

Health & Social Care (Double Award)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1493**

Reports on the Units

June 2010

1493/R/10

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	6
4871 Understanding Personal Development and Relationships	9

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 fairly successful in achieving results. Responses showed that, in the main, candidates have been well prepared but where candidates did less well their answers reflected a lack of specificity and factual knowledge. Details relating to specific questions can be found in the Principal Examiners report.

For Units 4869 and 4870, portfolio evidence, candidates generally demonstrated a sound understanding of the topics in each unit. The Principal Examiners Report provides details of the findings for each unit.

4869 Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision

General Comments

The assessment of candidates work for this last examination session was done well, many teachers taking a great deal of time to annotate candidates work which made the moderation process run smoothly. Centres generally had guided their candidates well and there was evidence to show that they clearly understood the organisation of Health and Social Care and Early Years services and they showed understanding how to promote the health and well being of a specific individual.

Those Centres which supported their candidates with well constructed assignment tasks that supported understanding of the banner evidence clearly gained marks. Many Centres had written clear task sheets for candidates which included the depth and breadth of knowledge; understanding; and skills required.

Most Centres were co-operative and sent their work promptly when requested. Centres with 10 or fewer candidates entered sent all their work once the Moderator was known to them.

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

The majority of Centres remembered to send the Centre Authentication Sheet along with their sample.

There was evidence of some very interesting and excellent practice. Where Centres had guided candidates to select two different services; eg a doctors surgery providing health care to the local community, and a Playgroup run by a voluntary organisation providing early years education for pre-school children, primary data could be collected. By selecting two local settings, these candidates 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 and used video footage and invited speakers to classes for students to interview. Candidates needed to produce work of equal standard for both services if they are to achieve a particular mark. Some candidates produced a very good standard of work for one of the services chosen but were not as consistently good for the other service. This tended to mean an adjustment to the marks was necessary.

There was evidence that Centres had supported candidates organising their portfolios because many were presented in a logical way, favouring combining the two settings together 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.

Individual Questions

Application of Assessment Criteria

Achievement within Strand A

This strand was often the weakest area – many candidates spent time describing the whole of the care services ie statutory / non statutory and informal carers, they were too generalised in their comments. The evidence submitted must be related to the two services chosen.

A1 – Candidates who included a diagram or map of the structure for the services chosen at both national and local level as well as a brief explanation of the diagram or map achieved a high level response to this criterion. A diagram alone, copied from a text book / internet source is insufficient evidence. Candidates need to show the care sector to which the service belongs and include a basic statement about how services are funded at a local and national level.

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

A3 - 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 service. This strand was often over marked; marks were 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.

Achievement within Strand B

B1 - This was generally very well done and candidates had obviously been well prepared. A high level response would include a detailed breakdown of the day-to-day tasks of the direct care workers chosen; this was evident when candidates had access to primary data. Candidates needed to be aware that caring for people requires 24 hour cover and shift work may be involved.

B2 – Most candidates were well aware of the requirements of the care workers they 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 requires 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.

B3 – Many candidates gave alternative career routes for their chosen jobs or professions. For a high level response, candidates needed to actually discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the different career routes.

Achievement within Strand C

Generally, the C 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 year's settings did not score highly in this strand.

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

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

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.

Achievement within Strand D

Where this Strand was done well, candidates had carried out a survey and were then able to address Strand D2 and D3, and they could use in detail the primary evidence that they had collected from their survey work. The survey work was undertaken in many different ways: in the form of observations, questioning clients that used the services or interviewing care workers. It is good practice for candidates to explain how they have conducted their survey.

It was disappointing to see that many Centres had no survey and this resulted in generic information being given. Candidates were therefore unable to assess how the care setting met the needs of the clients.

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 able to give a detailed response and a conclusion about how well the services met needs.

Achievement within Strand E

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

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

E3 – A high level response included evidence of synthesis of knowledge ie drawing together information from a range of sources. Candidates chose realistic solutions as to how to overcome the barriers identified and in some cases had interviewed care workers or clients to gather ideas. Some excellent work was seen when candidates looked at the effect the barriers had on clients,

there were some very thoughtful comments made with explanations as to how barriers could/were overcome. When Candidates showed how service users are empowered if barriers are removed, achieved the highest marks.

Examples of Good Practice within Teacher's Preparation and Marking of the Portfolio

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.

Annotate work clearly throughout the text and on the Unit Recording Sheet (URS) front mark sheet, this supports and justifies the marks awarded.

Ensure that pupils number the pages of their assignment, once it is complete. The page references should be clearly shown on the URS form, as this allows for quick referral to each section when looking for assessment criteria.

Ensure that marking is consistent between members of a department by undertaking internal standardisation.

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 using it.

Avoid excess material in the portfolio: eg only include one copy of a survey used; make reference to leaflets, internet research in a bibliography rather than include in the portfolio evidence.

Ensure 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.

Good Practice within Coursework Administration

Send work promptly once the Moderator is known to the Centre – when 10 candidates or fewer send work straightaway, do not wait for the Moderator to make contact.

Check that the marks for each Strand have been added up correctly and all marks are out of 50.

Send a signed Centre Authentication Form (CCS160) for each Unit sampled.

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.

Include the Coursework Assessment Form (which gives a breakdown of marks given for each strand of each unit) with the copy of the MS1 that is sent to the moderator.

Avoid plastic wallets for individual pieces of work. Candidates portfolios kept in order using treasury tags assist the moderation process.

Avoid sending ring binders of work as these are heavy to post and bulky to send.

Ensure that Internal Moderation is evident.

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 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. 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 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.

Individual Comments

Achievement within 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 health of their client's. Some candidates did not use the information collected when completing the other strands of the portfolio.

Achievement within 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; 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 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 persons health.

Achievement within 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 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.

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. 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

Achievement within Strand E

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

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.

Examples of Good Practice within Teacher’s Preparation and Marking of the Portfolio

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.

Annotate work clearly throughout the text and on the (URS) front mark sheet, this supports and justifies the marks awarded.

Report on the Units taken in June 2010

Ensure that pupils number the pages of their assignment, once it is complete. The page references should be clearly shown on the URS form, as this allows for quick referral to each section when looking for assessment criteria.

Ensure that marking is consistent between members of a department by undertaking internal standardisation.

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 using it.

Avoid excess material in the portfolio: eg only include one copy of a survey used; make reference to leaflets, internet research in a bibliography rather than include in the portfolio evidence.

Ensure 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.

Good Practice within Coursework Administration

Send work promptly once the Moderator is known to the Centre – when 10 candidates or fewer send work straightaway, do not wait for the Moderator to make contact.

Check that the marks for each Strand have been added up correctly and all marks are out of 50.

Send a signed CCS160 for each Unit sampled.

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.

Include the Coursework Assessment Form (which gives a breakdown of marks given for each strand of each unit) with the copy of the MS1 that is sent to the moderator.

Avoid plastic wallets for individual pieces of work. Candidates portfolios kept in order using treasury tags assist the moderation process.

Avoid sending ring binders of work as these are heavy to post and bulky to send.

Ensure that Internal Moderation is evident.

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 mis-read questions or appeared not to have the specific knowledge demanded by the questions. All questions were based on the specifications for the unit.

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 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 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 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 was also tested.

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

- Teaching technical terms used within the specifications and their meanings so that alternatives are understood.
- 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’.
- Encouraging candidates to read questions accurately.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1(a)** Learners were required to accurately give two physical and two social-characteristics for an older adult. Nearly all were successful in giving social characteristics, but some were unable to give two physical characteristics. Acceptable answers for physical characteristics could have included for example, wrinkles, loss of height, poor mobility.

- 1(b)** The question required candidates to give the life stage and the age span for the events listed. Most candidates generally scored full marks but some placed their responses under the wrong heading and consequently lost all marks.
- 1(c)** Candidates were required to give three ways that parents could encourage intellectual development for a child of two years old. Where responses were less successful the candidates failed to give ways that were appropriate for a two year old. Some candidates failed to note that 'intellectual' development was the focus of the question? Most candidates succeeded in obtaining all three marks for the responses given.
- 2(a)** Candidates often scored both available marks for this question about the meaning of 'peer pressure'. Where candidates were less successful answers were too vague eg stating 'people' instead of 'friend' or 'peers'.
- 2(b)** Many candidates mis-read this question. The focus of the question was on 'Ali going against his parent's wishes'. In other words 'going out with his friends' and not 'staying in as requested'. This was one of the less well answered questions and few candidates achieved high marks. An example of an acceptable answer could have been:
- 'Ali being angry with his parents and refusing to accept their advice'.
- 2(c)** Most candidates were successful in stating that the accident was 'unexpected'. Not all candidates obtained the full two marks for the reason why it was 'unexpected'. For example, if the candidate had stated:
- 'The accident was not predicted or planned' or 'It happened suddenly and there was no warning that an accident was likely to happen', two marks could have been awarded.
- 2(d)** The command word for this question was 'explain', therefore a subject and an effect should have been given. There was a mixed response to this question. An acceptable answer could have been:
- 'Ali could become withdrawn because he now has no one to share things with / talk to'.
- 3(ai)** When explaining the term, 'genetic factor' most candidates were able to state that it was a 'shared characteristic that was passed down from parents/ from one generation to another'. A few candidates did not appear to be familiar with the term even though it is within the specifications.
- 3(aii)** Most candidates were able to give a full explanation of how the prejudice would affect an individual. Where no marks were scored candidates gave very vague response such as, 'her confidence would be affected'. How would her confidence be affected? Would she be less confident or more confident?
- 3(aiii)** Frequently two successful examples were given for two generic factors.
- 3(b)** The focus of the question was differentiation between different types of factors for example, environmental, social and economic. From the text given candidates were asked to select and give two examples from:
- Environmental eg living in a rural area, living in a village
 - Social eg having a friend, mixing with others at evening class
 - Economic eg having a well paid job, managing a retail business.

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, confident, feeling fulfilled, feeling isolated.

An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

Environmental: 'may be less prone to illness because she lives in a rural area with little pollution'.

The economic examples were least well done. An acceptable answer could have been, 'she would have no money worries'.

There was a mixed response to this question.

- 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 and how they would effect 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 how a divorce and loosing a friend would effect development eg worry/ have a lower self esteem/ feel lonely.

Many candidates gave vague responses, such as 'it would affect her self esteem'. How would self esteem be affected? Or she would 'feel down'.

- 4(a)** Candidates were required to identify three types of relationship and to give two features of each. There was a mixed response to this question. Candidates did not appear to be able to differentiate between 'working relationships' and 'friendships' as far as features of the relationships were concerned.
- 4(b)** When answering this questions candidates failed to give the 'effect of the activity on development'. It also appeared that they could not differentiate between physical, intellectual and social development. The question received a very poor response and was least well answered. An example of an acceptable answer for intellectual development could have been:

'Showing them pictures would stimulate the child mind and encourage them to think'.

An acceptable answer for physical development could have been:

'Using large equipment would help them to develop co-ordination so they would be able to improve their balance'.

- 5(a)** This was a question where a quality response was required. Candidates were required to give two positive and two negative 'explanations' of the 'effects' on Pete of his father having to move out of his home and into a nursing home. An 'explanation' was required so detailed responses were necessary.

Some candidates incorrectly identified Pete and instead wrote answers concerning how 'Eddi' would feel.

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:

'Pete would have more time to spend with his wife (factor) *and he could relax more (effect)*.

There was a mixed response to this question.

- 5(b)** This was a question where a quality response was required. Candidates were required to give two positive and two negative 'explanations' of the 'effects' on Grace of Eddi having to move out of their home and into a nursing home. As an 'explanation' was required detailed responses were necessary.

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:

'Grace could feel guilty (effect) *because she could no longer look after Eddi (factor)*.

There was a mixed response to this question.

- 5(c)** This was a question where a quality response was required. Candidates were required to give two positive and two negative 'explanations' of the 'effects' on Eddi of having to move out of his home and into a nursing home. As an 'explanation' was required detailed responses were necessary.

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:

'Eddi could feel happier (effect) because he would now be looked after by staff who have been trained to do this (*factor*).

There was a mixed response to this question.

- 6(a)** The effects of abuse on Sheila'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 quite high 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:

'Sheila 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(b)** Many candidates did not appear to know about the role of a counsellor. Quite a large number gave 'advice' as being one of the roles. This is totally inaccurate. An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

'A counsellor could have encouraged Sheila to talk about her concerns to help her move on from these events'.

There was a very poor response to this question.

- 6(c)** This question had a very disappointing response. Lack of specificity resulted in candidates achieving fewer marks than expected. Three different types of informal support were required, what each could do to help Sheila and how each would help Sheila to cope. Having identified three different types of informal support eg family, friends, neighbours, faith groups, voluntary groups, candidates were required to:

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

AND

- *explain* how each would help Sheila to cope

Responses demonstrated:

- lack of factual knowledge eg who was an informal support and what each could do
- lack of specificity over how it would help Sheila to cope. An example of a partial answer could have been:

Friends (1) could take Sheila out (1). This would help Sheila to cope because it would **help to build up her self esteem and give her confidence** (1)

Where answers were vague and did not specifically identify what the informal support/ 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 Sheila to cope?

Marks were awarded for the quality of the response.

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