

# **Business and Communication Systems**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1950**

## **Report on the Components**

---

**June 2007**

**1950/MS/R/07**

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 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
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	1
1950/01	Paper 1	3
1950/02	Paper 2	7
1950/03	Coursework	11
*	Grade Thresholds	17



## **Chief Examiner's Report**

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.

Regrettably, there was very little response from Centres in relation to the free 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 in relation to 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 GCSE Business and Communication Systems Subject Officer, OCR, Progress House, Westwood Way, Coventry, CV4 8JQ. Please allow a four week turn around time when sending work for consultancy.

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 candidate.

Within the written papers, candidates should be encouraged to answer in the context of the question to gain higher level marks. It would appear that 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 which are either new or thinking of adopting OCR Business and Communication Systems. Details of all INSET provision is available from OCR Customer Service Centre on 01223 553998.



## 1950-01 PE Report 2007

### General Comments

Overall the performance of candidates on this paper was similar to last year.

The number of candidates who appear to have not been fully prepared for this examination is diminishing, but still affects a number of Centres. Some Centres still appear to enter all their candidates for the Higher Tier, where entry for the Foundation Tier would have been more appropriate for many.

There are still many instances of candidates failing to gain marks due to a misreading of the questions. If a question asks candidates to explain the drawbacks to customers, they will score no marks for a list of benefits to the business. Some candidates showed good examination technique by underlining the command words in each question.

Centres are once again reminded that where questions ask candidates to name a particular type of applications software (eg spreadsheet), they will gain no marks for giving a brand name (eg Microsoft Excel or Lotus 1-2-3). The specification requires candidates to have knowledge of types of applications software, not *examples* of software applications.

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, eg sending an email is quicker than sending a letter by post.

### Comments on individual questions

- 1a Virtually all candidates gained full marks for this part of the question.
- 1b Most candidates did not know the name of the Equal Pay Act, though there were numerous close but incorrect guesses.
- 1c Very few candidates were unable to answer this part of the question correctly.
- 1d Generally well answered with some candidates mentioning the Health and Safety at Work Act. Answers mostly referred to damaged equipment, lack of concentration and employees getting hurt.
- 2a A large number of candidates thought that a salary is paid before deductions and a wage is paid afterwards. Many gained one mark for an awareness that a wage is paid weekly, whereas a salary is monthly or annually. Relatively few candidates had a sufficiently clear understanding of the differences to gain full marks.
- 2b Many candidates lost marks by not using terms correctly; “tax” and “insurance” are insufficient without being preceded by “income” and “national”.
- 2c Most candidates gained full marks.

*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

- 2d A worrying minority of candidates were unable to complete this part of the question successfully. The most common difficulty occurred when multiplying 40 by £6. Most candidates appreciated the need to include the £ sign in their final answer and so gained full marks.
- 2e Many candidates lost the first mark by referring to a brand name rather than a type of software. However, their relevant knowledge usually gained the second mark.
- 3a Most candidates gained one or two marks, those who did not gave benefits rather than features. A minority guessed incorrectly that a PDA is equivalent to a Personal Assistant.
- 3b Many candidates had a weak understanding of the term “security risk” and so gave ‘being dropped’ as an (incorrect) answer. Most candidates, however, gained full marks for offering “easy to lose” or “easy to hack into”.
- 3c Very few candidates failed to gain the mark.
- 3d Most candidates gained full marks.
- 4a/b Very poorly answered, candidates typically had either no relevant knowledge or gave a brand name for (b). This is clearly a topic which some candidates had not thought about before.
- 4c/d These questions revealed the weaknesses in many candidates’ examination technique. These candidates generally misread the questions, relating (b) to customers and (c) to the business or in some cases describing drawbacks. However, most candidates who could answer the questions set scored well, with a failure to develop points in (d) being the main weakness.
- 4e Answered well by virtually all candidates, though some did not know or realise the relevance of the Data Protection Act in part (ii).
- 4f Most candidates had the knowledge required to answer this part of the question, though not always the ability to develop their answers to gain more than two marks.
- 5a Most candidates gained full marks though a few failed to spot all five errors.
- 5b Most candidates could give a considered response as to what was *wrong* with using a spreadsheet for this purpose. However, many candidates scored no marks because they claimed disadvantages that a spreadsheet does not possess. Spreadsheets are, for example, capable of including images and different font styles and sizes, as well as hyperlinks. Candidates who claimed these as the drawbacks of using a spreadsheet gained few, if any, marks. A minority of candidates evaluated the choice of software fully, by comparing it with other, more suitable choices, such as a word processor or desk top publishing package. Candidates who gave a valid reason for their choice of alternate software gained full marks.
- 5c This part of the question was generally well answered with most candidates able to complete the memo headings correctly. Some, however, misread the question and gave their own name, others failed to provide a subject. The body of the memo was generally well completed, with a common error being a mistranscription of the email address. Some candidates who perhaps were unprepared for a memo question used a letter structure for the body of their message and so failed to gain full marks.



*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

- 6a Most candidates achieved one or two marks (Level 1) by identifying either the benefits OR drawbacks. Only a few candidates analysed them to achieve 3 or more marks.
- 6b Most candidates achieved only Level 1 (1-2 marks) for a partial evaluation – a discussion of the benefits and drawbacks of the method. Very few gained Level 2 (3-4 marks) for a full evaluation - comparing this method with other security measures, or by suggesting improvements.
- 6c Whilst some candidates clearly knew what a firewall is and could describe its benefits, very few could explain *how* a firewall works and so gain any marks.
- 7 Some Centres had clearly prepared their candidates well for this document production question. It is clear, however, that many Centres had not, with candidates struggling to do more than attempt a version of the required documents. Most candidates scored one or two marks for the Notice and one or two marks for the Agenda. Knowledge of the standard agenda items was generally poor, with many candidates guessing incorrectly or producing letters and memos. Centres are once again reminded that, with sixteen marks for the document production questions, many candidates could improve their total mark greatly, simply by answering these questions correctly.
- 8a Most candidates could describe the benefits and drawbacks of the back-up system (Level 1), but then failed to compare it with other methods or make suggestions for improvement (Level 2).
- 8b Although most candidates knew of two external media, some lost marks for suggesting inappropriate media (floppy disks, CD-ROMs) or for suggesting drives not disks.
- 9a Most candidates had the knowledge required to gain full marks.
- 9b Many candidates scored no marks because they gave examples of situations (eg to advise of a special offer), not the circumstances which would make those circumstances appropriate (eg where the customer has consented to contact by text).
- 10a Most candidates gained one or two marks. A minority of Centres had prepared candidates well for this part of the question by enabling them to understand the five points included in this topic on the specification.
- 10b Most candidates scored full marks.



## 1950-02 PE Report 2007

### General Comments

Overall the performance of candidates on this paper was similar to last year.

The number of candidates who appear to have not been fully prepared for this examination is diminishing, but still affects a number of Centres. Some Centres still appear to enter all their candidates for the Higher Tier, where entry for the Foundation Tier would have been more appropriate for many.

There are still many instances of candidates failing to gain marks due to a misreading of the questions. If a question asks candidates to explain the drawbacks to customers, they will score no marks for a list of benefits to the business. Some candidates showed good examination technique by planning their responses to six mark questions and by underlining the command words in each question.

Centres are once again reminded that where questions ask candidates to name a particular type of applications software (eg spreadsheet), they will gain no marks for giving a brand name (eg Microsoft Excel or Lotus 1-2-3). The specification requires candidates to have knowledge of types of applications software, not *examples* of software applications.

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, eg 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 (eg Q9b) but who are not awarded Level 3 (five to six marks). This is typically because these candidates either offer an unsupported conclusion (eg “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 (eg “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 (eg “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.

<b>Comments on individual questions</b>	
1	Most candidates had the knowledge required to gain full marks.
2a	Most candidates had good knowledge of this part of the question but only a minority discussed the points made (Level 2) and very few evaluated their responses (Level 3).
2b	Most candidates gained one or two marks. A minority of Centres had prepared candidates well for this question by enabling them to understand the five points included in this topic on the specification.
2c	Very few candidates knew what project-planning software is, despite it being in the specification.
2d	Most candidates could give a considered response as to what was <i>wrong</i> with using a spreadsheet for this purpose. However, many candidates scored no marks because they claimed disadvantages that a spreadsheet does not possess. Spreadsheets are, for example, capable of including images and different font styles and sizes, as well as hyperlinks. Candidates who claimed these as the drawbacks of using a spreadsheet gained few, if any, marks. A minority of candidates evaluated the choice of software fully, by comparing it with other, more suitable choices, such as a word processor or desk top publishing package. Candidates who gave a valid reason for their choice of alternate software gained full marks.
2e	Most candidates gained full marks by identifying four valid actions which a user would need to take. Some candidates misunderstood the question and described how a digital drawing could be created from scratch.
3a	Most candidates achieved three or four marks (Level 2) by analysing either the benefits OR drawbacks. Only a few candidates did both and so reached Level 3.
3b	Most candidates achieved only Level 1 (1-2 marks) for a partial evaluation – a discussion of the benefits and drawbacks of the method. Very few gained Level 2 (3-4 marks) for a full evaluation - comparing this method with other security measures, or by suggesting improvements.
3c	Whilst many candidates clearly knew what a firewall is and could describe its benefits, very few could explain <i>how</i> a firewall works and so gain any marks.
4a	Some Centres had clearly prepared their candidates well for the document production question. It is clear, however, that many Centres had not, with candidates struggling to do more than attempt a version of the required documents. Most candidates score one or two marks for the Notice and one or two marks for the Agenda. Knowledge of the standard agenda items was generally poor, with many candidates guessing incorrectly or producing letters and memos. Centres are once again reminded that, with eight marks for this question, many candidates could improve their total mark greatly, simply by answering this question correctly.
4b	Most candidates gained good marks for this part of the question, though many did not explain how the actions would improve the conduct of the meeting.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

5a	Most candidates could describe the benefits and drawbacks of the back-up system (Level 1), but then failed to compare it with other methods or make suggestions for improvement (Level 2).
5b	Although most candidates knew of two external media, some lost marks for suggesting inappropriate media (floppy disks, CD-ROMs) or for suggesting drives not disks.
5c	Many candidates scored no marks because they gave examples of situations (eg to advise of a special offer), not the circumstances which would make those circumstances appropriate (eg where the customer has consented to contact by text).
6a	Many candidates scored no marks because they answered in the context of job-related training (either on- or off-the-job).
6b	This part of the question was generally answered poorly, with many candidates discussing drawbacks to Anne or failing to develop points.
6c	Most candidates achieved Level 2 by being able to develop their good knowledge of this topic. Very few, however, offered an evaluation as to whether it was something the organisation should encourage or discourage.
7a	Some candidates confused this with a trade union and referred to strike action. Very few were aware that the committee would also include representatives from the organisation's management.
7b	Generally poorly answered. Most incorrect answers stemmed from candidates assuming that meetings were either compulsory, outside working hours, or unpaid.
8a	This part of the question was poorly answered by most candidates who knew their right to access personal data under data protection legislation, but not the circumstances in which they are entitled to exercise this right.
8b	Many candidates misunderstood the question and continued to discuss data protection legislation. Those who answered the question set gained one or two marks, but very few could say more than "seek permission when copying". Many candidates were mistaken in the belief that organisations are <i>required by law</i> to copyright their own intellectual property.
9a	Most candidates gained one or two marks for identifying how the reference could make it easier to file and retrieve documents but very few explained how or why. Some candidates believed that this was the only way either the organisation or the recipient could identify the properties of the document, whilst others confused the reference with a mail-merge field code.
9b	Most candidates could discuss how paper filing systems are bulky and less efficient than electronic systems and so gain Level 2. Some candidates, however, merely discussed the benefits of keeping any type of copy, regardless of its medium, and so gained few if any marks. Once again for a six mark 'assess' question, very few candidates evaluated their responses to achieve Level 3.

*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

10	Most candidates knew what a WAP phone was and what its functions are. Very few candidates, however, answered the question as set on the paper. Those who did generally scored between two and three marks depending on whether they developed the points made. Many simply confused senior with elderly, many others appeared to assume that senior staff would <i>per se</i> have difficulty understanding how to use such a complex piece of technology and that it would “confuse” and “demotivate” them.
----	--

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

It was pleasing to see further new Centres examined 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 which 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 for your Centre. This should be returned with the original sample to the moderator.

### **Assessment Objective 1**

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

#### **Task 2**

If the five extra completed copies of the Client Registration Form are not included then “part of tasks omitted” must be indicated.

### **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 that 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 five extra client details gained from the completed Client Registration Forms and should not be in alphabetical order. There were instances where the five extra copies of the Client Registration Form had not been submitted. All other printouts should be in alphabetical order and Task 3(d) 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 four 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 five different agencies from each town/city, and research four/five 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 Tasks 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 A03. It also creates difficulties when inputting data into Task 3.

There were instances where candidates provided Client Registration Forms which spanned three-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 zero then the mark for AO3 should also be zero.

### **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 for whom the report was being written. There was no introduction or conclusion and the report often continued onto 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 a “lack of sophistication.”

## *Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

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 marks.

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 was the case that a writing frame was suggested to assist candidates with regard to this task, but such an approach is no longer acceptable under the guidelines for the completion of coursework issued by the Joint Council for Qualifications but Centres still need to be aware that the document is 'ongoing' and that candidates should 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.

*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

Unfortunately, many Centres awarded marks incorrectly when there was very little evidence provided.

*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

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.

**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, as well as 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 are the completed Client Registration Forms 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 2007 Assessment Series**

**Component Threshold Marks**

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	100	n/a	n/a	64	55	47	39	31
2	100	58	49	40	32	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	127	107	87	68	49
Percentage in Grade	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	27.0	27.6	23.8	13.1	5.8
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	27.0	54.6	78.4	91.5	97.3

The total entry for the examination was 2690.

**Higher Tier**

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	150	133	116	99	76	69	n/a	n/a
Percentage in Grade	200	5.5	17.1	31.7	25.5	16.1	2.1	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	200	5.5	22.6	54.3	79.8	95.9	98.0	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 2410.

**Overall**

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	2.7	8.2	18.2	26.3	22.0	13.2	6.8	3.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	2.7	10.9	26.4	52.7	74.7	87.9	94.7	97.7

The total entry for the examination was 5114.

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.



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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@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**

© OCR 2007