

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 2008

1954/1054/MS/R/08

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

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 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education Food Technology (1954)

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

REPORTS ON THE COMPONENTS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
1054/03 1954/05 Coursework	2
1054/01, 1954/01 Paper 1 (Foundation) 1054/02, 1954/02 Paper 2 (Higher)	9
1954/03 Paper 3 (Foundation) 1954/04 Paper 4 (Higher)	13
Grade Thresholds	18

Chief Examiner's Report

During the assessment of the Specification the standard achieved by candidates in the coursework and 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. Candidates need to practise answering questions during the course particularly those aimed at the higher grades. Examiners were particularly concerned about candidates' lack of nutritional knowledge across all papers.

Overall the standard of coursework remains consistent with that seen last year, with a similar number of Centres requiring adjustments. However, there were slightly more Centres that required larger adjustments to their marks. 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.

1054/03 1954/05 Coursework

General Comments

Once again this year, the standard of presentation continued to improve, with many candidates organising their folders into the separate objectives. A4 work is now rarely sent in ring binders, however a number of centres are still sending A3 work in thick plastic folders making the parcels very heavy. Fewer Centres submitted work where each objective was separated into plastic wallets. Some Centres need to label coursework clearly with both the candidates name and number. Generally, folders are becoming more concise.

Overall, the standard of coursework projects was similar to last year but once again, there were quite a few Centres requiring adjustments. Possible reasons for this: -
the Levels of Response in the Assessment Objectives had been interpreted too leniently and 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

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 noted an increase in the 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

- Moderators noted an increase in the number of Centres that had credited candidates with high marks for little or no explanation of how candidates had arrived at their design brief particularly their target group.
- 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 candidates are becoming more selective in the information they include in this section of their work. However, many Centres are still encouraging candidates to research different commercial production methods when the Specification states that the product should be batch produced. There were some good examples of packaging and labelling information but many candidates are still omitting any consideration to environmental issues. A number of moderators noted a reduction in the number of folders that included downloaded sheets from the Internet.
- 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.
- Too many Centres still allow candidates to use the same proforma chart and look at the same 6 products irrespective of their design brief so in many cases the products evaluated are not appropriate. 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. There was more evidence this year of the design specification not reflecting the findings from research. 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 and some candidates are continuing to include criteria for the packaging which is no longer a requirement .

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.
- 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.
- Detailed evaluation of solutions against the specification continues to be 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. Other candidates had evaluated the making of the products rather than the product itself.
- Nutritional analysis of the trialled products was varied. A significant number of candidates are still omitting to refer to the nutritional analysis when evaluating their trialled products. 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.

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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Many Centres are now producing a Product Specification. However, the quality of these varies greatly. In some Centres there is little difference between the design and product specification.
- This objective is frequently marked too leniently because Centres credit candidates for carrying out modifications for which there is no written evidence.

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.

Report on the Components taken in June 2008

- 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. Moderators commented that there had been an increase in the number of Centres not providing written comments of Candidates practical work this year.
- 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. In some Centres, candidates had been awarded high marks for the final product when there was no evidence of a packaging net

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

- Many candidates provided 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 was less evident 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.

Report on the Components taken in June 2008

- 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.
- Evaluation of the packaging is no longer a requirement.

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 in 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
- (e) 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.
- (f) 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.
- (g) A copy of the task(s) should be included with the sample.
- (h) Encourage the candidates to divide their work under headings for the separate Assessment Objectives.
- (i) 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.
- (j) 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.

1054/01, 1954/01 Paper 1 (Foundation)

1054/02, 1954/02 Paper 2 (Higher)

General comments

The overall performance of candidates was good. The standard for both papers was similar to 2007. However examiners felt there was more 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, to consider how many marks are awarded to each part of a question and to understand the command 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.

On the Foundation paper most candidates attempted all the questions. However it is clear that many candidates did not have an understanding of quality control and the use of CAD when designing packaging. The quality of the drawings in the design based question were 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 quality control and the use of CAD when designing packaging. The 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. The design based question was poorly attempted; the majority of students did not complete accurate drawing and give detailed notes relating to their specification. This was very disappointing as there is always a design based question on the paper.

Comments on individual questions

Foundation Paper 1954 / 01

Question 1

- a) This part of the question was answered correctly by the majority of candidates. A few candidates did write that the ham should be stored in the freezer.
- b) This was answered correctly by the majority of candidates. Incorrect responses included: barcode, nutritional information. A significant number still use the term 'Sell by date' – marks are not awarded for this.
- c) This was well answered, most with either price or a variation of identifying the product as the correct answer.
- d) There were mixed responses depending whether a centre had covered this section of the specification. Canning and freezing were well answered. Cook chill was less well known the most common correct responses were ready meal, lasagne and curry and rice.

Question 2

- a) Virtually all candidates gained this mark. Nearly all said orange, a few stated kiwi fruit.

- b) There were very few correct answers.
- c) Protects against infection was known widely however very few knew that vitamin C helps with the absorption of iron.
- d) Areas of improvement were identified correctly by nearly all the candidates, but the suggestions of how to improve were often too vague e.g. vegetables but did not name the vegetables.

Question 3

- a) i) This was well answered by most candidates. The most popular answer was questionnaire but many went on to say survey as well. Using the internet and books featured frequently.
ii) This was well answered although there was repetition of bar graphs and bar charts. Tally, graphs, and charts were the most common correct answers..
- b) Most candidates scored one mark for naming a protein food. The better candidates stated colours and textures but these were in the minority and were often from centres where candidates had clearly practiced this type of question. Very few candidates scored a mark for fibre, they put pasta without any reference to it being wholemeal. Those that did score usually put vegetables. Overall this part of the question was poorly answered.
- c) Candidates were often too vague to get two marks though many scored one mark; this was usually for reference to meeting the needs of the target group.

Question 4

- a) This part of the question was not answered well by foundation tier candidates. They were unable to translate the skills from their coursework to the formal exam. The majority put hygiene points or copied the method from the chart.
- b) Very few foundation tier candidates understood how CAD was used in the designing of the packaging. Many gave computer or printer as CAD, not many could give two examples.
- c) Generally well answered with recycling, recycled, biodegradable and using less packaging as the most frequent answers.

Question 5

- a) Virtually all candidates scored two marks.
- b) Most common correct responses were related to travelling abroad and immigration / mix of cultures. A lot of candidates wrote about 'wanting to try new things'
- c) Most candidates scored one mark. Reducing weight / changing rice were the most common correct answers. Suggesting ways of reducing the cost of a product is clearly not understood by candidates.
- d) Majority scored well here although some are still referring to growth of bones.
- e) Soya and quorn were given by the majority of candidates; a small number gave pulses as a correct answer.

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

Question 1

a) This was generally answered well with fewer candidates referring to hygiene rules. Reference to the correct oven temperature and weighing ingredients accurately were the most common correct answers.

b) Very few higher tier candidates understood how CAD was used in the designing of the packaging. Many gave computer or printer as CAD, not many could give two examples.

c) Generally well answered with recycling, recycled, biodegradable and using less packaging as the most frequent answers.

Question 2

a) Virtually all candidates scored two marks.

b) Most common correct responses were related to travelling abroad and immigration / mix of cultures. A lot of candidates wrote about 'wanting to try new things'

c) Most candidates scored at least one mark. Reducing weight / changing rice were the most common correct answers. Suggesting ways of reducing the cost of a product is clearly not understood by candidates.

d) Majority scored well here although some are still referring to growth of bones.

e) Soya and quorn were given by the majority of candidates; a small number gave pulses as a correct answer.

Question 3

a) The majority of candidates only scored one or two marks. They did not look at the command words in the sentence which asked them to explain. Many candidates have a vague knowledge of the functions of vitamins.

b) Response to the specification points were generally good. Higher achieving candidates made reference to target audience, colour, texture and cost, weaker candidates repeated parts of the question and gave very vague points e.g. size, taste.

c) Responses to this part of the question were very poor. Some still drew packaging even though the instructions told candidates not to. The quality of diagrams were poor with the majority being completed in pen. Most candidates failed to develop their specification points and simply repeated the point from part b or labelled the ingredients with out relating to the specification points. Some scored one mark as they referred to the colour of the vegetables and the textures of the different vegetables.

Question 4

a) Most could give one correct answer but not the second these usually referred to making improvements and meeting the needs of the target audience.

Report on the Components taken in June 2008

b) The majority of candidates scored one mark on each section if they identified how to improve the crispiness or shape of the biscuits but few went on to give a correct explanation. Of those who did the most common answer referred to using a cutter and ensuring round shape was achieved each time.

c) The majority of candidates gained one mark for the function of preservatives; however few candidates developed their answer to gain the two marks. The most frequent correct answer was extending shelf life. Candidates should refrain from using phrases such as 'going off'. Very few candidates mentioned micro organisms or safe food / food poisoning.

The function of emulsifiers was known by many candidates but poorly explained and so many candidates didn't score the two marks. The more able candidates gave clear explanations referring to emulsifiers preventing the separation of oils and liquids and then related this to mayonnaise.

Question 5

a) Candidates often did not look at the command statement in the question and then just provided a list of points instead of discussing them in detail; this meant they failed to achieve high marks for this part of the question. Many candidates gave very vague phrases such as 'healthier food is now being produced'. Many candidates did mention clearer labelling and traffic light system and that manufacturers are reducing fat and salt in foods and scored marks for this.

b) Very few candidates scored more than 1 or 2 marks for this part of the question. The most response was the fair price for the producers.

1954/03 Paper 3 (Foundation)

1954/04 Paper 4 (Higher)

General comments

The paper allowed candidates the opportunity to score across the full range of marks.

There were a number of candidates who had been entered for the higher paper that perhaps would have benefited from doing the foundation tier.

There have clearly been some strengths and weaknesses across the range of centres. Some candidates appeared to have common misconceptions especially when it came to the CAD and CAM questions, it seemed that perhaps this had not been taught thoroughly in some centres.

Most candidates attempted all questions on the paper, but some candidates failed to attain marks on some questions because they gave brief, vague answers which did not show knowledge or understanding. There were still far too many one word answers. It is also clear that candidates are still not carefully reading the questions.

This year, it was disappointing to note the responses for the themed question. There was a distinct lack of knowledge with regard to the chilling process.

Teachers need to stress to candidates that words such as quicker, easier, healthier, faster, cheaper, good for you, mean nothing at all unless qualified in a statement. Statements like 'going off' cannot be awarded marks.

At both Foundation and Higher level, answers to the designing questions were weak as candidates failed to show how their design met the specification points, and left to the examiner to assume the composition of the product.

On the whole, the questions seemed appropriately worded and gave enough opportunity to stretch and challenge candidates in a range of areas, especially in paper 04.

Comments on individual questions

Foundation Paper 1954 /03 2008

Foundation Question 1

1(a) This question was generally well answered. Very few candidates just mentioned the item rather than naming the hazard. Most candidates gained full marks on this section choosing two of the many hazards visible. Water on the floor, knife hanging, plug and cable in water were popular answers.

1(b) Some candidates did not gain marks on this question because they did not read it correctly. Quite a few named personal hygiene rather than specifically related to the tasting of food. Popular responses were clean spoon and wash hands.

1(c) A vast majority correctly named the colour of the plaster and the reason.

1(d) The majority of candidates answered this question well although there was a wide range of spelling of insecticides. Some candidates incorrectly put fly spray.

Foundation Question 2

2(a) Most candidates achieved the marks for this question, the most popular responses were the free gift and chocolate.

Report on the Components taken in June 2008

2(b) Generally this question was well answered with most candidates scoring at least one mark. Some repeated answers from 1a.

2(c) This was very disappointing, as a vast majority of candidates incorrectly named hyperactivity and failed to identify obesity, diabetes, and tooth decay.

2(d)(i) This was not well answered with candidates stating vague products such as cakes and biscuits without thinking of precisely how the sugar could be replaced by the dried fruit. Many candidates simply wrote the products which dried fruit could be added to.

2(d)(ii) This was generally well answered with flavour, texture, added vitamins, fibre being common answers. Healthy was not acceptable.

Foundation Question 3

3(a) This question was generally badly answered with candidates not reading carefully the stem of the question. They did not understand that the product was a carton of filling to put onto a jacket potato and did not think about the ingredients that would combine to make the product. Very few candidates scored 4 marks. The textures and low cost were incorrectly answered. Candidates failed to state how a variety of textures could be achieved simply stating 'use a variety of textures', instead of stating texture descriptors. To reduce the cost many put 'use less ingredients', instead of explaining how the cost could be reduced.

3(b) This was well answered but there was a lot of repetition of different advertising campaigns instead of suggesting different promotions.

3(c) It was disappointing that this was not well answered. The most common correct answer was a healthy digestive system or aids digestion. A worrying number thought that fibre provided energy and many stated a source of fibre as they had not read the question properly.

3(d) Again this was well answered with boiling and micro waving as the most common correct answer. Some candidate did not read the question correctly and repeated baking as their answer.

3(e) It was obvious from the answers whether this had been taught to the candidates. It was generally well answered where detailed teaching had taken place. Answers varied from 'prepare before cooking' to 'cook quickly'.

Foundation Question 4

4(a) Industrial production continues to be a poorly answered question with many candidates failing to achieve marks because they had not read the question. Those who did read the question gained two marks, faster than by hand and professional finish were popular answers. Many candidates gave CAM type responses.

4(b) Many candidates gained one mark for stating 'less workers needed' but a common response was 'quicker' or 'easier' which was not qualified.

4(c) Candidates had a knowledge of control but failed to fully explain its effect on the biscuits. Weighing and mixing were popular responses.

4(d) Few candidates showed knowledge of the benefits of batch production. Many repeated answers from 4b. There is a lack of understanding of how batch production works.

Report on the Components taken in June 2008

Foundation Question 5

This was the pre release question and so it was disappointing to see such a poor standard of responses. It was obvious where candidates had been prepared.

5 (a) Well answered with many candidates correctly stating gelatine or lime juice as popular responses.

5 (b) Most candidates were able to gain half marks on this question. A worrying number of candidates still believe that sugar is high in fat! It must be explained to candidates that it is not an acceptable answer to make the base thicker in order to increase the fibre. Some candidates did not think about the functions of the ingredients, so incorrectly stated changing the double cream to single. Good responses for increasing the fibre were to use wholemeal biscuits and change the chocolate topping to a fresh fruit.

5(c) There were very few correct answers for this with only a few candidates correctly naming a temperature probe.

5(d) It was disappointing to see how many candidate at both Higher and Foundation level did not know the principles of the chilling process. It was obvious where this had been taught well by the centres..

Higher paper 1954/04 2008

Higher Question 1`

1(a) Industrial production continues to be a poorly answered question with many candidates failing to achieve marks because they had not read the question. Those who did read the question gained two marks, faster than by hand and professional finish were popular answers. Many candidates gave CAM type responses.

1(b) Many candidates gained one mark for stating 'less workers needed' but a common response was 'quicker' or 'easier' which was not qualified.

1(c) Candidates had a knowledge of control but failed to fully explain its effect on the biscuits. Weighing and mixing were popular responses.

1(d) Few candidates showed knowledge of the benefits of batch production. Many repeated answers from 4b. There is a lack of understanding of how batch production works.

Higher Question 2

This was the pre release question and so it was disappointing to see such a poor standard of responses. It was obvious where candidates had been prepared.

2 (a) Well answered with many candidates correctly stating gelatine or lime juice as popular responses.

2(b) Most candidates were able to gain half marks on this question. A worrying number of candidates still believe that sugar is high in fat! It must be explained to candidates that it is not an acceptable answer to make the base thicker in order to increase the fibre. Some candidates did not think about the functions of the ingredients, so incorrectly stated changing the double cream to single. Good responses for increasing the fibre were to use wholemeal biscuits and change the chocolate topping to a fresh fruit.

2(c) There were very few correct answers for this with only a few candidates correctly naming a temperature probe.

2(d) It was disappointing to see how many candidate at both Higher and Foundation level did not know the principles of the chilling process. It was obvious where this had been taught well by the centres..

Higher Question 3

3(a)There was a lack of creative original ideas for the design of this product with many candidates merely describing an apple pie.

The most popular improvement of flavour was cinnamon. Thinner rolled pastry was the most popular correct answer for reducing the pastry with only a few candidates suggesting lattice tops and flan type versions. Variety of textures continues to be a weakness with very few candidates naming an ingredient and giving a texture descriptor. It was good to see some candidate suggesting creative ways of designing the pie to make it appeal to families but quite a few candidates incorrectly suggested ways of improving the packaging.

3(b)This was answered well with many candidates identifying that pastry was a high fat product and that customers were wanting lower in fat healthier options. Many candidates also considered the cost implications.

Report on the Components taken in June 2008

3(c) Quite well answered with most scoring one mark for each reason but explanations tended to be weaker. Most answers were brief points, taste testing, meeting the specification, testing linked to production requirements were popular responses.

Higher Question 4

4(a) Responses to this question were often vague. Very few candidates scored more than one mark. Most made reference to bacteria becoming dormant or inactive but many incorrectly said that bacteria were killed. Terms such as going off, mouldy food, and germs were still evident. There was little evidence that candidates could relate dormancy to the impact on the product.

4(b) Most candidates were able to answer this part of the question but their answers lacked detail. Generally there was a good knowledge of vitamin C and its instability and so many candidates gained one mark for the reason but couldn't explain why. There was a lack of understanding of what 'water soluble' meant.

4(c) It was very disappointing to see such a lack of knowledge of a vegan diet and their nutritional needs. A few had been well taught and were clearly able to explain why there were nutritional deficiencies of protein, iron or calcium and how this could be addressed. Some candidates wrote vaguely about protein and incorrectly suggested Quorn. Too many candidates think that vegetarians and vegans can eat fish.

Higher Question 5

5(a) Many candidates gained two marks on this correctly stating meat being cooked on the outside and raw in the middle and that barbeques are outside and therefore exposed to flies etc but they failed to give detailed consequences of this. Quite few candidates gave the explanation that 'it caused food poisoning' thus repeating the question.

5(b) Candidates seem unaware that this is an A* question and that it requires depth and detail in the response. Many candidates wrote a lot of general comments that merely included the statutory labelling requirements. They failed to explain how packaging materials helped in the prevention of food poisoning and how the instructions for cooking, storage and serving prevented bacteria growth. Very few candidates included specific detail of preservation methods, packaging material knowledge and cooking/storing temperatures and times.

Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education
D&T Food Technology Short Course (Specification Code 1054)
June 2008 Examination Series

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Paper 1	50				31	27	23	20	17
Paper 2	50		29	24	20	15			
Coursework	105		84	73	62	50	39	28	17

Specification Options

Foundation Tier

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	175				98	84	70	56	42
Percentage in Grade					17.1	24.7	25.7	19.0	7.6
Cumulative Percentage in Grade					17.1	41.9	67.6	86.6	94.3

The total entry for the examination was 153

Higher Tier

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	175	135	120	105	90	65	52		
Percentage in Grade		4.7	4.7	19.0	52.3	14.3	4.7		
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		4.7	9.5	28.5	80.9	95.2	100		

The total entry for the examination was 42

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	0.8	0.8	3.1	23.0	23.0	22.2	15.8	6.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	0.8	1.6	4.7	27.7	50.8	73.0	88.8	95.2

The total entry for the examination was 195

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
D&T Food Technology (Specification Code 1954)
June 2008 Examination Series**

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Paper 1	50				31	27	23	20	17
Paper 2	50		29	24	20	15			
Paper 3	50				30	26	22	18	14
Paper 4	50		30	25	21	15			
Coursework	105		84	73	62	50	39	28	17

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					27.5	27.2	20.6	13.6	6.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade					27.5	54.7	75.4	88.9	95.3

The total entry for the examination was 8693

Higher Tier

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	175	136	121	106	92	71	60		
Percentage in Grade		11.6	22.1	29.6	21.6	12.2	1.4		
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		11.6	33.8	63.5	85.2	97.4	98.8		

The total entry for the examination was 8972

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	5.9	11.3	15.1	24.5	19.6	10.8	6.6	3.1
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	5.9	17.2	32.3	56.9	76.5	87.3	93.9	97.1

The total entry for the examination was 17665

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



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