

**OXFORD CAMBRIDGE AND RSA EXAMINATIONS
GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION**

A214/02/RB

**TWENTY FIRST CENTURY SCIENCE
SCIENCE A**

Unit 4: Ideas in Context (Higher Tier)

RESOURCE BOOKLET

To be opened on receipt

JUNE 2011

SUITABLE FOR VISUALLY IMPAIRED CANDIDATES

READ INSTRUCTIONS OVERLEAF

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- **This booklet contains three articles.**
- **Take these articles away and read them through carefully.**
- **Spend some time looking up any technical terms or phrases you do not understand.**
- **For the examination on FRIDAY 27 MAY 2011 you will be given a fresh copy of these articles, together with a question paper.**
- **You will NOT be able to take your original copy into the examination with you.**

ARE ORGANIC FOODS BETTER FOR US?

WHY DO PEOPLE BUY ORGANIC FOOD?

Organic food has been a success story. Shops and supermarkets sell organic fruit and vegetables. Total sales of organic food were worth more than £2 billion in 2007 in the UK alone.

There are many reasons why people choose to buy organic food. Some people think it tastes better, is safer and contains more vitamins and minerals. Other people think it is better for the environment or that it is more 'natural'. Some may also think that eating organic food is a way to reduce their intake of pesticide residues.

IS ORGANIC FOOD MORE NUTRITIOUS?

One reason why many people buy organic food is because they believe that it is more nutritious. However, the balance of current scientific evidence does not support this view.

Nutrient levels in food vary depending on many different factors. These include freshness, storage conditions, crop variety, soil conditions and weather conditions. The available evidence shows that the nutrient levels are similar in food produced by both organic and intensive farming methods. However, organic food is more expensive, and this also affects people's choices. Sales of organic food are likely to fall when people have less money to spend.

RESULTS OF AN INDEPENDENT STUDY

The Food Standards Agency (FSA) helps to bring about changes in diet that will improve people's health. For

this reason the FSA funded an independent study of the levels of nutrients in organic and non-organic food. This 2009 study reviewed evidence published over the past 50 years of the different nutrient levels found in crops from both types of farming. It also looked at the possible health benefits of eating organic food.

The study concluded that in terms of the nutrient content there is no good evidence that organic food is better than non-organic food. The results of this study showed that there is little, if any, nutritional difference between organic and intensively produced food. There was also no evidence of additional health benefits from eating organic food.


For example, evidence shows that there is more phosphorus in organic food. Phosphorus is an important mineral in the diet, but the diet of most people contains enough phosphorus. Acidity is also higher in organic produce, but acidity is about taste and makes no difference at all for health.

FURTHER SUPPORT

The FSA is not alone in making this assessment. In 2003 the French Food Safety Agency published a review which concluded that there is no difference in terms of food safety and nutrition. Also, in 2007 the Swedish National Food Administration reported that there were no nutritional benefits from organic food.

PESTICIDES

The FSA report did not look at pesticide residues in food. Farmers using intensive methods spray their crops with pesticides to give good yields at low cost. Before pesticides are approved they are rigorously assessed. This ensures that they do not pose an unacceptable risk to human health and that residues left in food will not be harmful to consumers. Pesticide residues in the food chain are also monitored to check they are within legal and safe limits.



Nevertheless, many people prefer not to have detectable pesticide residues in their food, even if they are not a risk to health. Buying organic food is one way to reduce the chances that your food contains pesticides. Organic food contains fewer pesticide residues because other methods, such as natural predators, are used to control insect pests.

It is also possible to produce intensively grown fruit and vegetables with residue levels as small as those found in organically grown crops. This can be done by carefully controlling the amount of chemical sprayed and adjusting how long before harvesting this is done. Modern pesticides can be sprayed at very low concentrations and they quickly break down into harmless chemicals.

VITAMIN C IN TOMATOES

Scientists measured the amount of vitamin C in tomatoes grown using organic and intensive farming methods. Their results are shown in the table.

These scientists concluded that there is not a real difference between the vitamin C content of the tomatoes grown using organic farming methods and those grown using intensive farming methods.

VITAMIN C CONTENT IN MG/100 g							
	SAMPLE 1	SAMPLE 2	SAMPLE 3	SAMPLE 4	SAMPLE 5	SAMPLE 6	BEST ESTIMATE
organically grown tomatoes	19.5	19.9	19.6	19.9	19.8	19.5	19.7
intensively grown tomatoes	20.2	20.0	19.8	19.1	19.9	19.7	19.9

METHANE FROM THE ARCTIC

Most scientists agree that global warming is due to greenhouse gases, and that the consequences of continued global warming will be severe. Concern about greenhouse gases has focused on carbon dioxide, which has been released in greater and greater amounts over the past two hundred years. However, methane also absorbs infrared radiation, and so contributes to the greenhouse effect. The table shows how the levels of these gases in the atmosphere have changed over the past two hundred years. Water vapour is also a powerful greenhouse gas, but it has been omitted from the table as the water cycle has kept the amount of water vapour in the atmosphere roughly constant since pre-industrial times.

	CARBON DIOXIDE	METHANE
pre-industrial level in ppm (parts per million)	280	0.700
current level in ppm (parts per million)	387	1.745

The carbon dioxide level has gone up by 107 ppm since pre-industrial times, an increase of nearly 40%. In the same time, however, the amount of methane has gone up by 150%. Further increases in methane could have a serious effect.

Methane is a much more powerful greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. Although the methane level is 200 times less than the carbon dioxide level, the current contribution of methane to global warming is estimated to be about one-third that of carbon dioxide. Most methane is produced by bacteria decomposing dead tissues from

plants or animals. These bacteria live in places where there is no oxygen, such as the mud at the bottom of stagnant ponds.


BUBBLING LAKES

Recently, scientists have discovered an alarming new source of methane in the frozen north of the Arctic. Investigating bubbles coming out of lakes at Fairbanks in Alaska, Professor Katey Walter of the University of Alaska found that large quantities of methane were being released from the ground underneath. Field work by other scientists in Cherskiy in northern Russia produced similar results.



THAWING PERMAFROST

The top few centimetres of the ground in the Arctic thaws in the summer. Beneath this, the ground is frozen all the time. This is the PERMAFROST (permanently frozen ground). Permafrost contains dead plant and animal matter that has been locked in cold storage for thousands of years.



section through Arctic soil

As the climate warms, the melting snow and glaciers are producing more and more lakes. The water at the bottom of these lakes melts the permafrost, allowing microorganisms to break down the dead matter into methane.

THREAT OR OPPORTUNITY?


As global warming continues, the problem of methane being released from the Arctic permafrost becomes more serious. The more thawing there is, the more lakes

will be formed. These lakes will warm up the permafrost underneath them and release methane. This will increase global warming further.

One method suggested to deal with the methane is to collect it and burn it. Although this produces carbon dioxide, the carbon dioxide is far less powerful as a greenhouse gas than methane. Burning the methane can generate energy for the local inhabitants too, although there are problems with supplying this methane to a thinly-spread population in such a harsh environment.

Another possible method is to prevent the permafrost from thawing by introducing massive herds of plant-eating animals to the region. These animals will remove the insulating layer of snow when foraging for food. This allows the cold winter temperatures to penetrate deeper into the ground and keep the permafrost frozen. This is what used to happen when mammoths, which are now extinct, roamed around the Arctic. The animals suggested for this are moose, reindeer and horses. This is currently being tried out in a village in northern Russia.

'PUMP HEAD' SYNDROME



typical heart-lung machine

People with heart problems sometimes need bypass surgery. During this operation the heart is stopped. A heart-lung machine then takes over the functions of the heart and the lungs. The machine adds oxygen to the blood and pumps the blood around the body. Some patients who have heart bypass surgery find that their brain does not work so well after the operation. It can take up to five years to recover. Surgeons have called this reduction of brain function 'pump head' syndrome.

PART A

Bruce Stutz had surgery to repair one of his heart valves. During the surgery he was connected to a heart-lung machine for two hours. In the months following surgery, Bruce noticed that he had problems concentrating. He found even simple tasks difficult. Bruce was not alone. Many other patients that had been placed on a heart-lung machine reported similar symptoms. Was the heart-lung machine the cause of 'pump head' syndrome? Many scientists thought so.

A study in 2001 found that of 261 heart disease patients who had operations using the heart-lung machine, 42% experienced reduced brain function for up to five years after surgery. This was true even when the figures were adjusted for age. Further studies supported this data.

PART B

However, some scientists thought that the data was flawed. They noticed that the data only included patients that had been on the heart-lung machine during heart surgery. It did not include a control group of patients that had heart surgery but had not been on the heart-lung machine. It also did not include patients who had heart disease but did not have any surgery at all.

PART C

Doubt has been cast on the idea that a heart-lung machine is the cause of 'pump head' syndrome.

Some scientists now think that heart disease does not just affect the heart, but that it could also affect the brain as well.

So the question is – is it the treatment or the disease which causes ‘pump head’ syndrome?

A new study by Ola Selnes, Professor of Neurology at The John Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, examined 326 people who had coronary heart disease and 69 who did not.

Of the 326 with heart disease, 152 had heart surgery using the heart-lung machine, 75 had heart surgery without using the heart-lung machine and 99 had treatment that did not involve surgery. Each patient was tested for brain function before treatment and for up to six years after treatment.

The scientists found that the patients who did not have heart disease retained full brain function. They also found that the patients with heart disease who had been on the heart-lung machine suffered from decreased brain function as shown by previous studies. The real surprise was that those patients who had heart disease but were not on the heart-lung machine (whether or not they had surgery) suffered the same loss of brain function as those patients who were on the heart-lung machine.

So, is it the heart-lung machine, or is it the heart disease that causes the syndrome?

What do you think?

BLANK PAGE

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 and is freely available to download from our public website (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.