

**GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION  
TWENTY FIRST CENTURY SCIENCE  
SCIENCE A**

**A214/01/INS**

Unit 4: Ideas in Context (Foundation Tier)

**INSERT**

**Friday 28 May 2010  
Morning**

**Duration: 45 minutes**



**MODIFIED LANGUAGE**

**INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMS OFFICER/INVIGILATOR**

- Do not send this Insert for marking; it should be retained in the centre or destroyed.

**INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES**

- This insert contains the three articles required to answer the questions.

**INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES**

- This document consists of **8** pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

## To cull or not to cull?

Tuberculosis (TB) is a disease caused by a bacterium. It was once a very serious human disease. The discovery of antibiotics brought the disease under control. In recent years a new strain of TB has become resistant to many antibiotics. TB is making a comeback in the UK. This is because fewer people are being vaccinated and many people travel to the UK from countries that do not vaccinate against TB. The human TB vaccine is not 100% successful and it does not provide lifetime immunity.



Cattle and badgers can also catch TB. Vaccines for badgers and cattle do not yet exist but are being developed. It is likely that these vaccines will not be 100% effective either.

Some farmers think that badgers may provide a reservoir of infection for TB. They are worried that their herd will have to be destroyed if their cattle get infected with TB from the badgers. They want to reduce the number of badgers to prevent them from spreading the disease. This killing of badgers is called a cull.

Some conservationists do not agree that the badgers spread the disease. They believe that the disease is spread when farmers move their cattle around the country to other farms and markets.

In 1998, scientists started a five-year study to answer the question “Do badgers spread TB to cattle?” They decided to cull badgers in 30 high-infection areas of the country. They wanted to see if the number of cattle catching TB dropped.

The scientists divided each high-infection area into three zones:

zone 1 all badgers culled

zone 2 no badgers culled

zone 3 badgers only culled around farms that have cattle with TB.

They then monitored the number of cases of TB in cattle in each zone. Different zones gave different results. The results also varied from one high-infection area to another. For example, in one high-infection area the number of cattle with TB in zone 1 remained the same, but in another high-infection area the number of cattle with TB in zone 1 actually increased.

These results did not definitely prove that badgers spread TB. In fact, more cattle developed TB in areas where badgers were culled. One possible explanation for this is that the surviving badgers wander much further in areas where badgers are being culled. This results in the TB being spread even more.

Some scientists think that a more effective way of reducing TB in cattle would be to have better cattle control measures. These include moving cattle less often, testing cattle for TB before they are moved, keeping newly purchased cattle separate from the rest and having more frequent TB tests.

There are different opinions about culling badgers.

**Jane**

Culling badgers is cruel. I do not believe that they spread TB to cattle.



**Ranjit**

The number of cattle with TB increases when badgers wander about more. This is because they are more likely to come into contact with cattle in neighbouring farms.



**Peter**

As more badgers were culled, TB in cattle on neighbouring land increased. On average, this increase was 20%.




**Stella**

I am a farmer. If I were allowed to kill the badgers I am sure that I could stop my cattle getting TB.

## Cleaning up the Marshall Islands

### Nuclear weapons in the 1950s and 1960s

In the years after the Second World War, the USA and the Soviet Union (now mostly Russia) developed powerful nuclear weapons. The USA tested many of its weapons on a tiny part of the Marshall Islands. This is called the Bikini Atoll, in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. At the time, these islands were governed by the United States. The few people who lived on Bikini were moved to islands many kilometres away.



A particularly powerful test, named Bravo, was carried out in 1954. Radioactive chemicals were spread much further than had been expected. People living on Rongelap Island, 150 km away from the blast, had to move away to the islands of Kwajalein Atoll because Rongelap was too radioactive.

### Radioactive waste


Nuclear weapons produce radioactive waste just like nuclear power stations do. However, the waste from nuclear weapons is spread over a large area. The waste from the Bravo test contained radioactive forms of the elements plutonium and americium, which emit alpha radiation, and strontium and caesium, which emit beta radiation. All four of these also emit gamma radiation. A large enough dose of any of these forms of radiation can cause serious damage to living cells.

## Decontaminating Rongelap Island

The most contaminated soil was removed from the areas where people lived. Then clean, crushed coral was used to cover the remaining soil.

Coral was used because it is better at absorbing ionising radiation than sand, as shown in the graph.

**absorption of gamma radiation by sand and by coral**



## The future for Rongelap

By the summer of 2002, the levels of radiation in Rongelap were no higher than the background radiation in most places in the world. Building is now taking place so that the people can return.

A new source of income for this tiny island is tourism. The waters around the tropical island of Rongelap have not been disturbed for half a century. They provide an untouched marine environment for tourists attracted by the ideal conditions for diving.



## Call to ban food colourings

Between 5% and 10% of school-age children suffer some degree of ADHD – attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Symptoms of ADHD include a lack of concentration, excessive activity and impulsive behaviour.

In 2008, the Food Standards Agency (FSA) advised that six artificial colourings should be banned from food and drink made in Britain by the end of 2010. They asked for this ban because research suggested that the additives may cause hyperactive behaviour in children. FSA representative, Dame Deirdre Hutton said, 'We have evidence that suggests it would be sensible for these colourings to be taken out of food.' Some supermarkets have already stopped using these additives in their own-brand products.

One study of food additives was carried out at Southampton University. Scientists gave drinks containing mixtures of some food colourings to 153 three-year-olds and 144 eight-year-olds. The drinks also contained the preservative sodium benzoate. The children were randomly given one of three soft drinks. Drink A and Drink B contained different mixtures of colourings with the preservative. These two drinks were designed to be like those that a typical child might have during a normal day. Drink C was water.

Drink A	Drink B
Carmoisine (E122)	Allura red (E129)
Ponceau 4R (E124)	Carmoisine (E122)
Sodium benzoate (E211)	Quinoline yellow (E104)
Sunset yellow (E110)	Sodium benzoate (E211)
Tartrazine (E102)	Sunset yellow (E110)

The children's hyperactivity levels were measured before and after they had the drinks.

The scientists found that some mixtures of colourings resulted in an increase in hyperactivity.

Results showed that, compared with water:

- in the sample of 3-year-old children, Drink A increased the average level of hyperactivity within the group. Drink B did not
- in the sample of 8-year-old children, Drink B increased the average level of hyperactivity. Drink A did not.

There were differences between children in their response to Drink A and Drink B. The mixtures had a large effect on some children but had no effect on others in the same group.

The British Soft Drink Association said in a statement, 'All additives, including colours used in food and drink, have been approved by the FSA as being safe for use and are carefully selected and monitored. They are included to meet the expectations of the public about the appearance and shelf-life of products and to enhance the choices that are available to them.'

Advisers to the European Food Standards Agency do not consider that the Southampton University research provided enough information to support changes to recommended intakes of food colourings. Scientists advise caution in using results from such a small study to judge effects on the whole UK population.



**Copyright Information**

OCR is committed to seeking permission to reproduce all third-party content that it uses in its assessment materials. OCR has attempted to identify and contact all copyright holders whose work is used in this paper. To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced in the OCR Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations, is given to all schools that receive assessment material and is freely available to download from our public website ([www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)) after the live examination series.

If OCR has unwittingly failed to correctly acknowledge or clear any third-party content in this assessment material, OCR will be happy to correct its mistake at the earliest possible opportunity.

For queries or further information please contact the Copyright Team, First Floor, 9 Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 1GE.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group; Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.