

VCE

Examiners' Report

**VCE
Health and Social Care**

June 2003

Edexcel
Success through qualifications

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Response Centre on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk

June 2003

Publications Code V013836

All the material in this publication is copyright
© London Qualifications Ltd 2003

Contents

1.	Chief Examiner Report	4
2.	Principal Examiners Reports	6
	Unit 1: Equal Opportunities and Clients Rights	6
	Unit 3: Factors affecting Human Growth and Development	8
	Unit 8: Current Practice in Early Learning	9
	Unit 9: Social Policy	10
	Unit 12: Educating for Health and Wellbeing	11
3.	Grade Boundaries	13
4.	Chief Moderators Report	14

Chief Examiners Report for VCE

This is the second series for the new style papers for VCE, particularly for units H301T, H304T and H309T. Once again the overall improvement in results in each unit has been due to a number of inter-related factors.

Centres have comprehensively covered the unit specifications with their candidates and thoroughly prepared them in examinations techniques allowing them to show their knowledge and understanding. This has been demonstrated in the quality of answers being provided by candidates, which in this series has been generally good.

The new format adopted for some papers has continued to offer candidates greater opportunities and accessibility than was possible in previous years.

The introduction of visual stimulus has acted as a positive prompt by encouraging candidates to achieve and demonstrate their knowledge and understanding in a more coherent manner. Again this has been evidenced by the lack of gaps being found by examiners when marking candidates' scripts.

- The majority of candidates are now demonstrating a sound and accurate knowledge and understanding of the units examined. This is reflected in the fact that no major gaps of knowledge have appeared in any of the papers.
- It was noted that the unit specifications have been comprehensively covered by centres and that 'good' teaching is being achieved in many centres.
- It is apparent that some centres have taken time to carefully prepare their candidates in examinations techniques such as reading questions carefully and accurately and tailoring their knowledge to the requirements of the question/case study. I welcome and.
- It is noticeable that many candidates were using the vocational language associated with the unit appropriately, however, their ability to provide precise definition of terms such as 'glass ceiling' 'empowerment' etc still needs further refinement.
- It is encouraging to observe that many candidates are now attempting to develop their answers more fully when given the opportunity for extended writing.
- It is pleasing to see that more candidates are now developing a clearer understanding of what is required of higher graded questions, those which ask candidates to compare, contrast, analyse or evaluate.

Despite the strengths outlined above, some weaknesses are still evident, such as:

- Candidates still lose valuable marks due to misinterpretation or inaccurate reading of the question. Very often the question stem sets the context for the question. Failure to read the question accurately will lead to loss of marks due to irrelevant answers being offered.
- The lack of understanding and inappropriate use of vocational terms and concepts such as 'empowerment' and 'advocacy' continues to be an ongoing problem and has led to not only inaccurate answers being given but also misleading and confusing answers.
- Although there has been a general improvement in candidates' knowledge and understanding of theories, it is important that candidates learn to apply their knowledge of those theories to the question rather than providing a description of what that particular theory was about.
- Although ability to accurately apply theory to practice through the use of legislation and policies is difficult for many candidates to comprehend it is an important aspect of the award and an area that needs greater input by centres.
- Lack of understanding of what is required of the verb hierarchy still remains a problematic area for some candidates and unfortunately this has meant that some

very capable candidates fail to maximise both their marks and potential by only being able to provide lower level responses that are weak and descriptive in content.

•
Suggested improvements

- Fully integrate candidate knowledge and understanding through the use of simulations, role plays and case studies.
- Access the services of specialist teachers, guest speakers or build in educational visits and work experience so that candidates can see at first hand how theory relates to practice.
- Develop a more holistic approach to the award and where possible make links between units whether examined units or moderated units so that candidates can see how they relate to each other.
- Encourage the development of independent research and study skills so that overall candidate self-expression, use of language and ability to use the verb hierarchy can develop and improve. No only will this benefit candidates in this award but also help them cope with the demands of higher education if they desire to progress onto that route.

Principal Examiners Reports

Unit 1: Equal Opportunities and Clients Rights

- 1(a)&(b)** Generally well answered but a small but significant number of candidates confused social and emotional consequences.
- 1(c)** Poorly answered very few candidates scored full marks and most could not define empowerment. Many described the reverse – power over the client.
- 1(d)** Understood and generally correctly answered.
- 2(a)** Very poor responses – Some whole centres answered well but most candidates were not familiar with the term.
- 2(b)** Generally satisfactory responses but students were more able to identify individual than community responses.
- 2(c)&(d)** Once again, answers to these questions were poor. There were a minority of centres where this topic had been carefully taught, but despite previous papers most candidates were lost.
- 2(e)** Few candidates were able to apply their knowledge and analyse the effect of legislation to gain more than ½ marks.
- 3(a)** Few candidates were able to define social exclusion or showed any knowledge of this government initiative.
- 3(b)** Answered well but with a minority of candidates confusing social and emotional consequences.
- 4(a)** Generally understood but some candidates did not refer to areas of employment.
- 4(b)** Many candidates got full marks.
- 4(c)** Poorly answered with few candidates showing evaluative skills. To achieve full marks on these questions candidates must discuss both sides of the argument and this was rare.
- 5(a)** Some good answers but few candidates scored full marks.
- 5(b)** Poorly answered. There was generally a disappointing knowledge of elder abuse.
- 6(a)** Generally well answered.

6(b) Responses were poor. Many candidates were unfamiliar with the care value base and very few could site 4 care values. This is disturbing and unsatisfactory.

7 A well answered question and in some instances very good responses in others, a sound knowledge poorly expressed.

Candidates generally found the paper accessible. The quality of answers has improved. Too many candidates, however, were not familiar with the key terminology in this area e.g. social exclusion, the glass ceiling and care values. Not all candidates could explain the phrase 'equal opportunities employer'. Candidates need to develop further their evaluative skills.

The layout of the paper posed some candidates a problem and a small number missed the final question on the back page.

Unit 3: Factors affecting Human Growth and Development

This is the second of the new style papers for Unit 4. It was felt that the paper was slightly more demanding and that the candidates did not perform quite so well. The slight decrease in the mean mark reflected this. There appeared to be a wider range of marks with this June paper, compared to January. This is indicated by an increase in the standard deviation. In general, the style of the paper enabled the candidates to demonstrate their knowledge across the whole of the specification for the unit. There were very few papers with parts of questions left unanswered. However, candidates still appeared to be reluctant to relate their answers to the case studies in the questions.

- Q1** Question 1 was straightforward for most candidates with a significant number gaining high marks. Parts (a) and (b) were answered well. Most candidates were able to identify motor skills and language development infancy, and physical changes in adolescence. Parts (c) and (d) were more demanding. Many candidates were unclear about environmental influences on development.
- Q2** All parts of question 2 were answered well, in particular, (a) (ii) and (iii). In part (b) (ii) candidates did not always refer to the positive part of emotional development, despite the strong hint in the stem of the question.
- Q3** Question 3 was a more discriminating question, although part (a) and part (b) (i) were generally answered well, with most candidates familiar with the conservation experiment. Only the better candidates were able to apply the results of the conservation experiment to new situations.
- Q4** Certain aspects of question 4 proved to be challenging for many candidates. The main reason for this was their inability to apply their knowledge to the case study about the footballer. In addition, in part (b) (ii) some candidates gave theories of development that were inappropriate, not relating to behaviour.
- Q5** Question 5 was also challenging for many candidates, although most were able to gain some marks in (b) (i) and (b) (iii). However, it was clear that some candidates did not know about Bowlby. Part (b) (iv) discriminated well between those who understood and were able to apply psychological theories and those who could not.
- Q6** Parts (a) and (b) of question 6 were generally answered well, although only the more able candidates gave an explanation of the factors that would improve lifestyle. Part (c) (ii) allowed the better candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of nature vs. nurture and to apply it coherently to the case study in question.

Unit 8: Current Practice in Early Learning

Candidates overall response to this paper was good. Most candidates were well prepared with few centre specific issues. The case studies were well used by many candidates, although some centres would be well advised to remind candidates that these form the basis from which many responses should be developed. Questions, which were well answered, were those where candidates used this material and extracted relevant information. In doing so, they were able to demonstrate the skills of description, comparison and evaluation. Evidence also shows that candidates were well prepared in most areas of the specification, although, many centres might encourage more detailed study of how national and local strategies affect early year's settings. Centres should reinforce the need for good sentence construction, grammar and spelling.

- Q1** Many students answered this question well. Candidates demonstrated the skill of extracting information from the case study material provided. There was evidence that some candidates confused the social and environmental factors which can affect learning. The skill of explanation was clearly demonstrated by many candidates in the second part of the question.
- Q2** Many candidates provided good descriptions of the benefits of play. Centres need to focus clearly on the theories of child development and ensure candidates can describe the main features of their theories. Candidates were weak in their understanding of how biological factors could account for the differences in children's development. There were some good answers on the positive effects of a structured approach to learning. Explanation was clearly evident in the work of many students.
- Q3** Most candidates answered the first part of the question well and were able to describe features which might affect children's learning. The case study was well used. Once again centres need to focus attention of applying theory to case study material, as there was a poor response in the second part of the question. Candidates were able to show explanation skills in the third part of this question by many chose to offer two explanations rather than develop one as the question asked them to do.
- Q4** This question elicited a poor level of response from most candidates, with many scoring few marks or no marks. Less able candidates demonstrated a poor understanding of national or local strategies. Candidates from centres who had taught this section of the specification well were able to access all parts of the question with many achieving maximum marks.
- Q5** A well answered question by the majority of candidates. Centres have clearly taught candidates comparative skills.
- Q6** This question elicited a full range of responses from candidates. The case study material was used well and creatively by many candidates to demonstrate the skills of explanation and evaluation. Weaker candidates offered poor responses and these candidates should be encouraged to use the stimulus material offered in the case studies.

Unit 9: Social Policy

This is the second of the new style papers for H309T Social Policy. The paper was contemporary in style and content and provided students with the opportunity to not only demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of Social Policy but also access marks from the mark scheme.

The overall performance of students has improved greatly on previous years and centres should take much credit in the comprehensive and thorough way in which candidates have been prepared for this paper.

The paper consisted of 9 questions with each question being broken down into subsections some of which were tiered in difficulty to test the ability of the candidate in being able to apply their knowledge and understanding of the principles of social policy to specific areas. The main weakness identified was the lack of preciseness, accuracy and clarity in candidates work both in terms of self expression and definitions which they presented as answers.

- Q1** Was a relatively straightforward question which many candidates were able to access marks. However, as the question evolved many candidates did have difficulty in defining what a primary care partnership was and identifying the advantages of it over GP Fundholding.
- Q2** This question was generally well answered by all candidates. Definitions and examples were both accurate and relevant.
- Q3** This question proved difficult for many candidates. Whilst some candidates were able to describe accurately differences between the collectivism and individualism many candidates were unable to then analyse their impact to a relevant area of social policy.
- Q4** This question was answered extremely well by the majority of candidates many of whom could apply their knowledge accurately and relevantly.
- Q5** This question proved difficult for many candidates. Of the marks awarded for this question most candidates achieved those marks in 5a. A stepped mark scheme was introduced to allow students to access marks for question 5b, however, many candidates knowledge of the area was weak and superficial.
- Q6** This proved to be a popular question which many candidates answered well. The main criticism was the lack of clarity and accuracy with terms such as 'social exclusion'.
- Q7** This question was attempted well by all candidates many of whom gained full marks for this question.
- Q8** Despite being both a contemporary and pertinent area within social policy at the moment many candidates failed to access marks and displayed a lack of knowledge and understanding of the topic area.
- Q9** Once again this question was attempted well by all candidates.

Unit 12: Educating for Health and Wellbeing

There were a range of marks obtained for this paper, with a few exceptionally well answered scripts at the top end of the mark range. At the other end of the range a number of low scoring candidates seemed poorly prepared for this unit. Often their health promotion was poorly planned and demonstrated a lack of understanding of health education principles and theory. This then limited their capacity to score marks in the test. Candidates scores seemed often to be linked to the centre they attend, with some centres preparing their candidates well and ensuring that they followed a health promotion plan that would enable them to gain marks in the test. Other centres had not done this, and it was sad to see the effort that some candidates had put into work that was poorly planned in terms of addressing the assessment criteria for this unit.

A number of candidates submitted a considerable amount of material along with their test paper that was not required, and in some cases was prohibited. In particular some candidates failed to enter any answer in the space provided for the display of results on the question paper for Q7(a) but included results as extra sheets attached to the paper. Candidates need to deal with their results in the space provided on the question paper in order to gain marks. A number of centres had failed to ensure that the Teacher Declaration had been signed.

- 1(a)** Generally well answered. Most candidates scored marks here.
- 1(b)** Some candidates gave superficial or inappropriate reasons for their choice. Sometimes the reasons given were not linked to the target group chosen. A number failed to gain marks by simply stating 'ease of access' as their reason for their choice.
- 2** A number of candidates had misunderstandings about the nature of aims and objectives, and of the relationship between them. Unrealistic aims were sometimes given, and often objectives were unrelated to the aim given. Some candidates cited the creation of a questionnaire as an objective. Those candidates who had stated useful and related aims generally went on to score well on their explanation of the relationship between them.
- 3(a)** Most candidates were able to identify two pieces of research used. A number gave 'internet' and 'books' as answers which were unspecific.
- 3(b)** A number of candidates copied issues directly from the student brief. A number of candidates merely stated issues briefly and failed to develop an explanation and gain extra marks.
- 4(a)** Many candidates scored well on this question. Descriptions were often full and detailed. Some candidates gave what was effectively a report of the planning of their activity, and failed to deal with the activity itself. Some examiners have expressed concern about the nature of some of the activities described in terms of safety and sensitivity. It is essential that these issues are taken into account when guiding candidates through this unit.
- 4(b)** A number of candidates scored some marks for mentioning questionnaires. Only a few mentioned aims and objectives and showed a better understanding of review and monitoring.
- 5(a)** Most candidates could name at least one model/approach. This question was split on a centre basis; some centres appeared to have prepared their candidates, others seemed not to have.

- 5(b)** This question was not well answered. Many candidates gave one advantage that was generic to the model mentioned, but failed to show direct relevance to their target group or subject.
- 5(c)** Those who had been coached in the models scored well here, though few were able to go further than outlining advantages and disadvantages and provide an evaluation. Weaker candidates gave answers that concerned the particulars of their health promotion activity, rather than answers about the model itself.
- 6** A significant number of candidates gave answers that were impossibly grandiose, such as 'the NHS' or 'government'. For those who had been well guided by their centres this question often provided easy marks.
- 7(a)** This question was generally poorly answered. As mentioned in the General Comments above there were a number of candidates who failed to present any results or comments upon them, in the space provided on the question paper. There was much extraneous attached material. Few candidates made a serious attempt to present their results in a clear and coherent manner.
- 7(b)** This question was poorly answered. Very few candidates seemed able to draw conclusions from their results. In many cases this was because the results themselves were so poor that this could not be achieved. Also there were weaknesses in the work of some candidates that prevented the drawing of results, usually due to the narrow range of data that their results comprised.
- 8(a)** A number of candidates answered by evaluating their project's success, rather than the methods used to judge success.
- 8(b)** Generally poorly answered. Few candidates were able to give a balanced evaluation of their promotional activity. Many failed to mention aims and objectives, despite them being mentioned in the question stem.

Grade Boundaries

Unit 1: Equal Opportunities and Clients Rights

Unit No		A	B	C	D	E	N	U
H301T	Upper	80	53	47	41	36	31	26
	Lower	54	48	42	36	31	26	0
	Cum%cands	4.0	12.4	27.8	48.6	67.2	81.8	100

Unit 3: Factors affecting Human Growth and Development

Unit No		A	B	C	D	E	N	U
H304T	Upper	80	62	55	48	41	34	27
	Lower	63	56	49	42	35	28	0
	Cum%cands	7.0	23.2	48.6	73.1	89.8	96.6	100

Unit 8: Current Practice in Early Learning

Unit No		A	B	C	D	E	N	U
H308T	Upper	80	57	50	44	38	32	26
	Lower	59	52	45	39	33	27	0
	Cum%cands	6.6	18.5	37.5	54.9	71.4	86.3	100

Unit 9: Social Policy

Unit No		A	B	C	D	E	N	U
H309T	Upper	80	55	49	43	38	33	28
	Lower	56	50	44	39	34	29	0
	Cum%cands	6.3	13.9	27.7	41.1	56.9	72.1	100

Unit 12: Educating for Health and Wellbeing

Unit No		A	B	C	D	E	N	U
H312T	Upper	80	53	47	41	36	31	26
	Lower	54	48	42	37	32	27	0
	Cum%cands	8.1	20.1	38.2	57	71.6	83.7	100

Chief Moderator's Report

Overall, some good work was seen this year. Annotation of work by Centres is improving – although not always wholly accurately – and it is good to see Centres picking up on points made in last year's reports.

There were still some disappointments, however, and still many instances of misinterpretation by Centres. VCE Unit H302 continues to be misinterpreted as a Communication Unit rather than about the application of Communication skills in Care settings. VCE Unit H322 also has been misinterpreted by a number of Centres. There needs to be a programme here, rather than unrelated activities and the activities need to be creative.

Centres should note that, in the light of further experience, some changes have been made to some of the Unit recommendations, with particular respect to Intermediate Unit 1, VCE Units H303, H313, H314, H317, H324 and H306. These changes have been made after considerable consideration and to enable Centres to access the evidence requirements more easily.

There were 4217 Centres moderated at VCE level and of these 3.69% were out of tolerance, overall. The Units mainly out of tolerance were H302P at 5.05% , H303P with 5.06% and H307P with 5.24% out of tolerance. These figures disguise the practice of not putting a Centre out of tolerance where there is a misinterpretation by the Centre as otherwise the "ut of 'tolerance' figures would be very much higher particularly for H302P. This also applies to H306P where the 2.56% out of tolerance figure also disguises a number of misinterpretations and may apply to H322P as well as to H324 P with 2.7% and 3.83% respectively of Centres out of tolerance.

The only Units without any Centres out of tolerance were H310P, H315P and H323P. These are very specialist Units and probably reflect the availability of staff to teach them especially as the numbers of Centres submitting were very low – 20, 32 and 105 respectively.

Most work came in from centres at the end of May as requested and few problems were noted. There were still, however, a large number of instances of incorrect samples being sent. This is still an issue for all concerned.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4LN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Order Code V013836 June 2003
For more information on Edexcel qualifications please contact our
Customer Response Centre on 0870 240 9800
or email: enquiries@edexcel.org.uk
or visit our website: www.edexcel.org.uk

London Qualifications Ltd. Registered in England and Wales no. 4496750
Registered Office: Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DN

Edexcel
Success through qualifications