

# Home Economics Food Nutrition & Health

Advanced GCE A2 H511

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H111

## Report on the Units

---

**June 2010**

**HX11/MS/R/10**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the Examination provides 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.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

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

© OCR 2010

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### GCE Home Economics (H511)

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE Home Economics (H111)

#### REPORTS ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Chief Examiner's Report	1
G001 Society and Health	2
G002 Resource Management	5
G003 Investigative study	8
G004 Nutrition and food production	12

## **Chief Examiner's Report**

This was the second year for the new AS Home Economics: Food Nutrition and Health specification and both G001 and G002 saw a slight decrease in entries. It was only the second time that the A2 units G003 and G004 have been examined. The work submitted for all the examination papers and the coursework unit showed the overall performance of candidates was most encouraging. The Principal Examiner's reports in this document provide detailed feedback and advice for improvement on the performance of each of the externally assessed units.

For both the AS units the A grade and the E grade were set at very similar boundaries suggesting that candidates respond to both units in a similar way. Clearly, some teachers are now more experienced and confident in preparing candidates for the examinations. The Principal Examiner's reports suggest that, across the AS papers, candidates seem to struggle most with the application of knowledge and planning their responses. Section B questions in the AS units should be contained completely within the examination booklet.

Overall, there continues to be a large variation in the performance of candidates; those who attained high marks were able to demonstrate that they have a wide ranging knowledge and understanding of the key concepts underpinning the subject. Secure subject knowledge was particularly evident in the assessment of G004 and here candidates were likely to describe, explain and discuss issues with greater precision. On the other hand, low achieving candidates had a very basic subject knowledge and understanding and tended to write about the topic in question rather than the question itself. Centres need to spend more time practising extended writing and revision techniques with these candidates.

The Principal Examiner's report for the Unit G003 is particularly thorough and aims to clarify and reiterate the key requirements for all the assessment criteria. This will be a useful tool for preparing candidates for this unit. Many centres are providing candidates with clear guidance to ensure all the assessment criteria are met and presented in a logical manner. Teachers who have attended training sessions have applied the guidance provided by trainers and have effectively utilised the support materials made available to them.

In G003 higher achieving candidates demonstrated their ability to apply their knowledge and understanding to all the assessment criteria. Their evidence was succinct and demonstrated the capacity to execute research methodologies with an excellent level of technical and creative skill. Low achieving candidates did not always address the assessment criteria and sometimes did not provide sufficient research evidence to support the marks allocated. There was little evidence of cross referencing between the report and the research, and a heavy reliance on secondary sources throughout their submissions.

Accurate administration is very important to ensure moderators are able to confirm the assessment decisions made by centres. Annotation of coursework should be used to indicate where assessment decisions have been made and a reference to the assessment band should be made. Moderators should not have to remark the work; therefore, the support of centres is appreciated to ensure the process can be completed as efficiently as possible.

# G001 Society and Health

## General Comments

Section A was answered adequately by the vast majority of candidates.

The vast majority of candidates followed the instructions for section B and only picked two questions to answer. However, there were some candidates who did not follow the instructions and answered all three questions.

It would be useful if Centres could take note of the fact that at this level, the section B answers are extended answers not essays. Candidates need to take note that the second part of each Section B question is worth 15 marks, therefore more time should be spent on answering this part of the question. Some candidates wrote answers to both parts of a Section B question as one piece of continuous prose. This proved difficult to mark, and was unlikely to have produced clearly focused responses.

There are still too many candidates wasting paper in the booklet by starting a new question on a new page and then needing extra paper. Candidates do not need to use extra sheets when they are omitting whole blank pages between questions which should not happen and needs to be addressed by centres.

Candidates also need to plan their time. Long repetitive answers to questions often led to candidates running out of time. Those who wrote well-structured and concise answers gave no indication of being short of time.

It appears that centres are often using last year's papers as a mock examination. This often led to candidates using responses from previous examination sessions and as a result candidates lost marks because they did not answer the question.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Section A

- 1 (a) (i) The data was extracted correctly by virtually all candidates.
- (a) (ii) The data was extracted correctly by virtually all candidates.
- (a) (iii) A number of candidates misread the question. The question asked for a trend not a percentage or number.
- (b) Candidates were often able to define the term household and gave an appropriate example.
- (c) This question was answered by the vast majority of candidates. Some failed to identify that a family is defined as a group or social unit and simply gave the answer as people, thus only scoring half marks.
- (d) This question was generally quite well answered with few candidates failing to score at least three marks out of a possible four.
- (e) The majority of candidates answered this question well, but there was some confusion between the definition of extended and nuclear families.

- (f) This question, was on the whole, poorly answered. A number of candidates described the roles of a family rather than the needs of the family which could be met by a community, which was the emphasis of the question. A clear explanation of the correctly identified need was not always acknowledged, which led to a loss of marks.

## Section B

Centres need to consider the amount that candidates write for Section B answers. There are 25 marks available for each question, with 15 marks for the second part of each question. Centres may like to stress to candidates that these responses require a full and clear explanation of each point raised. Many candidates are often choosing to write out the question or lengthy introductions, which do not gain them any marks and in fact, waste examination time.

Question 2 was answered by a very high proportion of candidates.

Some candidates did not read the question carefully and gave answers which related to poverty and not to homelessness. The causes of homelessness were often dealt with very briefly and answers were often repetitive.

The second half of the question was generally not well answered. Candidates dealt with effects of homelessness superficially, with answers lacking the detail required to access higher marks. Candidates often gave a brief description, with little detail relating to the effects of homelessness. For example, not having a permanent address will have an impact on the ability to access a range of services; each one could be explained along with the implication. Weaker candidates focussed generally on responses such as low self esteem and depression leading to drug and alcohol addiction. There were a small number of concise but detailed answers which scored well.

Question 3 was the least popular question.

Once again the candidates often mis-read the question, which specifically asked for the range of recycling options, not how to sustain the environment. Marks for this question were often limited as answers lacked the detail required to access higher mark bands. Candidates often hinged their answers on reduce, reuse or recycle, or reiterated facts about waste in the United Kingdom, which was not part of the mark scheme. As a result, this wasted valuable examination time.

This was the question which elicited the poorest answers from those candidates who attempted it. The question asked how housing design can ensure effective management of energy and yet a number of candidates described how to manage energy in the home. Candidates appeared to regurgitate last year's answers rather than those which related to the design of a house, for example, double glazing, solar panels and insulation.

Question 4 was also popular

This question was answered quite well by those who attempted it. Some candidates demonstrated an excellent knowledge of the relationship between diet, lifestyle and Coronary Heart Disease. However, some vague answers were often seen with points made in long lists with little explanation given for the causes of Coronary Heart Disease.

This question was not generally well answered. Candidates were able to demonstrate knowledge of healthy eating but were unable to link this knowledge to the demands of the question, which actually asked for the candidates to explain the current dietary advice given by the government and relate this to the reduction of Coronary Heart Disease. 'Five a Day' was the one initiative that most candidates identified but they could not explain the reasoning behind the scheme.

# G002 Resource Management

## General Comments

Almost every candidate followed the instructions correctly, answering two out of three questions in Section B. There were, however, a small number of candidates who completed only one part of their second question. Most candidates finished the paper, suggesting that most candidates were using their time wisely in the examination, but a few gave shorter answers to the final part of their second question in Section B, indicating that they were rushed. A number of candidates left space between questions to give opportunity to revisit them, so some had left time to concentrate on the questions that they could answer best.

The question paper was accessible to all abilities.

There were, however, a number of very poor scripts where the candidate's performance on Section B was very weak. There were few very good scripts but some excellent parts of questions were seen, in particular answers to 2a and 4b.

Poor handwriting does remain an issue in a small minority of scripts. In some cases words were impossible to decipher.

In Section B, some candidates are still wasting time by writing out the question at the beginning of each answer. Also, many candidates did not take time to read the questions carefully and so often misinterpreted what was required. This was particularly evident in 2b and 4a.

It is essential that centres advise their candidates of the importance of reading the 'trigger' word in the question. Many candidates lost marks by 'describing', when the question asked for them to 'explain'. This was particularly evident in 1e.

One common observation was that candidates are simply not providing enough concise, relevant information in their responses to access high level marks. This was particularly noticeable in the 15 mark questions.

More candidates are keeping their planning of long answers brief, which is encouraging to see. A few candidates requested additional sheets to use for planning when there was plenty of space in their answer booklets. Centres should encourage candidates to complete their planning in the answer booklet prior to writing up their response.

Where additional comments are added to a response on another page (often indicated with a \* and sometimes an arrow), it is helpful to the examiner if the page number is given.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Section A.

- 1 It was apparent that the questions were appropriate to challenge the different abilities of the candidates. Section A was straightforward up to 1d and e. These last 2 questions clearly showed the difference in the quality of responses from candidates.
  - (a) (i) The vast majority of candidates answered this question correctly
  - (a) (ii) There were a few incorrect responses where candidates quoted the number of incidences rather than the year.

- (a) (iii) Most candidates gave the correct answer to this question. However, a surprising number of candidates did not appear to understand the term 'overall' trend and gave unnecessary detail in their answers regarding how the trend had fluctuated. Also, some candidates did not state an overall trend but quoted the actual number by which incidences had decreased.
- (b) The majority of candidates were able to correctly name, but not always correctly spell, two commonly found food poisoning bacteria.
- (c) (i) Most candidates were able to correctly identify three conditions that bacteria require to grow, although a small minority incorrectly gave 'the dark' as one of the conditions. 'Heat' rather than 'warmth' was also a common incorrect response.
- (c) (ii) The majority of candidates correctly identified the temperature range known as the danger zone, although a very wide range of incorrect answers were also given. Some candidates failed to gain the mark because they omitted °C when giving the temperature range.
- (c) (iii) Most candidates were able to gain one mark for stating that bacterial growth is slowed outside the danger zone, however, many did not clarify how growth is affected differently above and below the danger zone. Many candidates referred to bacterial growth slowing at temperatures below 5°C, but did not acknowledge that bacteria are destroyed at temperatures above 63°C.
- (d) Some candidates had a very clear understanding of the factors that have accounted for the changes in reported food poisoning cases and gave excellent answers, the most common being increased public awareness of food poisoning. Quite a large number of candidates gave repetitive answers that described poor hygiene.
- (e) Few candidates achieved full marks in this question, largely because they 'described' rather than 'explained' techniques for the safe handling of foods. However, prevention of cross contamination with reference to raw and cooked meat was correctly explained by many candidates. A large number of candidates incorrectly included answers on the hygienic storage of foods rather than just preparation and cooking.

## Section B

- 2 (a) Those candidates who read and understood this question accurately gave excellent answers, with a number of candidates achieving full marks. A significant number misinterpreted the question and simply described the guidelines, often giving the reasons for them, without describing how to implement them.
- 2 (b) The best responses to this question showed detailed knowledge of how equipment can be used to provide healthy family meals, discussing a good range of pieces of equipment. A few high level responses included insightful comments on the use of microwaves, breadmakers etc. However, knowledge of equipment was generally limited to steamers, contact grills and blenders/smoothie makers. Also, many candidates found it hard to link the equipment with healthy eating. A significant number of candidates gave muddled responses, focusing on methods of cooking and food preparation, including vague discussions of why cooking 'from scratch' is healthier without relating their comments to specific equipment.

- 3 (a) There was a wide range in the quality of responses to this question. Generally some of the methods used to attract and secure customer loyalty were well known, particularly advertising, loyalty cards and special offers. The best responses were able to explain a much wider range. A few also gave nice valid explanations of methods used by smaller food retailers rather than focusing exclusively on supermarkets. Many candidates identified methods of attracting/securing customer loyalty without adequately explaining them. Frequently candidates incorrectly discussed methods used by non-food retailers, or how supermarkets generate sales or use marketing strategies.
- 3 (b) The more able candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge by describing a wide range of technological advances in both the distribution and retailing of food. However, a number of responses were very limited referring to on line grocery shopping only. Some candidates incorrectly wrote about technological advances in food production e.g. fortified foods and myco-protein. Also, some of the technological advances described were ones that benefit supermarkets not consumers, e.g. anti theft tags. One clear area of confusion was the difference between hand-held self scanning and self scanning checkouts, which sometimes made it difficult to award marks.
- 4 (a) There were some excellent responses to this question, with the best candidates achieving full marks and accurately explaining a good range of factors affecting resource management with specific reference to time, energy and money. As with 3a, a number of candidates lost marks by simply identifying factors without explaining them. A significant number of candidates incorrectly attempted to explain time, money and energy as the factors and this limited the quality of their response because they were really answering 4b.
- 4 (b) This was probably the best answered question. Many candidates who had performed poorly on 4a were able to describe well how time, money and energy can be effectively managed in the home. However, a frequent error was to describe how to save money when shopping, rather than in the home. In order to access high level marks in questions such as this, candidates must give a balanced response addressing all three resources.

## **G003 Investigative study**

### **General comments**

The contrast in the quality of work produced from centres which have attended training and/or had experience of the legacy specification investigation and those centres completing coursework for the first time was enormous. The role and importance of INSET training and the A2 textbook in helping centres understand the investigative study is crucial. Many teachers have taken the time to fully understand the assessment criteria and it has been a pleasure to see so much high quality work. The effort that some candidates have put in is a real credit to them. Considering this is the first year of a new specification they have set very high standards.

Some candidates were able to demonstrate a wide range of skills and extensive subject knowledge. These investigations progressed logically and employed a wide selection of primary research methods. The level of skill demonstrated in the execution of research methods is very high from some centres. Each research method was fully evaluated and the original aims referred to in the final report or in a separate evaluation.

By contrast some work was very poor. There appeared to be a lack of guidance from centres on how to approach the investigation. In this work there was little evidence of cross-referencing and research methods relied too heavily on secondary sources. Cut and pasted photocopies of text, food labels and leaflets were presented as high order technical skills. The heavy reliance on the internet, as the sole source of reliable information was evident too.

### **Administration**

Generally the presentation of work was acceptable. Some work was beautifully presented for moderation; the use of spiral bindings was the most effective. There was no evidence of arithmetical errors. The vast majority of centres included all the necessary paperwork, and those who had not responded promptly to the requests for it. There were very few centres whose marks and work arrived after the 15<sup>th</sup> May deadline.

### **Annotation and Assessment**

It was apparent that where centres had annotated, the marking was generally more accurate and the work produced better quality. However, a significant number of centres do not annotate anything. Annotation was haphazard and rarely linked to the three assessment bands L, M or H. Where teachers had written comments they were generally detailed and helpful.

Many centres over marked their candidates' work, the wording of the assessment criteria is very specific and centres need to check the candidates' work carefully to ensure that the submission contains the evidence to support marks awarded. Many centres had worked scaled due to over marking so they need to take care when assessing their candidates' work for the next session.

### **Titles and Contexts**

The majority of titles were derived from the A2 Nutrition and Food Production unit (G004). Some students did choose contexts and titles from the AS units and their choices were generally appropriate though the point needs to be made that they are not covering any new topic areas of the specification which may be examined at A2 in G004. A small number of students selected the Design and Technology route these were generally very well done. Students who had direct

contact with the primary sources of information they were studying produced better quality work. The use of interviews, observational visits, food diaries and questionnaires to gather evidence was fully exploited.

## Addressing the Criteria

### Analysis and Aims

- 1 (a) Web diagrams are an excellent starting point but need following up with a discussion, which shows the opportunities, issues and inter-relationships. Many candidates failed to do this.
- 1 (b) Some candidates only identified one context to study. When the context was identified the discussion and justification was often too brief. The assessment criteria clearly states that a range of possible contexts should be examined before a decision is made on the course of action.
- 1 (c) The discussion of the scope of opportunities offered by the potential investigation was completed thoroughly by most candidates. Candidates who devised a table to demonstrate the value of possible research methods scored well.
- 1 (d) Most candidates selected an appropriate and realistic number of aims, which offered scope for primary research. Some candidates were too ambitious and devised too many aims, which would take much longer than the allocated time to realistically achieve. There was some confusion between what an aim is and what an objective is. The wording of aims needs attention in some centres. The aim needs a stem e.g. 'to investigate'. An objective statement of how each aim will be achieved is also required. Some objectives were simply a list of research methods with no development. The majority of candidates had on average six aims.

### Planning and development

There was a significant amount of lenient marking with this section and centres must recognise to achieve high level mark all the criteria need to be addressed to that standard.

- 2 (a) This was often omitted by some centres. Some centres did a range of mini predictions for each piece of investigation, rather than a whole task prediction which is what is required.
- 2 (b) All candidates must be encouraged to write a design specification. Many centres omit this criterion. The design specification can be easily linked to the decision making process necessary for choosing food practical work. Too few candidates used their specification to help them evaluate their practical work, even though in most cases the specification was written at the start of each practical session.
- 2 (c) This was very well done by the majority of candidates.
- 2 (d) Centres need to ensure that decision-making is evident in the appendices or report. The choices made by the candidate should develop from the initial research and knowledge acquired.
- 2 (e) Generally, the plans for entire investigation were poor and exceptionally brief. Good orders of work were presented in tables with detailed time scales. Planning for the whole task was often retrospective.

## Implementation – process

The process provides the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate a range of investigative skills. The success of the process depends upon the nature of the task, the choice and execution of the research methods.

All candidates had at least one questionnaire and there was usually always reference to the pilot copy. Some candidates failed to use the results to the fullest potential.

Shop surveys were usually evidenced with photographs, but in many cases this was very low level research, because the aim was not always fully defined.

The vast majority of candidates had evidence of practical work. All candidates had used sensory analysis as a means of testing and evaluating their work – with varying degrees of success.

Nutritional analysis was often poor. Many candidates did not fully analyse the printed information fully and most did not relate it to the original nutritional area they were studying. E.g. A suitable item for a child's lunch box – what age, how much of the daily requirement should it contain?

Many candidates did work in primary schools which was very interesting and had gone to a lot of trouble to put on presentations, carry out surveys or do individual activities – it is good to see intergenerational work.

- 3 (a) Background research was variable and some candidates failed to submit any. It was encouraging to see effective use of secondary sources if the information collected was analysed and discussed. Some centres encouraged candidates to include too much background research instead of focusing on other research methods which would demonstrate more skill in their execution. Lower ability candidates included extensive research but with little justified selection. On the whole a variety of different sources had been selected although candidates must be wary of including reams of information downloaded from the internet and then highlighting it – better to use the information and put it into their own words.
- 3 (b) The choice of food practical activity is crucial and some candidates did not demonstrate sufficient skill to be awarded high level marks. There were a few cases where the recipes selected were of such a low standard that they did not stretch the candidate e.g. chocolate cornflake cakes. By contrast, others did more than enough and excelled. Photographic evidence which fully supported the work was outstanding. Usually with step by step pictures as well as the finished result. There was often photographic evidence of testing.
- 3 (c) Time scales were of variable quality, but on the whole very well done, but most stopped at the point where the food went into the oven. Often washing up was never referred to and food was rarely removed from the oven.
- 3 (d) Most candidates completed a questionnaire and/or an interview, and a selection of food practical work. It was encouraging to see the level of sophistication towards sensory testing adopted by some centres. The way in which sampling and measurements were recorded displayed a good level of skill.
- 3 (e)
- 3 (f)

### **Implementation – Realisation**

- 3 (g) A small number of candidates omitted to tackle their original objectives. Weakness in 1d usually led to lack of focus in this area.
- 3 (h) Good ICT skills were not always evident. All candidates need to ensure that they use ICT competently to be awarded the high band. Analysis of the questionnaire is one area where technical skill can be demonstrated. Some candidates produced a different style of graph for each question on their questionnaire but this does not necessarily show more skill, the skill is the choice of graph. The choice of graph should represent the data clearly and candidates may wish to choose the same graph each time if this graph best represents their data. Graphs with no labelled axis or title are not accepted at this level. Many candidates had produced leaflets some of which were of exceptional quality showing aesthetic awareness and originality. However, some leaflets too often had two pieces of paper glued together, this is completely unacceptable at A2 level.

Evidence of the use of digital cameras and scanners was pleasing.

### **Evaluation**

Many centres are generously allocating marks to the evaluation. Too often the evaluations were short and repetitious. A detailed discussion on possible future work does not meet the assessment criteria. This was probably the weakest area for all candidates as they struggle to analyse what they have done and tend to state what they have done rather than be analytical about it.

- 4 (a) Most candidates are good at writing descriptively about their investigation and the outcomes. They also make valid judgements about the effectiveness of each research method they have used.
- 4 (b) Aims were usually evaluated one by one in the report – to a variable level of detail.
- 4 (c) This was generally well done.
- 4 (d) Only a few candidates made critical comments about their findings and research. In stronger investigations candidates referred to the original aims, title and hypothesis.

### **Reports and Word count**

A number of investigations did not give a clear statement of the word count. When a word count was given it was usually within reasonable tolerance.

### **Appendices**

Generally appendices were labelled correctly and cross-referencing was evident. A table of appendices is helpful when moderating for locating evidence and was not always completed by candidates. There is considerable skill in producing organised and clearly referenced appendices. Centres need to offer more guidance to some candidates of how to approach this task.

## G004 Nutrition and food production

### General comments

The paper proved appropriate in the level of difficulty for the candidates. The range of abilities completing the exam was wide and the paper was both accessible and challenging to all candidates. It delivered the opportunity for all candidates to demonstrate varying levels of knowledge and understanding. Marks were awarded across a wide range and only a few candidates produced a very poor performance.

There were very few misinterpretations of questions. There were no rubric errors. There appears to have been sufficient time to complete the exam with little evidence of candidates wasting time. Spelling, punctuation and grammar was generally acceptable though in some cases writing was difficult to read.

### Section A

The majority of candidates were able to attempt all of the questions – there were very few no responses.

- 1 (a) The majority of candidates were able to name two good sources of vitamin C.
- 1 (b) Most candidates were able to correctly name, but not always spell, scurvy as the deficiency disease associated with a lack of vitamin C. Some candidates confused vitamin C with vitamin D and suggested 'rickets'.
- 1 (c) Most candidates were able to identify correctly one possible symptom of vitamin C deficiency in the body.
- 1 (d) Whilst higher achieving candidates were able to state three different dietary functions of vitamin C, there were many vague responses such as needed for growth or to keep the skin healthy. Sometimes there was repetition in the responses too.
- 1 (e) There were some good descriptions of the differences between saturated and unsaturated fatty acids. Most candidates referred correctly to the nature of the bonding between the carbon atoms and the physical state whether solid or liquid at room temperature. Some candidates tried to give very complex explanations of saturation yet those who went for the clear, simple differences generally fared better and probably had a clearer understanding of what they were trying to say.
- 1 (f) Two types of information required by law to appear on a food product label were stated correctly by the majority of candidates although a few stated nutritional information without mentioning that a nutritional claim has to have been made for it to be required.
- 1 (g) Some candidates just repeated the information found on a label without explaining its significance to the consumer, for example 'so that the consumer knows what is in the food product'. Some candidates misinterpreted the question and wrote about the importance of packaging in the marketing of food products to consumers.

- 1 (h) (i) Most candidates could identify a behaviour changes which take place during the kneading of bread. The explanation of the process was more challenging. The candidates who kept their response simple and gave clear and concise explanations usually did well. Some candidates were able to give excellent explanations referring to the formation of gluten from glutenin and gliadin.
- 1 (h) (ii) Browning and rising were the two most popular behaviour changes suggested by candidates. Many candidates referred to dextrinisation or the Maillard reaction in their explanations of browning. The explanation of the bread rising was less well known. The 'yeast is expanding' and the 'yeast produces gas' or 'air' were offered as explanations, knowledge of carbon dioxide was not wide spread.

## Section B

### Question 2

All candidates were able to demonstrate at the least, superficial knowledge of the concept of a balanced diet in the UK. Features of the more limited responses included a poor knowledge of the functions and sources of vitamins and mineral elements. In addition, candidates simply gave an account of the functions and sources of each of the nutrients and did not really apply this to the context of a balanced diet.

Candidates who focused on the nutritional aspects of a healthy diet were able to access high marks. Some candidates discussed the specific nutritional needs for different groups of people and generally gave clear and concise answers. However, a number of candidates confused 'balanced diet' with 'healthy lifestyle' and tended to lose focus by putting undue emphasis on exercise and being active rather than concentrating on the nutritional needs of individuals. Examples of campaigns were included by the majority of candidates with some being able to give the correct proportions of the foods represented in the Eatwell Plate, although they were often less sure of the figures when it came to appropriate energy sources. Generally, only the proportions for starchy foods and fruit and vegetables were widely known by candidates.

### Question 3

This question was the least popular. There were some very good responses and higher achieving candidates were able to demonstrate an accurate knowledge of the importance of HACCP and how it is used in the food industry. A detailed understanding was shown of the seven stages with relevant examples quoted. Candidates who knew the seven stages in a HACCP plan and were able to write fluently about the process gained the best marks, this gave their essay a structure and enabled them to display their knowledge to best advantage. Very good examples and explanations of hazards, controls, critical control points and tolerances were offered by some candidates demonstrating a secure understanding of this process to the examiners.

More limited responses lacked technical knowledge and were repetitive. These responses dwelt on describing different ways of ensuring good personal hygiene and just identifying a range of hazards and controls.

### Question 4

Most candidates were able to present a good balance in this question between the discussion of the nutritional needs of vegetarians and knowledge of the use of alternative protein sources in the diet.

This question produced a range of responses with a few that were outstanding. Features of the very good responses included an ability to demonstrate detailed knowledge and understanding of the different nutritional needs of vegetarians and the use of a wide range of alternative protein sources.

There were some more limited responses with candidates tending to become confused with the different types of vegetarian. The terms lacto- and lacto-ovo vegetarians were often confused and many thought fruitarians eat vegetables. Often the discussion was a repetition of the information given in question 2 without any application to the specific needs of vegetarians. The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate some knowledge of the use of alternative protein sources in the diet. Mycoprotein and its derivatives were referred to by almost all candidates but many thought it to be a source of HBV protein and a few thought it was manufactured from soya. The concept of HBV and LBV foods tended not to be clearly explained and although most candidates used the term 'complementation' few seemed to appreciate what was actually happening in terms of different foods providing different amino acids.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@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 2010

