

# **Design & Technology (Food Technology)**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1954**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **GCSE 1054**

## **Report on the Components**

---

**June 2007**

**1954/1054/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.

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 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 Food Technology (1954)

### General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) Food Technology (1054)

#### REPORTS ON THE COMPONENTS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
1054/03 1954/05	Coursework Coursework	3
1054/01 1954/01	Paper 1 (Foundation)	11
1054/02 1954/02	Paper 2 (Higher)	13
1954/03	Paper 3 (Foundation)	15
1954/04	Paper 4 (Higher)	19
*	Grade Thresholds	21

### **Chief Examiners Comments**

During the assessment of the Specification the standard achieved by some candidates in the coursework was a little disappointing but the level of achievement in the examination papers continues to be of a similar standard as last year.

The Principal Examiners identified a number of centres where candidates had been entered for the wrong tier. Centres need to consider carefully, the appropriate tier of entry for each candidate. Highlighting key words in a question would help candidates focus on the requirements of the question, as would, careful reading of the questions, before attempting to offer a response.

Overall the standard of coursework was not as good as previous years with an increase in the number of centres requiring adjustments. The detailed report produced by the Principal Moderator clearly outlines the requirements for each objective and highlights where issues relating to inaccurate assessment arose. Centres are encouraged to read the report and if possible attend the training sessions offered by OCR in order to clarify any problem areas. Evaluations in Assessment Objectives 2, 3 and 4 and consideration of the possibilities and implications of quantity manufacture still remain the weakest areas within the coursework project. However, many candidates are now producing the required Product Specification at the conclusion of Assessment Objective 4.

## **REPORT ON COMPONENT 5 COURSEWORK**

### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

Generally the standard of presentation continues to improve by most candidates organising their folders into the separate objectives. A4 work is now rarely sent in ring binders, however a number of centres send work in thick plastic folders making the parcels very heavy. Some Centres are still submitting work where each objective is in a separate plastic wallet. This is very time consuming for the Moderator and makes it difficult to look back at previous objectives during the moderation process. Centres need to label coursework clearly with both the candidates name and number. Generally, folders are more concise, but some candidates are still including vast amounts of irrelevant research.

Overall, the standard of coursework projects this year was not as good as previous years and there was an increase in the numbers of Centres requiring adjustments. Possible reasons for this: -

- the Levels of Response in the Assessment Objectives had been interpreted too leniently
- incorrect interpretation of the assessment criteria

The Specification requires candidates to produce a product that can be batch produced and marketed. Candidates are required to discuss why batch production is a suitable method in Assessment Objective 4.

When developing the product the candidate needs to consider the implications for quantity manufacture. This should involve the candidate in the development and use of a control system that will ensure consistency over a small batch production run.

It is not sufficient for the candidate to state how this could be done or how industry would do it. To score the higher mark ranges in Assessment Objective 4 and Assessment Objective 6, the candidate is asked to analyse the performance of the product and the planned control system in the manufacture of the product.

Most Centres are using Board set tasks which allow candidates the opportunity to design and make a quality Food Technology product. However, some Centres are devising their own and in some cases these are too prescriptive and do not allow the candidates the opportunity to investigate the situation or the user. The task needs to be evident at the front of the folder.

There continues to be lack of written evidence in some candidates' folders of the adaptations/modifications to the recipes being trialled in Assessment Objective 3. Clearly, this is not within the philosophy of Design and Technology. Candidates should be encouraged to use their own ideas creatively throughout the whole design and make process.

Candidates continue to demonstrate good use of ICT, not only in the production of questionnaires, graphs, packaging designs, photographic evidence, etc. but in word processing the whole folder.

The presentation of work is a very important aspect of the project. To achieve high marks candidates need to present their ideas adeptly in a logical and concise way. An increasing number of candidates are using A4 paper and whilst Moderators saw some very good A3 folders, there are still a number of candidates who present very little information on a page, consequently not meeting the criteria required for presenting the work concisely.

The following are not required: -

Objective 2: -

- information on HACCP and commercial production methods
- criteria relating to packaging in the design specification

Objective 3: -

- packaging designs
- method of making and lists of equipment

Objective 5

- a model of the packaging

## **APPLICATION OF ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

The level of response is an important part of the mark scheme and should be carefully considered when assessing candidates work. The levels should equate to the quality of the evidence, the capability and depth of involvement that has been employed to produce what is on offer. Within an Assessment Objective the quality of evidence to fulfil a particular level of response at a lower level must be very different from the evidence that might fulfil a similar level of response at a higher level. The capability and depth of involvement must be evident to gain the marks at the higher level. The mark scheme continues to be misinterpreted by a number of centres. Moderators once again noted a number of candidates using structured proforma sheets produced by teachers. Whilst these are useful for weaker candidates they limit the initiative and individuality often shown by high-attaining candidates.

Moderators were very appreciative of the Centres who had annotated the work in detail. This greatly assisted the moderation process.

The procedures for annotation of candidates' work are outlined in paragraph 7.4 of the specification.

"The sample of work which is submitted to the Moderator for moderation must show how the marks have been awarded in relation to the internal assessment objectives defined in Section 7.3 of the specification".

If it is not clear within a coursework project folder where the marks have been awarded by the candidates' own presentation of work, annotation must be carried out by the teacher marking the work.

A separate cover sheet containing reference to the criteria applied and their location within the project is recommended.

There must also be written teacher comments of the practical work carried out during Assessment Objectives 3, 4 and 5, and a photograph of the final product. When this is included, it is helpful in checking marks for Assessment Objective 5, particularly for the lower attaining candidates where there is little written evidence in their folders. There are still too many centres sending work without teacher comments and although there was an increase in the number of centres making good use of a digital camera, a few centres are still providing very little evidence of the practical marking, in some cases only a final mark was given, without the necessary photographic evidence. This clearly does not help the moderation process.

## ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE 1

- Many Centres continue to use a questionnaire to identify a need/target group but in some cases the Design Brief does not arise from the findings of research.
- Many candidates do not justify their choice of target group.
- Centres are still crediting candidates with full marks when there is little supportive evidence for the choice of the design brief and when a precise design brief has not been given.

**A high level of response to this section would include:**

- **carrying out the necessary research to provide a detailed description of both the situation and the user(s) e.g. through questionnaires, statistical information. Questionnaires should be structured so they allow candidates to identify a need/opportunity; target group;**
- **providing a detailed analysis of the results in order to identify the need/opportunity, target group, which then leads to a clear and precise design brief of a marketable product.**

Weaker candidates tended to offer information which was not specific to the task and/or showed little evidence of consideration of the user and the situation, resulting in rather vague briefs, with no reference being made to the research. This would be regarded as a low level of response.

The final product needs to be one that can be sold 'off the shelf' and the many candidates are now adhering to this by including the word 'marketable' in their design brief. A few candidates this year had presented their design brief as a long and wordy "mini-specification", whereas others had been too specific e.g. "design and make a pizza", both limited the marks that could be achieved in the following assessment objectives.

Candidates need to be encouraged to present a clear and concise design brief.

**For example: - Design and make a marketable lower in fat product aimed at teenagers.**

Centres are advised to include a copy of the task at the beginning of each candidate's work.

**For the Short Course;**

- The questionnaires do not need to be distributed to a very large group of people, this in turn will reduce the work required when analysing responses.
- The design brief could be a little more focussed from the outset. This would allow the investigation and generation of design solutions to be more focused (Assessment Objectives 2 and 3) which in turn will reduce the complexity of the work required for Product Development (Assessment Objective 4). However care must be taken not to limit the range of practical skills that the candidate can demonstrate.

## ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE 2

- Research into the design brief, which results in a design specification, needs to be explained carefully to candidates. It is essential that they have sufficient direction and focus for their work through an analysis of what needs to be done so that data identified and collected is relevant to the design brief.
- Data had been identified and collected showing signs that some candidates are becoming more selective in the information they include in this section of their work. There were some good examples of packaging and labelling information but many candidates this year

made no reference at all to packaging and labelling and environmental issues were frequently omitted.

- Most candidates choose to carry out a questionnaire to identify the needs of the user but often these were not focused therefore, not allowing candidates to identify the qualities respondents require from a new product. This resulted in existing products not being evaluated against identified needs and the design specification not being developed from analysis of the research.
- In a number of Centres all candidates used the same proforma chart and looked at the same 6 products, irrespective of their design brief. In some cases products are evaluated in the form of a table with no conclusions drawn from the results. Detailed evaluation of 2 products was seen by some moderators but a number commented that evaluations of the 2 products tended to be very limited and superficial. Centres are still encouraging candidates to evaluate packaging and more emphasis is placed on this than evaluating the products.
- The quality of design specifications varied widely. Some candidates produced very detailed design specifications which covered all the required aspects, other design specifications were far too brief and in some cases, they tended to be teacher led. Making reference to a system to ensure control over the production of the product in quantity is still being omitted from the design specification by a number of candidates.

**A high level of response to this section would involve;**

- **fully examining the intended use of the product with relevant data identified and collected;**
- **carrying out market research to identify users' needs;**
- **identifying and evaluating existing products against the needs of the intended user(s);**
- **analysing all the research before developing a detailed design specification that shows consideration of a system to control production of the product in quantity.**

**For the Short Course:**

The number of existing products to be evaluated does not need to be too extensive, but the products chosen must be relevant to the design brief and be evaluated in depth.

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE 3**

For marks to be awarded in Assessment Objective 5 there must be evidence of:

- forward planning;
- teacher comments on the practical work;

so that marks can be awarded to Assessment Objective 5.

- The standard of forward planning continues to be varied. Many Centres had not encouraged candidates to show evidence of forward planning and sometimes when this was completed, plans were far too superficial. Candidates need to show evidence of planning so marks can be awarded in Assessment Objective 5.
- Some candidates still continue to choose products that show little or no skills or only allow them to show the same skills, some only chose to trial 3 products, therefore limiting their level of achievement in Assessment Objective 5. This year, a number of Moderators



commented that candidates were choosing to trial products that showed no relevance to the design brief or specification.

- A number of Centres are still failing to encourage their candidates to adapt or modify original recipes to fit their design specification and to record the proposed changes.
- Some candidates had trialled and tested a wide range of interesting solutions. There was good evidence of star diagrams/profiles and rating charts but marks were lost if these results were not always explained or conclusions drawn.
- Providing detailed evaluations of solutions against the specification was the weakest area in this Objective for many candidates. Evaluations were often cursory with only a ticked chart and this cannot be considered a detailed evaluation. Some candidates had evaluated each solution but then failed to make any reference to the specification.
- Nutritional analysis of the trialled products was varied. Marks were lost if there was little evidence of the analysis or reference to the analysis in their evaluations. Nutritional analysis for this assessment objective only needs to be carried out if it is appropriate to the design brief.
- Costing of products continues to be an area that needs further improvement. Some candidates are failing to show any evidence of costing and others produce evidence that is very superficial and/or inaccurate.
- Explanation of the final design proposal is once again a weak area and candidates who had scored highly gave well thought out and detailed proposals, but in other projects there was no evidence of a proposal. A number of candidates had stated why they were going to develop a product but had not explained why other ideas had been rejected.
- It was pleasing to note that some candidates had continued to use a wide range of appropriate techniques to present their design solutions.

**A high level response to this section would involve:**

- **Proposing a wide range of appropriate solutions – three for the Short Course, four (if the products are complex) to six for the Full Course, with detailed evaluation against the specification, consideration of the need and fitness for purpose.**
- **Using a wide range of appropriate techniques to present solutions.**
- **Giving detailed evidence to support choice of final design proposal and explaining why other possible solutions were rejected.**

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE 4**

There was again great variation in the standard of work submitted for this objective. Some centres have now adapted effectively to the specification with all the required elements achieved. In Centres where this Assessment Objective was done well, candidates showed detailed: -

- trialling and testing with all modifications/adaptations to the product clearly explained with reasons – e.g. changes to ingredients, shape, size, decorations, coatings or cooking methods.
- evaluations highlighting the success/failure of the modifications and any further changes needed to ensure success before arriving at detailed explanations for their final decisions.
- costing and nutritional analysis was evident although once again these were not always referred to in the evaluations.
- nutritional analysis during the development of the product is only required if appropriate to the brief but all candidates must analyse the nutritional content of their final product.

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

- Many candidates did not show any reference to comments made in Objective 3 (when the chosen product was originally trialled), during the first development and showed lack of justification and reference to testers views when carrying out further modifications. Consequently, the product was not developed according to user(s) needs. Some candidates developed more than one product. Candidates did not gain marks if they had decided on developments at the beginning of Assessment Objective 4.
- Evaluations in this objective often lacked the necessary detail to be awarded high marks.
- Reasons for choice of materials had improved this year.
- Written evidence of an effective control system for the product was evident in many candidates' projects, although some candidates continue to produce controls that are vague and not specific to the product.
- Consideration of the possibilities and implications of quantity manufacture still remains a weak area in many centres. Candidates must show a good understanding of the requirements to gain marks. Frequently, projects reflected lack of understanding and evidence of scaling up, accurate costing of the final product and quantity manufacture did not always refer to batch production or the possible use of pre-manufactured components. Moderators did report an improvement in the depth and quality of product specifications. However some candidates still need to distinguish more clearly between the design and product specification.

It is important that within this assessment objective there is evidence of;

- teacher comments on the practical work so that marks can be awarded to Assessment Objective 5.

**A high level of response to this section would involve candidates:**

- **Carrying out the appropriate testing and trialling – (development on at least one occasion for the Short Course, with the second occasion being the final product. Development on at least two occasions for the Full Course, with the third occasion being the final product. ) to:**
- **identify necessary modifications for the product to meet the design brief;**
- **arrive at reasoned decisions about materials, production methods and manufactured items.**
- **providing full details about the final solution and an effective control system for the product to be produced in quantity manufacture.**
- **considering the possibilities and implications of producing their product in quantity.**
- **designing a detailed product specification.**
- **using a wide range of appropriate techniques to present the final solution.**

Centres who had given clear guidance allowed candidates to score well in this Assessment Objective.

### **ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE 5**

- In the best submission, forward planning was thorough and specified an effective order of work (Assessment Objectives 3) and the flowchart for the final product was detailed. High marks cannot be awarded if forward planning is missing from Assessment Objective 3.
- Some candidates are producing products that demonstrate a wide range of skills, but it was noticeable that an increased number of Centres are crediting candidates with high marks without evidence of this range of skills or for demonstrating complex skills. Lack or incomplete comments from the teacher about the practical work, comments which do not correspond to the work documented in the candidate's folder, or when the mark given does not match the annotation of the practical sessions, do not assist the moderation process. There are still too many Centres providing little or no written comments.
- The wider use of digital cameras has allowed more candidates to include photographs of their work in Assessment Objectives 3, 4 and the final product. Centres are reminded that the minimum requirement is a photograph of the final product.
- A final design proposal for the packaging was evident in many candidates' projects but often these were not presented to a high standard. Some candidates' design lacked colour and detail, being no more than a net with spaces for nutritional information etc. therefore were incomplete. Candidates cannot be awarded full marks for the quality of the final product if the packaging is incomplete.

#### **A high level response to this section would be:**

- **Providing evidence of forward planning (Assessment Objectives 3);**
- **Producing a detailed flowchart, including their control system.**
- **Being resourceful and adaptable with materials, foods and equipment.**
- **Independently combining a range of skills and techniques appropriate to the task.**
- **Showing a high understanding of safe working procedures.**
- **Producing a product (food and packaging design) to a high standard that meets the requirements of the specification.**

### **ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE 6**

- Moderators noted some good evidence of testing of the final product but conclusions, were often superficial and unsupported, resulting in the evaluations being descriptive rather than evaluative.
- Many candidates are still evaluating against the **Design Specification** rather than the **Product Specification** and comments continue to lack specific detail stating that the product has met the specification without any justification.
- Suggesting proposals for further developments, modifications or improvements for the product had improved this year.
- A few Centres continue to misinterpret the marking criteria for this Assessment Objective resulting in candidates not confining their comments to the final product. They tended to discuss the use of time and resources for the whole project and, in some cases evaluated each objective in turn.
- The evaluation should also include a review of the performance of the control system so it could be used to enable the product to be manufactured in quantity.

**A high level of response to this section would be:**

- **Critically evaluating their product against the product specification, initial design brief and use of resources.**
- **Carrying out detailed testing (more than one person and they should be possible users) with meaningful conclusions.**
- **Suggesting proposals for further development, modifications or improvements for both the product and control system.**

**PRESENTATION**

A number of centres are still awarding high marks for presentation when the work is not presented in a logical and concise way.

**GOOD PRACTICE WITHIN ADMINISTRATION OF THE COURSEWORK**

- (a) Work should be removed from ring binders, presented so that pages can be turned without having to remove sheets from plastic wallets and securely fastened together e.g. by means of a tag, then clearly labelled with Centre Number, Name and Candidate Number. Mark sheet/annotation sheet should be attached to each piece of work.
- (b) Where questionnaires have been carried out by candidates, only one exemplar questionnaire is needed once the work is called for moderation
- (c) Candidates need to be encouraged to present their work concisely e.g. present graphs on 1 or 2 pages.
- (d) There were far too many clerical errors this year. The transference and addition of marks on the Coursework Assessment Sheets need to be checked thoroughly to reduce the amount of paper work sent to Centres for amendment. If an amend form is sent this should be returned to the Moderator as quickly as possible. A HB pencil should be used to complete the MS1 and teachers initials should be used to clearly distinguish the different teaching groups.
- (e) The Coursework Assessment Sheet(s) should be sent to the Moderator with the MS1. Centres need to make sure that this paperwork arrives to the Moderator by the date specified by OCR and Coursework Projects should be sent within 3 days of receipt of the request for the sample.
- (f) A copy of the task(s) should be included with the sample.
- (g) Encourage the candidates to divide their work under headings for the separate Assessment Objectives.
- (h) Centres who provide effective annotation greatly help the moderation process. The standard of annotation is improving, but it is still poor and in some cases non-existent.
- (i) Where more than 1 teacher is involved in the assessing of candidates work, the centre should carry out effective internal standardisation to ensure a reliable rank order.

## 1954 Papers 1 and 2 General comments

The overall performance of candidates was good. The standard for both papers was similar to 2006. There is still some evidence of candidates being entered for the wrong tier, these candidates struggled with their understanding of English, reading the questions and subject knowledge. Some candidates continue to repeat part of the question in their answer therefore having insufficient space to complete detailed responses. Candidates need to read the questions carefully. Candidates need to consider how many marks are awarded to each part of a question and to understand the command words, particularly the words explain and discuss. When questions ask candidates to explain or discuss, simply writing a statement is a low level response, with marks being awarded accordingly. There was very little evidence of candidates highlighting the key words of a question before answering it. Candidates need to practise answering questions during the course.

On the Foundation paper most candidates attempted all the questions. However it is clear that many candidates did not have an understanding of job production. The quality of the drawings in the design based question was poor; very few original designs were seen. Those candidates who made use of colour and annotation seemed to spend longer on the questions and their scores were notably higher. Candidates should be encouraged to make use of colour when completing design questions.

Towards the end of the question paper some answers lacked the detail to score high marks.

On the Higher paper candidates had a better understanding of job production and candidates responded well to the product evaluation question. However their inability to explain and discuss meant they failed to score high marks on Questions four and five.

## Comments on individual questions

### Foundation Paper 1954 / 01

#### Question 1

- a. Whisk and hand mixer were the most common correct answers. Most candidates answered this correctly and were able to say what the equipment was used for. Most pupils identified the second piece of equipment as a food processor or juicer. Both answers were acceptable. Where candidates did not use the correct term for the equipment they often gave the correct function of the equipment
- b. This part of the question was correctly answered by most candidates. The most common answers given were related to the equipment not being near to water and to switch off after use.
- c. The majority of candidates scored at least one mark. The most common answers related to washing hands and tying hair back. A few candidates discussed kitchen hygiene.
- d. Many candidates gave the correct cleaning tasks. A few candidates gave personal hygiene rules.

#### Question 2

- a.
  - (i) Ham and mayonnaise were the most common correct answers.
  - (ii) Some correct answers were seen but this clearly depended on pupil's knowledge.
  - (iii) It was disappointing to see that many candidates did not know the function of carbohydrates in the diet.
  - (iv) Many candidates gave the correct answer. Some candidates were vague and suggested cold or cool areas, instead of stating a refrigerator.
- b. Most candidates could identify the fridge and freezer temperatures correctly. There were many muddled answers for the safe reheating temperature and the danger zone.

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

- c. There were many correct answers but candidate's lack of technical language was very vague. Cross contamination was rarely seen.
- d. Many colours were given the most popular being white. Only a small proportion of candidates gave the correct answer.

### **Question 3**

- a. The majority of candidates knew the function of yeast was to make the bread rise. Less able candidates often said it was to give the bread colour.
- b. This question was poorly attempted which was disappointing as similar style questions had been in previous papers. Very few candidates labelled the diagram correctly. They often repeated the words from the question. Some candidates labelled the fruit and or vegetables they were adding. There was very little reference to appeal and candidates' knowledge of high fibre dough was weak.
- c. There were very few answers for high fibre dough. Candidates were able to clarify what fruits and or vegetables they had used in their design. Very few candidates explained how their product would appeal to children. If they mentioned their product was small there was no reference to size or that it was hand held.
- d. (i) Plastic was the most common answer.  
(ii) Many correct answers were seen, the most popular were to keep the product fresh and so that you could see the product.

### **Question 4**

- a. (i) Wedding cake was the most popular correct answer. However it was very clear that many candidates had not been taught job production and were giving examples of products suitable for batch production. Their lack of understanding was then reflected in the answers that they gave for the rest of this part of the question.  
(ii) Special items, one off items, were the most popular answers. Some candidates referred to the item being unique.  
(iii) Many candidates repeated the same answer as in part (ii).  
(iv) Time consuming and expensive was the most common correct answers.
- b. (i) Most candidates referred to the packaging being more attractive or accurate. They scored one mark for this. Very few candidates could give an explanation.  
(ii) Some candidates did not read the question correctly and continued to discuss packaging. Consistency was the most common answer however they did not score the two marks as they failed to explain their answer.  
(iii) Saves time and less staff / wages were popular answers. A few candidates said quicker or cheaper without an explanation.

### **Question 5**

- a. (i) The majority of candidates scored at least one mark. The most common incorrect answer was beef bouillon.  
(ii) There were many correct answers but some candidates still referred to the growth of bones and fighting infection.
- b. Many correct answers given, from all areas of the mark scheme. A few candidates did not make it clear whether they were discussing the luxury or the cheap.
- c. Many candidates made reference to nutritional qualities. Weaker candidates gave one word answers which were not very clear e.g. colour.
- d. This part of the question was well answered with most candidates making reference to food poisoning or to prevent the growth of bacteria.
- e. Both parts of this question were poorly answered.  
(i) To thicken was the most common correct answer.  
(ii) Only the more able candidates understood the function of emulsifiers, to prevent separation being the most popular correct answer.

**Comments on individual questions  
Higher Paper 1954 / 02**

**Question 1**

- a. (i) Wedding cake was the most popular correct answer. However it was very clear that many candidates had not been taught job production and were giving examples of products suitable for batch production. Their lack of understanding was then reflected in the answers that they gave for the rest of this part of the question.
- (ii) Special items, one off items, were the most popular answers. Some candidates referred to the item being unique.
- (iii) Many candidates repeated the same answer as in part (ii).
- (iv) Time consuming and expensive were the most common correct answers.
- b. (i) Most candidates referred to the packaging being more attractive or accurate. They scored one mark for this. Very few candidates could give an explanation.
- (ii) Some candidates did not read the question correctly and continued to discuss packaging. Consistency was the most common answer however they did not score the two marks as they failed to explain their answer.
- (iii) Saves time and less staff / wages were popular answers. A few candidates said quicker or cheaper without an explanation.

**Question 2**

- a. (i) The majority of candidates scored at least one mark. More able candidates scored full marks. The most common incorrect answer was beef bouillon.
- (ii) There were many correct answers but some candidates still referred to the growth of bones and fighting infection.
- b. Many correct answers given, from all areas of the mark scheme. A few candidates did not make it clear whether they were discussing the luxury or the cheap product.
- c. Many candidates made reference to nutritional qualities. Weaker candidates gave one word answers which were not very clear e.g. colour.
- d. This part of the question was well answered with most candidates making reference to food poisoning or to prevent the growth of bacteria.
- e. Both parts of this question were poorly answered.
  - (i) To thicken was the most common correct answer.
  - (ii) Only the more able candidates understood the function of emulsifiers, to prevent separation being the most popular correct answer.

**Question 3**

- a. The majority of the candidates did not have a good knowledge of the function of the ingredients in the flan.
  - (i) Function of flour the most popular correct answers were for bulk and for adding texture. However many candidates incorrectly said to thicken.
  - (ii) The most popular correct answers were for adding flavour and colour.
  - (iii) Eggs – very few candidates scored marks. Candidates referred to binding ingredients together.
- b. Candidates' answers were often very vague and did not include sufficient detail in their answers.

Only more able candidates could link foods to a specific country or culture. Many gave vague answers such as to add cheese from another country. Candidates suggested foods for texture but many did not state the texture they would provide. When describing how to make the flan more attractive many said to glaze which is not possible on a flan, some candidates referred to garnishing and the use of colourful vegetables on top of the flan.

*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

- c. (i) Pastry was the most common answer.
- (ii) Candidates gave good responses to the benefit of using components, with saving time and saving labour costs been common answers.
- (iii) Candidates found it more difficult to give a limitation of using components. More able candidates referred to suppliers letting the manufacturer down.

**Question 4**

- a. Most candidates scored one mark making reference to different types of promotions. Many candidates referred to advertising but did not make it clear that it needed to be a new advertising campaign.
- b. The qualities of many of the answers were poor with candidates giving very vague answers. Many candidates referred to using less ingredients / make cheaper but did not include a description of how this would be carried out. More able candidates gave examples of ingredients which could be changed and talked about increasing the amount of pasta as this was a cheaper ingredient than chicken. Some candidates also related the answer to changing the packaging.
- c. The quality of the answers varied considerably. Weaker candidates wrote about what cook-chill foods were, some candidates also thought cook chill foods were frozen foods and wrote about frozen foods. More able candidates scored more marks, though they were often not following a point through with clear explanation and or example.

**Question 5**

- a. (i) This part of the question was answered correctly by many candidates.
- (ii) Candidates who had been taught this answered it very well, with candidates referring to the need to have water to cleanse the palate, charts for recording the results on and needing tasters to work independently. However many candidates described in great detail how to complete a star diagram.
- b. (i) Candidates often gave an example of a quality control; very few candidates gave a good explanation of this.
- (ii) Many candidates just rephrased the question. More able candidates made statements referring to guarantee of consistent quality. Only a minority of candidates gained full marks.



## **1954: D&T Food Technology Papers 03/04**

### **General comments**

Candidates achieved the full range of marks on both papers although the Foundation was generally answered better with a higher range of marks. There is still evidence of centres entering candidates for the higher paper when they would have performed better on the Foundation paper. Every candidate made some attempt at the paper, however, many candidates failed to attain marks on some of the questions because they gave brief, vague answers which did not show any knowledge or understanding of the questions. There were far too many one word answers.

Writing and grammar seemed to be better but there was evidence of text speak from some candidates. Some candidates do not read the question properly leading to complete questions being answered incorrectly.

Examiners were concerned about the lack of nutritional knowledge from a large number of candidates with many writing that sugar was low in fat.

Teachers need to stress to candidates words such as quick, easy, healthy, good for you and cheaper mean nothing at all unless qualified in a statement.

Most Centres had prepared candidates thoroughly for the themed questions on Frozen Foods, although a surprising number of candidates at both levels did not know the symbols used on frozen food packaging. Candidates at both levels achieved well on this question.

At both Foundation and Higher level, drawings are improving but candidates did not show clearly how their design drawings met the specification points, it was left to the examiner to assume which ingredient met each point.

### **Comments on individual questions**

#### **Foundation Paper 1954 /03**

##### **Question 1**

- 1 (a) The question was generally well answered. Most candidates mentioned oven gloves, not leaving doors open, pan handles and turning off after use. Some gave food hygiene points and thus did not gain marks.
- 1 (b) Most candidates gained marks on this question correctly naming the egg storage but a worrying number put the raw meat above the cooked meat and some did incorrectly put the raw meat in the salad drawer.
- 1 (c) Most candidates gained full marks on this section choosing two of the many hazards visible. Water on the floor, knife hanging, door open were the most popular answers.
- 1 (d) The majority of candidates answered this question well. Common popular responses included; diarrhoea, nausea, vomiting, stomach pains, and fever. Some candidates failed to read the question correctly and gave causes of food poisoning rather than symptoms e.g. Flies on food and not washing hands.

## **Question 2**

- 2 (a) Most candidates achieved the marks for this question, the most popular being vitamins, minerals but very few mentioned specific ones. Those candidates who failed to gain marks had put good for you or healthy as their answer.
- 2 (b) This question gave disappointing results as most candidates failed to think of positive ways to encourage a child to eat more fruit and vegetables. Those who did correctly answer it suggested fun ways of serving fruits and vegetables or disguising in other foods, fruit smoothies, fruit salads were common answers. Many candidates suggested bribery and rewards, there very few really exciting ideas.
- 2 (c) This was well answered by the majority of candidates with heart disease and obesity being the most popular answers.
- 2 (d)(i) This was not well answered with candidates stating quantities and not naming the ingredient or just suggesting an ingredient and no quantity. The reduction of sugar was the common answer with many getting this correct but candidates did not consider the making of the crumble topping when suggesting the reduction of fat. It was rare to see an answer considering the changing of fruit pie filling to fresh fruit as a way of reducing the sugar level.
- 2 (d)(ii) Only about half the candidate gained marks on this question. The most popular answer was wholemeal flour with a few suggesting using fresh fruit or adding nuts. Some candidates failed to gain marks by referring to brown flour or brown sugar.
- 2 (d)(iii) Those candidates who understood the question gained 2 marks here but some failed to understand the word promote. The most popular answer was advertising. Good responses included free samples and tasting sessions.

## **Question 3**

- 3 (a) This question was generally well answered with good drawings of a burger in a bun, however some candidates produced messy and confused drawings and just repeated the specification terms in their labels. Candidates included spice or relish, tomatoes and cucumber for colour and texture. Often measurements were given and there was much detail of the filling, sesame seeds being a popular way of improving texture.
- 3 (b) This was not generally well answered. Candidates failed to state what ingredient gave the spicy flavour, what actual colours were included in the design and where the textures came from e.g. crunchy lettuce, soft bread.
- 3 (c) Cutters and moulds were the most popular correct answers with some candidates stating CAM. Some candidate's answers were very vague but most were able to gain one mark on this question.

#### **Question 4**

- 4 (a)(i) Industrial production continues to be a poorly answered question with many candidates not understanding repetitive flow or assembly line. Candidates gave answers such as it can be made in batches or they gave quicker, cheaper or easier without qualifying it. Popular correct answers included consistent quality and that staff did not need to be highly trained. The majority of candidates understood that this system was non-stop for 24 hours and all products the same. Some realised it was inexpensive to run with minimal staffing.
- 4 (a)(ii) Some candidates did not understand the word limitation. Popular correct answers included that it could not be used for other products and that if the machinery breaks down then all production is stopped.
- 4 (b) Most candidates gained marks for stating a cutter and biscuits, a few correctly named the equipment as a rotary cutter. Candidates did not recognise the bratt pan.
- 4 (c) Popular responses to this was putting filling into sandwiches, icing cakes tasting/testing and packing. Some candidates then proceeded to explain the reason for the task not the reason for it being carried out by people. Many failed to get 2 marks because they stated because a machine cannot do it.

#### **Question 5**

- 5 (a) Many candidates failed to gain marks because they just put easy or quick without qualifying their answer. Many candidates correctly named vegetarians and gave good answers why it was suitable, including that it did not contain meat or explained the significance of the label.
- 5 (a)(i) The majority of candidates included reference to user needs or appeal to the target group, using familiar terms from their coursework.
- 5 (b) This question was not very well answered. Many candidates stated 'add more filling and add more colours but failed to state what ingredient would make it more filling or what would add colour. Those who did answer it well suggested including meat, chicken, quorn, tofu, pasta or noodles to make it more filling. Named vegetables such as tomatoes, carrots, red or yellow peppers were popular answers.
- 5 (c) There were very few correct answers for this with candidates inventing all sorts of weird suggestions for the symbols.
- 5 (d)(i) A very popular correct answer for this was the retention of nutritional value and comments on the convenience of no preparation, minimal cooking, longer storage time than fresh. Again here many candidates did not gain marks because they used one word answers of quicker, easier, cheaper.
- 5 (d)(ii) Popular answers here were that they could not be re frozen and that a freezer was needed. Here again some candidates did not understand the use of the word limitation.

### Higher paper 1954/04

- 1 (a) Industrial production continues to be a poorly answered question with many candidates not understanding repetitive flow or assembly line. Candidates gave answers such as it can be made in batches or they gave quicker, cheaper or easier without qualifying it. Popular correct answers included consistent quality and that staff did not need to be highly trained. The majority of candidates understood that this system was non-stop for 24 hours and all products the same. Some realized it was inexpensive to run with minimal staffing.
- 1 (a)(ii) Some candidates did not understand the word limitation. Popular correct answers included that it could not be used for other products and that if the machinery breaks down then all production is stopped.
- 1 (b) Most candidates gained marks for stating a cutter and biscuits, a few correctly named the equipment as a rotary cutter. Candidates did not recognise the bratt pan.
- 1 (c) Popular responses to this was putting filling into sandwiches, icing cakes tasting/testing and packing. Candidates were generally able to give good reasons why including reference to delicate work, human skill and people making decisions.

### Question 2

- 2 (a) Many candidates gave a target group and correctly explained why it was suitable A popular response was vegetarians with including that it did not contain meat or explaining the significance of the label as the reason.
- 2 (a)(i) The majority of candidates included reference to user needs or appeal to the target group, using familiar terms from their coursework.
- 2 (b) It was disappointing to see that this question was not very well answered. Many candidates stated 'add more filling and add more colours but failed to state what ingredient would make it more filling or what would add colour. Those who did answer it well suggested including meat, chicken, quorn, tofu, pasta or noodles to make it more filling. Named vegetables such as tomatoes, carrots, red or yellow peppers were popular answers.
- 2 (c) There were very few correct answers for this with candidates inventing all sorts of weird suggestions for the symbols.
- 2 (d)(i) A very popular correct answer for this was the retention of nutritional value and comments on the convenience of no preparation, minimal cooking, longer storage time than fresh. Again here many candidates did not gain marks because they used one word answers of quicker, easier, cheaper.
- 2( d)(ii) Popular answers here were that they could not be re frozen and that a freezer was needed. Here again some candidates did not understand the use of the word limitation.

### **Question 3**

- 3 (a) There were some lovely drawings for the luxury casserole but many candidates did not gain marks because they did not explain how the diagram met the specification. Many able candidates lost marks on this question. Candidates labelled a rich sauce but did not show how it was rich. Some candidates did not understand the concept of a luxury product whilst others designed pies with potato or pastry toppings. Candidates must show a different ingredient for each specification point.
- 3 (b) A large number of candidates failed to gain marks on this part of the question as they just repeated what they had put in part (a). They needed to explain how they may have used organic ingredients, free range, unusual interesting ingredients, quality finish using herbs/garnish, expensive named cuts of meat.
- 3 (c) Quite a few candidates lost marks because they just mentioned a picture or a photograph without any qualification or made reference to quality packaging. Good answers included gold/ silver colour of packaging, choice of font on packaging, pictures of posh table settings. Many candidates correctly referred to the ingredients list.
- 3 (d) If centres had taught this, candidates gained full marks. Many candidates gave vague answers and did not mention that heat was needed. Some candidates thought the question was about gelatine.

### **Question 4**

- 4 (a) This was not very well answered, very few candidates could explain functions of sugar fully. Some candidates repeated the question and stated sweetening or taste/flavour as the answer. Most candidates did not consider that the pudding was steamed.
- 4 (b) Most candidates were able to answer this part of the question but their answers lacked detail. Vague answers included reduce the fat to lower the fat. This is an A grade question and candidates should be prepared to put some thought and detail into their answers. The answers had to relate to obesity and a good response should have made reference to lowering the fat, lowering the sugar and increasing the fibre by the use of named ingredients.

### **Question 5**

- 5 (a) Use of high and low temperatures were the most common answers to this question. Good candidates included specific temperatures and explained how the growth of bacteria could be controlled. Many candidates also explained about the removal of water. This part of the question was generally answered well.
- 5 (b) This question was either answered very well with candidates gaining high marks or was not very well answered. It is obviously taught very well in many centres. Some candidates struggled with the terms implications and legislation. Candidates included detail of HACCP, Cross Contamination, safety of equipment, Labelling requirements and consumer rights. Those candidates who explained their points and gave specific examples to illustrate their answer scored well on this question.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education**

**D&T Food Technology Short Course (1054)**

**June 2007 Assessment Series**

**Component Threshold Marks**

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	50			33	28	24	20	60
2	50	29	24	19	14			
3	105	84	72	61	49	38	27	16

**Specification Options**

**Foundation Tier**

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	175				102	86	70	55	40
Percentage in Grade	175				17.0	30.3	23.4	12.7	10.5
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	175				17.0	47.2	71.0	84.0	94.0

The total entry for the examination was 145

**Higher Tier**

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	175	142	124	106	89	69	59		
Percentage in Grade	175	13.9	37.2	30.0	13.9	4.4	0.00		
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	175	13.9	51.1	81.0	94.9	99.3	99.3		

The total entry for the examination was 137

**Overall**

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	6.8	18.9	14.7	15.4	17.6	11.8	6.5	5.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	6.8	25.2	40.0	55.2	73.0	85.0	91.1	97.0

The total entry for the examination was 282

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education**

**D&T Food Technology Full Course (1954)**

**June 2007 Assessment Series**

**Component Threshold Marks**

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	50			33	28	24	20	16
2	50	29	24	19	14			
3	50			31	26	22	18	14
4	50	27	23	19	13			
5	105	84	72	61	49	38	27	16

**Specification Options**

**Foundation Tier**

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	175				103	86	70	54	38
Percentage in Grade	175				28.0	57.6	78.8	92.0	97.7
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	175				28.0	29.6	20.4	13.3	6.6

The total entry for the examination was 10284

**Higher Tier**

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	175	134	119	104	89	68	57		
Percentage in Grade	175	11.4	22.2	28.0	23.7	11.6	1.3		
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	175	11.4	33.8	62.9	86.6	98.0	99.2		

The total entry for the examination was 10079

**Overall**

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	5.8	11.02	14.4	25.5	19.5	11.0	6.7	3.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	5.8	17.2	32.1	58.2	78.2	89.2	95.7	98.5

The total entry for the examination was 20363

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