

Health & Social Care (Double Award)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1493**

Report on the Units

January 2009

1493/MS/R/09J

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

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 2009

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 Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision	2
4870 Promoting health and well-being	4
4871 Understanding Personal Development and Relationships	6
Grade Thresholds	12

Chief Examiner's Report

Candidates submitting for the written paper Understanding Personal Development and Relationships (4871), for Health and Social Care (Double Award), have been successful in achieving quite good results. The responses showed that, for the most part candidates have been well prepared and that delivery of the unit has 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 relating to specific questions can be found in the Principal Examiners report.

For Unit 4869:Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision, candidates who based their portfolio evidence on two local settings tended to produce work of a higher standard than those who worked from written case studies, as they were able to base their work on primary evidence. Candidates should not base their evidence on primary care workers but should focus on the setting.

Some results for Unit 4870 were disappointing and assessment decisions in some instances were considered to be quite 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 often made few actual links between the positive factors or gave insufficient information within the 'plan'. Details can be found in the Principal Moderator's report.

4869 Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision

General Comments

The majority of Centres had guided their students to choose two suitable care settings upon which to base their portfolios on. However there were a few Centres that had directed candidates towards the NHS. The NHS is not an organisation and should not therefore have been used.

Where centres had guided candidates to select two different services; e.g. a play centre and a nursing home, 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 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.

Comments on Individual Questions

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 at national and local levels, the effect of funding on service provision and a knowledge of where the two care setting 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 to which sector each belongs.

Some of the flow diagrams included to show where care settings fitted into the overall structure were out of date – Centres should direct their candidates to up-to date structures. The more able candidates had carried out research into additional aspects of funding, thus fulfilling the requirements for A2.

It was disappointing to see that some Centres had allowed their candidates to describe the staff within the organisation which is not required. Many had copied text from introductory booklets, which did not show understanding or applied knowledge. A3 – the more able candidates were able to analyse the impact of both increased and decreased funding. Some excellent use of current news coverage was evident.

Strand B

Candidates need to focus on the day-to-day task in detail, explaining the times of a working day. Candidates often lacked evidence of an explanation/description and were awarded too many marks for bullet points with little detail of understanding. A few candidates looked at the job role of an indirect care worker – Centres are to be advised that this is incorrect.

This was generally a well produced strand. The day-to-day account of a direct care worker's role was, in the main, informative. Those that had actually been on work experience or who had observed first hand gave a detailed and more accurate account. The weakest day-to-day accounts were given in bullet form and failed to 'describe the role'.

Being specific about the skills and the qualities and the qualifications applied to the roles gained higher marks within B2.

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 give opinions.

Strand C

Many candidates gave a detailed account of how the direct care worker applied the care values. Weaker candidates did not apply the care values and gave generic points. Some candidates were able to describe the effects of the care values if they were not applied and gained more marks.

More able candidates were able to explain the principles behind the care values.

Strand D

The majority of candidates carried out a survey or conducted a questionnaire to collect some of the data for this strand. Those who had gathered significant primary research were able to progress onto D2 more effectively. D3 was at times weak – the conclusions given were brief – candidates did not use the evidence within D2 and gave very simplistic conclusions.

Strand E

Some Centres tackled both care settings together and sometimes did not cover all of the specified criteria. Those that gained most marks looked at each care setting separately, fully detailing three barriers for each care setting.

E2 – Lots of varying effects were given covering all aspects of development.

E3 – Some thoughtful and innovative ways of overcoming barriers were seen.

4870 Promoting health and well-being

General Comments

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 to be studied does not have to have complex health needs that need addressing, but someone who needs to be provided with a plan to maintain their present state of health.

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.

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.

Strand A

This strand was generally done very well. Some excellent questionnaires enabled many candidates to collect valuable data on their client. The ability to analyse this information was generally good. The best practice seen was those candidates who had sub-divided the analysis of their client's health into PIES - this gave a logical sequence to their work. The weakest portfolios were those that showed no sequence and were somewhat jumbled. Many gave a diet analysis, which supported their conclusion as to the healthiness of their clients. Some candidates did not use the information collected when completing the other strands of this portfolio

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, should 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; many describe the positive effects with respect to PIES but failed to make the crucial links. Some candidates were misguided and used effects as a positive factor, e.g. 'having a high self esteem'. 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 eg diet. It should be noted that credit can only be given for an explanation in one of the strands and not in both.

Strand C

This section 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 demonstrate the 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.

Those who scored the highest had made the short and long term effects applicable to their client.

Unfortunately some Centres continue to award high scores for lists only.

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 included.

BMI / height and weight were the most popular measures 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. The best work seen was when candidates had reviewed the client's lifestyle and had given their own thoughts and judgements.

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. Disappointingly some candidates had produced health plans, which were of a theoretical basis as opposed to practical. support, motivation and the effects of the plan were often omitted although marks were awarded by assessors. Far too many printouts were seen in some plans, not showing application by the candidate – these should be discouraged.

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.

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. Conclusions given regarding the plan were at times weak and did not reflect back on the positives and negative aspects of the health plan.

4871 Understanding Personal Development and Relationships

General Comment

The responses given by candidates within the paper generally demonstrated a sound understanding of each topic. A few candidates either miss-read questions or appeared not to have the specific knowledge demanded by the questions. All questions were based on the specifications for the unit. Some candidates were awarded quite high marks as their answers demonstrated their ability to synthesise information and the ability to write with fluency. This was an advantage when dealing with questions that required quality response answers.

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 "describe" command words. Such questions required a phrase or a complete sentence response. A few questions required an 'explanation' which required an account, examples and reasons for the decisions made. Scenarios and mini case studies were included in the paper to help motivate and stimulate candidates' responses.

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 as was fluency and synthesis, particularly for quality response type questions.

Topics within the question paper included the physical, intellectual, emotional and social characteristics associated with each life stage, the effects of relationships on development, factors that could influence development and self concept. The different types of support that would be required in particular situations and the way that such support could help an individual to cope were also tested.

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

- Making sure that candidates understand the technical terminology related to the unit e.g. characteristics, factors, positive, negative, emotional, social etc.
- Ensuring that candidates have the underpinning knowledge for each section of the unit and have had practice in applying their knowledge.
- 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, where actual specific facts were required rather than vague statements such as 'she would have support'.
- Giving candidates the opportunity to practise answering questions, particularly those that required a subject and an effect.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1(a)** Learners were required to accurately match four different life stages to the illustrations given and to 'describe' for each two different features.

Most were successful in matching the illustration to the correct word that indicated the relationship in the text box, but did not 'describe' the features of each relationship, instead giving one word answers for which they did not receive any marks as the command word was, 'describe'.

It should be noted that candidates were required to use a feature only once and many were not awarded marks because of repetition or through giving only one word answers.

- 1(b)** The question required candidates to think about the 'effects' on an individual of being involved in a break-up of a friendship. The focus of the question was on the 'effect' which required use of the words such as, 'lonely, sad, and isolated.

Candidates generally scored two of the three available marks, but some gave a subject rather than an effect. An example of an acceptable answer could be:

'She could feel isolated (effect) as she had no one to go around with or keep her company when she went out (subject).

- 2(a)** Candidates were required to differentiate between physical, intellectual, emotional and social characteristics of an adolescent called, Zena. This could be male or female as it is only the physical characteristics that would change within responses given.

Most candidates scored well on this question but a few achieved very low marks as they were unable to differentiate between the P.I.E.S.

Acceptable answers could include

- Physical - growth spurt, periods start, hips widen or shoulders broaden, penis enlarges, facial hair
- Intellectual - capable of understanding difficult concepts, learning new skills, enjoys solving problems
- Emotional - mood swings, sad as boyfriend relationships break up
- Social - makes new friends, goes out with friends more

- (2(b))** Nearly all candidates were able to differentiate between the P.I.E.S. and could apply their knowledge to a variety of different contexts when considering whether the characteristics were physical, intellectual, emotional or social.

For those candidates who did not achieve high marks the responses indicated that they did not know the differences between the P.I.E.S.

3(a) The focus of the question was differentiation between different types of factors for example, environmental, physical and emotional. From the text box given candidates were asked to select and give two examples from:

- Environmental e.g. walking through the woods, living in a village, pollution
- Physical e.g. heart condition, severe arthritis, walking through the woods, catching a bus
- Emotional e.g. death of wife, retirement, stopped going for walks.

Having identified each type of factor from the scenario candidates were required to give an 'effect' on development. It was this part of the question that received a very poor response as candidates failed to give an actual 'effect' for example, sadness, low self esteem, feeling depressed.

An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

Environmental: 'Feeling happy because he could walk through the woods' or 'Feeling healthy because he could walk in the woods'.

The description should have matched one of the factors identified, in the example given e.g., 'walking in the woods'.

The emotional examples were least well done as candidates gave 'effects' instead of examples. For example they gave 'lonely' or 'sad' as emotional when these should have been 'effects' and the examples were 'his wife died' and 'retirement'.

There was a mixed response to this question.

3(b) This was a question where a quality response was required. Candidates were required to give one positive and one negative 'explanation' of the 'effects' of Alan having moved in with the family, therefore, a detailed response was necessary.

Some candidates incorrectly identified Alan.

To gain a quality answer candidates should give a factor and an effect as well as writing fluently and demonstrating synthesis.

An example of part of an acceptable answer for a positive response could have been:

'Having someone to care for him (factor) *would help him to not to worry (effect)*.'

3(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 could 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. having no brothers and sister+ being unemployed + low income for the family
- Give reasons why e.g. not enough money to buy essential food, school trips
- Show how it would affect development e.g. worry/ have a lower self esteem.

- 4(a)** The question focussed on distinguishing between an expected and unexpected life event besides giving specific reasons to support the decision made.

The life event was 'unexpected', for which the majority of candidates were successful in achieving a mark.

The second part of the question required two succinct reasons. For example: 'It was not known by Edith that it was going to happen and it was not predicted'.

Such an answer would have achieved two marks as two different facts were given.

- 4(b)** This quality response question required candidates to give two positive and two negative 'effects' on Edith of redundancy. Additionally to achieve the high level marks evidence of synthesis was required within the work.

Once again answers did not give a subject followed by an 'effect' on development or visa versa. Answers too had to be realistic to the situation given. An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

'Enid could now spend more time with her friends/ family (subject) and have a higher self esteem / feel valued (effect).

OR

'Enid is less likely to worry about money (effect) because she would probably receive a large some of money as part of the redundancy payment'.

The question received a mixed response with some candidates not providing evidence of an 'effect' on development.

- 4(c)** Candidates were not required to identify a voluntary group. The emphasis of the question was on the type of support a voluntary group could give. A 'description' was required; therefore a complete sentence or meaningful phrase was needed. An acceptable answer for two marks could have been:

'Giving advice to Edith about how to develop skills to help her obtain another job'.

In this answer specific points were being made e.g. 'advice', 'to develop new skills' in order 'to obtain a new job'.

The question was poorly answered.

- 5(a)** Two marks were awarded when candidates provided an 'explanation' to show how Rita's self concept could be affected by her husband's attitude in wanting her to remain at home to look after his father rather than obtaining a new job.

This meant that a 'subject' and an 'effect' had to be given for each full answer. The question was answered poorly as candidates were often unable to empathise with the question. For example how did Rita feel and why? An acceptable answer could have been:

'Rita could become stressed (effect) because Errol was trying to control her life', (subject).

OR

'Rita may have felt guilty (effect) because she did not want to stay home and look after Ben' (subject).

The question received a poor response, mainly because answers lacked detail and only stated either a subject or just an effect.

- 5(b)** The question focused on 'how Ben's self concept could be affected' by the differing opinions between Errol and Rita about Rita having to give up her job to look after Ben.

Some candidates were confused about Ben's identity. Others failed to give any 'effects' of the situation on Ben's self concept. To be awarded full marks for each 'explanation' candidates were required to give a subject and an effect. This was a quality response and consequently marks were also influenced by the correct use of technical terminology and fluency when writing.

There was a mixed response to this question.

- 6(a)** Two examples were required for genetic factors and economic factors given within the text. Additionally candidates were required to provide a 'description' of how the factors could have affected Jade's development.

The question was answered correctly by a large number of candidates. Where candidates were less successful it appeared that they were not familiar with the term 'economic' and did not provide a possible 'effect' on development.

- 6(b)** The effects of abuse on Jade's development was the focus of this question, not the different types of abuse. For each full answer a subject and an effect of abuse was required. Many candidates were successful in achieving full marks for this question showing that they had quite a good understanding of the topic. Where candidates were less successful repetition contributed to low marks.

An example of an acceptable answer was:

'Jade could have become withdrawn/ isolated which could have affected her social development (effect) which caused her not to want to meet/ mix with her friends as she did not feel good enough'.

6(c) This question had a very disappointing response. Lack of specificity resulted in candidates achieving fewer marks than expected. 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 Jade to cope

Responses demonstrated:

- Lack of factual knowledge e.g. what each professional carer given would do, particularly for the Counsellor
- Lack of specificity over how it would help Jade to cope. An example of a partial answer could have been:

A Counsellor could have encouraged Jade to express her opinions about how she felt about having a heart attack (1). He/ she could set Jade small specific goals or targets and listen to the answers Jade discussed (1). This would help Jade to cope because it would **stop her from worrying and would feel relieved that she was not to blame for what had happened** (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 Jade 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)
January 2009 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	95	84	73	62	52	43	34	25	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 %		0.0	0.0	2.6	13.2	15.8	21.1	26.3	28.9	28.9

	Maximum Mark	DE	EE	EF	FF	FG	GG	U
1493		135	120	105	90	75	60	0
Cumulative %		36.8	50.0	57.9	73.7	84.2	100.0	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