

# **Home Economics (Child Development)**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1972**

## **Report on the Components**

---

**June 2006**

**1972/MS/R/06**

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

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

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

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

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

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

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annersley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

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

## CONTENTS

### General Certificate of Secondary Education Home Economics (Child Development)(1972)

#### REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	5
1972/01	Paper 1	7
1972/02	Paper 2	9
1972/03	Coursework	11
*	Grade Thresholds	17



### **Chief Examiners Report**

It was pleasing to see that all candidates managed to achieve at some level. However, Centres could help their candidates further by:

- Ensuring at the end of the Task Analysis a Criteria for Completion is included.
- Interpreting the specification correctly to enable candidates to answer all the assessment areas but in particular the development and observations sections.
- Ensuring the whole of specification is taught to candidates.
- Allowing time for a good revision programme to be undertaken.
- Giving appropriate guidance to candidates to enable them to successfully answer the free response questions.
- Considering the training programmes available to all Centres during the autumn and winter by OCR.
- Following OCR administration procedures correctly.

NB: please note the deadline each year for MS2's, Coursework Summary Marksheets, and Centre Authentication Form is to be received by moderators by the 15 <sup>th</sup> May at the latest.
--

## GCSE HOME ECONOMICS CHILD DEVELOPMENT (1972) 2006

### WRITTEN PAPER

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

The format of the paper was consistent with previous years with the content covering a wide range of the specification and achieving differentiation in each tier. The questions proved accessible to all candidates and it was very rare for no attempt to be made to any question.

There was a range of marks within each tier but this often appeared to be Centre dependent which would indicate that some Centres had prepared their candidates well for the examination, covering in detail all aspects of the specification.

Marks were generally lost in the Foundation Tier through lack of basic subject knowledge and misreading of some questions. On the Higher Tier paper, candidates often gave vague and unsupported responses which did not show their knowledge and, more significantly, the understanding necessary to score well at this level. On a positive note, there was less evidence of candidates answering the question with another question.

On the Higher Tier candidates who could give only vague and unsupported answers with a lack of understanding found it too difficult and did not score well at this level.

Most candidates achieved well in Section A of the papers whilst the Section B questions were more demanding to ensure differentiation. Candidates who demonstrated depth and breadth of knowledge accurately scored well.

A few candidates failed to read the command word at the beginning of the free response questions and as a result a lack of depth in their answers limited the number of marks that could be awarded. This was due mainly to answers not being explained or giving direct repetition of the information in the question.

Centres could support candidates when preparing for the examination by:

- Ensuring that the underpinning knowledge has been taught for **all** parts of the specification.
- Training candidates to **read** each question carefully before answering.
- Ensuring candidates understand the command words '**describe**' and '**explain**'.
- Teaching through the use of practice questions so that candidates give **factual** responses rather than repeating the stem of the question.
- Ensuring appropriate tier of entry by **matching** a candidate's ability to the type of questions on each tier.

## Paper 1 – Foundation Tier

### Comments on Individual Questions:

- 1 (a) As intended, this question gave access to all candidates and they were able to gain good marks, *'hungry'*, *'tired'*, *'wet nappy'* and *'in pain'* being the most popular answers.
- (b) Candidates were able to select correct answers from the pictures provided.
- (c) Well attempted with *'bicycles'*, *'swings'* and *'push-along toys'* as the most frequent answers.
- (d) Many candidates were able to give two correct answers such as *'right size'* and *'waterproof'* but often failed to give a third.
- 2 (a) Well answered by all candidates, often gaining full marks.
- (b) *'No sharp edges'*, *'suitable for age'*, *'non-toxic'* and *'non-flammable'* were the correct answers often given. Candidates lost marks if they did not read the question carefully enough and gave points to look for when buying toys for a baby rather than a four year old.

<b>TIP – Teach candidates to focus on the age of a child mentioned in a question</b>
--

- (c) Most candidates correctly identified two reasons for a temper-tantrum, for example *'can't get its own way'* or *'attention seeking'* but found difficulty mentioning a third different point.
- (d) *'Ignore'* and *'put in a naughty corner'* were correctly suggested. Incorrect answers included *'give the child a light smack'*, *'bribe with sweets'* or *'send to room'*.
- 3 (a) It was very rare for candidates to read the data incorrectly in all three sections of the question.
- (b) Mixed responses here. *'Window locks'* and *'stair gates'* were correctly named but *'a bed-rail'* or *'a strap/harness for a pushchair'* were not often given.
- (c) *'To give parent a break'*, *'parent working'* or *'allows child to socialise'* were all good responses. Candidates failed to gain marks if they said *'to give the child an education'*.
- (d) Candidates who have been taught well achieved good marks by giving factual statements. For example *'make sure she is experienced/qualified/police checked'*. Some candidates incorrectly answered the question with another question which led to an ambiguous answer.

<b>TIP – Avoid answering a question with a question</b>
---

- (e) Mixed responses, with candidates gaining marks for *'babysitting/childminding'* or *'bonding with family'*. Weaker responses were vague statements about giving help and support but not saying how.
- (f) Candidates who read the question carefully gained good marks, but those who wrote from the point of view of the special needs child gained no marks.

- 4 (a) *'Don't like', 'tired', 'attention seeking'* were the most frequent correct answers.
- (b) Better candidates achieved well by showing their knowledge, for example *'variety of foods', 'colourful', 'eat as a family', 'involved in shopping/cooking'* whilst weaker candidates incorrectly said *'take to doctor's', 'play trains', 'offer sweets if they eat their dinner'*.
- (c) (i) Many candidates correctly identified *'strawberries', 'dairy'* and *'wheat'*.
- (c) (ii) Well attempted with many candidates giving a version of *'wheat/gluten/intolerance'* or *'coeliac'*. Candidates did not gain marks if they incorrectly said *'vegetarians'*.
- (d) (i) Reasonably well answered on the whole.
- (d) (ii) Candidates scored highly if they read the question and gave answers that reflected that immediate medical help was needed.

**TIP – Teach candidates to read every question carefully and highlight key words**

- (e) Well attempted and candidates gained good marks, particularly if they gave four distinctly different rules rather than one rule rephrased.
- 5 (a) Candidates who have been taught well gave the precise terminology required. A few candidates just gave the same answer in each box.
- (b) Candidates who had revised well could show their knowledge.
- (c) Those candidates who had learned the factual information achieved good marks.
- (d) & (e) Mixed answers which showed gaps in some candidates' knowledge. Candidates who were able to use the correct terminology gained the marks.
- (f) Badly answered, with many candidates thinking that genetic counselling is a routine procedure that all couples follow 'just in case'.
- (g) Better candidates offered *'less money', 'less freedom', 'less time for themselves', 'less sleep'* whereas weaker candidates gave vague statements e.g. *'can't go out'*.
- 6 This question is intended to achieve differentiation between a C grade and below. The question was reasonably attempted with many candidates gaining up to half marks. Candidates remained in the lower level if they gave few signs of pregnancy and had little or no knowledge why blood tests are taken. Many answers were either vague or incorrect e.g. *'test blood for diabetes', 'test blood temperature'* or *'test blood pressure'*. More able candidates were able to give some signs of pregnancy and could name the blood tests taken in pregnancy.

**TIP – Candidates should be advised not to answer this extended writing question in list form as marks are taken into consideration for written communication.**



## Paper 2 – Higher Tier

### Comments on Individual Questions:

- 1 (a) *'Don't like', 'tired', 'attention seeking'* were the most frequent correct answers.
- (b) Better candidates achieved well by showing their knowledge, for example *'variety of foods', 'colourful', 'eat as a family', 'involved in shopping/cooking'* whilst weaker candidates incorrectly said *'take to doctor's', 'play trains', 'offer sweets if they eat their dinner'*.
- (c) (i) Many candidates correctly identified *'strawberries', 'dairy'* and *'wheat'*.
- (c) (ii) Well attempted with many candidates giving a version of *'wheat/gluten/intolerance'* or *'coeliac'*. Candidates did not gain marks if they incorrectly said *'vegetarians'*.
- (d) (i) Reasonably well answered on the whole.
- (d) (ii) Candidates scored highly if they read the question and gave answers that reflected that immediate medical help was needed.

<b>TIP – Teach candidates to read every question carefully and highlight key words</b>
--

- (e) Well attempted and candidates gained good marks, particularly if they gave four distinctly different rules rather than one rule rephrased.
- 2 (a) Candidates who have been taught well gave the precise terminology required. A few candidates just gave the same answer in each box.
- (b) Candidates who had revised well could show their knowledge.
- (c) Those candidates who had learned the factual information achieved good marks.
- (d) & (e) Mixed answers which showed gaps in some candidates' knowledge. Candidates who were able to use the correct terminology gained the marks.
- (f) Badly answered, with many candidates thinking that genetic counselling is a routine procedure that all couples follow 'just in case'.
- (g) Better candidates offered *'less money', 'less freedom', 'less time for themselves', 'less sleep'* whereas weaker candidates answered the question with a question or gave vague statements e.g. *'can't go out'*.

<b>TIP – Avoid answering a question with a question</b>
---

- 3 This question is intended to achieve differentiation between a C grade and below. The question was reasonably attempted with many candidates gaining up to half marks. Candidates remained in the lower level if they gave few signs of pregnancy and had little or no knowledge why blood tests are taken. Many answers were either vague or incorrect e.g. *'test blood for diabetes', 'test blood temperature'* or *'test blood pressure'*. More able candidates were able to give some signs of pregnancy and could name the blood tests taken in pregnancy.
- 4 (a) Candidates who had been taught well identified the term with correct terminology *'the use of the hands and fingers'*.
- (b) This was answered well if candidates had read the question and related it to the correct age group.

**TIP – Teach candidates to focus on the age of a child mentioned in a question**

- (c) Candidates scored highly if they gave skills that related to a child in the first year of life. Candidates who did not take this into consideration gained no marks e.g. *'kicking a ball', 'playing catch' and 'skipping'*.
- (d) Most candidates managed some marks for *'keeping fit', 'gives appetite'*. However, those who failed to give precise answers gained few marks e.g. *'keep healthy', 'can play', 'will be used to it'*.
- (e) Better candidates scored highly but many failed to read the question with understanding and gave answers relating to skills a baby learns.
- 5 (a) Most candidates could state *'a single parent'* or *'both parents work'* but struggled to find a second answer.
- (b) Well attempted on the whole. Weaker candidates gave vague answers and did not score highly.
- (c) Better candidates knew this terminology. Poor answers were either Centre dependent or from very weak candidates.
- (d) In general, candidates could name activities but not the link to a mathematical concept. Weaker candidates gave many repetitions about numbers and counting. Better candidates could show depth and breadth of knowledge by naming concepts and explaining how different activities could help a child.
- 6 This is the most testing question on the paper and is intended to give the more able candidates chance to demonstrate their depth of knowledge and understanding. There was a noticeable lack of planning for this free response question.
- Although candidates wrote in detail, answers lacked the correct terminology and were often vague, muddled and inaccurate. Many could describe some accidents that occurred to children, but failed to identify the factors that made accidents to children more likely. Weaker candidates wrote about safety in the home. Some safety features were given, but candidates did not explain precisely why they were necessary.
- Where candidates had read the question carefully, planned their answers, understood the word 'explain' and then showed their factual knowledge and understanding they were able to gain good marks.

**TIP – Candidates are strongly advised to do a plan for the free response questions to prevent repetition and keep focused on what the question is asking.**

## **Coursework**

### **General Comments**

It was pleasing to see that the majority of Centres continued to apply the marking criteria effectively and accurately.

An increasing number of candidates are using ICT through word processing and the use of digital photography, thus enhancing the overall presentation of their work. There were many high quality tasks and evidence of good practice throughout a number of Centres. Many Centres used original task titles for both the Individual Task and the Resource Tasks. This showed an improvement on previous years. However, there is still cause for concern in a minority of Centres where coursework did not meet the assessment criteria and resulted in a major adjustment. Teachers need to look carefully at the criteria before awarding marks for work that was not apparent and should match the marks to the criteria only if the evidence is shown. Occasionally the Centres will identify that very little/no work has been completed in a particular assessment area yet marks were still awarded.

It is still apparent that some Centres are producing pieces of coursework which are very long. Some produce masses of research covering numerous pages which is irrelevant and unnecessary. Centres should encourage candidates to produce work where one assessment area flows naturally and is connected to the next section.

It assists the moderation process when a Centre includes a copy of the criteria with the candidates work, and the teacher indicates where the work has been completed.

Some Centres gave excellent annotation both throughout the work and on the front sheet which was relevant and personal to each candidate, although some Centres are still using the phrases copied from the criteria sheet without fully linking them to the candidates work in question.

It was pleasing to see that in general the organisation of the work has been improved upon last year. More structured folders are apparent and the majority of the work has been undertaken in the correct order.

### **Resource Tasks**

There were many excellent tasks seen this year and it was noted that a number of Centres introduced new task titles that fulfilled the aspects of the specification well and provided candidates with interesting and original outcomes. A limited number of Centres are still producing excessive research in the Resource Task or including information downloaded from the internet which is not utilised and is sometimes not relevant to the appropriate task. Centres should be reminded once again these tasks are designed to be short and focussed.

The execution section is usually of a good standard. The use of ICT to produce leaflets enabled candidates to create high quality work with excellent presentation. However, Centres need to be aware that it is not necessary to forward bulky practical items for the moderation process. Photographic evidence together with annotation to justify the marks awarded in this section is sufficient. There has been an improvement in the evaluations with clear strengths and weaknesses being discussed. However, candidates often lost marks where there was no conclusion to their work.

Resource Tasks where candidates attained high marks was linked to the preparation of toddler's meals, the undertaking of a junk item, safety and first aid aspects, and the layette. These lend themselves to good detailed planning with relevant and enjoyable outcomes together with a high standard of evaluation.

A popular choice this year for the variety of booklets constructed were the importance of breast feeding or "bottle verses breast". Some excellent results were apparent especially where ICT

was utilised. A small minority of Centres produced disappointing work that showed poor presentation, lacked originality, or understanding of what was expected.

**Key issues.**

Centres should discourage candidates from producing excessive downloads from the internet, research, and background information. There are still some Centres that require their candidates to undertake detailed research and mark this as planning in the planning section of the Resource Task.

The use of questionnaires is to be encouraged if an introduction is included as to why the questionnaire is being carried out and if the inclusion of relevant and appropriate subject material is used. If questionnaires are undertaken relevant conclusions must be identified to state what has been found out. Only one copy of the questionnaire should be included for moderation purposes.

Most Centres adhered to the assessment and marking criteria, however some evaluations were limited identifying brief strengths or weaknesses, yet were awarded full marks. Overall conclusions relevant to the task title should be highlighted if high marks are to be awarded.

The annotation was detailed, relevant and supportive in the majority of Centres work moderated. However, there are still Centres where candidates work has little annotation to support and justify the marks awarded. A simple good or poor is not helpful to the candidates, the Centre or moderator.

It was pleasing to see that many Centres had introduced different task titles and that candidates had undertaken a variety of tasks which enabled them to introduce interesting and original work.

There were some good examples of pictures taken from web sites for use when illustrating equipment. Some were used by just replacing, cutting and pasting but others were used in a more constructive manner.

Candidates of limited ability seem to gain more marks if they were undertaking a food product item or booklet as they found decisions and priorities easier to make and their resources list accurate. Investigational types of task proved far more difficult for the lower ability candidate.

This year highlighted fewer Centres were submitting two Resource Tasks with all candidates following the same task titles. This enabled the majority of Centres to produce a wider variety in which the task proved to be more interesting and where candidates seemed well motivated, therefore results were of a better quality.

An effective plan is vital if the candidate is to carry out the execution in a positive and successful way. Those candidates who produced a logical plan achieved highly in the execution. Plans written in retrospect should be avoided.

In the execution section the candidate must produce evidence of carrying out the task. This can take many forms; a booklet, game, graphical statistics etc. Photographic or results tables together with written support can be used as evidence to justify the marks awarded. Some Centres still continue to provide no evidence in the execution section yet are awarded full marks. This practise must be avoided as candidates are being penalised. Centres must produce both detailed annotation to support the marks awarded together and evidence from the candidate in this section.

## **Individual Task**

It is vital that Centres have a clear understanding of the Criteria to enable them to be in a position to support their candidates and thus facilitate them in achieving high quality work that is suitable, well ordered and fulfils the assessment areas worthily.

A number of Centres produced interesting Task Titles resulting in relevant and varied work, however, some Centres need to guard against allowing candidates to choose unsuitable and excessively complicated Task Titles as they are far too difficult to follow and subsequently evaluate its success .e.g. 'Investigating the intellectual, social and emotional development of a 2 year old.'

Again it has been highlighted that the development section in the Individual Task proves to be a problematic area, as many Centres see this as research on development and not developing the task. Centres must refer to the assessment criteria to support and guide their candidates positively through this section.

Candidates were able to confidently achieve in the Application of Knowledge section when appropriate detailed research in the Task Analysis had been carried out together with observations that were well documented and recorded.

## **Key Issues**

The confidentiality of the child and family is still not being adhered to, in particular, surnames and irrelevant family background information is disclosed in the coursework. Nursery class details should not be included. Centres should not allow candidates to include surnames or information of a personal or sensitive manner about the child or family.

A large proportion of Centres produced work of a high standard meeting all the assessment criteria admirably. However, it was disappointing to see the number of Centres producing work which was disorganised, not logical, and did not identify where each section of the work started or finished. Clear headings or dividers would improve this situation and enable candidates to focus on their work in a more structured and organised manner.

Some Centres are still starting with the Task Title, and of more concern some without a title.

Some candidates are at a disadvantage as they do not research in sufficient detail or a task is chosen which is far too wide. A number of centres select all four areas of development and then have extreme difficulties with the rest of the task. Teacher guidance is imperative. The majority of the Individual Tasks are focussed on play and learning generally through play. Excellent results have been achieved where specific areas e.g. gross motor skills, and creative skills have been the focus.

Where Centres instruct candidates on what they should undertake, the development and originality is limited.

A number of Centres allow their candidates to produce questions that are impossible to observe and measure and refer back to research. Centre guidance is needed for successful outcomes. The Task Title should be narrowed down with only a small aspect of that development being the focus at the end of the Task Analysis section.

There has been an improvement in the Task Analysis section this year where lower ability candidates have obtained satisfactory marks. However, many Centres are not including criteria for completion towards the end of the Task Analysis section.

Candidates who undertook to observe the child in their own home enabled their plans and activities to be carried out more effectively. Those candidates who undertook school or nursery observations were not so successful, as observing the child in a nursery often resulted in the candidate just giving an account of what happened. This put them at a disadvantage in the

Development and Planning section, as they were unable to choose activities and justify them. It also limits them in the methods of observation. They cannot meet the assessment criteria and thus attain less mark as they have “no control” over the “nursery day” and find it difficult to plan activities.

Many Centres are undertaking a very brief focus on PIES and then introducing the child and researching in detail an area relevant to the age/stage of the child. However, some Centres submit a task where the first twenty pages are not relevant and such a waste of candidate’s time. Centres must stress to their candidates that detailed research must be specific to the age and stage of the child they are studying.

The Development section is still illustrating a concern as Centres continue to see this as further general research and not on developing the task. A number of Centres discuss ways of observing the activities but do not mention actual methods e.g. “participative” “snapshot” or “time sampling”.

Some Centres just suggest an idea and include a random list with no reference to research and sometimes not directly related to the task.

There has been an improvement in the Planning section of the work seen from Centres this year. However, some Centres undertake planning at the beginning of the task and then forget to plan observations in detail and wander off at a tangent not focussing on their chosen areas. This also makes evaluation more difficult. Not all candidates gave overall plans; many gave detailed plans before each observation. Sometimes “ways of recording” was missing and equipment needed for the visits. An overall plan is vital to avoid repetition. Some candidates are not choosing suitable activities as they are not related to the Task Title/area of development chosen.

The marking of observations proved to be fairly accurate with candidates undertaking appropriate recording, however, some Centres are still giving marks on the basis of the number of visits undertaken and not the quality and use of different methods. A number of candidates confuse types of activities and methods of observing and care needs to be taken that their observations are on their task title as many become distracted into other areas of development. A number of candidates are giving good accounts of what happened and are being marked highly but they have not focussed on their chosen area/s. Centres must guide their candidates to make sure that different methods of observations and a variety of recording is undertaken.

The Application of Knowledge section still has areas for improvement. Too frequently candidates talk vaguely about the child being at the “right level” “being able to do what it should” but do not quality this with reference to research. Some candidates made no reference directly to their earlier research. Comparisons with the norms were evident but many candidates did not compare with another child. A number of Centres over marked this section.

An improvement was seen in the evaluation section this year. This was evident in the candidates that gave clear headings for each area of their work. This enabled their approach to be relevant, logical and detailed. Good practice was highlighted by candidates who concluded their work by considering in detail their task title.

General paragraphs or essay type evaluations usually ended up being vague and were often over marked. Brief work that lacked detail and did not refer back to the task title also frequently did not warrant the marks awarded.

### **Administration**

- Improvement in annotation from Centres, however, some Centres using phrases copied from the criteria sheet.
- Excellent administration by the majority of Centres.
- Good use of ICT.
- Receipt of work still variable, work from Centres received early or by 15<sup>th</sup> May was usually well organised. Work received much later often needed a great deal of sorting out.
- Centres still not sending Coursework Summary Mark Sheet with MS1's
- Poorly packaged work not securely fastened.
- Work with no titles, or candidate numbers.
- Increasing number of Centres not completing totals on the MS1's.
- Increasing number of MS1's not clearly completed with faint or undistinguishable marks recorded, clarification then is required. This causes delay in the moderation process and extra work for both the Centre and moderator.
- Increasingly difficult to contact examinations officers who are often part time, are not from a teaching/education background and subsequently are not clear themselves of procedures, forms etc.
- A number of Centres are still sending large hard backed ring binders which are cumbersome to pack, expensive to post and unnecessary.
- Excessive use of plastic wallets.
- A number of Centres misunderstood instructions regarding the authentication forms. However, eventually the majority of Centres did forward them to moderators.
- Centres are still failing to send lost coursework forms.
- Centres are still including excessive materials with whole booklets, internet downloads with little or no reference to them and several questionnaires when one would suffice.
- Little evidence of poor internal moderation.
- A number of Centres are still sending work which is not clearly labelled, and poorly organised. Where candidates work was not clearly identified and sometimes there was no number/name or identification of which Resources Task was the first/second. Moderators had to look back at the marks to distinguish which was which.





**General Certificate of Secondary Education (Home Economics: Child Development )  
(1972)  
June 2006 Assessment Series**

Component Threshold Marks

<b>Component</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Paper 1	100			51	44	37	31	25
Paper 2	100	60	49	39	30			
Coursework	100	79	67	56	44	33	22	11

**Syllabus Options**

**Foundation Tier**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200				103	86	69	53	37
Percentage in Grade					34.1	26.6	20.2	11.0	5.00
Cumulative Percentage in Grade					34.1	60.8	81.0	92.0	97.0

The total entry for the examination was 11334

**Higher Tier**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	152	133	114	95	74	63		
Percentage in Grade		4.44	18.1	32.7	28.1	12.8	1.94		
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		4.44	22.5	55.2	83.4	96.3	98.2		

The total entry for the examination was 6823

**Overall**

	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Percentage in Grade	1.71	6.98	12.6 0	31.8	21.3	13.2	6.77	3.07
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	1.71	8.69	21.2 8	53.1	74.45	87.6	94.4	97.5

The total entry for the examination was 18357







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

**OCR Information Bureau**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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



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

© OCR 2006