

Moderators' Report/  
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2014

Pearson Edexcel GCE in Health and  
Social Care (6939)

Unit 1 Human Growth and  
Development

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2014

Publications Code US038007

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwant to/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Overall this year, students have been able to meet the criteria for the four assessment objectives with varying levels of success. Centre assessments tended to be fair and generally accurate. A few centres awarded marks somewhat generously mainly because they did not take into account all the criteria for MB3.

Stronger students set out their work with an introduction explaining where they were going to visit. This enabled them to focus on the task in hand. Where students launched straight into 'communication and the transmission of values', without an introduction, they tended to lose focus when they had to apply their knowledge to the interactions. Indeed, there were some pieces of work where it was a long way in before it became apparent who the client was. Some students combined all 4 assessment objectives in a narrative throughout, which made it very difficult to see how much they had produced on each one. For example, there were odd evaluative comments here and there which made it difficult to gauge the mark band accurately – especially if there was not much annotation or if the annotation was inaccurate.

## **AO1**

The majority of students were able to demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of communication. In some cases there was no individuality as the learners all followed the same format. This might help the weaker students focus but seemed to constrain the stronger ones. They often had a ideas concerning some of the theories of communication but left out SOLER or the communication sandwich, for example. They tended to write more about care values than the transmission of care values. Transmission was often implicit without the student realising what they had said. More often than not, it was the assessor who highlighted the transmission. When writing about the care values, some students would spend more time on discrimination and include out of date legislation to illustrate this. There was often irrelevant material including as an example the theories of play and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Where strong students could manage meaningful comparisons, weaker students were often just repetitive as they tried to make comparisons between each of their interactions, particularly if they had carried out four.

## **AO2**

Weaker students did not always focus on applying their knowledge to the interactions. They would write at length about activities and the set-up of the room and so on. Often there was little indication of the context. In much of the work there was little indication of other similar contexts. If transcripts were included, they were extremely brief with little real content to analyse.

Some learners included 'witness testimonies' but these did not always include anything about the skills used. Again, the transmission of values was more often than not implicit and identified by the assessor and not the learner. Often there was little appreciation of other similar contexts.

### **AO3**

Often barriers cropped up in AO1 and AO2 but the students did not recognise them for what they were. Many barriers were not related to communication. Quite often, 'possible' barriers were not considered just a few that were met. Some even said they did not meet any barriers. In this instance candidates would state simply how they overcame the barriers without any explanation and there was little sign of an evaluation of the strategies they used. Strong students often did not evaluate their strategies either. Work-related issues and problems were either not included or not related solely to communication.

### **AO4**

Some students made evaluative comments throughout, often without realising it. Again, these were more likely to be noted by the assessor. Often, candidates wrote summaries or descriptive accounts of their interactions all over again. If they considered their strengths and weaknesses they often did not reach any meaningful conclusions. Some had really detailed witness testimonies but failed to make use of them in their evaluations. This was also true of stronger students. They might not realise that these can help them view themselves from another perspective.

The Quality of Written Communication tended to meet the criteria for the higher mark bands overall. Where SPAG tended to be reasonably accurate across the board, focus and organisation was a problem for some students. If students did not provide a clear introduction to their clients, then they tended to be waylaid and not keeping to the point. Overall, they were able to use specialist terms with varying degrees of sophistication – obviously stronger students having the greater confidence.

Bibliographies were included in some work but not all. Some students only included e.g. Moonie or other text books and a few internet sites. The referencing of sources was poor overall and it was difficult at times to tell if words were the learners' own in some instances.



