

GCE

Home Economics (Food, Nutrition and Health)

Advanced GCE **A2 H511**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H111**

OCR Report to Centres June 2017

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 specification 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 2017

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Home Economics (Food, Nutrition and Health) (H511)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Home Economics (Food, Nutrition and Health) (H111)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
G001 Society and health	4
G002 Resource management	6
G003 Investigative study	9
G004 Nutrition and food production	12

G001 Society and Health

Overall Comments

This paper was a very fair paper which discriminated well between candidates. No question in section B stood out as more difficult to answer, or more popular so there was a good spread of candidate responses across all questions. A tiny minority of candidates ran out of time. Far too many candidates used extra paper when they did not need to.

There were some candidates who did extensive plans which then meant they virtually rewrote their plan in their answers, which wasted valuable time.

Q1

[a] [i] and [ii] Nearly all candidates got the right answer.

[iii] Many responses included 'poor diet' 'drinking' 'drinking alcohol' 'eating an unbalanced diet'. They needed to be more specific – eg drinking excess alcohol.

[b] Most candidates were able to describe the differences between absolute and relative poverty.

[c] [i] Most candidates were able to access 3 or 4 marks for this question on homelessness. The majority stated eviction and unemployment as the reasons for homelessness.

[ii] Most candidates were able to access this question on the effects of homelessness – disease, lack of address for access to services, low self-esteem being the most common answers.

[d] Most candidates were able to identify correctly NHS and pensions. Some however incorrectly identified things like care homes, bus passes, and carers.

[e] Most candidates were able to access this question on standard of living. Some candidates mentioned a range of factors with a limited explanation. Those who scored highly were able to explain each factor mentioned.

Q2

[a] Most candidates answered this fairly well and were able to highlight and explain appropriate factors. Some candidates were unable to actually explain the factors given and tended not to explain points raised. Some answers focused solely on all aspects of the role of women. Many stated declining fertility /mortality rates without giving any supporting answers. Some wasted valuable time discussing the issues of World War 2 and baby boomers.

[b] Overall, this was very well answered – most cited ramps, stairlifts, handrails, wetrooms, door frame size and lowering work surfaces. Some confusion as to whether it was better to have small rooms so everything in easy reach or larger rooms for turning wheel chairs.

Q3

[a] This was quite well answered by most candidates and a range of factors were discussed. Some lost the focus and morphed into writing about population patterns / role of women.

[b] Most candidates were able to discuss several relevant support services and explain their roles. The weaker candidates used generic statements such as 'certain government departments can help find you jobs / help with work experience / give you money'. Also, many candidates stated that the CAB is a support service for the unemployed. Most knew jobseekers, income support, job centre, work experience, apprenticeships, job trials, training courses, - some named local charities and Community groups. Very few mentioned colleges, job fairs, careers advisors or differentiated between compulsory and voluntary schemes.

Q4

[a] Most candidates focused on the actual advice given such as reduce saturated fats / sugar etc without identifying the organisations that give the advice, so much of the answers given in part (a) were then repeated in part (b). Those well written answers identified the eatwell guide (and explained how this had changed from the plate), change4life, NHS, and 5 a day all supported with very good detailed information. Very few mentioned doctors' surgeries, NHS, PSE lessons or organisations such as British Heart Foundation.

[b] Most candidates were able to identify the lifestyle choices that impact on health but the reasons given often included lots of repetition, eg 'it causes CHD / it causes blockages which cause CHD'. A significant number of candidates wrote about packaging labelling / traffic lights on packaging. Some candidates focused solely on the nutritional aspects of CHD.

G002 Resource Management

General Comments:

A good range of marks were seen for this unit. Candidates were able to answer all of the questions, with very few “no responses” seen across the whole entry. The paper allowed clear differentiation amongst candidates and was a similar level to in previous years. There was a good mix of candidates across all three of the essay style questions in section B.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1 a (i)

The majority of candidates picked out the correct information. Where candidates answered incorrectly, the answers they provided were usually either £2.20 (so doubling the savings) or £10.17(which was the total to pay).

Question No. 1a (ii)

All candidates correctly identified how many points had been earned in this visit. A few candidates also went on to state how many points had been earned overall.

Question No.1a (iii)

The majority of candidates achieved this mark, with the most common correct answers relating to coupons, money off or offers such as ‘buy one get one free’. Incorrect answers included a given percentage (eg ‘25% extra free’) and ‘loyalty cards’ on their own.

Question No. 1b

This question differentiated well between candidates. Candidates tackled this question in a number of ways, and this was allowed for in the mark scheme. Many candidates stated a piece of legislation and then gave an example of what this meant for the consumer in real terms. Where candidates tackled the question this way, they often correctly identified and described two pieces of legislation but did not always manage a third example. Other candidates gave more of a description, such as “if the product is faulty then the consumer can return the product”. Not all statements were fully described or applied so could not achieve the full marks.

Question No. 1c (i)

Candidates either knew the answer to this question or had seemed to guess foods. The most common correct answers were unpasteurised milk/cheese, pâté, cook-chill and ready meals. The most common incorrect answers were raw meat, eggs and red meat. Some candidates stated dairy/milk or cheese but omitted the ‘unpasteurised’ so could not be awarded the marks.

Question No. 1c (ii)

This was answered slightly better than c (i), with the most common answers being raw meat, raw poultry and unpasteurised dairy/milk/cheese. The most common incorrect answers related to animal intestines, faeces and humans. Some candidates did not gain full marks as they simply responded with ‘soil’, rather than a fuller answer of ‘dirty vegetables containing soil’. There was a similar issue with ‘dairy’, rather than ‘unpasteurised dairy’ and with ‘water’ rather than ‘dirty water’.

Question No. 1c (iii)

Most candidates were able to achieve at least one mark for this question. Where candidates only achieved one mark, it was often due to simply giving two examples of lack of knowledge/education, which was considered a repeat. A good range of answers were given, covering the entire mark scheme. Some candidates stated “more eating out ...” but also stated

that all places you would eat out are unhygienic, therefore, this is the reason for the increase. This was not considered to be accurate so was not credited. If candidates stated the 'eating out place' could be less hygienic, or there are larger quantities of food being produced, then the mark was awarded.

Question No. 1c (iv)

Candidates gave a whole range of answers for this question, although few achieved full marks. Many candidates incorrectly stated that the EHO closes the restaurant and also gives a star rating. Candidates also often stated that samples could be taken/seized and taken to the laboratory for further testing, which was not considered part of ensuring the restaurant food was safe, as by that point it would be unsafe. Candidates were awarded marks for stating that the EHO regularly inspects restaurants, gives feedback, offers advice and serves hygiene improvement notices or hygiene emergency prohibition notices. The candidates often tackled this question by simply providing examples of what the EHO does or the type of checks they make such as; checking the storage conditions, checking for pests, checking the fridge temperature etc. Although these are correct and were credited, they were awarded one mark (unless further appropriate information was given) and could only be awarded once; other examples (unless completely different, eg safety record checks) were considered a repetition. Where candidates knew the role of the EHO, they achieved full marks and gave lots of relevant information,

Question No. 1c (v)

Candidates often stated six examples but did not offer much or any further explanation which limited them to band 1 or 2 of the mark scheme. Candidates who achieved full marks for this question often offered a range of points with relevant explanations and could have been awarded more marks if they had been available. Common correct answers related to the order in which things were stored, not putting hot food in the fridge until it had cooled and not overfilling the fridge. A common error was for candidates not to differentiate between raw and cooked meat, simply stating "meat should be stored on the bottom shelf..." which could not be credited.

Question No. 2a

Candidates were able to make a good attempt at this question, giving a range of answers on the mark scheme, although answers tended to focus on age, health, number of people or dependants, working hours/leisure time and number of appliances in the home. Some candidates seemed to almost misread the question and answered it in more of the style expected of 2b in that they tried to answer how to save time in the home, which was not the focus of the question. A few examples were also given of how to manage time in relation to things outside of the home such as travel or location (if it wasn't related to spending more/less time at home). Candidates needed to make sure that their answers related to factors that affect time management as well as being related to in the home.

Question No. 2b

Again a good attempt was made to answer this question by all the candidates that chose it. Most of the answers seen were on the mark scheme, with a good spread of knowledge seen and applied by candidates. Those that achieved full marks were able to offer a range of ways to save both fuel and human energy and discuss this in detail. If candidates only discussed fuel or human energy they could not achieve level 4.

Question No. 3a

This question saw a mixed response – the question actually has two focus points which not all candidates picked up on. The first focus point is the ‘purchase of food resources’ so answers had to relate to the family buying the resources, rather than cooking, which some candidates answered about. The second focus of the question was the ‘family with young children’, which was covered well by the majority of candidates. If candidates did not achieve full marks, it was often due to repetition of answers – usually relating to healthy eating guidelines, and nutritional considerations which could only be credited twice (there are three bullet points looking at nutrition). Candidates also wandered off the question offering information about where the parent shopped in terms of parking availability, crèche facilities and trollies being available, which were not considered relevant. Candidates achieving full marks tended to offer information across a range of factors such as money, time, where to shop and nutrition, demonstrating a good breadth of understanding.

Question No. 3b

Like question 3a, some candidates missed the focus word “preparing” in this question, so many examples (especially relating to fat, sugar and salt) were focused on cooking. For this question, candidates were expected to apply their knowledge of the dietary guidelines and not simply state and discuss the dietary guidelines. Some candidates limited the marks they could achieve and they stated the guidance, and explained why it was important, but did not actually apply it to how a family could make changes when preparing food. For example; candidates may have responded “One of the guidelines is not to skip breakfast. Breakfast is the most important meal of the day, it provides energy to keep going and this will lead to less snacking. This is important as it helps us to control our calorie intake and then we are less likely to become obese”. In order to achieve full marks, candidates needed to discuss how the guideline could be applied, for example “One of the guidelines is not to skip breakfast. A family could make sure they do not skip breakfast by preparing food the night before, such as overnight oats or prepare breakfasts that are quick such as instant porridge – just add water”. In order to achieve level 4, candidates were expected to cover a range of guidelines and offer a few relevant examples for each.

Question No. 4a

The information given for 4a and 4b was often similar if not the same – candidates seemed to not differentiate between the two questions. Question 4a was focused on food preparation equipment whereas 4b was cooking equipment. Many candidates wrote about a mixture of both cooking and preparation equipment for both parts. The most common pieces of food preparation equipment discussed were; blenders, smoothie makers (and named versions), food processors, mixers and bread makers. In order to gain level 3, candidates needed to offer a range of correct equipment and explain their technological advances, linking this to improvements in lifestyle. For example; “Mixers now have a variety of attachments which mean people can easily and quickly complete a variety of tasks including kneading bread”.

Question No.4b

As 4a – this was often muddled with a mixture of cooking and food preparation equipment. The most common pieces of equipment were; microwave, cooker, slow cooker and steamer.

G003 Investigative study

Administration of Coursework

Most centres sent their work ahead of the deadline date and all enclosed all of the necessary documentation.

Nearly all centres had annotated the candidates' work and supplied additional evidence – normally by highlighting the assessment criteria. Generally speaking these centres were very accurate and nearly always within tolerance. Occasionally there were differences because of the standard of practical work and the selection of primary research methods.

Centres where work was annotated with Low/Medium/High tended to be more accurate with their marking.

Introduction

The standard of the work submitted was better than previous years. There were more samples within tolerance and the centres clearly know what they are doing and are teaching this qualification very well. The way the teachers are annotating the work has improved.

Task titles

The vast majority of the work came from the nutrition section of the specification. There were a few centres which focused on food technology and product development whilst the rest were based around specific dietary problems such as coeliac disease, or around specific age groups e.g. primary school children. Popular themes were sugar and obesity. Food costs seemed to be popular this year, particularly linked to university students, and food banks.

Word Count

Most centres' work was within the word limit.

Appendices

Generally speaking these were very well used by the higher order candidates and in nearly all cases followed the order of the assessment criterion. Many of the weaker candidates did not refer to them at all. Teachers could support their candidates more by explaining how to reference their work.

Interpretation of the Assessment Criteria

Analysis Aims and Initial Research

There was often insufficient discussion of the mind maps to reach the higher band. The actual mind maps were generally detailed and linked to specific areas from the specification. There was usually initial research into the three or four areas to see what might be a good area to study and a number of titles were discussed before the final title was reached. Some centres allowed their candidates to spend too long on the initial research section and submitted more than was required to cover this criterion.

Opportunities for study were mainly submitted as a table and were generally very well done.

Candidates know what they are doing and clearly understand the requirements.

Many candidates this year created too many aims. Sometimes up to 10. This made it more difficult to achieve an in-depth study in the time required. Aims were generally well written, being both realistic and detailed.

Planning and Development

There was some confusion over criteria 2a. Some candidates had a hypothesis for each aim or area of study. Where the candidates had written a more simplistic hypothesis, or prediction of perhaps just one or two sentences, they were much more capable of proving or disproving this and these candidates usually referred to it during evaluation. Those with overly complicated or more than one hypothesis, however, were not so successful at this.

Some candidates did not complete their specifications in enough depth. In many cases the specification points lacked specific details and rarely did candidates refer back to them to help evaluate their work.

Time plans were an area of success for nearly all candidates, with only one centre not having time plans for the practical work. Some of the higher level candidates also included a list of materials necessary for each area of their primary research.

Evidence for criteria 2d was mostly in the report, but some candidates did summarise each area of research and say what they were going to do next. To gain access to the higher band marks the candidates needed to make judgements and explain how the findings from one section of work were leading them to the next.

On the whole plans of action were very well done. Candidates who achieved top band marks had commented on problems arising, showing it was a working document and not one written after the coursework had been completed.

Implementation

There has been a vast improvement in the amount of secondary materials being included in the submission, with many candidates now choosing to write a summary, sometimes with a screen shot of the book or magazine used. There has been a great deal of internet research carried out and many candidates are referencing the website used and providing a bibliography. Unfortunately there are still a small number of centres that just submit sheets of photocopied pages which have been highlighted with no attempt at discussion.

When addressing criterion 3b candidates need to consider the relevant aspects of economy. Repetition of the same practicals is very wasteful and should be limited to avoid wasting of resources and ingredients. Sometimes costings had been done, but without discussion. In many cases the costings were computer-generated and were included with the nutritional analysis but without any comments. Some candidates were planning meals for school canteens without comparing them to either the selling price or a discussion of how much their research had told them the ingredients should cost.

Where candidates had completed questionnaires, most had been piloted. Interviews were well planned, always with the transcript included in the appendix. Shop surveys were carried out usually with supporting photographs, and many candidates were carrying out this activity online. Case studies and food diaries were also very popular. All candidates used sensory testing, and the majority included comparative testing. The poorest area was nutritional analysis where the majority of candidates put in a print out, without any discussion of the findings. In some cases, where there was discussion, it did not show a deep understanding, e.g. a dish might have 100% of the day's protein requirements and the candidates thought this was good, without taking into

account the other food to be consumed during the day. The candidates who had set themselves realistic objectives were able to achieve them.

The standard and layout of the work produced this year has improved. There were several PowerPoint presentations with feedback from when they had been used. All reports were word processed and most appendix work was fully word processed.

Evaluation

The individual evaluations can be found throughout the work at the end of each particular activity. In the majority of cases this section was very well done.

When evaluating their aims, candidates who copied and pasted their original aims and evaluated underneath them whether or not they had achieved what they set out to do.

How well candidates completed an evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses was very much dependent on the research carried out and how much they had understood about what they were trying to achieve. Some of the weaker candidates completed a bullet-pointed list of their strengths and weaknesses but failed to evaluate them.

The critical evaluation is the weakest area of evaluation with only the candidates at the top of the mark scale doing this well. Many did not refer back to the hypothesis and say how it was proved or disproved, or refer to their title.

G004 Nutrition and food production

General Comments:

The session saw a wide range of candidate performance and differentiated well. It appears that Centres are familiar with the structure of the examination paper; candidates are well prepared for the assessment requirements of each section and are managing their time accordingly. The majority of candidates allocated their time appropriately and recognised that two thirds of the time allocated for the exam should be spent on Section B. A significant number of candidates write out the essay question, Centres should discourage this practice and encourage candidates to plan their responses instead.

Generally, there was a clear difference between the high and low achieving candidates. Good responses were characterised by the precise application of knowledge and understanding of a range of appropriate facts, concepts and principles. Weaker responses failed to provide accurate knowledge and understanding and their answers were generalised and were not applied concisely to the question.

In terms of the assessment objectives, Knowledge and Understanding (AO1) remains the strongest area; good candidates were able to recall with accuracy detailed factual information and concepts. AO2, Apply knowledge and understanding and analyse problems, seemed to be the most difficult skill area for candidates; whilst many have been taught to recall factual information, they are less successful at interpreting knowledge and applying it to the specific question or context.

Overall, candidates fulfilled the requirements in terms of quality of written communication, producing work written in continuous prose and with clarity of expression.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

- 1ai Generic terms including 'vegetable oils' and 'plant oils' were not accepted.
- 1aai Most candidates were able to achieve some marks for stating the functions fats. Each statement required a supporting description to be awarded full marks.
- 1aiii The term hydrogenation was well understood. Some candidates needed to be more precise in their description and focus on the process not just name the outcome of a solid fat.
- 1b Generally well answered. The role of folic acid was described accurately and the link between pre-conceptual health was understood.
- 1c The function of vitamin E as antioxidant was most commonly identified.
- 1d This was reasonably well answered. Many misinterpreted the question and explained the advantages to the consumer not retailer.
- 1e This question was well answered by a majority of candidates. Some candidates were vague and explained the statutory contents of the label in generalised terms. Good responses included an example to illustrate the explanation.

- 2 This was a popular question attempted by many candidates. To access the higher band of the mark scheme candidates needed to demonstrate accurate recall of mineral elements requirements for the specific age groups being quoted. Some candidates did not distinguish between the two different stages of adolescence or between males and females and this limited their achievement. A clear distinction between the needs of adolescent girls and boys was essential. Weaker responses just described healthy eating practices and failed to make specific reference to mineral elements or whether they were particularly important to adolescents.
- Q3 All candidates were able to demonstrate at least a superficial knowledge of the nutritional value and use of eggs. Where candidates had learnt about eggs it was well answered and candidates applied technical knowledge fluently and accurately. The terms coagulation, foaming and aeration were explained clearly and linked to relevant food products e.g. meringues and quiches. Many candidates could apply some important principles of food science to their discussions. Candidates who failed to achieve good marks did not use subject specific terminology correctly and described characteristics of eggs in a generalised way. Some candidates focused on the production process and the different types of eggs. In a few responses there was too much emphasis on just one aspect e.g. the uses, with the other areas only addressed briefly. In this type of question, to achieve the higher mark band, a balance needs to be achieved and a plan would be helpful.
- Q4 This was a well answered question. There were some excellent responses where detailed knowledge and understanding was shown of the changes in the supply and availability of food. The development of refrigerated transport, packaging innovations and the increased choice of food products from around the world were widely mentioned. High band responses provided many factors that influence the supply of food and used relevant examples to support their statements. To achieve high marks candidates needed to discuss a wide range of developments. To develop their responses further all candidates could be encouraged to use relevant examples of food products to support their discussions.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

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 2017

