

Health & Social Care (Double Award)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1493**

Reports on the Units

January 2010

1493/R/10J

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, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, 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 specifications 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 specification 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 2010

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

REPORTS 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

Overall candidates entered for Understanding Personal Development and Relationships (4871), for Health and Social Care (Double Award), demonstrated some reasonable levels of knowledge and understanding. Their responses showed that, in the main, candidates have been well prepared. Where candidates did less well their answers reflected a lack of specific detail 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. Details relating to specific questions can be found in the principal Examiner's report.

For Unit 4869: Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision, the majority of centres appeared to have guided candidates to choose two suitable care settings on which to base their portfolio. Where candidates selected two local settings, evidence was produced which was of a higher standard than those who worked from written case studies. Portfolios from some Centres continued to be based on care workers rather than services. It should be noted that the 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 high standard of work for one of the services chosen but the other service was not covered to the same standard. Candidates need to produce work of equal standard for both services if they are to perform well overall.

Some results for Unit 4870: Promoting health and well-being are 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'. Further details can be found in the Principal Moderator's report.

4869 - Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision

General Comments

The majority of candidates chose two suitable care settings upon which to base their portfolio.

Where candidates had selected two different services; eg 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, for example in using video footage and/ or inviting speakers to classes for candidates to interview.

There were still a number of candidates who based the portfolio on care workers rather than services. It should be noted that the 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 well overall.

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 unless this is clearly referenced and of relevance to the point being made.

Comments on Individual Strands

Strand A

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 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 in which sector each belongs.

Some of the flow diagrams included to illustrate where care settings fitted into the overall structure lacked detail or were not explained.

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 candidates had described the staff within the organisation which is not required. Many had copied text from promotional literature for a service, 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.

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.

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; qualities and the qualifications applied to the roles gained higher marks within B2.

B3 – Many candidates did not give alternative career pathways 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 pathways 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 and candidates did not use the evidence within D2, giving 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

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.

It should be remembered that it is not essential for the individual being studied 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. There was some good evidence presented when candidates had chosen an appropriate individual. Those who had been able to access primary data, showed individuality and these candidates achieved the higher marks.

It is important for candidates to realise that the plan should be in a form that the individual could use. 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.

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.

Comments on Individual Strands

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 about the health of their client. Some candidates did not use the information collected when completing the other strands of the portfolio.

Strand B

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, eg '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.

This section was often generously marked; with the inclusion of significant amounts of generic information. 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 eg 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.

Strand C

Some Centres continue to award high scores for lists only, 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 point 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 candidates that achieved the higher marks had made the short and long term effects applicable to their client.

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. Pulse rate alone is not included; it needs to be used in conjunction with resting after exercise.

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, eg 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

The focus of this Strand was to ensure 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.

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.

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 misread questions or appeared not to have the specific knowledge demanded by the questions and as a result candidates found it quite difficult to achieve high marks on this paper. Quite a large number of candidates misread questions or gave a nil-response.

Questions were based on the “What You Need to Learn” of OCR’s Approved Specification and Assessment materials for Teaching from September 2002. 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 complete sentence response. A few questions required an ‘explanation’ which required an account, examples and reasons for the decisions made. Scenario’s and mini case studies were included in the paper to help motivate and stimulate candidate responses.

Section B of the paper was accessible to all 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. Specific detail 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 specific 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 through:

- making sure that candidates understand the technical terminology related to the unit eg characteristics, factors, positive, negative, emotional, social
- 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’.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1(a)** Learners were required to accurately match life stages, age span and the intellectual characteristics that match selected life stages.

Many candidates were not successful in giving the correct responses to the life stage for intellectual characteristic. Answers were generally too vague or a nil-response was given.

- 1(b)** The question required candidates to think whether the activities given were physical, intellectual, emotional or social (P.I.E.S.)

Most candidates were successful in achieving the full marks for this question. Where they were less successful the answer to, 'a counsellor talks to a client', was often given as emotional instead of intellectual or social.

- 2(ai)** Candidates were required to describe three physical changes that Ben could experience at aged 14 years.

Most candidates scored well on this question but a few achieved very low marks, this was often as a result of not being able to differentiate between physical and social characteristics.

- 2(aii)** Candidates were required to describe three social changes that Ben could experience at aged 14 years.

There was a mixed response to this question as some candidates were not able to differentiate between social, emotional and physical changes. Other responses lacked specific detail and gave general comments.

- 2(b)** Candidates were required to explain three different emotional features that could affect Ben in this life stage.

Candidates appeared to have difficulty in selecting emotional features that could affect Ben. Many did not recognise that the command word was, 'explain', and consequently did not give a reason and an emotion for each answer. For example, an acceptable answer could have been:

Ben could have been moody (emotion) as he is going through puberty (reason).

- 2(c)** Candidates were required to describe what is meant by the terms given below for each feature of this relationship.

The terms 'protection' and friendship were reasonably well attempted but the term 'love' received a very poor response. Acceptable answers could have been:

'having an affection for someone' or 'having an intimate relationship' or 'having a close bond'.

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

- Economic eg - Ewan being promoted or Chai having a part time job
- Social eg - having one friend or mother and step father arguing
- Cultural eg - living in China or being discriminated against.

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:

- Economic: 'Ewan being promoted could mean that there would be more money available for Chai to join clubs'
- Cultural, 'may miss his friends in China which could make him sad'.

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

The cultural examples were least well done as candidates only appeared to be able to produce one response for the example and gave no effect on development. There was a mixed response to this question.

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 could be effected. Some candidates repeated the same point several times while a few left the page blank. Candidates were required, for example to:

- show the link eg having a stepfather + moving to a new country + parents arguing
- give reasons why eg having a step father
- show how it would effect development eg could make Chai feel resentful or angry.

3(c) Candidates were asked to explain how being neglected could affect an individual's development.

The question received a fairly good response with candidates showing a sound understanding of the meaning of 'neglect'. The emphasis of the question was on the 'effect on development'. An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

'Not being able to have cooked, well balanced meals could mean that Jay was prone to illnesses.

- 4(a)** This quality response question required candidates to give negative 'effects' of Chris' attitude towards women on Ritchie and Camilla. 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 had to be realistic to the situation given. An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

'The children could become angry **because** they felt their grandfather's attitude towards Camilla and their mother is unfair.

OR

'Camilla's self esteem could decrease **because** she feels her grandfather does not value her'.

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

- 4(b)** The focus of the question was on the positive effects that Chris could have on Merrick's self concept. This question too was a quality response which required a subject and an effect for each full answer. An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

'Merrick could feel happy (effect) because he is able to provide support for his father (subject).

Some candidate's response focussed on the effect on Chris instead of on Merrick. Others gave rather muddled answers. The response was generally quite poor.

- 4(c)** Candidates were not required to identify a voluntary group. The emphasis of the question was on the different ways that a voluntary group could help. Candidates were only required to 'identify' the ways.

An acceptable answer could have been:

- giving advice
- providing information
- playing board games
- taking Chris out etc.

The question was poorly answered.

Reports on the Units taken in January 2010

- 5(a)** The question required candidates to match words from the text box to the type of relationship given.

Most candidates received full marks for this response.

- 5(b)** Two marks were awarded when candidates provided an 'explanation' to show the meaning of 'self concept'. An acceptable answer for the full two marks could have been:

'The picture we have of ourselves made up from our own views and the views of others'.

The question was reasonably well answered.

- 5(c)** Candidates were required to give the meaning of the factors listed and then to give one example of each. There was a mixed response to the different factors. For example, least well completed was 'access to health services'.

The meaning could have been: being able to visit a service/ professional easily or quickly.

The example: could have been: illness could be diagnosed quickly or visiting a GP

There was a mixed response to this question.

- 6(a)** The focus of the question was on the negative ways that Chris' self concept could be affected by his decision to move into a residential home.

Some candidates did not note that it was '**his decision**' and so their answers did not reflect this. Other candidates did not respond to the command word, 'explain' which meant that for a full answer a subject and an effect was needed. An example of an acceptable answer could be:

'Chris may have a low self esteem (effect) **because** he has decided to move away from his family.

The question received a very poor response.

- 6(b)** Candidates were required to explain three different ways a physiotherapist could provide help for Chris.

Many candidates were unable to demonstrate in their responses that they knew the tasks carried out by a physiotherapist. Answers lacked specific details and were exceptionally vague with little mention of:

- assessing the client
- planning exercises
- carrying out exercises
- giving massage
- referring the service user to another professional etc.

The question was very poorly answered.

- 6 (c)** Candidates were required to explain how living in a residential home could improve the quality of Chris' life and help him to cope.

This question was not well answered. There was a lack of detail which resulted in candidates achieving low marks. The question focussed on how moving into a residential home could improve the quality of Chris' life.

Responses demonstrated:

- lack of factual knowledge of what happens in a residential home
- lack of specific detail over how it would help Chris to cope

Part of an acceptable answer could have been:

'The residential home could assess Chris' needs (1) which could stop him from worrying(1). They could make sure that he is taking his medication regularly (1) so that he keeps healthy(1). Playing board games (1) could keep his mind stimulated (1) and by providing well balanced meals (1) Chris is likely to be less prone to illness (1).

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

'They could give Chris support'.

This was not rewarded because it was not clear what type of support was being provided or how the support helped Chris to cope?

Marks were awarded for the quality of the response.

Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education
Health and Social Care (Double Award) (1493)
January 2010 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
4869	Raw	50	47	42	38	34	28	23	18	13	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4870	Raw	50	47	42	38	34	28	23	18	13	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4871	Raw	100	92	81	70	60	50	40	31	22	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*	A*A	AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD
1493	300	300	270	255	240	225	210	195	180	150
Cumulative %		0.0	0.0	2.9	8.8	35.3	52.9	76.5	94.1	97.1

	Maximum Mark	DE*	EE	EF	FF	FG	GG	U
1493	300	135	120	105	90	75	60	0
Cumulative %		97.1	97.1	100	100	100	100	100

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

104 candidates were entered for aggregation this series.

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums/index.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