

Cambridge Technicals Level 3

Health and Social Care

05830-05833 & 05871

Unit 4 Anatomy and physiology for health and social care

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice 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.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our Reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/>

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on the [OCR website](#).

Further support from OCR



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>

CONTENTS

Cambridge Technicals Level 3

Health and Social Care

05830-05833, 05871

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Unit 4 Anatomy and physiology for health and social care	4

Unit 4 Anatomy and physiology for health and social care

1. General Comments:

The overall performance of candidates was mixed, but some candidates generally demonstrated a sound knowledge of the majority of the specification.

There was a small but significant number of candidates who were challenged by this unit. Centres would benefit from reviewing the 'i.e.' within the specification to ensure everything has been covered.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.1.

Identification of the different types of joint in part (a) was answered accurately by many candidates, with the answer to "sliding joint" proving the least well known. Examples are given in 4.2 of the specification.

The causes of arthritis and the possible treatments were known adequately by the majority of candidates.

Part (d) proved extremely challenging for most candidates. A number wrote about a variety of effects rather than limiting themselves to writing about effects on movement as required by the question.

Question No 2.

Most candidates were able to name the parts of the digestive system, although a number confused the large and small intestines, and labelled the rectum as the anus.

The description of pancreatic juices was answered reasonably well by most candidates. All but a small number of candidates could identify a malfunction of the digestive system. The later descriptions of the effects that the malfunction has on the digestive system were quite often inaccurate or confused.

Part (d) about negative feedback mechanisms was a question which discriminated well between candidates. Weaker candidates were able only to paraphrase the stem of the question, giving little additional information. A few candidates chose to give very detailed answers concerning how feedback mechanisms work. The quality of these answers was often high. The majority of candidates chose specific mechanisms. Many of these descriptions gained Level 3 marks without huge amounts of detail. Some became confused, particularly between the effects of insulin and glucagon in blood sugar regulation thus reducing their mark.

Question No 3.

The straightforward linking of parts of the eye with their function provided a reasonable level of discrimination. The most commonly incorrect answers were for the conjunctiva and cornea. Many candidates confused the pupil with the iris. Most candidates could describe the effects of cataracts, although a small number wrote about macular degeneration. Most candidates had some idea of monitoring and treatment for cataracts, but few answers contained sufficient information for full marks.

Very few candidates knew the difference between the function of an axon and a dendron. Many referred to carrying messages to and from the brain. The description of events at a synapse was reasonably well known.

Question No 4.

Relatively few candidates understood why the term double pump was used to describe the heart. Many answers were muddled and contradictory.

A good number of candidates were able to identify what the various parts of the ECG showed. The number of candidates who had any idea about the relationship between blood plasma, tissue and lymph was very small. The majority simply paraphrased the question, gaining no marks.

The kidney was poorly known or understood. Most candidates could give one or two functions of the kidney, but when it came to describing how these functions were carried out, many gave no correct information. Answers rarely linked the process(es) with kidney physiology.

Question No 5.

Most candidates were able to correctly identify the parts of the respiratory system. Part (b) proved a good discriminator. Some candidates wrote about gaseous exchange rather than the mechanism of breathing. Many candidates were able to link the movements of the ribcage and diaphragm to inspiration and expiration, although many seemed to think that it was the lungs expanding or contracting which caused these parts to move, thereby limiting the marks that could be awarded.

The correct part of the brain was well known, as was another function of the medulla. Almost all candidates were able to identify a respiratory malfunction, with most choosing asthma. Despite the fact that candidates had been able to select which dysfunction they wished to describe, a good number knew only the most superficial facts. Those describing asthma almost universally knew that two different inhalers might be required as treatment. However many could only differentiate between them by their colour and not by any biological action. Equally the monitoring by peak flow meter, which was usually mentioned, was poorly understood.

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

© OCR 2018

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Telephone: 02476 851509

Facsimile: 02476 421944

Email: vocational.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:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2018

