	Raw	50	47	42	37	33	27	22	17	12	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4870	Raw	50	47	42	37	33	27	22	17	12	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4871	Raw	100	86	75	64	53	44	35	27	19	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

Maximum Mark	A*A*	A*A	AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD
1493	270	255	240	225	210	195	180	165	150
Cumulative %	0.7	2.5	7.4	14.9	24.9	36.0	49.6	60.4	69.5

Maximum Mark	DE	EE	EF	FF	FG	GG	U
1493	135	120	105	90	75	60	0
Cumulative %	77.3	84.1	89.1	93.6	96.5	98.4	100

10,322 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