

**OCR STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE**

**REPORT OF THE TEACHERS' COMMENTS  
ON THE OCR GCE AS & A2  
EXAMINATIONS 2011**

## **OCR STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE**

The OCR SJC exists to scrutinise and put forward to OCR GCE examiners and officials, where appropriate, teachers' comments – both critical and laudatory – on all aspects of OCR GCE examinations. The SJC system was established by teachers' professional associations: the OCR SJC, in common with others, is made up of practising, specialist teachers who, between them, cover the complete range of subject expertise. The appropriate subject specialist examines all submissions from teachers and the report which is generated as a result is discussed by the SJC. All subjects reported upon are examined in detail. The names of individual teachers and schools are not published.

### **OCR Responses**

OCR would like to thank the SJC and those teachers who made detailed comments about the GCE AS and A2 summer examination series.

We have answered each comment to the best of our ability but recognise that in some cases we may need to address further questions or requests for information.

We encourage any further feedback to be directed through the SJC to their established contacts within OCR. However, individual enquiries can always be made through the OCR Customer Contact Centre, the contact details for which can be found on the OCR website at <http://www.ocr.org.uk/index.html>

## **AS/A2 ADMINISTRATION REPORT: GENERAL COMMENT and OCR RESPONSES**

The Standing Joint Committee expressed their concern regarding the preparation of papers, especially for those in Biology, ICT and Mathematics.

The following questions were raised:

How are QPEC members selected?  
How are Revisers and Scrutineers appointed?

Assessors attending QPEC meetings are selected in line with the rules of the Ofqual Code of Practice.

Where a new Setter/Reviser/Scrutineer is required, Assessor Management place an advert in the appropriate medium where the advertisement will guide the potential applicant to the Assessor page on the OCR website. The potential applicant will view the task descriptor, further information on the task, the assessment opportunities application form and download the assessment exercise required to be completed and submitted. If they are interested in applying the applicant completes the application form and the assessment exercise and submits to OCR electronically.

Assessor Management log the applications and forward to the relevant Chair of Examiners and Qualifications Manager for selection. Applicants are selected against the task descriptor and criteria as outlined in the briefing and selection pack. In addition Setters are interviewed. The successful applicant will be informed by email. Once we have received the acceptance from the successful applicant, the unsuccessful applicants are informed by email.

How long is the Term of Office of QPEC members, Revisers and Scrutineers?

Setters, Revisers and Scrutineers are sent invitation documentation electronically. This contains a cover email, the OCR Assessor Terms and Conditions, the Task Descriptor, a schedule, handbook, and acceptance of assessment task form. If the assessor reads, agrees and accepts the Terms and Conditions for assessment tasks, the agreement terminates automatically and without notice when the assessor has completed the assessment task.

A Setter, Reviser or Scrutineer will normally be invited to undertake the task again unless there are concerns with the quality of the task produced/undertaken, or other professional issues.

What checking procedures are in place to ensure that amendments have been implemented and that revising has taken place?

Once the setter has produced a first draft of the assessment material OCR Question Paper Management (QPM) send this to the reviser(s). The reviser completes their task and fills in a detailed checklist and returns the material to QPM who log the material and send the revisers comments to the setter who will decide on what amendments to make. Once completed the assessment material is returned to and logged with QPM.

## SUBJECT ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS and OCR RESPONSES

### A2: CHEMISTRY

**Specification/code number/alt: H435**

**Paper/code number: F334 & F335**

These two question papers were not hole-punched in the top left-hand corner. Some candidates used additional paper and needed a hole to be punched to be able to attach extra paper using a treasury tag.

OCR policy is to ensure that sufficient space is provided within question/answer booklets, negating the need to attach additional continuation paper. Normally, question/answer booklets are only drilled where it is essential for the candidate to attach additional material, for example, where pre-release material or graph paper needs to be returned with the script.

There are several reasons for this approach:

- Additional material often becomes detached from answer booklets and this can consequentially lead to a candidate's additional work being damaged or misplaced.
- In the heat of an examination candidates frequently forget to complete their details on continuation material making it difficult to identify to whom the material should be assigned if it is detached from the answer booklet.
- Increasingly scripts are marked on screen and the inclusion of unnecessary additional material with the script requires manual intervention in the scanning process, potentially delaying the availability of the script for marking.
- The vast majority of candidates do not require continuation stationery and unnecessarily 'drilling' hundreds of thousands of question/answer booklets is costly and impractical.

OCR monitors the performance of each examination series and the answer space provided within question/answer booklets is reviewed in light of candidate responses and any evidence that the space provided was inadequate. Many question/answer booklets are now printed with additional lined blank pages appended for candidates' use.

In exceptional cases where it is necessary for continuation pages to be used they still can be securely attached to the question/answer booklet and will be marked as normal, this is made clear in the rubric instructions on the front of the question/answer booklets.

## A LEVEL ICT

**Specification/Code No/Alt: H117**

**Paper code/number: G062**

It was reported that the published mark scheme for G062 contained a number of errors.

OCR agrees that errors such as these should have been picked up during the question paper process and actions have been put in place to ensure errors such as these will not occur in future mark schemes.

### **Task 4 e (i):**

4ei asked for the rule for the 'status of Cola Lite'. However, the mark scheme was looking for a 'stock left' rule.

This was a typing error in that the word 'status' was left out of one of the tasks.

It is likely that failure to notice this data entry error at subsequent checks was because it made sense within the context of the question. During moderation no centres were seen to mark their candidates as incorrect for this when they had indeed given the correct solution.

### **Task 6 mark point 2:**

The mark scheme requires "Due Date" in the loan table, but candidates would not have "Due Date" in the loan table as it is a calculated field and so should be in the form or query etc. However, the candidates should have start date or loan date as a field.

The error arises from the fact that the words "due date" should have said "date taken out". It was clear that there must have been a particular solution in mind when the mark scheme was written and that the possible solution which generated the due date later in the task had not been considered. Although this was one correct solution it did not allow for others. It was therefore not an error on the mark scheme but a preconceived expectation that the task would be tackled in a specific way. In this instance it was unfortunate that those involved in the question paper process had all taken the same approach.

**Task 6 mark point 4, bullet point 9:**

Candidates were asked to use contact details from task 2 which included an email address of admin@dulton.biz but in the mark scheme they were expected to put admin@dulton.sch.biz which does not appear anywhere in the question.

This was a proof reading error in the mark scheme and the answer [admin@dulton.biz](mailto:admin@dulton.biz) was marked correct. During moderation there was no evidence that any centre penalised a candidate for this.

**Task 6 e (i) mark point 17:**

The question required candidates to produce and print a list of the overdue books and the books due for return on 22/03/2011, including details of who had them on loan. The list should indicate for how many days the books are overdue on this date. The printed list must also have covered no more than one side of A4 paper. The mark scheme requires "fine" to be included which was incorrect.

The error arises from the fact that the values £2.40, £5.00 and £0.80 should have been removed. The values were not explicitly requested within the task. However, the values are correct values and a correct candidate solution would have also generated these values (even if not evidenced on the report in question). Hence the mark scheme was correct, but, the issue was whether it was fair to expect these results from candidates. It was decided that these results for the fines were beyond what could be reasonably expected.

It was also reported that OCR as the Awarding Body did not issue an Erratum Notice as requested by many Centres. Instead, Centres were instructed to mark correct work as incorrect. It was further reported that, following several complaints to OfQUAL, OCR then re-issued the mark scheme on 1<sup>st</sup> July after the moderation process and asked all Centres to re-mark the work of all candidates for task 6, but the re-issued mark scheme did not address all four of the errors, addressing two of the errors, but still containing explicit errors within the solutions.

With reference to Task 6, mark points 4 and 17, the mark scheme was available from 23 March and the first complaint was received on the 30 March. It was decided not to send a corrected mark scheme out to all centres but to ensure that these errors were addressed through the standardisation process. The reason for not sending an amended mark scheme was that many centres were on holiday and many centre assessors would have already started marking and two mark schemes in centres could have been confusing. In hindsight this may have not been the best decision. It is worth noting that the typing errors in Task 4 and Task 6, mark point 4 were not raised until the standardisation meeting. There were only three queries on these points, all post standardisation. No centres were found to have marked correct answers incorrect.

During May, public disquiet regarding OCR's handling of the errors in the mark scheme grew and complaints were made to Ofqual, and as a result OCR was asked for a full explanation as to how the errors were being dealt with, and how OCR could guarantee that no candidate had been disadvantaged or advantaged as a result of them.

As part of this redress OCR issued an addendum to centres who were advised to send work possibly affected by the change in the mark scheme to OCR. The Qualifications Manager and a number of GO62 Moderators reviewed the work originally submitted by centres for moderation, **and** the work subsequently submitted after the issue of the addendum.

All marks for the unit were available before the awarding meeting was held.

The Standing Joint Committee expressed their disappointment that errors such as these were allowed to pass through QPEC and any subsequent monitoring processes. How and why did this happen?

Explanations as to how the 'errors' occurred are detailed above. For future series scrutineers will be required to submit their worked copies to OCR as will attendees at the mark scheme review meeting. As in previous series, attendees to the mark scheme review meeting will include at least two centre representatives not involved in the question paper process for G062.

**SUBJECT SPECIFIC COMMENTS and**  
**OCR RESPONSES**

**A2 BIOLOGY**

**Specification/Code No/Alt: Biology H421**  
**Paper code/number: F215**

Ecosystems and sustainability accounts for only a small part of the specification for this unit but accounted for a considerably larger proportion of the questions; namely part or all of Q.1, Q.3, Q.4 and Q.7.

In the OCR endorsed textbook by Hocking, Kennedy, Sochacki and Winterbottom there is an 'Examiner Tip' on page 243 stating:

*"You should not try to learn lots of examples of behaviours from the types listed."*

*"It is more important that you can identify what type of learned behaviour has taken place from the information you are given in the question."*

Despite this, question 2 asks for reference to specific examples of each type of behaviour and this question is worth 11 marks which is a significant proportion of the marks for the paper (7%).

Given the extent of this unit, it should have been possible to compile a paper which was more balanced and did not put so much emphasis on limited parts of the specification.

It was also reported that this paper was believed to be very heavily weighted to favour some topics of Biology e.g. ecology, and yet missed out large sections of the course e.g. bio-technology, genetics crosses, muscles etc. Thus, this paper was felt to be very disproportionate in the distribution of mark allocation.

The interaction of living organisms with their environment is an overarching theme in unit F215 (Control, Genomes and Environment). References to these interactions, from the genetic to the behavioural, are found in all four modules of the F215 specification and the question paper reflects this.

Question 1 (a) assessed the recycling of nitrogen, whilst parts (b), (c i) and (c ii) were on genetic variation, mutation and metabolic adaptation. As part (c

ii) was a 'stretch and challenge' question of the 'Suggest' type, it was hoped that better candidates would approach the answer synoptically and incorporate biochemical ideas on metabolic poisons from the F212 AS specification into their answers. The question paper also assessed learning outcomes on the genetic code (Q5), genetic clones (Q3), and the nervous system, gene therapy and meiosis (Q6). The two main essay questions i.e. Q2 (b) and Q3 (d) assessed knowledge of animal behaviour, and the laboratory techniques used in tissue culture (biotechnology).

As the new Biology specification requires data questions to be embedded within a biological context rather than 'stand alone', questions 4 and 7 were set in ecological contexts, although limited amounts of ecological *knowledge* were asked for. These questions were designed to test candidates' ability to handle, interpret and evaluate data. Q7 was largely a 'stretch and challenge' data question aimed at top ability candidates.

Whilst it was reported that this summer's paper focused on a small section of the F215 specification i.e. ecology, this was not indeed the case. The examination paper was fair and allowed candidates to demonstrate their biological knowledge and understanding of a range of topics (as detailed above), and their ability to use and apply mathematical skills, as required by all new A level science specifications. Some F215 topics that were assessed in the June 2010 and subsequent January 2011 examinations e.g. muscles, nervous control and genetic crosses, were not repeated in the June 2011 paper.

The endorsed OCR textbook contains a section on the behaviour of organisms in which examples of animal behaviour are given. The book also states in an 'Examiner tip' - *You should not try to learn lots of examples of behaviours from the types listed* - as students do not need to know more than the few examples provided in the chapter. It is unfortunate that some students have misinterpreted '*lots of examples*' as meaning that '*not any examples*' are required. The section of the F215 specification on animal behaviour cannot be taught, nor properly understood, without reference to examples.

In the essay question on animal behaviour, Q2 (b), if candidates provided suitable examples in their answers, other than those given in the OCR endorsed text, they would have gained credit. OCR examinations are based on the specification and not on the content of any particular textbook since Centres can, and do, use a variety of texts.

## LATIN A2

### Specification/Code No/Alt: H039

#### General comment:

The SJC is most concerned about the use of publicly available material, likely to have been seen and used by a significant portion of the candidature, to provide examination passages. In the case of this subject, there were two such passages in this one session. In both instances the material was reused from other current Cambridge Assessment resources, such that many, but certainly far from all, candidates must have seen and practised on these passages before.

Specific comment is given below, but we would emphasise that all the Latin literature is in the public domain and certain popular passages have been published several times over in different places during the past few years. We confirm that our setters did not 'reuse' material from other current Cambridge Assessment resources. They set the passages from other, older published sources, unaware that there was any doubling up.

We do our best to avoid using passages that candidates might have seen before but we will never be able to avoid this possibility. If we vigorously avoided any passages but the most obscure, candidates might have to deal with material that is more dull or more difficult than the passages we use now. We would be reluctant to do this.

We are sorry for any anxiety that centres and candidates felt about this summer's passages. It was a particularly anxious year for securing university places before the tuition fees go up and we appreciate that teachers, candidates and parents would naturally have been dismayed by the internet chat, as were we. It is easy for this medium to breed disquiet. We have monitored these examinations carefully, as well as the feedback we have received. Our information indicates that few candidates will have practised on these passages before and for any that did there was not any discernible improvement on performance, over what we usually expect to see from Latin candidates at this level. We can, furthermore, confirm that there was no impact on grade boundaries.

#### LATIN LANGUAGE: F361

The Cicero unseen translation passage (Section B, question 2) was largely the same as one of the practice passages used in the Oxbox resource (which is specifically recommended and promoted by OCR on its website). However, the resource is expensive (currently reduced to £182.40 at Amazon), and so not all schools can afford this. While there is always a chance that a passage used in lessons or as homework will come up in the examination, it seems very unfair for OCR to set a passage with which certain candidates will be

familiar (if their schools invested the money with OCR's partner company), and it may appear that those who buy this resource have a real advantage. While the SJC assumes that there is no commercial reason for the use of this passage, it still represents a serious instance of the use of publicly available material, likely to be used by a significant portion of the candidature, to provide an examination passage.

We do regret that there was overlap between the Oxbox resource and the Cicero unseen translation passage on F361. While all the Latin texts are in the public domain, as noted above, we would not intentionally set out to use material which appears in an endorsed resource. We will be conducting extra checks in future but this time the exact Oxbox text attribution (2.4.17) was not the same as our setter's (II.iv.38-39) and so we were not alerted to the possible problem. This has highlighted for us the difficulties with line numbers in different editions of source texts. We would confirm that our passage was not *taken from* the resource. Our setter does not personally have a copy and found it in another source published a considerable time ago.

It is our understanding that the Oxbox is not widely used in centres and we have had very little feedback on this unit. However, if any centres had happened recently to work on that passage before – as can sometimes happen with any Latin passage, and as acknowledged in the SJC comment above – it was not apparent in candidate responses that there had been any advantage from it.

### **LATIN VERSE: F363**

This paper's compulsory Unprepared Translation and Comprehension passage (Section B3) was from the same part of Ovid's *Fasti* as the Cambridge Pre-U Specimen paper for use from 2008. As a result, many A2 candidates had seen the paper before, albeit, except for the first 6 lines. As this paper will have been used, in all probability, by all candidates for Oxbridge in Latin, and by others in schools with more generous teaching time, other pupils were at a disadvantage because they had not seen the passage before.

Such candidates were competing with Oxbridge candidates who had done so, and who were already probably intending to study Latin at University. Two specific candidates were reported to the SJC as needing an A in Latin to study Medicine at University. The level of attainment in this paper must have been skewed by the unfair advantage that Oxbridge candidates, and others, have gained through this serious error on the part of the awarding body. As OCR and the Pre-U International Examinations boards are both part of Cambridge Assessment, and since OCR should have access to the Pre-U materials, it is particularly regrettable that such a duplication, which in effect used 'live' material as a specimen occurred. The SJC has been told of much discussion about the situation on a student website, with those many students who had already translated this passage in class sympathising with

those that had not. There is a righteous sense of outrage among candidates and their teachers that such a situation could have occurred.

One respondent commented, 'From my point of view, the fact that this has happened, as well as the well-advertised mistakes on the GCSE paper, has made me question my confidence regarding OCR's checking procedures. I am very concerned that this extra blunder could have cost two students their places at Medical School because the average level of attainment will have been heightened by the many students who will achieve almost full marks for this section. Many on the student website had translated the passage shortly prior to the examination and would therefore have a distinct advantage, but all who knew the passage would also have pushed up the standard. How can I be reassured that my pupils are not disadvantaged and that their career choices have not been ruined?'

The SJC fully sympathises with this view and seeks reassurance that all that is possible has been done to ameliorate the unfairness and to ensure that such duplication of material does not occur again. Surely there is no shortage of suitable Cicero and Ovid material from which to select?

The Ovid passage in F363 is a famous passage and was chosen because of its interest and appropriateness for the task. Its mentioning a dolphin might have been a feature to make it more memorable than some other passages. As with all the Latin, it is in the public domain. It was taken from a text published a considerable time ago.

It transpired that it was also part of a Pre-U specimen paper. Our setter chose the passage unknowingly.

While the contributors to the SJC comments above have been very concerned that the Pre-U materials will have been widely used by schools, certainly with their top candidates, this has not been our understanding. We have heard from a wide cross section of schools, many with Oxbridge candidates, that they had not used the Pre-U papers at all. Indeed the Pre-U passage is substantially harder, with far fewer words provided in the glossary, and those that are give translations of words from a section which we chose to leave out because it was too difficult.

Although internet chat suggests that some candidates had indeed recognised the passage, what is now clear is that the actual numbers who might have seen it must have been low. When we became aware of this issue we asked our senior examiners about it. They advised us, with their wealth of Latin GCE teaching experience, that it would be unusual for students clearly to remember Latin 'unseen' passages and that students would have no reason actively to commit an 'unseen' translation to memory. Essentially it was a test of language skills on the day and a well-prepared candidate who has had other Ovid practice should be able to do just as well as someone who may have seen it before.

However, we made every effort, at standardisation, at every stage of marking, at the award and in post awarding analysis, to be watchful for any signs of advantage gained by any possible preview of the Ovid that some candidates may have had. We were able to conclude with certainty that there had been no effect on outcomes - there was in fact unusual stability in the data for 2011 compared with 2010 - and there was no question that grade boundaries were affected by it. No one was disadvantaged by this issue and we are confident that overall the results were fair.

## A LEVEL ICT

**Specification/Code No/Alt: H117**

**Paper code/number: G062**

Comments related to the appropriateness of tasks set this year. Two particular elements of this paper - Tasks 3 and 6 - were believed to be inappropriate.

### **Task 3 – Website:**

The aspects relating to the booking form (part e in the responses) was not thought to be an appropriate task for an AS ICT paper. There was no non-application specific method of solving this without writing code or script. It has been previously stated in the Awarding Body's own FAQ section that ICT A Level candidates do not need to write code or script. When this was queried with OCR the best response related to using tools built in to applications, which are not available in all Centres. Using application specific features is not an appropriate method of solving a coursework task. Additionally, it was also difficult to solve this task without use of a web-server, which most Centres will not have and to which modern network policies will not allow access. It is reported that use of standalone machines in networks or allow candidates access to a web-server, which is unlikely to be an unusual situation. It is outside of the expected skill set of an AS ICT candidate to set up a web-server for themselves, and it is not part of the specification.

In relation to Task 3, Candidates were not expected to write code but could make use of pre-written code or scripts that are commonly available to solve generic problems with regards to form processing for web pages. The use of any software package will make use of application specific routines/features. This task could be solved using a variety of different web authoring packages and centres are expected to be able to offer such packages, if they are delivering the course. Centres must also make sure that they can make suitable software available to their students to allow them to access the tasks. The design of forms within websites has been included within the tasks in previous years without any concerns being raised.

### **Task 4 – Spreadsheet:**

The task itself tested suitable skills, although it was believed to be a poorly constructed idea with which to do so.

It was expected that candidates would be familiar with the school tuck shop scenario.

### **Task 6 – Database:**

This entire task was believed to have been inappropriately pitched at this level of candidature and it required a range of skills and techniques that are above the level that are usually taught to A Level candidates. The task was

poorly conceived and written in such a way as to require very specific skills rather than testing a more general understanding of databases and that, in order to complete the task, candidates would either have to use substantial programming or do – at this level – very complicated calculations

Concern was also expressed regarding d (i) that candidates will have been marked down if they did not put in all their calculations in even though the question only asked for a list of the loans.

The wording was also described as “very confusing”. Using ‘copy’ to mean two different things is testing the candidates on their interpretation and not on their ability.

This task appears to have been used as a crude way to differentiate the paper to candidates of a different level. Simply making one task extremely difficult does not feel to be an appropriate method of doing this. The ability and understanding of databases required to fulfil this task completely independently was believed to be far outside of the remit of an AS ICT course.

It is requested that the Awarding Body returns to the normal level of database tasks. The other tasks e.g. the spreadsheet, was described as “Incredibly easy this year” and did not allow the candidates to demonstrate what they know. On balance the database task was believed to be much harder than any other task undertaken in the past decade. It was felt that it would stretch the candidates in the spreadsheet task as well as in the database task if there was a return to the more even level that the tasks were set at before.

There are a number of issues raised with regard to this task. It is worth noting that the task as a whole must cover the full ability range with 20% of the marks aimed at A grade candidates. Boundary thresholds this summer were very close to the target grade boundaries. Some tasks by their very nature will be more demanding than others and the database task had more A grade marking points proportionally when compared to other tasks but that is to be expected as it is one of the more challenging topics within the specification. The database task this session, as in previous sessions, required candidates to use a wide range of tools and techniques to produce solutions. These were high level marks but within the range of skills and techniques expected.

The concern that candidates will have been marked down if they did not put in all their calculations when the question only asked for a list of the loans can be easily dealt with. During the standardisation meeting the moderators were clearly instructed that evidence of calculations was not required – merely the correct list of loans.

## AS/A2 MATHEMATICS

**Specification/Code No/ Alt: 3890/3892/7890/7892**

**Paper code/number: Decision Mathematics 1 – 4736**

### **General Comments:**

In general, the D1 paper as a whole takes far too long to read and answer. There is little allowance for this in the mark scheme. There are far too few questions of a routine nature and the level of difficulty is distinctly greater than for other AS modules. A number of questions need a sophistication of explanation more akin to A2 level. This has been a trend in recent years and there is a possibility that candidates and Centres may not opt for D1 in future.

It was acknowledged that this was a tougher paper than in previous sessions and the mark scheme was eased considerably. In addition the script ranges considered at award were much lower than before and consequently the grade boundaries were adjusted accordingly.

**Q1:** There were too few marks awarded for each part of this question, especially with it being the first question.

The mark scheme was eased so that for example in part (i) any two boundary lines gained credit rather than needing to write all of them down.

**Q2:** There are far too few marks awarded for the question as a whole. Although the algorithm for finding the square root of a number might be familiar to A2 candidates (iterative processes occur in C3), it is not necessarily familiar to AS candidates, and it takes time.

Candidates were only required to recognise that the two values they had found in parts (i) and (ii) were (close to) the square roots of the inputs.

**Q3:** Again more marks should be awarded for some parts.

Again the mark scheme was eased and there was no evidence that candidates did not finish this question.

**Q4:** Although this was a more straightforward question more marks should be given for the arithmetical operations.

Although there was credit for follow through in part (ii) it was felt that the balance of marks was about right for the question and that a candidate making a little slip would only be penalised once.

**Q5 (i):** This was a good question and there should have been more routine methods like this in the whole paper.

The positive feedback is appreciated although there was some evidence that some candidates did not find it straightforward.

**Q6 (i) and (ii):** These were potentially good questions but the egregious errors, already admitted by OCR, in fact made these very bad questions.

The error was restricted to (ii) but the item level data for the question paper suggested that candidates found part (i) very difficult also. In relation to part (ii) there was a significant number of candidates that did very well on this. The mark scheme was adapted so that candidates that got far enough into the question and realised the error got appropriate credit.

**Q6 (iii) (a):** Where were the candidates expected to draw their minimum spanning tree? Also, candidates would be puzzled by what to write to explain why Shauna's problem is longer.

Candidates were expected to draw the spanning tree on the network in the answer booklet but it is accepted that this may need more space in the future. Shauna's route must be longer because the minimum spanning tree is, by definition, shorter than the shortest cycle (and this is why the method for finding a lower bound for the travelling salesperson problem on a network on a complete graph works).

## AS MUSIC

**Specification/Code No/ Alt: H142**

**Paper code/number: G353**

Re: Paper G353 "Introduction to Historical Study of Music" of AS Music for Summer 2011, sat on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2011.

Question 1 on page 2 requires the harmonic function of the crotchet D at bar 2 beat 1. It is believed that the list of options in the multi choice answer does not include the correct description of the harmonic device, which should be correctly described as a suspension since the D is clearly prepared in the previous bar and is resolved on the second beat of bar 2. The fact that the note is resounded on beat 1 of bar 2 (rather than being tied) does not affect the correct description as the note is in the same voice.

The accepted scholarly description of an appoggiatura given in Grove Online (the world's most authoritative source for musical definitions) is as follows:

### Appoggiatura

(It.; Fr. appoggiature; Ger. Vorschlag).

A 'leaning-note'. As a melodic ornament, it usually implies a note one step above or below the 'main' note. It usually creates a dissonance with the prevailing harmony, and resolves by step on the following weak beat. It may be notated as an ornament or in normal notation. In the Baroque and Classical periods, and the early Romantic period, the appoggiatura, even when not notated, was taken for granted in certain contexts, particularly in recitative. See ORNAMENTS for a full discussion; see also NON-HARMONIC NOTE.

This defines exactly what the note in question 1 (G353 June 2011) does: the note (D) forms a dissonance with the prevailing harmony (a dominant 7th chord in 2nd inversion) and then resolves by step on the following weak beat (falling to the note C#).

With regard to the term suspension the definition given in Grove Online is as follows:

### Suspension.

(Fr. suspension; Ger. Vorhalt; It. sospensione).

A dissonance configuration in which the dissonant or NON-HARMONIC NOTE is tied over from the previous beat (where it is consonant) and resolved by step, usually downwards; a suspension whose non-harmonic note resolves upwards is sometimes called a 'retardation' (from Lat. retardatio, a term used in the 17th and 18th centuries).

This states that a true suspension must be tied over the bar line and this is not the case with the example used in extract 1A.

OCR believes that the question is both valid and accurate in terms of the mark scheme and the acceptable response. Candidates were offered four possible options, all of which describe non-harmony notes, but the only one that is correct in any detail is the response "appoggiatura". Candidates should have been able to recognise this as the only acceptable alternative among the list of options offered.