

General Studies

Advanced GCE A2 7831

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3831

Reports on the Units

June 2008

3831/7831/MS/R/08

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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 syllabus 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 2008

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

Advanced GCE General Studies (7831)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE General Studies (3831)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Component	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
2961: The Cultural Domain	3
2962: The Scientific Domain (Written paper)	6
2964: The Social Domain 1	11
2965: The Scientific & Cultural Domains	15
2966: The Social Domain 2 (Written paper)	19
2967: The Social Domain 2 (Coursework)	23
2968: Culture, Science and Society: Making Connections	24
Grade Thresholds	26

Chief Examiner's Report

This was a good year for General Studies with a cohort of energetic and enthusiastic candidates engaging with the questions in an informed manner.

This introduction summarises the main trends that can be drawn from the detailed reports on each unit that have been prepared by each Principal Examiner. There are eight main themes of which the third is the most telling.

1. Centres are encouraged to work with candidates on their management of the papers. Candidates need to look at the time available for the paper and have a notion of the proportions of time to be devoted to each section. Centres should warn candidates not to spend excessive amounts of time on the short answer questions that form parts of the earlier sections of the AS papers.
2. Principal Examiners wish to encourage centres to engage with their students in an exploration of disputes and issues where a range of opinions exists. At the moment too many candidates deal with such topics using rather simplistic 'tabloid' thinking. Their language at times appears to copy the headline and opening paragraphs of some tabloid newspapers. Centres might give time to sessions where the same issue is explored using tabloid, broadsheet and weekly articles. These would show the different ways in which an issue can be explored in greater depth and with more supported arguments.
3. This year examiners have taken the opportunity to list the content areas of the specification where, in general, candidates appear to be less well informed than might be expected. These areas include:
 - 3.1 Aspects of contemporary English and British culture
 - 3.2 Specific scientific knowledge of a level expected at Key Stage 3
 - 3.3 The ability to articulate and write down mathematical activity
 - 3.4 Details of the recent past such that a rose tinted view is held of such times as they become covered with the moss of history
 - 3.5 Misconceptions on the scope of social care and social work, the power of government to set maximum wages, fix house prices and spend to solve all problems
 - 3.6 Knowledge of the central tenets of one religion.
4. Principal Examiners note with pleasure the remarkable progress made by candidates as they move from AS to A2. The pieces of under-developed and hesitant writing seen at AS become well developed and crafted essays for many candidates at A2.
5. Centres are reminded that the questions set are drawn up with candidates in mind. Triggers and clues are placed in the questions to support the structure of answers. It is suggested that centres give candidates more opportunity to deconstruct questions. In this way they will be able to observe the various challenges in the question. This is important at all levels of achievement. Weaker candidates will often write an unbalanced essay because they fail to recognise both parts of the question e.g. advantages and disadvantages. Better candidates need to see that the question requires an assessment of the various aspects that have been explored in the question. Such an assessment is often a crucial indicator to higher quality answers.
6. Candidates frequently use media evidence to support their arguments. In doing this candidates often reveal a rather naïve view of the power of the media and the way it works. Centres should encourage candidates to use the media for evidence but they need to place such evidence in the context of the wider aspects of the industry. For example the

need to sell newspapers, competition, ownership, advertising revenue, political viewpoints and readership expectations all influence newspaper editors.

7. Centres should discourage the use of anecdotes. Whilst the use of personal experience is valued there are times when the personal anecdotes take over from a more objective description. Such activity should be discouraged. It tends to suggest a rather immature analysis of the situation.
8. All the questions set in these papers are built upon four assessment objectives. These can be summarised as Assessment Objective 1(AO1) Knowledge; AO2 Communication, AO3 Evidence, Analysis and Conclusion and AO4 Types of Knowledge. Of these four, examiners feel that AO2 and AO4 are the weakest. In the case of AO2 examiners ask that candidates ensure that the text can be read, that it has some plan and structure and that it is proof read at the end of the examination. They want to be sure that the examiner readily understands what they have written. For AO4 it is suggested that candidates use personal experience to show what they know and to indicate the limitations of that knowledge. Better candidates may also be able to explore the definitions that have been used that condition the direction of thought and analysis.

Examiners trust that these main headlines from the more detailed reports will be of value to centres. They thank the many centres who prepared their candidates with skill and commitment.

2961: The Cultural Domain

General Comments

Year on year it is pleasing to see the consistency which this examination brings in terms of the general performance of candidates. Some things have definitely changed for the better: there are fewer spoiled papers either through rubric infringements or immaturity on the part of the candidate; most students manage to complete the paper in the time allowed with varying degrees of success.

On the other hand, some things never seem to change: many previous reports have indicated the need for examination preparation before taking the General Studies papers – this remains an acute problem and probably the single most important issue that has emerged this summer. Though this has been published in earlier reports it is worth restating some perennial advice. If a question in Section A is worth three marks it is usual to expect there to be three pieces of information in order to gain a maximum. This might consist of a key fact supported by some additional detail, explanation and/or example.

A full answer can be easily achieved through the presentation of a well-constructed sentence with its subject and objective support. Indeed, the general standard of literacy remains only satisfactory. Too significant a number of candidates fail to make contact with their examiner through an inability to express clearly what they want to say. Centres are reminded for the need for some structured and organised examination practice especially in the case of a subject which, for some students and in some curricula, is afforded only small amount of study time. General Studies is a thinking examination and success depends on the skilful presentation of ideas and arguments that may be both tangible and controversial. In effect, the process of learning and examining in this subject is the closest to the nature of individual research at undergraduate level.

On the whole, this appeared to be an accessible paper which gave the candidates ample opportunity to show what they knew, understood, and thought about a range of cultural issues. In **Section A** there was an emphasis on *gender* which appeared to be a topic that had not been well-considered or covered by many. This led to a number of predictable and repetitive answers which gave examiners some difficulty in deciphering what candidates actually knew and thought. It was somewhat dispiriting to see so many scripts that showed little evidence of a critical attitude to such an issue, adopting a robotically conditioned posture towards stereotypes (even while condemning them) and expressing views in sometimes very poor, tabloid English. The topics proposed in **Section A** should have promoted some sense of engagement or reaction but many candidates omitted the opportunity to score highly by entering a personal view or response.

Section B offered a good variety of questions with candidates showing equal choice for all three essays. It would seem that there is some progress being made in structuring responses into, at the least, a version of ternary form – introduction, opening statements and definitions, followed by discussion, followed by a concluding summary. Essays with shape tended to score well and were only penalised when there was an imbalance of facts and analysis. Examiners still witnessed evidence of desperate, unfinished discourses of limited worth that served as testimony to bad planning and preparation for the examination.

Time management does appear to be a major issue this session; the same applies to the standard of English, which remains disappointingly poor. What has emerged has been an inability to extend and develop ideas as opposed to attempting to furnish as many facts and examples as possible.

Comments on individual questions

SECTION A

- 1
- a) Answered well with a good range of ideas about maturity, concentration and peer pressure. Weak candidates made questionable assertions such as 'girls are more intelligent' or 'girls have more brains.'
 - b) Again, good answers revolving around practical 'hands on' abilities though there was a problem with the word 'vocational' which a number of candidates saw as connected with 'vocal' – a link to oral examinations. As a consequence it was not unusual for there to be the suggestion that girls were too shy to speak!
 - c) This created some confusion. Many argued that boys had to make more effort with their work for various reasons or that the girls were copying the boys and doing less. Those that did not grasp this question simply implied that boys matured after doing GCSE.
 - d) A well-answered question with references to female equality, improvements and developments in the job market, a decline in traditional gender roles as well as role reversal caused by the pressures of the current economic climate. There was limited awareness of the cultural change, with regard to entering Higher Education (which was confused with Further Education).
 - e) Mainly well-answered with convincing arguments based around distractions by the opposite sex and the fallibility of teaching methods.
- 2
- The question was clearly about male dominance in the workplace and very few of the entry seemed to immediately grasp this fundamental idea.
- a) This was misinterpreted so many times. Obviously the term was not widely understood as the interpretations included Steve being a girl, an old man unable to do a 'boy's' job, or quite commonly, Steve was seen as gay!
 - b) It was pleasing to see that a large number of candidates recognised the irony that it was indeed not much of an honour for a woman to be treated as a man but that it perhaps leads to a more conducive working environment for the solitary female.
 - c) Interpretations of 'laddism' focused on the Office Party and the outrageous behaviour of the drunken males. A more subtle and effective answer would involve the explanation that groups of men or a single male within a group can behave badly and regard this as virtuous and a sign of acceptance.
 - d) Not as popular a choice as the others but when answered there seemed to be universal agreement that the answer surrounded a female being accepted into a male dominated group. Some answers were absurd: 'statutory=to build a statue of Nelan!!
- 3
- It was perhaps most clear in this question how little the candidates knew about gender as the answers became more and more stereotypical. Nursing and the armed forces proved to be the most popular choice. Unlike the previous questions in Section A, there were a large number of marks available for this answer, 20 in all. This meant that to secure a creditable total it was implicit that candidates would need to follow the rubric carefully: compare, suggest two reasons for differences, examples, supporting analysis. These commands offered ample opportunity to score positively and highly.

Examiners observed sound knowledge on the characteristics of each career and identified tradition, upbringing, gender stereotyping, media influence and physical attributes as key reasons. Assertive candidates were the weakest and they tended not to answer all parts of the question. Weaker answers also shared the characteristic of tackling only one of the pairs well, at the expense of the other. For example, primary teaching is for girls and motherly types whereas motor trade workers needed little intelligence and no training.

SECTION B

- 4 a) This proved a popular and successful choice as it was an area with which most students had an opinion or were familiar. Centres are warned that the command *'Briefly'* is there to advise students about the ratio of marks available to the time allowed and is not an indication to state things in as few words as possible with no explanation. The simple listing of three 'ways' would only attract three or four marks out of the ten available. Good answers referred to primary and secondary socialisation as well as religion and family traditions.
- b) It is disappointing to see candidates struggling with the concept of a 'moral dilemma' when this is an integral part of the Specification. The question also asked for illustration. It appeared that the four choices created some confusion: **Whistle-Blowing** was linked to wolf-whistling and referees. Some saw this concept as 'owning up', 'grassing', or reporting a crime to the Police. **Plagiarism**, if chosen, tended to be done well with reference being made to the Rowling case and even the idea of students cheating in their examinations. Some far-sighted souls even took time out to examine the dangers of the school coursework system and how easy it might be to cover things up. **Persuasive Advertising** answers focused on propaganda and were able to see both sides of the case but failed to engage with the moral dilemma. Some candidates confused **Bribery** with blackmail but this was the least popular choice and those that chose bribery were invariably well-versed.
- 5 a) A well-answered section as it seems that teenagers are easily able to explain how they are perceived by adults. Most were seen in a negative light though it was nice to see that some teenagers are seen positively as caring and helpful members of a community.
- b) Some of the more popular choices listed in the mark scheme were included in what turned out to be a successful question. Key elements were seen as the responsibility to earn, be employed, and take charge of one's finances as well as that of relationships and sex, and the difficulty in leaving home and finding a place to live. Candidates were good at preparing to leave but weak in offering explanation and methods which needed to be employed in order to effect a smooth transition. The question was crying out for examples of personal experience and conjecture but neither rarely emerged.
- 6 a) This question asks for three ways and is connected with the idea of *'controversy.'* Ideally examples needed to be given to explain points but these were not forthcoming. There emerged the simple identifying of newspapers, satellites, and the internet but without any regard for the technology involved which was the crucial element of the question. Answers followed the perennial pattern of candidates trying to convince examiners that they knew all there was to know about the media.
- b) The main issues that emerged here were 'bias', *'the distorting of images'*, *'the impact of headlines and strap lines'*, and the instances of *'selective reporting.'* Relaying many instances of content rather than method was a common occurrence. Many simply wrote about the ability of advertising to influence retail purchasing with some simplistic assertions that editors should only print the truth and stop writing about celebrities, plainly missing the fact that it is the reporting of their lives that affords them celebrity status in the first place!

2962: The Scientific Domain (Written paper)

General comments

Overall this paper was well received by both candidates and centres. Each of the section A questions were accessible to the majority of candidates and almost unusually there was a reasonably even spread of selections from section B. Although marks in excess of 90% were rare, the paper generated a wide spread of marks in the range from 10% to 85%.

Although the majority of candidates used their time reasonably well, there is still a tendency for a significant number to spend too much time on section A, thereby jeopardising a good performance in section B. Fortunately there were few instances of candidates answering more than one question from section B.

Comments on individual questions

Section A

Question 1

Responses to this transport based question were somewhat uneven. For the most part, better marks were achieved in parts a) (iii) and c), and worst in part b).

- a) It is a matter of concern that a significant number of candidates could not perform the simple calculations in parts (i) and (ii). They involved quite basic every day skills and not complex abstract mathematics. Some treated the calculation in (i) as a decimal and interpreted a correct initial calculation of 5.5 as 5 hours and 50 or 5 minutes, rather than 5 hours and 30 minutes; other errors included 330 minutes or were simply hopelessly incorrect. Whilst part (ii) was better answered there were still some inaccuracies.

Part (iii) was however well answered. Most interpreted the stages in the time-distance graph correctly. Common errors usually involved regarding stage Q as stationary and not differentiating between the rates of acceleration in stages P and S.

- b) Overall this part was quite poorly answered. Instead of describing the characteristics of the respective stages in the journeys, candidates were more inclined to repeat the question by stating in a variety of ways that A and C were the same and that journeys 1 and 2 were different. Although a significant number of candidates were successful in their interpretations, many were unable to translate the graphs into what actually happened on the journeys in terms of speed, distance and routes through urban areas, country roads and motorways/dual carriageways.
- c) Many candidates engaged enthusiastically with part c). The table proved to be something they could relate to, and on which extensive knowledge was displayed; unfortunately some overdid it and wrote far too much. Whilst many candidates achieved the full 8 marks available, the most common errors were to not select one car and to refer to factors that were not in the table.

Question 2

Scientific modelling, in this case 'The Scientific Method' has been a topic candidates have in the past found difficult. However the format of the question set this year has proved to be much more accessible. By providing a topic and structure for the investigation, candidates were able to access more marks than in previous years.

Nearly all answers used the given structure with some utilising continuous prose and other breaking their answer into labelled sections. There was a little unevenness in the coverage with stages 2 and 3 (methods and results) frequently being stronger than the remainder; very few candidates regarded feedback as being a stage in scientific method.

Overall question 2 was well answered.

- Most were able to reconstruct the topic description into a hypothesis and some even referred to a null hypothesis. Very few candidates went beyond the hypothesis to introduce the theory and general ideas underpinning the experiment.
- The methodology was frequently well described with many candidates achieving the maximum marks awarded for this part. Although many concerned themselves with equipment, plants and a controlled greenhouse environment, a small number developed field techniques.
- Most candidates either mentioned or drew tables and graphs as mechanisms for displaying the results. Invariably this was supported with an invented description of the results.
- The final sections were quite varied in quality. There were some excellent conclusions that capably drew together the results and referred back to the initial hypothesis. For the most part evaluative statements mentioned flaws in the experiment and how it could be improved. Very often the feedback, which is such an important feature of scientific research, was either incorporated into the evaluation or absent.

Most candidates did draw upon their own experiences from GCSE science and there were very few wholly generic answers.

Question 3

This proved to be a moderately popular choice and one which some candidates did not find easy. In the majority of cases there was equivalence in quality across parts a) and b).

- a) Fig.4 comprised a standard model that uses birth rates and death rates to project three scenarios for population growth. Whilst plenty of general reasons were given, a significant number of candidates failed to explain the projections in terms of the interactions in changes to the birth and death rates e.g. the projection for x is based on the birth rate being significantly higher than the death rate. Those candidates who had some knowledge of the demographic transition model (page 41 Advanced General Studies for OCR) should have coped with birth and death rates as well as provide appropriate explanations.

A small number of candidates completely ignored the title to Fig 4 which stated 'global population change' and dwelt on immigration unless planet Earth is receiving migrants from Mars much of such answers became irrelevant.

b) The section on managing population size was reasonably well answered. The highest quality answers were achieved by candidates who developed four strands:

- the contrast between developed (MEDCs) and developing countries (LEDCs)
- that whilst some nations try to reduce their population others may attempt to increase their populations
- population change can be achieved through strategies affecting both birth rates and death rates.
- a nation's population size can be influenced by emigration and immigration.

The majority of answers dwelt on birth control, education and China with its one child policy. Other exemplar material was drawn from Sweden, Italy and the UK and Africa; unfortunately many regard Africa as a country rather than a continent.

Question 4

Question 4 was marginally the most popular question; the role of zoos and wildlife, followed by the photographic prompt material, proving attractive. Those candidates who developed clear scientific reasoning for both a) and b) generally did well. Almost expectedly so, many candidates used non-scientific reasons in both parts and as a consequence their answers suffered.

- a)** Scientific reasons for zoos and wildlife parks include: species preservation, breeding studies in anatomy and pathology, veterinary medicine, science education etc. Most candidates were able to identify such reasons and the quality of their answers depended on the level of elaboration. Poor quality answers either failed to give four reasons or wrote about holidays, pretty animals etc without mentioning scientific reasons.
- b)** Although it was a little disappointing that only a small number made direct reference to the splendid Rain Forest images, there were some implicit references. Most candidates were able to produce a reasonable essay based on descriptions of animal habitats, medicinal plants and the reduction of global warming. High quality answers mentioned anthropological reasons such as 'lost tribes', localised climatic change and managing the Earth's oxygen/carbon dioxide balance.

Needless to say, a small number of candidates ignored the question requirement of assessing reasons for conservation and opted for descriptions of conservation measures. Finally it is worth stating that once again some candidates commented on global warming being caused by heat getting through a hole on the ozone layer. It might be worthwhile suggesting that one current theory is that the cooling produced by ozone depletion might compensate for the warming contributed to by greenhouse gases. Many answers would have been improved by mentioning some ecological principles such as productivity, nutrient recycling and the inter-relationships of organisms, much of which appears in GCSE Science and Geography.

Question 5

Although marginally the least popular in section B, Question 5 was answered well by those who made an attempt at it. The objective of part a) was to turn the topic of scientific development around and invite candidates to comment upon why such developments occur; food, the atmosphere and electricity are sufficiently broad to achieve this objective. The essay on the contribution of scientists (therefore science) to increasing life expectancy formed a development of part a).

- a)** Although rarely achieving the full 10 marks this question was generally well answered. The most common links being: food and obesity; atmosphere and greenhouse gases, electricity and the need for alternative energy. Although clear problems were often given, their connection to scientific research was not always made explicit.

- b)** This question gave candidates the opportunity to explore a wide range of areas. Most answers focused on a range of medical advances with the better candidates identifying: faulty genes, diagnostic tools (e.g. scanners), equipment such as dialysis machines and procedures such as transplants as well as vaccines and other medications. It was pleasing that many candidates realised that increasing life expectancy could also be achieved through industrial developments e.g. car safety, advances in physical fitness, diet and research into the effect of smoking, alcohol and drugs.

2963: The Scientific Domain (Coursework)

It was sad to realise that this is probably the last year that this option will get any significant entry, particularly as there was such a good performance by the majority of the candidates.

What was heartening was that many grasped exactly what the title 'The triumph of technology?' was looking for (and had really thought about the '?' part). What was also pleasing was that many did not simply do one of the topics suggested but did one of their own which had arisen out of either their other studies or something they were particularly interested quite outside the classroom. There were some very good debates on whether a technological/scientific development could or could not be considered as a triumph or not.

There were quite a few scientists who displayed an impressive grasp of their science, but also plenty of non scientists (at this level) who made intelligent use of what scientific knowledge they had. There were quite a few who let it get all too descriptive and just described how something worked (without really considering whether it was a 'triumph' or not) and just pushed out the odd idea or two in the end, leaving the examiner to try and work out whether a point was being made by implication or not.

Examiners are responsible for judging the quality of the analysis they see in front of them. If there is none, they cannot allocate those marks designed to be given for analysis. As always, sticking to the recommended guidelines and showing a real awareness of how many marks were being given for what, was the key to success. There was some good reading there and far less dependency on internet downloads.

2964: The Social Domain 1

General Comments

The general impression of examiners was that this appropriate paper had drawn many good responses from the candidates.

The key features of the better responses were:

- confident and fluent responses
- the engagement with the topic in question 2
- developed responses to the piece of extended writing.

Popular misconceptions given by some weaker candidates included:

- the power of government to fix wage and salary levels
- the level of supervision of internet traffic.

Comments on individual questions

Section A

Candidates were expected to attempt to answer all of the questions in this section. Most candidates answered the questions in number sequence. However a small number elected to answer Section B first. This may have been a strategy to make sure they allocated sufficient time to the mark rich territory of Section B part (b) question. There was some evidence that this strategy was not effective. Some candidates who answered Section B first were clearly rushing their answers in Section A and generally produced a poor performance.

1 This question explored the gap in income between the richest and poorest families in Britain in 2005. Though candidates generally had some understanding of tax arrangements in the UK many were clearly insecure on finer details. In future centres may wish to concentrate some of their teaching on the income tax, national insurance and the benefits that are available in the UK.

- a)** A number of candidates confuse 'gross' and 'net' income. The position of income tax and national insurance appeared to cause confusion.
- b)** This question asked candidates to suggest two ways in which the average income figures given in the stem of the question might be misleading. Most candidates were able to suggest one way and many gave two satisfactory answers. The most popular territory concerned the effect of extreme values on the average. Others discussed the type of sample implied by the stem. They appeared to think that only twenty percent of the richest and poorest people had been sampled.

Some rather clumsy answers suggested that income figures are not known with any accuracy. A small number of candidates suggested that the self-employed do not pay income tax.

- c)** The most popular answers here involved the 'rich' paying higher rates of tax and the minimum wage rate being increased.

Some candidates thought that the government regulated all wages and could announce a national maximum wage.

- d) This question asked the candidates to explain two advantages for people with low incomes if some people have very high incomes. Far too many candidates suggested that poverty made people more worthy and proceeded to disregard the link to the rich.

2 This question explored the messages contained in a table of responses by 16-24 year olds to various aspects of their sexual behaviour. The thrust of the question was an exploration of the differences of interpretation that can be made from data and the disagreements amongst social scientists that can arise.

In general the question evoked many good answers. This was perhaps because the subject was so relevant to the candidates concerns and recent experiences. The answers were sensible with neither prudery nor salaciousness evident.

One unsatisfactory feature of the candidates' use of evidence was their poor understanding of percentages. For example if 27 % of females stated that they had 8 or more sexual partners and 27% of males stated the same feature too many candidates presumed that 54% of those responding had 8 or more sexual partners.

- a) In this section the candidates had to identify two pieces of information that supported the belief that Britain had a high rate of sexually transmitted disease with the blame lying with the poor quality of sex education in schools.

The candidates used the table well to cite the percentage of 16 years olds who had already lost their virginity, the percentage of young people with multiple sexual partners, the percentage not using a condom and the belief that the 'pill' protects from sexually transmitted diseases.

- b) This question asked the candidates to use the same data to support the view of a group of social scientists that it showed young people were in no rush to have sex and that they were willing to talk about contraception.

The candidates pointed out the a high percentage of young people 'waited' until they were 16, that half have only one sexual partner and the fact that there had a large response to the survey indicated their willingness to engage with the topic.

- c) The candidates did well in this section showing a clear understanding of the problems of on-line surveys.

- d) In this section it was suggested that 'Safer sex advice is not getting through to young people'. Candidates were invited to suggest three ways in which this situation could be improved.

In general, the responses were very good showing imagination and responsibility. The roles of professionals, teachers and parents were highlighted by many. Interestingly, many young people appeared insecure in the suggestion of open discussion of their misconceptions and lack of experience.

Section B

In this section candidates had to select one question from a choice of three. Question 4 was the most popular with questions 3 and 5 attracting a roughly equal number of answers.

In Section B candidates are instructed to write their answers in continuous prose. The greater majority did this. However a small number of candidates, maybe because of time management problems, wrote using bullet points. These answers tended to be under developed since this style of presentation appears not to encourage elaboration and development of a point.

- 3** This question focused upon the value of the characteristics surrounding and underpinning team spirit.
- a)** In this part candidates were asked to identify two ways in which team spirit is a useful model for an ideal society and one way in which it is not. In general candidates were able to identify two useful aspects of the model and one negative feature. However many candidates then had some difficulty in linking these features to an ideal society.
- b)** In this part the candidates had to develop the advantages and disadvantages arising from the UK continuing as a member of the EU. The EU is mentioned specifically in the specification document and a good number of candidates showed a range of detailed pieces of knowledge.

Candidates were perhaps stronger on the advantages than disadvantages. Some discussions were perhaps over dependent upon the role of migrant workers from the newer EU members. In some cases the impact of these workers was over stated in terms of its negative effects,

- 4** This question focused upon leisure and the use of the countryside. It was a popular question but did not score many very high marks.
- a)** In this section candidates had to suggest two reasons for and two against the suggestion that people actually have more time for leisure. Items such as shorter working hours, shorter working weeks, increased number of leisure facilities, advertised weekend breaks and better transport were mentioned. Conversely the long hours worked by some managers, the falling membership of some clubs and Sunday shopping were seen as evidence of less time for leisure.
- A number of candidates wrote from their own experience of the heavy burden of A level study though few mentioned part-time jobs. Some appeared to think that watching television or playing video/computer games did not constitute leisure activities.
- b)** There were many answers to this question that scored in the mid-band 3 territory and consequently were awarded around half marks.

The key skill needed for this question was to balance the two points of view. Many candidates were able to give two or three reasons on each side. These included the demands of urban life, the shorter working week, the countryside for food production, the damage done by visitors' and the role of ownership.

Answers could have been improved by the inclusion of more examples of National Parks. Only the better answers attempted to assess the relative merits of the two cases. A popular conclusion was that with good planning the situation could be managed.

Some of the answers to this question were enhanced by the inclusion of personal experience.

A pleasing aspect to the answers was the way in which they were structured. A successful structure included an introduction, points for the people in the countryside and then points in favour of the visitors. These answers concluded with a balanced assessment.

5 This question looked at politics and the success of particular politicians.

- a)** In this part the candidates were asked for two arguments for and two against the policy of forming women only short lists for parliamentary candidates.

In general this produced some good answers, though there were few examples used.

- b)** In this part the candidates were asked to name three leading political figures, one of whom should have been active in the candidate's lifetime.

Popular choices included Tony Blair, Margaret Thatcher, Winston Churchill and Hitler. Some candidates included Bill Clinton, Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King.

The inclusion of one politician who had been active in the candidate's lifetime posed few problems.

Many answers included a pleasing amount of biographical detail. Considerable detail was included for Blair, Thatcher and Churchill. In addition candidates identified characteristics that had enabled these politicians to be successful. These included good speech making, charisma and clear policies.

The main stumbling block for all but Band 1 candidates was the need for an account of any common reasons for their success.

2965: The Scientific & Cultural Domains

General Comments

It is pleasing to report that many examiners felt that the candidates had applied themselves with knowledge, energy and skill to the questions set.

Candidates achieved a wide range of marks in answering this paper. Those gaining high or very high marks read the question carefully and produced answers that focused on all its parts. They developed each section and were able to assess the quality of the case they had made. Those candidates gaining very low marks appeared to lack the energy to meet the challenge or to be very under-prepared for this examination. It was characteristic of candidates gaining marks in the lower half of the range that they failed to focus on the question as set or to drift from it in the answers they provided.

In terms of popularity, in Section A, question 1 was selected by the most candidates. This was particularly the case in terms of gender where females selected this question far more regularly than males. In Section B it was question 5 that attracted most answers. Question 6 was the least popular on the paper. In some centres question 4 was popular and many good answers were read.

The greater majority of candidates used their time well and there were very few cases of rubric infringement.

Examiners noted that in many centres candidates are planning their essays. This can be seen in the answer booklets in terms of some organised bullet points or ring/spider diagrams. These candidates then provide an introductory paragraph where they interpret the question. The substance of such planned essays is then presented and a closure rounds off the essay. This produced a satisfying fluency. Writing coherent essays that follow the structure of the question does tend to help acquire a good mark even when the content is less secure.

A feature of the answers in this session was that the marks achieved in the two sections appeared to be more even. In the past too many candidates tended to write from their strength in one section and to fall away in the other. The even distribution this time suggests candidates were well prepared for the paper as a whole.

Many examiners noted that candidates do not pay sufficient attention to their handwriting and as a consequence their argument is less clear than it might be. In addition it was noted that spelling, punctuation and grammar often fall below the level of the content.

Comments on individual questions

Question 1

A very popular question but not often well done. Only a few demonstrated a thorough experimental method providing detail and precision in obtaining and analysing their results. One or two provided examples of questionnaires and possible graphs to employ. A small number suggested descriptive statistics.

Some of the better responses failed however to provide much information of specific diets, which was all that many weaker candidates did achieve! These candidates were able to provide long and detailed descriptions and comparisons of different dietary programmes and surgical solutions but then failed to focus upon ways of determining effectiveness. A small number of very good answers included a section discussing the definition of effectiveness.

One distraction in many answers was the time candidates gave to media coverage of diets, the role of celebrities, the size zero debate and their own views of particular diets.

Most however, did provide a modest attempt at assessing effectiveness, together with many practical problems which could have been resolved in their sampling techniques.

Question 2

There were some enthusiastic responses to this question. Particularly successful were those choosing car safety. Least successful were those adopting global warming, with less focus on the safety aspects and often a paucity of scientific inputs. Many simply described various policies including Kyoto et al. Some interesting comments on awareness however, one or two going beyond Al Gore.

The two ways chosen were often unevenly addressed and many lacked balance, therefore not assessing success particularly well.

The answers scoring high marks described two ways that were clearly the work of scientists. They included a specific scientific input e.g. names of diseases that now have preventative treatments or cures, the use of DNA in crime protection. In addition they focused upon safety rather than better lives and were well written.

In contrast weaker answers made a poor choice e.g. nuclear weapons and global warming were two choices that were more difficult to link to safety. The scientific input was at best modest with few specifics mentioned and the text was only weak in its link to safety.

Question 3

In this question the candidates had to identify a development in technology where progress was clear. They then had to cite a second example where the outcome was less clear. Their final task was to suggest lessons that could be learned as a result of these different outcomes.

The greater majority of candidates selecting this question were able to identify two developments in technology. The two selected generally met the requirements of being clear and less clear in terms of outcome. The final part of the question, to state what could be learned, proved challenging for all but the better candidates. Far too often this final part was answered in very general terms, rather than having a clear link to the two innovations described.

Popular selections for those items where progress was clear included transport, cars in particular and medicine. Selections where the outcome was clear included weapons and mobile phones. A number of candidates selected global warming and found it more difficult to articulate this in terms of the question as set. In addition, and once again, there was confusion over the role of the ozone layer in this context.

Question 4

This was a popular question. Christianity, including Roman Catholicism, was a popular choice with a significant number selecting Islam.

In terms of Christianity the candidates found it easier to cite doctrine for the divorce part of the question. They were less secure in terms of child poverty and attitudes to the elderly. The candidates selecting Islam tended to write of custom rather than religious tenets. This was pleasing in terms of the strengths of a supportive and extended family. Where they were less secure was in citing underpinning principles or philosophy for their religion.

All of the answers to this question could have displayed more in depth knowledge of the central tenets of their chosen religion.

Better candidates did try to extend their arguments to include perspectives on the outcome of their choice being more widely followed.

Many of the students drew linkages between their chosen religion and church and acts of charity. Some had wayward views of compulsory donation of 10% of earnings by active members of Christian churches.

Some weaker candidates took considerable time to analyse social conditions in the UK today. These were linked to the three areas under review and the role of religion was relegated to a low place. Indeed some approached the question in terms of the failure and irrelevance of religion to these questions.

Question 5

In this question the candidates were asked to cite five criteria that a committee could use to select four items, from a list of seven, to represent creativity at the beginning of the 21st century.

Examiners read many interesting answers to this popular question.

One of the main problems that candidates from some centres experienced was in their understanding of the term criteria. At its worst these candidates used terms such as 'Art' and 'Music' as their criteria. Some used five of the seven items selected as criteria.

Typically successful criteria included uniqueness, quality, popularity, reflecting national achievement, in danger and reflecting change.

Popular choices for inclusion were the plans for the UK Olympics stadium and fashion designs. It was interesting that many candidates included the water colour of a national park because they recognised such land to be under threat. Many included the manuscript of the plays or drawings of the statue because of their social commentary aspects. Though many candidates selected the CD, sometimes including a comment that such a storage device would be obsolete in the future, they found it difficult to develop any deep reasons for its inclusion.

A key feature of this type of question is that the candidates specify their criteria precisely and that they give reasons for their choice. Once this is done they can select their items for inclusion and justify them in terms of their criteria. Crucially the justification should be in terms of the criteria but not just the repetition of them. Each item should have a justification that is particular to it but is drawn from the criteria chosen.

Question 6

This was the least popular question on the paper. However it was clear that those selecting it did so from a positive viewpoint. They drew upon their experience of a piece of creativity they had undertaken at A level or GCSE.

The greater majority of the candidates selecting this question were able to understand the model. They applied it to pieces of drama, song writing, painting and live performances.

The majority described stages 1 and 2 with clarity. They found stage 3 more difficult. This could be seen as rather disappointing in that creative candidates found it difficult to give evidence of their 'think out of the box' or 'use blue skies thinking'.

The major criticisms given by candidates included the apparently restrictive nature of the model and its requirement to put aside those ideas which were not related to the original purpose. They gave the impression that creative people were free to move in whatever way their imagination took them.

2966: The Social Domain 2 (Written paper)

General Comments

Examiners felt that the level of difficulty of this paper was appropriate for candidates at A2, an impression confirmed by a spread of marks covering the whole range. Apart from the differentiation achieved by the questions themselves, colleagues also noted that the performance of candidates varied as a function of the different approach of Centres. It seems clear that at some large Centres, General Studies is a compulsory subject attracting perhaps little commitment of staffing, time and resources. In such Centres candidates' performance shows little or no investment or interest in the subject, and occasionally leads to short, anecdotal and facetious answers. However, such candidates remain, happily, in a minority, and many scripts showed that answers had been carefully planned and considered. Such responses were on the whole intelligent and effective.

Examiners noted that the number of strands in a question was a very effective differentiator. Candidates who did not analyse a question thoroughly before answering it often missed central elements out of their response as a result. For example, a comprehensive answer to Question 1 required candidates to respond to the three quotations, calculate the values in the societies they reflected and then provide a context in which the changing significance of sport could be related to social changes during the last hundred years.

The standard of English produced by candidates varied considerably. There were some outstanding scripts in which the focus and relish of the writing gave a great deal of incidental pleasure to Examiners. Other scripts (often ones which showed no evidence that the answers had been planned) confused *their* and *there*, *too*, *to* and *two*, and disfigured otherwise sound work by the use of double negatives and such phrases as *more better than*.

That said, Examiners felt on the whole that the paper was varied and interesting and had engaged the candidates into performances which were, generally, good. One colleague summed up the feeling of many of his colleagues when he wrote

"It was pleasing to note that the standard of answers clearly signified an A2 cohort. There was a considerable amount of sophisticated material presented, where candidates displayed excellent personal knowledge to complement the analyses they had developed from the question."

One very pleasing feature of the entry was that all three optional questions were attempted in roughly equal numbers, and further that this spread of choice was mirrored in a spread of attainment in the answers. The compulsory Question 1 was more intricate than it might have appeared on a first reading, but happily candidates who may have struggled with it often found a surer footing with the question they chose for themselves.

In terms of advice for the future, it is worth noting that many responses found their place in Band Three because candidates did not pursue a point once they had made it. The ability effectively to develop a point - citing evidence, giving examples and illustrations, making links with source material, evaluating different types of knowledge - is what distinguishes a competent or good answer from an adequate one. Similarly, a good answer is usually furnished with a summative conclusion, which clinches the key points of the answer and offers an evaluation. Less effective answers do not conclude. They simply stop.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question One

This question produced the widest range of marks, and it was evidently a question which significant numbers of candidates found difficult. A good answer needed the candidate to understand that the question was about society, not about sport. Many weaker answers fell into the trap of providing a general commentary on sport and the way in which it has evolved during the past century. The question made it clear that the relationship between sport and society is both active and interactive, and one which needed to be analysed - using the changing values of the society which sport inhabits. A significant number of candidates, for example, quite credibly equated values with behaviour, and made useful reference to 'diving' (association football), 'ball-tampering' (cricket) and performance enhancing drugs. At this point, however, they needed to take this point further and attempt to define values in a way which would have given them the parameters of a measured response.

Examiners felt that the question succeeded because of its challenging nature, establishing a clear distance between the most able candidates and their fellow examinees. Mid-range candidates often tackled with question effectively by planning their answer round the three sources, making links with their historical contexts and citing societal parallels with the attitudes and values the sources exemplified. The weakest candidates either summarised the sources or wrote generalised commentaries about professional footballers and their inflated salaries.

One point of interest was that some Centres had clearly expected a question tied to the 2008 Olympic Games and had prepared candidates for this, with the result that some colleagues saw interesting (but, sadly, irrelevant) potted histories of the Olympiad. Remarkably, though, the range of reference to the 2008 Games (and indeed the 2012 Games) was narrow and often confused. Similarly, the range of reference to sports in general was restricted - Association football was the only sport to be regularly cited.

The range in quality reflects a challenging and multifaceted question, but more than that it is interesting to note the number of different ways in which this question could be successfully answered and was approached by candidates.

Question Two

For many candidates who attempted this question their approach represented a lost opportunity. Many candidates suffered due to poor examination technique which resulted in many failing to read the question properly or in some cases the question was read but the candidate seemed to latch on to the most immediately understandable part of it and then answer that part and nothing more. Thus it was that many candidates who attempted this simply listed advantages and disadvantages, with little or no reference to the source. The Kingsley Amis quotation made pungent comment on the "expansionist" case which was followed through in the question stem. "*In the light of Kingsley Amis's prediction and his reasons for making it...*" gave as clear a context as possible for the effective treatment of this question. Despite this many weaker answers did not engage at all with the source, and ran out of things to say as a result, making rather tenuous points about (eg) student debt and the housing shortages caused by expanding student populations in university towns.

Better candidates engaged more or less successfully with the central notion that "more will mean worse", although only a handful managed to distinguish between this prediction and the "rule" which Amis is often accused of promulgating, that "more means worse". Many of these better candidates also expressed well-evidenced concern about what they saw as the dilution of graduate status by it being conferred on huge numbers of students. Similarly, several candidates

gave convincing instances of the quality of university instruction being attenuated by the need to provide for lower ability students.

Several of the best answers placed Amis's opinion in an historical context and posed the question "If more does mean worse, then what precisely is wrong with that?"

At the same time, this was not a question which could be answered without a knowledge base, and some good responses included references to the differing nature of academic and vocational education and the practicalities involved in university expansion. One or two of the better answers also challenged Amis's idea that the supply of good wines and tins of salmon was necessarily inexhaustible.

One Examiner colleague wrote of these latter candidates that "far too few candidates are unwilling to challenge source material" - a point worth making. The lesson to be drawn from the responses to this question is that time should be spent in General Studies lesson on deconstructing questions. If more candidates could be clearer about what they are being asked and how they are being asked it, then perhaps more of them could achieve a better focus in their answers.

Question Three

This question proved to be the most popular question amongst candidates. It was also the best answered and the worst answered question on the paper. It seems to have been answered by two types of candidate - those who had a degree of expertise in this area by virtue of their other A levels, and those who chose the question by default. These latter often found themselves making bricks without straw. The crux of the question was its most speculative area - reliability - and it was this element which proved to be the most effective differentiator.

Sociology and Psychology students were often able to provide a good range of research methods and to list their advantages and disadvantages, but in comparing the relative reliability of research methods a degree of both imagination and sophistication is required, and this often proved to be more difficult.

The strengths of the better answers often lay in the accuracy and depth of the technical information they used. These distinguished, for example, between open and closed questions, covert, overt and participant observation, structured and unstructured interviews, primary and secondary research and other technical matters.

Weaker candidates also found themselves repeating the same advantages and disadvantages for different methods, and this pointed to another differentiator in the question - the need to choose the three methods so that they contrasted with one another as sharply as possible. Thus, candidates who chose three quantitative methods rendered themselves liable to repetition, but those who chose a mixture of methods - questionnaire, focus group and loyalty card, for example - placed themselves in a stronger position. In assessing advantages, disadvantages and reliability, such candidates were able to introduce breadth, depth and variety to their answers.

The apparent straightforwardness of this question concealed its difficulty, and reinforces the point made above about deconstructing questions before answering them. In this case, candidates need to consider not only what knowledge and analytical skills they can display, but also how they can exhibit the diversity, range and depth of these. Looked at in this light, it is obvious that imagination and a creative approach are as essential as the knowledge base in constructing an effective answer. These criteria above all are what make General Studies a very difficult examination in which to excel.

Question Four

This was a very complex question, and the best answers acknowledged and coped with this complexity. Such answers often took the approach outlined below.

Being tough on crime seems a simple concept until we consider the diverse nature and complex effects of crime. Should we treat speeding motorists in the same way as muggers or drug dealers? What do we actually mean by the term 'tough' in this context? Is toughness on crime always congruent with harsh punishment?

Similarly, what are the causes of crime? Is it a simplistic matter of greed, laziness, immorality and amorality? Or must we look at social deprivation, alienation, the lack of nurturing and validation experienced by many young criminals before they commit their first crime?

How may we evaluate our approaches to these problems? What kinds of difficulty would we encounter in fashioning an approach to crime and its causes which took account of all these possibilities? According to *Yes Minister*, policies which find political favour are usually quick, simple, popular and cheap - qualities which almost guarantee their ineffectiveness, or so it would seem.

Many candidates answered this question using the "quick, simple, popular and cheap" model - more police on the streets, more CCTV, zero tolerance, aggressive sentencing policies and considerably more discomfort in prisons. The judicial system was heavily criticised for lack of harshness and unwillingness to impose draconian punishment. Such answers often found it hard to deal effectively with the causes of crime, and identified the only difficulties as being financial.

Such answers failed to locate crime as part of society implying that crime took place in a vacuum. Such candidates often felt drawn to rant, some suggesting that the death penalty was the only solution to prison overcrowding and indeed to crime in general.

The best candidates answered this question very well. Many of them were able to locate 'New Labour' on the political spectrum accurately. Some gave competent analysis of the two parts of the quotation and their relationship to the difficulties involved. There were some good political and sociological points integrated into the analysis.

This was also a question which prompted some excellent responses which were not on the mark scheme. In particular, one candidate [perhaps picking up on the word 'slogan' in the question] offered a sophisticated and detailed analysis of Blair's words as a piece of political strategy – an approach showing both refreshing originality and considerable political intelligence.

A question offering elbow-room to such diverse approaches may be said to embody the principle underlying the whole General Studies specification.

2967: The Social Domain 2 (Coursework)

There was a good selection of candidates who tackled the task with sense and enthusiasm. What was refreshing was that a considerable number did not confine themselves to the topics suggested, but embarked on others, clearly close to their hearts. Local planning issues and ID cards, free movement and immigration all figured. Some got too involved in the issue and its 'rights' but never quite got around to actually considering the conflict between the individual and the community. One or two got very bogged down in detailed surveys on an issue, with their 'only 19% in favour and 41% did not know' etc, they often neglected to really deal with the issue as required.

The most successful identified a clear issue that lent itself to be easily dealt with in the context of this debate. They then followed the basic a-d tasks which, if followed, make it very easy for candidates to access the higher marks. The best ones not only identified a clear issue and explained it clearly, they carried on to 'examine and analyse the issues' surrounding the area. This usually involved looking at the issue from several different view points. In the case of ID cards there was a good examination of the reasons put forward by the UK government (and also other states which require them) and then a wide variety of other views (quite a lot based on the excellent House of Lords debate on the topic) . A good analysis here of the issue and views on it is invaluable for Examiners awarding candidates higher marks.

'Exploring different' viewpoints were usually well done. We tend to interpret this task fairly broadly, and when a range is considered carefully high marks can be obtained.

With task c) one candidate looking at the use of pesticides found to her surprise that there were considerable division of opinion between people of the same party and 'inclination', and none quite matched up to expectations. It was a surprise to some candidate's that politicians often knew little about topics they had to legislate on at both local and national level.

Some of the treatments of task (d) were excellent; with careful thinking about the practical and the ideological approaches.

As always, adherence to the actual questions set and awareness of how marks are allocated (on the cover sheet) were the key to success.

2968: Culture, Science and Society: Making Connections

General Comments

Once again, examiners this year were taken by the extremely wide-range of achievement which this examination brings with it. On the one hand there are quite remarkable feats of structured and original thought presented in a polished and erudite fashion, whilst on the other one witnesses a diatribe of disjointed and dubious facts which bear little or no resemblance to the topic in question. Indeed, success seems to boil down to preparation and most specifically in the understanding of the values of the four assessment objectives which the examination is based around. To be clear:

Assessment Objective 1 – the candidate’s knowledge	12 marks
Assessment Objective 2 – a clearly communicated piece	6 marks
Assessment Objective 3 – examples and analysis presented	13 marks
Assessment Objective 4 – relevant personal experience; other perspectives	19 marks
50 marks: TOTAL	

The imbalance with which candidates attained their final marks was not surprising and very consistent. Good scores in AO1 and AO3, reasonably well communicated (AO2) but with little extension or development of ideas in any direction or any personal conjecture or involvement. This tended to see a lot of essays reach Band 2 (31-40 marks) but not go much further due to these restrictions.

At the other end of the order of merit candidates were scoring fewer than 20 marks due to a lack of any real engagement with the topic and the source, or through the presentation of an abridged list of dubious facts.

On the whole, Question 1 was less successfully tackled than Question 2 as there was a distinct confusion in the nature of social care and also because, unlike global warming, it had not featured to any extent in the content of the school curriculum. Having said that, any well-prepared candidate would have been able to glean from the source and the question what was being suggested and superimpose this over any given essay structure. Sadly, this was rarely the case but when it did happen examiners were only too happy to award the maximum of marks.

Time management was judged to be good with most serious candidates able to make a good attempt at both questions. Possibly the tabloid-time presentation of Source 2 enabled candidates to formulate a longer and more detailed response since Source 1 required synthesis and evaluation.

The quality of expression remains only satisfactory with some very poor grammar and syntax. As noted in previous reports, this can only come as a result of a lack of practice or over reliance on computer technology in the study process.

Comments on individual questions

Section A

- 1 Perhaps the most sensible and logical approach to this question was to look through the source paragraph by paragraph in order to search for views and opinions on the status of social care. It was important to make distinctions between the NHS and social care in terms of financial support, the number of employees, and image. Many candidates failed to acknowledge an important social consideration in that social care is means tested whereas

healthcare is free. Indeed there was also the more subtle point that the social care sector is the only one that addresses social and cultural change at their heart.

Examiners offered much credit for detailed and balanced discussions about the status of social care and its employees with reference to many prominent case studies which had featured in the recent news. This failed somewhat when the topic veered into the domain of social workers, unemployment and social security – a different, but discontented type of social care to the one suggested by the source.

An effective balanced discussion revolved around the idea of ‘them’ and ‘us’ where it is proposed that social care is reserved for the unfortunates in society – the poor, the mentally ill, the addicts – whereas the need is there to supply everyone irrespective of socio-cultural background. The suggestion that the efficiency of social care was blighted by the recent influx of immigrants was accepted but only to a minor extent. The link between social care and poverty was more readily appreciated.

In terms of connections, the scientific domain proved the most difficult to assess for most candidates. The clearest responses took on the notion, indicated in the mark scheme, that medicine can cure conditions whereas social care might never do so and be infinite. Furthermore, mental illness is a growing concern in the UK today but is seen of lower status than other more high profile ailments.

When essays were punctuated with the personal experience of the candidate, Examiners were able to fully appreciate the breadth of the candidate’s arguments and feelings. Some touching as well as disturbing illustrations emerged in support as well as criticism of the social care system in the UK today citing the media as being the main reason that social care retains its low profile.

Section B

- 2** The question involved the identification of three measures, one from each domain. Sadly this was rarely the case as candidates spent time explaining the onset of the end of the world at the expense of considering and constructing a response involving the making of connections. Global warming is a feature of most schools’ general science course; in fact, it appears quite frequently in geography lessons. Therefore it was fruitless to spend a large proportion of the essay discussing the facts of the case.

Examiners were happy to hear of the consequences, such as the extinction of species or failed crops and droughts but these needed to be linked to measures such as re-educating the youth of tomorrow in their stewardship of the planet or changing our whole attitude toward waste and pollution.

Cultural measures appeared the most difficult to acquire. The most popular suggestion surrounded the idea of population control which promoted some incisive and interesting essays connected with China’s birth policy and the need for transcontinental tolerance in the sight of an approaching catastrophe. Indeed, one candidate, in applauding the stance of U.S. Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on his stance on global warming suggested that he should become World President and that mankind should join together to combat this advancing catastrophe.

Examiners awarded high marks for clarity and the succinct addressing of the key issues. If candidates could enlighten their ideas with personal views or provocative dilemmas then this unlocked the chest of 19 marks available for assessment objective 4.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE General Studies (3831/7831)
June 2008 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2961	Raw	100	71	64	57	50	44	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2962	Raw	100	63	56	49	42	35	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2963	Raw	90	69	61	54	47	40	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2964	Raw	100	69	62	55	48	42	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2965	Raw	100	72	64	57	50	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2966	Raw	100	67	60	53	47	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2967	Raw	90	68	61	54	47	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2968	Raw	100	64	58	53	48	43	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3831	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7831	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

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

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3831	8.3	22.7	43.0	65.1	83.0	100	25224
7831	9.4	27.6	53.2	78.1	94.3	100	15003

40227 candidates aggregated this series.

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.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

© OCR 2008

