

Home Economics (Child Development)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1972**

Report on the Components

June 2007

1972/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

CONTENTS

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

REPORTS ON THE COMPONENTS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
1972/03	Coursework	2
1972/01	Paper 1	10
1972/02	Paper 2	12
*	Grade Thresholds	14

Chief Examiners Report

Candidates of all abilities have been able to demonstrate a positive level of achievement in this specification. It was apparent that where teachers had a clear understanding of the specification appropriate guidance and support was given to their candidates.

Teachers who have responded to the comments stated in the feedback report which is sent out to Centres with the examination results have benefited their candidates.

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 section.
- planning and carrying out more than two Resource Tasks and encouraging candidates to include one Resource Task that is of an investigative nature in their submission.
- ensuring all parts of the specification are taught.
- giving appropriate guidance to candidates to correctly answer the free response questions.
- allowing time for a good revision programme to be undertaken.
- considering attending the Training Programmes which are available to Centres particularly those who have an adjustment to their coursework, are new to the specification or who are returning to the specification after a lapse of time.
- following coursework administration procedures correctly which includes forwarding the completed MS1, Coursework Summary Mark Sheet and Centre Authentication Sheet to their Moderator before the 15th of May.

General Comments

It was pleasing to see that the majority of Centres continued to apply the marking criteria effectively and accurately. Although most Centres sent in initial documentation well ahead or on time, administration problems have increased this year and with a number of Centres having to be repeatedly contacted to request that the necessary paperwork is forwarded to support the moderation process.

An increasing number of candidates are using ICT 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 the majority of Centres. Many Centres used original task titles for both the Individual Task and the Resource Task. This showed an improvement on previous years. However, there is cause for concern in a minority of Centres where coursework did not meet the assessment criteria and this resulted in major adjustments. Disappointingly, it seems that the same Centres year on year receive similar adjustments and are not implementing suggestions given in the feedback reports from their moderation. These Centres are failing to understand the requirements of the specification and subsequently are not guiding and supporting their candidates accurately. Centres need to refer to the criteria before awarding marks for the work. Occasionally Centres identify that very little or no work has been completed in a particular assessment area yet marks are still being awarded.

It is apparent that some Centres are producing coursework which is very long and is irrelevant and unnecessary. Centres should encourage candidates to produce work where one assessment area flows naturally from one section to the next section.

It assists the moderation process if a Centre includes a copy of the criteria with each candidates work and the teacher indicates where 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; however, some Centres are still using the phrases copied from the criteria sheet without fully linking them to the candidate's work in question.

It was noted that in general the organisation of the work has improved since last year, however, there is still excessive use of plastic wallets and A4 folders which contain plastic 'slip in' wallets. Centres are advised to secure candidates' work with treasury tags and place this in a cardboard wallet. Excessive packaging and hard back folders are unnecessary and are expensive to post.

Resource Tasks

There were many excellent tasks seen again this year and it was evident that a number of Centres introduced new task titles that fulfilled the aspects of the specification and provided candidates with interesting and original outcomes. However, a small minority of Centres produced disappointing work that showed poor presentation, lacked originality, or understanding of what was expected.

Centres should be reminded once again that these tasks are designed to be short and focussed.

The Execution section is usually of a good standard. ICT has continued to be used to assist candidates to produce leaflets of a high quality which has resulted in excellent presentation. 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. Candidates lost marks where there was no conclusion to their work.

Resource Tasks that achieved high marks were:

- the preparation of toddler's snacks
- designing a book to encourage children to count
- 'breast is best' leaflet.

These lend themselves to good detailed planning with relevant and enjoyable outcomes together with a high standard of evaluation.

Popular choices this year for booklets constructed were:

- preparing for a healthy pregnancy
- the importance of child safety equipment inside and outside the home.

Excellent investigative Resource Tasks included:

- antenatal care and facilities in their area
- comparison between bought and home made baby food.

Results from these investigations were presented using ICT and proved to be effective. Candidates of a lower ability seemed to gain more marks if they were making an item or a booklet as they found decisions and priorities easier to identify and could list resources accurately. There were only a few Centres where the execution areas seemed too generous and there was a lack of comments to justify the level of marks awarded.

Key issues

Centres should:

- discourage candidates from producing excessive downloads from the internet for background information.
- not encourage their candidates to undertake unnecessary detailed research and incorrectly mark this as planning as this gains no marks in the planning section of the Resource Task.
- use questionnaires if an introduction is included as to why the questionnaire is being carried out is relevant
- ensure questionnaires that are undertaken include relevant conclusions which must be identified and state what has been achieved.
- include only one copy of the questionnaire for moderation purposes.

There were only a few Centres where the execution areas seemed too generous and there was a lack of comments to justify the level of marks awarded.

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

The annotation was detailed, relevant and supportive in the majority of work moderated. There are, however, still Centres where candidates work has little annotation to support and justify the marks awarded. Simply the word good or poor is not helpful to the candidates, or the moderator.

On a positive note there were some good examples of pictures taken from web sites for use when illustrating equipment. Less basic cutting and pasting from magazines and the internet was apparent.

This year highlighted fewer Centres where all candidates followed the same task title in the Resource Task. 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; these are easily identified by moderators.

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 still award full marks. This practise must be avoided as candidates are being penalised. Centres must produce both detailed annotation to support the marks awarded together with evidence from the candidates work in this section.

Centres should be aware that inappropriate titles and subsequent work should not be encouraged by candidates. Virtual reality dolls and sensitive contraception issues should be avoided.

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 criteria.

All Centres should consider feedback or training for teachers.

A number of Centres produced interesting Task Titles resulting in relevant and varied work. Task Titles focussing on two areas of development were rarely seen this year. Most task titles focussed on play and learning through play with specific areas e.g. gross motor skills and creative skills. Centres supported their candidates by enabling them to produce appropriate task titles highlighting one area of development only.

Most candidates undertook the observations of the child they were studying in their own home, this enabled candidates to plan and carry out activities more effectively. When candidates undertake their observations in a nursery the evidence shown is often just an account of what has happened. This in turn disadvantages the candidate in the Development and Planning sections. They cannot meet the assessment criteria fully and gain less marks as they have no control over the nursery day and find it difficult to plan activities or see progression.

A number of Centres are correctly guiding their candidates by getting them to include brief research on PIES and then introducing the child and subsequently researching in detail an area relevant to the age and stage of the child.

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 title. Centres must refer and understand 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 and linked to 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 often disclosed. Centres should not allow candidates to include surnames or information of a personal or sensitive manner about the child or family. Excessive photographs of the child should be discouraged and only used if relevant to the development area being studied and then only if the face of the child is indistinguishable.

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

Teacher guidance with regard to task titles is imperative as some candidates produce titles that are impossible to observe and measure. The Task Title should be narrowed down at the end of the Task Analysis with only a small aspect of the development chosen being the focus of the remainder of the Individual Study.

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 a criteria for completion at the end of the Task Analysis section, and so they cannot gain full marks.

The following points have been bullet pointed for clarity:

- Candidates who undertook to observe the child in their own home enabled their plans and activities to be carried out more effectively than those who undertook school or nursery observations as these frequently resulted in the candidate just giving an account of what happened.
- Some Centres are continuing to see the Development Section as research on development and not developing the task title resulting in just a list of activities with little or no justification.
- An overall improvement in the Planning section, however:
 - some Centres undertake planning at the beginning of the task then forget to plan observations in detail
 - methods of recording in some Centres were weak.
 - some candidates are not using suitable activities as they are not related to the task title.
 - an overall plan is vital to avoid repetition.
- The marking of observations proved to be fairly accurate with candidates undertaking appropriate recording, however:
 - some centres give marks not on quality but on the basis of number of visits.
 - not all candidates focussed on their chosen area yet were awarded high marks.
 - a number of candidates confused types of activities and methods of observing.

The candidates that performed well had their tasks structured with support and guidance offered by the teacher.

- The Application of Knowledge section still has areas for improvement as:
 - candidates frequently write vaguely about ‘the child being at the right level’ and ‘doing what they should’ but do not quantify these statements.
 - candidates make no reference to the earlier research.
 - some Candidates made comparison with norms but not with another child when high marks were awarded
 - a number of Centres over marked this section where descriptive accounts of observations and little reference to the Task Title were evident.

Some excellent evaluations were seen this year, where candidates had scored high marks they had reviewed each section of the task thoroughly and few aspects were missed. This enabled the 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 did not warrant the marks awarded.

Administration Problems

- Poorly packaged work not securely fastened.
- Excessive use of plastic wallets and hard ring binders.
- Use of half marks – these should be avoided in all sections as this can lead to over-marking.
- Increasing number of Centres not completing the totals on the MS1 and checking that the lozenges match these totals.
- Increasing number of MS1's not clearly completed with faint or undistinguishable marks recorded on the moderator's carbon copy of the MS1. This causes delay in the moderation process and extra work for the both the Centre and the Moderator.
- An increased number of centres are not sending the Coursework Summary Mark Sheet with the MS1.
- Centres including several copies of questionnaires when one would suffice.
- An increased number of careless addition errors and blanks on MS1 or incomplete MS1's. This results in additional time consuming administration for the Moderator.
- Work with no candidate numbers to identify sample of work sent for moderation purposes.

WRITTEN PAPER

General Comments

The paper proved accessible to all candidates and gave opportunities for differentiation throughout both tiers. It was evident that some centres had prepared their candidates well, both in delivering the whole specification and in their instruction of examination technique.

It is important when delivering the specification that the factual information is correct and up to date. In addition, candidates should be made aware that information and concepts developed during coursework components are relevant to questions in the written paper. Issues must be taught in a balanced way with candidates being provided with factual evidence for both sides, allowing candidates to be assessed on their understanding rather than personal views or anecdotes.

In the Foundation Tier, examiners were pleased to say that there were few questions which had not been attempted, indicating that the paper had been framed in such a way that candidates felt confident about making a response. Where marks were lost, it was generally through a lack of basic subject knowledge and failing to use appropriate terminology.

On the Higher Tier, candidates who planned their responses were able to give detailed factual information demonstrating their literacy skills, good use of terminology and depth and breadth of knowledge.

Candidates in both tiers lost marks if they did not read the question carefully enough or failed to explain the points they identified.

Centres could support candidates when preparing for the written examination by:

- teaching correct and **up to date** factual information;
- teaching **facts** rather than personal views and anecdotes;
- 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;
- using glossaries to reinforce the use of **correct terminology**;
- ensuring candidates **link coursework** to the written paper;
- 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) (i)	As intended, this question gave access to all candidates and most candidates correctly answered 'condom'.
(ii)	All candidates attempted these but 'cap' and 'coil' were often muddled.
(iii)	Sterilisation was not widely known yet hysterectomy, vasectomy and circumcision were often given.
(b)	Candidates correctly identified 'alcohol', 'drugs' and 'cigarette smoke'. Weaker candidates gave examples of foods.
(c)	Candidates gained good marks re 'toiletries/nightdress/magazines/towels'. Candidates who failed to read the question carefully gave answers relating to items for a baby.
(d)	'Mother can have a rest', 'meet other mums', 'visitors limited' were the correct answers given. Vague answers did not gain marks i.e. 'cleaner', 'safer' and 'nurses'.
2 (a)	Candidates scored marks for a correct age but not if they gave an age range. A few candidates just named the equipment.
(b) (i)	The term 'layette' was not widely known which is surprising as so many candidates often produce a layette Resource Task for their coursework.
(ii)	'Easy to put on/off', 'washable', 'right size' and 'soft' were all good responses. A very small minority incorrectly answered the question with another question which led to an ambiguous answer.
Tip – Do not answer a question with a question	
(iii)	'Easy fastening', 'no washing' and 'no electricity' were good answers but many candidates lost marks for vague answers e.g. 'easier', 'comfortable' or 'cheaper'.
(c)	Good responses included 'feet measured', 'variety of styles', 'range of sizes' and even 'a toy corner'. Weaker candidates identified different types of shoes.
3 (a) (i)-(iii)	In general the data was extracted accurately.
(iv)	Good range of activities given, therefore candidates were able to score well. Incorrect answers included 'jigsaws' or 'painting'.
(b)	The terms 'nature' and 'nurture' were not widely mentioned whereas parents and friends were. A few candidates correctly identified 'genes' and 'environment'.
(c)	Candidates seemed to have a good understanding of the value of television but lost marks if they gave only one word answers e.g. 'colour', 'talks' or 'sings'.
(d)	Well answered with 'parks', 'swimming', 'playgroups' and 'going to friends and relatives'. Candidates lost marks if they gave four types of daycare provision.
(e)	Candidates who had been taught well correctly identified the different types of social play. Other candidates, however, incorrectly gave types of play.
(f)	Well attempted, with 'deaf', 'not talked to' or 'learning disabilities' being popular answers. Less able gave vague answers e.g. 'no one to play with'.
4 (a)	Answers given credit were 'bonding', 'two role models' and 'more money for the family'. Weaker candidates were unclear about shared care roles.

Report on the Components taken in June 2007

(b)	Good range of answers with many candidates scoring full marks e.g. 'divorced', 'died', 'sperm donor', 'prison', 'one night stand'.
(c) (i)	'Social Services' was well known. Just a few said 'social worker'.
(ii)	Many candidates correctly identified 'temporary' and 'gets paid'. To gain marks, answers needed to be factual rather than emotional judgements.
(d)	Well answered by all e.g. 'nanny', 'relatives', 'au pair'.
(e)	Good responses with little repetition and candidates gaining marks for 'child's routine', 'emergency numbers', 'how to contact parents', 'what time parents/carers will be home' and 'child's bed time'.
(f)	On the whole this was well answered. Candidates, however, lost marks if they gave four points of the Green Cross Code or gave incorrect information e.g. 'teach Highway Code' or vague answers such as 'use crossings' or 'getting children to cross when the traffic lights turn green'!
5 (a) & (b)	Candidates who had been taught well earned marks for the correct factual answers. Weaker candidates gave 'breast milk' and 'too rich for a baby'.
(c)	Candidates who read the question carefully gained very good marks, but those who wrote about the advantages to a baby rather than a mother gained few or no marks.
Tip – Teach candidates to read every question carefully and underline key words	
(d)	'Embarrassed', 'going back to work', 'baby cannot latch on' and 'not enough milk' were popular correct responses.
(e)	Many candidates did not gain a mark because they gave a brand name of a product or incorrectly identified soya milk, condensed milk.
(f)	Candidates who had learned the factual information gained marks. Quite a few candidates, however, could say only 'wash up' or 'rinse out' showing little understanding of the importance of sterilising feeding bottles.
(g)	Many candidates correctly identified 'measurements on the side', 'a lid', 'correct sized teats', 'wide neck for cleaning' and 'easy to hold'. Candidates who said 'a handle' or 'easy for baby to hold' did not gain any marks.
6	<p>This question is intended to achieve differentiation between a C Grade and below.</p> <p>The question was well attempted, with many candidates gaining up to half the marks. Candidates remained in the lower level if they gave only a list. Weaker answers concentrated on the treatment of different illnesses and how the parent/carer could be prepared for a child's stay in hospital rather than preparation of the child.</p> <p>Where evidence of planning for this question was seen candidates generally wrote very good responses, allowing the better candidates in particular to score well.</p>
Tip – Candidates should be advised to answer this extended writing question in full sentences rather than in list form as the quality of written communication is taken into consideration during marking.	

Paper 2 – Higher Tier

Comments on individual questions

1 (a)	Answers given credit were ‘bonding’, ‘two role models’ and ‘more money for the family’. Weaker candidates were unclear about shared care roles.
(b)	Good range of answers with many candidates scoring full marks e.g. ‘divorced’, ‘died’, ‘sperm donor’, ‘prison’, ‘one night stand’.
(c) (i)	‘Social Services’ was well known. Just a few said ‘social worker’.
(ii)	Many candidates correctly identified ‘temporary’ and ‘gets paid’. To gain marks, answers needed to be factual rather than emotional judgements.
(d)	Well answered by all e.g. ‘nanny’, ‘relatives’, au pair’.
(e)	Good responses with little repetition and candidates gaining 3-4 marks for ‘child’s routine’, ‘emergency numbers’, how to contact parents’, ‘what time parents/carers will be home’ and ‘child’s bed time’.
(f)	On the whole this was well answered. Candidates, however, lost marks if they only gave four points of the Green Cross Code or gave incorrect information e.g. ‘teach Highway Code’ or vague answers such as ‘use crossings’ or ‘getting children to cross when the traffic lights turn green’!
2 (a) & (b)	Candidates who had been taught well earned marks for the correct factual answers. Weaker candidates gave ‘breast milk’ and ‘too rich for a baby’.
(c)	Candidates who read the question carefully gained very good marks, but those who wrote about the advantages to a baby rather than a mother gained few or no marks.
Tip – Teach candidates to read every question carefully and underline key words	
(d)	‘Embarrassed’, ‘going back to work’, ‘baby cannot latch on’ and ‘not enough milk’ were popular correct responses.
(e)	Many candidates did not gain a mark because they gave a brand name of a product or incorrectly identified soya milk, condensed milk.
(f)	Candidates who had learned the factual information gained marks. Quite a few candidates, however, could say only ‘wash up’ or ‘rinse out’ showing little understanding of the importance of sterilising feeding bottles.
(g)	Many candidates correctly identified ‘measurements on the side’, ‘a lid’, ‘correct sized teats’, ‘wide neck for cleaning’ and ‘easy to hold’. Candidates who said ‘a handle’ or ‘easy for baby to hold’ did not gain any marks.
3	<p>This question is intended to achieve differentiation between a C grade and below.</p> <p>The question was well attempted, with many candidates gaining up to half the marks. Candidates remained in the lower level if they gave only a list. Weaker answers concentrated on the treatment of different illnesses and how the parent/carer could be prepared for a child’s stay in hospital rather than preparation of the child.</p> <p>Where evidence of planning for this question was seen candidates generally wrote very good responses, allowing the better candidates in particular to score well.</p>

4 (a)	Most candidates scored highly here unless they muddled the description for the cap with that for femidom.
(b)	Well answered, 'male condom' and 'femidom' being popular answers. Weaker candidates gave the withdrawal method.
(c)	Chlamydia was correctly identified.
(d) (i)	Some candidates showed a lack of revision and confused this with ovulation whereas others gave the correct answer.
(ii)	This allowed good differentiation as the more able candidates could correctly apply subject specific terminology.
(iii)	Most candidates gave the correct response whereas others who had not revised well gave 'uterus'.
(e) (i)	Candidates who had been taught well identified the term with correct terminology 'pre-conceptual care'.
Tip – The use of glossaries could underpin candidates' application of correct terminology.	
(ii)	On the whole this was well answered. Candidates did lose marks, however, if they did not give specific facts e.g. 'don't drink', 'take extra vitamins' or 'eat healthily' without qualification.
5 (a)	Most candidates could state 'head circumference', 'number of fingers and toes' and 'cleft palate'. Weaker candidates incorrectly gave 'eyesight', 'hearing' and then struggled to find a third response.
(b)	Midwife and Health Visitor were correctly identified. Again the less able gave general answers e.g. 'nurses' and 'doctors'.
(c)	Most candidates were able to identify some of the key ways to toilet train but failed to get full marks if they could not follow through each point with an explanation. Weaker candidates thought toilet training followed potty training whilst others talked about bribery and sweets as rewards.
6	<p>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. In some centres there was a noticeable lack of planning for this free response question.</p> <p>Many candidates could write in detail and differentiated well. Weaker candidates gave some way of disciplining children but these were not often correct e.g. 'smack', 'ignore bad behaviour' whereas learning acceptable patterns of behaviour was related either to social training e.g. 'table manners' / 'saying please and thank you' or to preventing criminal behaviour in adulthood e.g. 'ASBOs' or 'being expelled from school'.</p> <p>Middle range candidates could offer some valid points but did not have the understanding or literacy skills to follow through with an explanation. Some excellent responses were seen especially where planning of the question was evident and candidates had considered their responses more broadly.</p>
Tip – Candidates are strongly advised to do a plan for the free response questions to prevent repetition and to keep focused on what the question is asking.	

General Certificate of Secondary Education
Home Economics Child Development (1972)
June 2007 Assessment Series

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	100			45	37	29	21	13
2	100	70	60	50	40			
3	100	79	67	56	44	33	22	11
83	100	79	67	56	44	33	22	11

Specification Options

Foundation Tier

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200				98	79	61	43	25
Percentage in Grade	200				34.0	27.8	19.6	12.1	4.5
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	200				34.0	62.0	82.0	94.0	98.0

The total entry for the examination was 10860

Higher Tier

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	162	143	124	106	84	73		
Percentage in Grade	200	4.8	18.8	32.3	26.4	13.7	2.0		
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	200	4.8	23.6	56.0	82.2	96.0	98.0		

The total entry for the examination was 6975

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	1.9	7.4	12.6	31.0	22.3	12.7	7.3	2.7
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	1.9	9.4	22.4	54.2	77.0	89.9	97.0	99.1

The total entry for the examination was 17835

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

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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



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

© OCR 2007