

# **Business and Communication Systems**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1950**

## **Report on the Components**

---

**June 2006**

**1950/MS/R/06**

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.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide 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.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annersley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### General Certificate of Secondary Education Business and Communication Studies (1950)

#### REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	4
1950/01	Paper 1	5
1950/02	Paper 2	8
1950/03	Coursework	12
*	Grade Thresholds	19

### **Chief Examiner's Report - 1950**

Centres are strongly advised to read this report in conjunction with the examination paper and mark scheme, together with the support material available on the OCR website.

The majority of candidates produced high quality work. It is also pleasing to see, yet again, new Centres entering candidates. There appears to be a trend towards the vocational type of student.

Within the written papers, candidates should be encouraged to answer in the context of the question to gain higher level marks. It would appear Centres are adopting the guidance provided in relation to evaluative type questions and this was evident in the quality of responses provided. However, Centres need to ensure that they cover all aspects of the specification to allow candidates the maximum opportunity.

The attendance at INSET this year has been encouraging and it always pleasing to share ideas and resources with delegates from other Centres. As a result of responses included in some INSET evaluations it has been decided to provide INSET days specifically for those Centres who are either new or thinking of adopting OCR Business and Communication Systems at their Centre. Details of all INSET provision is available from OCR Customer Contact Centre on 01223 553998.

Regrettably there was very little response from Centres in relation to the Coursework Consultancy Service advised in last year's Report to Centres. Centres can submit up to five **photocopied** pieces of marked coursework (or completed tasks) from across the mark range. These will be looked at by a senior OCR Moderator who will write a short report in response offering guidance with your marking of the coursework. If appropriate the Coursework Consultant may offer guidance about how the work could be improved. This service is available between September and the end of March of each academic year. This would prove particularly beneficial for those Centres with large entries or to those Centres where adjustments to coursework marks have been made. Work should be sent to the Business and Communication Systems Subject Officer, OCR, Mill Wharf, Mill Street, Birmingham B6 4BU. Please allow a four week turn around time when sending work for consultancy.

## 1950/01 Principal Examiner's Report

### General comments

Overall the performance of candidates on this paper was similar to last year. There was, however, encouraging evidence that Centres have responded to the comments made in earlier editions of this report. In some Centres, however, this is not so apparent and so they are worth repeating.

There are a number of Centres where most candidates lost marks on a range of questions which indicated that the specification content had not been covered in full. This was particularly evident in the document production questions where sixteen marks were available, but rarely fully awarded.

There are still many instances of candidates not reading or understanding the requirements of questions. If a question asks candidates to discuss the **benefits to customers** then they are not going to be given marks for their knowledge of drawbacks to the business.

Centres are reminded that brand names are not acceptable; this is particularly important when questions ask candidates to select an appropriate type of software to perform a task.

A number of candidates still believe that "quick" and "easy" are benefits of using business communication systems. These answers will only gain credit if they are explained by offering a relevant comparator, e.g. sending an email is quicker than sending a letter by post.

### Comments on individual questions

**1a** Many candidates possessed the knowledge to answer this question but by giving brand names were unable to score any marks.

**1b** Most candidates scored full marks for this question. Some failed to spot "Series 1" as an error.

**1c** Generally well answered, although a few candidates misunderstood and gave answers such as "type out the report", when the question clearly said "you have been asked to send a completed copy".

**1d** Many candidates possessed the knowledge to answer this question but by giving brand names were unable to score any marks.

**2a** Candidates suffered from a lack of knowledge. Most confused e-procurement with on-line shopping and scored one or two marks for general comments that applied to both methods.

**2bi** Very well answered and often based on personal knowledge, although weaker answers merely stated "quick" and "easy". By not offering any explanation (e.g. quicker and easier than what and why) these candidates failed to gain any marks.

**2bii** Only a few candidates knew what encryption meant. Some candidates mentioned 'scramble' data or code, but did not mention the data being 'unscrambled', thus missing the second mark.

**2biii** Worryingly few candidates referred to visible security features such as https and the padlock symbol. Correct answers were concentrated in a few Centres, or among candidates who clearly had extensive experience of on-line shopping.

**2c** Candidates either knew the principles or they did not. Some candidates confused principles with data subjects' rights. Full marks were a rarity.

**3a** Very few candidates gained full marks for this part of the question as they did not include the name of the addressee before the address. They also tended to commence "Dear Sir/Madam", when the reply was to "Luke Sharp". An incorrect date and complimentary close were often given. Answers to the actual points of the reply were mostly correct. There was evidence that a number of Centres had not prepared their candidates for a letter writing question.

**3bi/3bii** Most candidates gained full marks for these questions. Candidates who did not relied on "quick" and "easy" for the benefits.

**3c** Most candidates did well on this part of the question. Weaker candidates failed to develop their points sufficiently to gain full marks.

**3di** Mainly well answered. A few candidates misinterpreted the question and gave benefits instead of drawbacks.

**3dii** Almost all candidates gave a correct method and gained a further mark for the reason. Very few candidates gave a full explanation of how their method would be beneficial.

**3e** This part of the question was poorly answered. Candidates appeared not to understand moral/ethical issues. A few candidates left the section blank.

**4a** Mostly well answered, although candidates sometimes misinterpreted the question and gave the answer as the benefit to the staff rather than the business. Good answers included "to prevent unauthorized access"; "it will be harder for unauthorized people to gain access to the network".

**4b** This was generally well answered, but many responses lacked development for the second mark, e.g. "easy to remember". A good answer included "no, because these usernames are easy to guess so it would be easier to gain unauthorized access".

**4c** This was generally well answered, with responses including "Fred losing his diary or it getting stolen". Many candidates achieved full marks as once the problem was stated, they were able to develop their answer by giving concrete examples of problems this would cause either Fred or the business.

**5** This was very well answered. Very few candidates gained less than four marks. The most common omission was the plant pot on top of the computer terminal.

**6a** This was very poorly answered as responses tended to relate to the company rather than the sales staff. Poor answers focussed on the benefits of improved motivation on company performance and the impact of the scheme on company profits. Good answers explained why the scheme might make the sales staff happy but at the same time instil feelings of unfairness and jealousy. Often candidates failed to achieve any marks for this part of the question.

**6b** This was answered well by around half of all candidates. Too many candidates had weak knowledge and thought that fringe benefits included items such as holiday time and sick pay.

**7ai/ii** Most candidates knew that a monitor was needed to view web pages. A surprising number also thought the same monitor was a piece of software. Only a minority of candidates had heard of a web browser, and some gave a brand name and so gained no marks.

**7b** Weaker candidates either ignored the part of the question and offered "usernames and passwords" or gave protection methods that would only prevent access from internet-based

attacks (e.g. firewalls). Most candidates could offer at least one valid method, typically password protection for the file.

**7c** This was mostly well answered, with candidates happy to describe their knowledge of the impact of viruses and hackers.

**8a** This was poorly answered. Candidates typically failed to understand the layout of a memo and very few achieved full marks. Often the incorrect date was given. They often confused a memo with a letter, poster or an agenda. Sometimes candidates did not read the details properly and lost marks by stating “staff can contact Serena Humphries” instead of “managers”. Also a few gave an incorrect phone number. A small percentage of candidates did not attempt the question. Centres should spend time rehearsing the creation of standard business documents.

**8b** This part of the question drew a mixed response. Better candidates were able to explain how a logo could affect the number of customers and their attitudes towards the company by making the business stand out from its competitors. Weaker candidates clearly knew nothing about this topic, but were still able to offer at least one creditable point about how a logo was “instantly recognisable”.

**9a** This was generally well answered by candidates who understood that Roger was a manager at the head office, not in a shop. Candidates who got full marks clearly understood the position of a manager in the hierarchy between operatives below and more senior staff above. For example, Roger might supervise the staff who pay the wages, but this is not a task he will himself perform.

**9b** Most candidates had some knowledge of BACS and could develop at least one point, so gaining two or three marks. Typical problems included candidates who confused the BACS process with the benefits of banking *per se*, and candidates who referred to the deduction of tax and national insurance, again outside the remit of this question.

**9c** Most candidates scored well on this part of the question, often a consequence of their own experiences with call centres and the recent well publicised changes to their location. Weaker candidates failed to develop points such as “expensive” and “time consuming”.

**9d** Very few candidates had an accurate knowledge of the Working Time Regulations. Most candidates gained one or two marks but this was often due to inspired guesswork rather than preparation for this question.

**10a** Most candidates offered a valid disadvantage, typically “lost” or “stolen”. A minority erroneously believe that laptop computers are incapable of being connected to a network or gaining access to network resources such as printers.

**10b** Most candidates could offer a valid security risk, often “lost” or “stolen” again. A minority did not understand the expression “security risk” and so got the answer wrong.

**10c** Candidates who understood what pirated software is usually gained one or two marks. Better responses focussed on the consequences of breaking the Copyright Designs and Patents Act. Weaker candidates confused pirated software with pirated DVDs and videos and discussed the poor quality of software, usually gaining no credit for so doing.

## 1950/02 Principal Examiner's Report

### General comments

Overall the performance of candidates on this paper was similar to last year. There was, however, encouraging evidence that Centres have responded to the comments made in earlier editions of this report. In some centres, however, this is not so apparent and so they are worth repeating.

There are a number of Centres where most candidates lost marks on a range of questions which indicated that the specification content had not been covered in full. This was particularly evident in the document production question where eight marks were available, but rarely fully awarded.

There are still many instances of candidates not reading or understanding the requirements of questions. If a question asks candidates to discuss the **benefits to customers** then they are not going to be given marks for their knowledge of drawbacks to the business.

Centres are reminded that brand names are not acceptable; this is particularly important when questions ask candidates to select an appropriate type of software to perform a task.

A number of candidates still believe that "quick" and "easy" are benefits of using business communication systems. These answers will only gain credit if they are explained by offering a relevant comparator, e.g. sending an email is quicker than sending a letter by post.

Some candidates appear to believe that their answer to a six mark question should include six points. Candidates are encouraged to take more careful note of the command words in the questions. 'Bullet point' type answers are only appropriate for 'state' or 'identify' type questions. These candidates are extremely unlikely to gain more than half marks for 'describe', 'explain' or 'analyse' type questions and are probably only going to achieve Level 1 (one or two marks out of six) for 'evaluate' or 'assess' type questions.

There are increasing instances of candidates who attempt to offer evaluation type responses to the 'evaluation' questions (e.g. Q9) but who are not awarded Level 3 (five to six marks). This is typically because these candidates either offer an unsupported conclusion (e.g. "so to conclude, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.") or because their evaluation is based upon incorrect or irrelevant analysis. Evaluation marks are awarded to candidates who either offer a reasoned summary of their argument (e.g. "so to conclude, desk top publishing software should not be used because it is easier to produce this report using a word processor, because the report will mainly consist of text.") or who are able to prioritise factors relevant to an issue (e.g. "e-procurement is an important tool for businesses providing they are able to ensure that the system is secure and reliable"). Candidates who offer rote learned generalised conclusions that could be applied to any evaluation question regardless of context will not be awarded Level 3.

Finally, there remains a decreasing but still sizeable number of Centres where all candidates appear to have been entered for the Higher Tier when the Foundation Tier would have been more appropriate for a large proportion of the cohort. Centres are advised to consider carefully whether individual candidates would be better served by being entered for the Foundation Tier.



## Comments on individual questions

**1a** This was very poorly answered as responses tended to relate to the company rather than the sales staff. Poor answers focussed on the benefits of improved motivation on company performance and the impact of the scheme on company profits. Good answers explained why the scheme might make the sales staff happy but at the same time instil feelings of unfairness and jealousy.

**1b** This was answered well by the majority of candidates. Some candidates, however, had weak knowledge and thought that fringe benefits included items such as holiday time and sick pay.

**2a** This was generally well answered, although some candidates gained no marks because they analysed the benefits to shop managers.

**2b** Weaker candidates either ignored the question and offered “usernames and passwords” or gave protection methods that would only prevent access from internet-based attacks (e.g. firewalls). Most candidates could offer at least one valid method, typically password protection for the file.

**2c** This was mostly well answered, with candidates happy to describe their knowledge of the impact of viruses and hackers.

**3a** This was poorly answered with a greater variation in the marks between Centres than within Centres. Candidates typically failed to understand the layout of a memo and very few achieved full marks. Often the incorrect date was given. They often confused a memo with a letter, poster or an agenda. Sometimes candidates did not read the details properly and lost marks by stating “staff can contact Serena Humphries” instead of “managers”. Also a few gave an incorrect phone number. A small percentage of candidates did not attempt the question. Centres should spend time rehearsing the creation of standard business documents.

**3b** This was generally well answered. Many candidates were able to explain how a logo could affect the number of customers and their attitudes towards the company by making the business stand out from its competitors. Better candidates gained marks for evaluation, often for well justified arguments explaining why a recognisable logo was an essential tool for any successful business. Weaker candidates clearly knew nothing about this topic, but were still able to offer at least one creditable point about how a logo was “instantly recognisable”.

**4a** This was generally well answered by candidates who understood that Roger was a manager at the head office, not in a shop. Candidates who got full marks clearly understood the position of a manager in the hierarchy between operatives below and more senior staff above. For example, Roger might supervise the staff who pay the wages, but this is not a task he will himself perform.

**4b** Most candidates had some knowledge of BACS and could develop at least one point, so gaining two or three marks. Typical problems included candidates who confused the BACS process with the benefits of banking *per se*, and candidates who referred to the deduction of tax and national insurance, again outside the remit of this question.

**4c** Very few candidates had an accurate knowledge of the Working Time Regulations. Most candidates gained one or two marks but this was often due to inspired guesswork rather than preparation for this part of the question.

**5a** Most candidates offered a valid disadvantage, typically “lost” or “stolen”. A minority erroneously believe that laptop computers are incapable of being connected to a network or gaining access to network resources such as printers.

**5b** Most candidates could offer a valid security risk, often “lost” or “stolen” again. A minority did not understand the expression “security risk” and so got the answer wrong.

**5c** Candidates who understood what pirated software is usually gained one or two marks. Better responses focussed on the consequences of breaking the Copyright Designs and Patents Act. Weaker candidates confused pirated software with pirated DVDs and videos and discussed the poor quality of software, usually gaining no credit for so doing.

**5d** Most candidates were ill prepared for this question. Many candidates confused a software audit with a virus check. Most candidates who gained full marks did so because they understood that a software audit was needed to ensure compliance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, and could state three actions that needed to be taken as part of the audit. Many candidates appeared to understand that other types of software audit are also possible.

**6a** Most candidates only gained one or two marks for this part of the question. There was a surprising lack of knowledge about what DTP software is, with some candidates believing that software programs such as Excel came into this category. Most candidates were unable to assess the suitability of the specific software and instead gave answers that referred to using computers *per se*. These candidates gained few, if any, marks. Level 3 marks were awarded to the minority of candidates who concluded that DTP software was either more or less suitable for this task than other types of software, for example word processing software. Centres are reminded that the specification asks candidates to be able to “evaluate software and systems for different purposes in specified situations”.

**6b** Most candidates gained one mark for suggesting that the file be password protected. Very few gained full marks.

**6ci** Weak knowledge of key fields meant that many candidates guessed incorrectly that the field was a poor choice because “London is not a town” or more worryingly that “Oldham is not a town, it is a small village”. Very few candidates recognised that ID would make a more suitable key field.

**6cii** This was well answered. Candidates have good knowledge of why databases are useful in this instance. Candidates who gained less than full marks typically did so because they gave a list of benefits without any explanation of them.

**7a** This was poorly answered. Candidates suffered from a lack of knowledge. Most confused e-procurement with on-line shopping and scored three or four marks for general analysis that applied to both methods. Level 3 marks were awarded to candidates who typically could justify why e-procurement was important to a business, or who could justify their choice of the factors which were important for it to be a success.

**7b** Most candidates struggled to give answers from the perspective of the software manufacturer. Many candidates thought that the software manufacturer was the customer, not the provider of the call centre service.

**8a** Most candidates gained good marks for this part of the question. Weaker answers typically explained the benefits to the staff rather than the business.

**8b** Most candidates could identify relevant benefits and drawbacks but few could explain how these points would impact on the business. Only a small minority of candidates could justify whether the company was correct to hire a consultant for this project.

**8c** This was poorly answered. Most candidates did not know what project planning software is. Some confused it with diary management software. Others guessed that the word ‘project’ was a reference to presentation software. Correct references to Gantt Charts and other features were

a rarity. Centres are reminded of the list of software on page 21 of the specification of which candidates should either have experience or knowledge.

**9** This was a well answered question. Most candidates could explain how consultations could affect the business, typically through improvements in motivation and better decision making, or through loss of output caused by the meetings. A typical Level 3 answer would then justify why businesses either should or should not hold regular staff consultations.

**10** This was poorly answered, although almost all candidates gained at least two marks for their knowledge of specific actions that the business would need to take in order to comply with health and safety legislation. Only a small minority were able to describe how this would impact on the business, for example in terms of increased costs. Very few of these candidates could evaluate this impact, for example by offering a justification of why compliance with health and safety legislation is important for businesses.

### Principal Moderator's Report, 1950/3

It was pleasing to see further new Centres entered this year together with the diversity of candidate, particularly in relation to vocational study. It is apparent from the quality of work submitted that even the weaker candidates who are entered for this particular specification take pride in completing the tasks. However, there is evidence from the work of some candidates that some Centres do not provide sufficient guidance and this matter must be addressed urgently.

There were again instances where summary mark sheets (CCS187) were not attached to each candidate's work and were either incorrectly totalled or it was impossible to read the figures. It is vital that these are completed correctly to assist in the moderation process. Please note that an electronic copy is available from the OCR website. It is important that Centres allocate sufficient time to complete all administration correctly otherwise this has a detrimental effect on the moderation process.

Regrettably there are still Centres who are submitting extra work eg Coursework Instructions, practice material, annotated printouts of research carried out in relation to the logo etc. This is unnecessary and leads to work having to be returned to Centres in order that the work to be moderated can be found.

It would prove beneficial to the moderation process if coursework could be annotated in relation to the allocation of marks. Where possible, candidates should also show their file name and path on each piece of work as per coursework instructions.

It would prove beneficial if addresses throughout were changed to the locality of the Centre. This would assist candidates particularly in relation to Task 3.

If Centres have made any approved changes to their Coursework Instructions these **must be** sent to the moderator.

Please note that MS1 forms should be sent to the moderator not to OCR. This can delay the moderation process significantly.

If regrettably the work of your Centre is returned for remarking, where necessary, your moderator will provide appropriate guidance. Please note that the work of **all** your candidates **must be remarked** and the appropriate CW/AMEND form completed to show **all** the marks of your Centre. This should be returned with your original sample to the moderator.

#### Assessment Objective 1

Care must be taken when "part of tasks omitted" as this has an immediate effect on the allocation of marks for Assessment Objective 3.

#### Task 2

If the 5 extra completed copies of the Client Registration Form are not included then "part of tasks omitted."

## **Assessment Objective 2**

### **Task 1**

The logo completed in Task 1 (a) should measure **no more** than 5 cm by 4 cm and include **text and graphics**. There were instances where these were incorrect and yet one mark was awarded. There were also instances where candidates had used logos from established companies. This is against the Copyright Designs and Patents Act and therefore should not be used.

There were instances where web addresses were used instead of an e-mail address.

There were many instances where a name and job title was not included on the business card. This would be standard business practice and therefore candidates should be penalised as the business card does not “meet requirements.”

### **Task 2**

There were instances where brackets had been used incorrectly for tick boxes and subsequently marks awarded incorrectly. Please note that the Client Registration form should be A4 size.

### **Task 3**

As this task is to be used as a data source for the mail merge in Task 4, Centres should ensure candidates use an appropriate structure. This would avoid any problems at a later stage.

There were many instances where candidates were awarded marks incorrectly. Task 3 (a) should include the original details from Resource Sheet 1 plus the 5 extra client details gained from the completed Client Registration Forms and should not be in alphabetical order. There were instances where the 5 extra copies of the Client Registration Form had not been submitted. All other printouts should be in alphabetical order and Task 3d should be a selective printout. It is expected that candidates should manipulate software to allow for all details to appear on one page.

### **Task 4**

There were many instances where a “suitable e-mail” had not been completed. Candidates **must** provide a screen shot as evidence of the e-mail they have created.

There were instances where queries/filters had been carried out for **either June or July**. These **must be** carried out for both **June and July**, if not, marks should not be awarded. This should yield 4 results from the original data.

The mail merge **must be** created using the data source created in Task 3 (c) and it is expected that candidates use the letter heading created in Task 1 for this purpose.

### **Task 5**

There were instances where the report did not contain a “suitable graphic.” It is expected that all details eg axes labels, legends, etc are appropriately displayed.

The advertisement **must be** no bigger than A5 size.

## **Task 6**

Candidates should produce evidence of research from the Internet in relation to the agencies in their area by copying over details, not produce a word processed list of companies and addresses. Some candidates provided unnecessary excessive research. As a guide it is recommended that candidates provide evidence of 5 different agencies from each town/city, and research 4/5 different towns/cities.

There were instances where graphics chosen were inappropriate and hyperlinks were difficult to identify. It would be particularly useful to the moderation process, if Centres could annotate this particular piece of work.

The majority of candidates are now hyper linking to their Client Registration Form. However, the Report created in Task 5 **must be** included in the web site and not hyper linked, and should be amended appropriately for publication on the web site.

It is not acceptable to include extra printouts of Task 2 and 5 with the website. There must be evidence to show that these tasks are a part of the website.

## **Assessment Objective 3**

Many Centres are misinterpreting the term "mailable standard" and as such marks are being incorrectly awarded.

## **Task 1**

Documents cannot be of "mailable standard" if:-

The name, address and details have been changed from one document to another.  
"www" used for an e-mail address.

No name or job title included on the business card.

The letter heading takes up too much space on the page.

If these types of errors occur work cannot be classed as "of mailable standard" and full marks should not be awarded.

## **Task 2**

There were instances where candidates from the same Centre provided Client Registration Forms which were of the same design. Candidates need to be given the opportunity to provide evidence to show their own design ability.

The coursework instructions state "the Client Registration Form should be based on Resource Sheet 1" and if candidates do not follow this instruction then full marks cannot be awarded for AO3. It also creates difficulties when inputting data into Task 3.

There were instances where candidates provided Client Registration Forms that spanned three to four pages. This is unnecessary and in some cases actually creates more errors.

### **Task 3**

There were many instances where the proofreading by Centres in relation to input errors was very poor and regrettably full marks subsequently awarded. Common errors were – no initial capitals, Jasbinder Lali the incorrect way round, many incorrect spellings of Mansfield, Crescent to name but a few and the telephone field set up incorrectly. If printouts contain errors the maximum mark available is one mark.

There were instances where the width of columns had not been adjusted to show all the data. Work cannot be marked or moderated correctly if it is not visible.

As this task is to be used as the data source for Task 4, candidates should not enter all data as capitals and should ensure that the data is set up in such a way that it can be successfully used in the mail merge ie appropriately splitting the various lines of the address. Please note that if printouts are missing, ie the mark for AO1 is 0 then the mark for AO3 should also be 0.

### **Task 4**

If any part of the task is missing then the work is “incomplete” and no marks should be awarded. However, if any part is inadequate then the maximum should be two marks. Many Centres were generous in relation to the allocation of marks for this objective. Many e-mails were poorly presented – candidates producing letters rather than e-mails and providing insufficient evidence to show that it was an e-mail. There must be a correct address on the e-mail and a subject. A screenshot **must be** provided to show e-mail structure.

Mail merge letters were often incorrect – Many candidates did not provide a correct salutation by inserting in the merge codes ‘Dear First name Surname’ instead of ‘Dear First name’ or ‘Dear Title Surname’; the name and address was placed on one line and there was evidence of inconsistent display. Centres need to ensure that they are using “conventions of style.” An addressee must be provided and only one copy of the standard document and one copy of a merged letter must be submitted.

### **Task 5**

The majority of candidates produced reports using a report layout. However, some candidates did not state who the report was being written for. There was no introduction or conclusion and the report often continued on to several pages displaying A4 size graphs and charts. These graphs were often poorly displayed showing inadequate axes labels and legends and yet full marks were being awarded.

The advertisement **must be** no bigger than A5 in size.

### **Task 6**

There were some excellent websites submitted. However, there were instances where Centres had been over generous with their allocation of marks.

Annotation in relation to the use of hyper links would be useful to the moderation process.

The Report created in Task 5 **must be** included in the website and not hyperlinked and the introduction and recommendations need to be deleted before inclusion.

Candidates need to ensure that the type of graphics used to enhance their website is suitable and relevant. There were instances of inappropriate graphics used and therefore showing “lack of sophistication.”

## *Report on the Components taken in June 2006*

It is beneficial to candidates to hyper link the Client Registration Form created in Task 2. This alleviates any issues when copying into a different type of document.

There must be evidence provided to show that every page submitted is actually part of the website. Some candidates just provided extra printouts of documents created in Task 2 and Task 5.

If there is **no search** submitted then the maximum mark available is two.

If candidates use a design template they need to ensure they amend all parts of the template.

There were problems of actually reading the content of the website due to the type of software used. In order for moderation to take place evidence **must be** provided to show all details.

### **Task 8**

There were some excellent examples provided of both resources used and filing carried out. However some candidates provided very little evidence of either but were subsequently awarded maximum marks. To achieve maximum marks there must be clear evidence of both, ie a screen shot of their directory/folder together with an explanation of their method of saving and filing work, an explanation of any manual filing carried out and of resources used throughout the completion of the coursework.

There must also be an accurate contents page and/or page numbering. There was also evidence of page numbers being hand written on the contents page and maximum marks being incorrectly awarded.

There were instances where candidates from the same Centre had provided identical Contents Pages. Candidates must be given the opportunity to design their own Contents Pages.

### **Assessment Objective 4**

Candidates should provide reasoned judgements as to why the various percentages have changed over the five years. There were also many instances where candidates did not provide satisfactory conclusions. These were often simplistic and did not contain sufficient detail with reasons for the higher marks. The conclusion should be that the agency needs to promote **employers** for **retail and clerical** posts and this **must be** the focus for the advertisement.



## Task 7

It is suggested that a writing frame be used to assist candidates with regard to this task and that the document is 'ongoing' ie Candidates input information into this task after the satisfactory completion of each Task.

Please note, that the material provided during INSET this year was "guidance material" and as such, it is expected that candidates provide further evidence to warrant full marks. Candidates cannot be awarded full marks when basically copying from the "guidance material."

There were some examples provided of excellent understanding of the wider effects of Business and Communication Systems. However, many candidates provided step-by-step details as to how they had produced/approached each task, which resulted in lengthy reports being submitted. This report gives candidates the opportunity to justify why their work has been presented in such a way and to outline the difficulties they may have encountered. Unfortunately many Centres awarded marks incorrectly when there was very little evidence provided.

An example for Task 3 could be:-

Why would information be sorted into alphabetical order? Why is there a need for selective printouts? Why has the file structure been set up in a particular way? What changes have had to be made to the page setup? Have there been any problems with the particular software chosen?

Guidance in relation to this task is available on the OCR website - [www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

## Assessment Objective 5

Many Centres were lenient in relation to the allocation of marks for this objective. There **must be** evidence provided of a high level of critical reflection in relation to legal, ethical, moral and security issues and this **must** relate to the individual tasks to attain maximum marks.

Many candidates mentioned briefly the Principles of the Data Protection Act but other acts which should be covered are The Computer Misuse Act, Copyright Laws, Sex Discrimination Act, Trade Descriptions Act, Race Relations Act, Equal Opportunities Act and security issues.

An example for Task 3 could be:-

How is the data protected once inputted into the system? – passwords, antivirus software, firewalls, methods of backing up of data, security cameras etc. How the completed Client Registration Forms are kept secure? Why is it necessary to keep data up-to-date? What are the implications of not doing so? What are the implications of selling on data without permission?



**General Certificate of Secondary Education**  
**Business and Communication Systems (1950)**  
**June 2006 Assessment Series**

**Component Threshold Marks**

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	100	n/a	n/a	59	50	42	34	26
2	100	61	51	42	35	n/a	n/a	n/a
3	100	86	75	64	51	39	27	15
83	100	86	75	64	51	39	27	15

**Specification Options**

**Foundation Tier**

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	119	100	81	62	43
Percentage in Grade	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.9	28.5	20.6	13.8	5.9
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.9	57.4	78.0	91.8	97.7

The total entry for the examination was 3073.

**Higher Tier**

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	155	137	119	102	83	73	n/a	n/a
Percentage in Grade	200	5.7	21.2	36.7	31.8	3.9	0.4	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	200	5.7	26.9	63.6	95.4	99.3	99.7	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 2417.

**Overall**

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	2.6	7.8	13.9	28.0	21.7	12.6	7.7	3.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	2.6	10.4	24.3	52.3	74.0	86.6	94.3	97.6

The total entry for the examination was 5564.

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.





**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Information Bureau**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [helpdesk@ocr.org.uk](mailto:helpdesk@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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