

Economics

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1985**

Report on the Components

June 2009

1985/MS/R/09

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, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 syllabuses 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 2009

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

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Economics (1985)

REPORT ON THE COMPONENTS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
1985/01 Paper 1 Foundation Tier	2
1985/02 Paper 2 (Case Study Paper) Foundation Tier	6
1985/03 Paper 3 Paper 3 Higher Tier	8
1985/04 Paper 4 (Case Study Paper) Higher Tier	12
Grade Thresholds	14

Chief Examiner's Report

There were 1313 candidate entries this session with 82% of entries being for the Higher Tier. The majority of candidates were entered for the appropriate tier, although there were instances where candidates were entered for the Higher Tier, when the Foundation Tier may have been more suitable for them. There were a few candidates on the Foundation Tier who would have exceeded a grade C if entered for the Higher Tier.

The question papers are in the form of question and answer booklets. Additional lined pages are given at the back of the paper for candidates to extend any of their answers should they wish to do so. Many take this opportunity, especially on the Higher Tier. However, in many cases, as in previous years, candidates do not notify the examiner that their answer is continued at the back of the booklet. Teachers should remind their candidates of the importance of this. A note such as 'see page 15' or 'cont. at back' would be very helpful.

1985/01 Paper 1 Foundation Tier

General Comments

Most candidates were able to display some breadth of knowledge and understanding on this paper, and a reasonable ability to analyse and evaluate within some questions.

While some weaker candidates did not attempt all parts of some questions, the majority were able to attempt all parts of all questions. There was no evidence of candidates running out of time.

The Quality of Written Communication was assessed within two questions and nearly all candidates achieved at least half marks for this skill. Common spelling errors included 'there' instead of 'their' and 'loose' instead of 'lose'.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

The data was in the form of an incomplete table of costs for a small pizza takeaway business.

- a) Candidates were asked to complete the table and the vast majority did this wholly correctly.
- b) Candidates were asked to draw and label a break-even chart from the data. Most did this for full marks. The most common reasons for failing to achieve all marks were not labelling the schedules and not plotting the fixed costs. There were a few incorrect schedules, but not many.
- c) The great majority of the candidates were able to identify 600 as the break-even output of pizzas, with a few incorrect answers of 6000 (£6000 was the total cost/revenue).
- d) This part of the question asked for two fixed costs. Most candidates could identify at least one. The cost of ingredients was a common incorrect answer.
- e) Candidates were asked to calculate the selling price of one pizza, which was £10. The majority were able to do this, although there were a variety of incorrect answers, some of which were unrealistic for a pizza!
- f) Making 1000 pizzas would make the most profit and many candidates were able to state this and explain the reason why using the data. There were some candidates, however, who had difficulty calculating profit.
- g) Two business objectives other than profit were required and the most common answers referred to growth, survival, market share or customer service. There were a variety of other answers. Some stated the same aim twice in different wording, e.g. more customers, grow larger.
- h) Candidates were asked to discuss the extent to which a competitive market benefits the customers. The most frequent point made was that consumers would benefit from lower prices and higher quality, followed by variety and choice of products and quality of service. Some candidates found possible drawbacks of competition such as too much choice leading to confusion.

Question 2

The data was in the form of a table showing the demand for and supply of car parking spaces in a town centre.

- a) Candidates were required to draw and label the demand and supply curves. Most did this for full marks but there were instances where labels were missing. Some candidates drew a supply curve which was not vertical.
- b) Candidates were required to draw and state equilibrium price. Nearly all stated the price correctly at £4, but many did not place an equilibrium price line on their diagram.
- c) What would happen if the price was fixed at £3 per day? Many candidates recognised this would lead to a situation of excess demand and the best answers used the figures in the table to help their explanation, although a lot of candidates omitted to do this. Some also discussed consequences such as the effect on revenue.
- (d)(i) Candidates were usually able to explain a reason why the council wanted people to leave their cars at home, referring to pollution or congestion. A common misconception was that the council wanted more revenue from bus services.
- (ii) Most candidates correctly identified the shift in supply curve to the left, although some only showed the new equilibrium point without drawing the new supply curve. A significant minority drew nothing. A few candidates showed the supply curve shifting to the right or a shift in both the supply and demand curves.
- (iii) Most candidates got this part of the question right. Where they did not, it was mainly because they had failed to show the right shift in the supply curve in part (ii).
- d) Most candidates showed the original equilibrium and the new one with the shift in the demand curve to the right. A few also showed a shift in the supply curve. As a result most candidates gave the right explanation of an increase in demand due to population growth resulting in higher prices and a larger quantity sold. Again errors in explanation were mainly not stating more tickets were sold or arose from drawing a wrong diagram. A few candidates did not draw a diagram at all.
- e) This part of the question asked for a discussion of the factors affecting the demand for cars and overall this was not very well done. A large number of candidates did not mention the income of consumers or the price of cars as factors influencing the demand of cars. Far more common were references to taste and fashion, price of petrol, technology, the need for a car to get to work, population, cost of public transport, etc. Quite a few candidates referred to the recession and the current government scheme for scrappage of cars over 10 years old. Generally though most failed to discuss and instead tended to write briefly about a whole range of factors without trying to reason which were the most important.

Question 3

The data was in the form of a line graph showing the UK inflation rate between 2000 and 2007.

- (a) The weakest answers, when explaining inflation, did not mention prices at all. A lot of candidates achieved one mark by recognising that prices rose but did not give a sound enough explanation for both marks. It was often referred to as a general rise in prices rather than a rise in the general price level. Quite a few candidates thought it was a rise in the value of money or the currency.

Report on the Components taken in June 2009

- (b) A majority got 2000 and 2007 right but quite a few candidates identified 1999 and 2006 instead.
- (c) Virtually no candidates got the UK inflation target right. Most answers were around 1-3 % and were probably guesses from the chart. Given that the 2% target has been there for a number of years, this suggests that perhaps some candidates were not aware of this figure.
- (d)(i) Most candidates correctly identified that savers will be pleased with the rise in interest rates. However, a minority were confused between savings and borrowing, e.g. stating that there would be more to pay back when the account was closed.
- (ii) Again most candidates got this right, although a few thought it had an impact on the price of the house they bought rather than the mortgage/loan. A few others thought it would be good news since it would increase the funds being saved by would be buyers prior to house purchase.
- (d) This part of the question was not well done on this tier. A few candidates did correctly identify that an increase in interest rates would encourage people to save or borrow less which would mean less spending resulting in less demand and producers lowering prices which lowers inflation. Too many candidates thought that higher interest rates would increase the income of savers enabling them to spend money; more money being spent would lead to lower prices being charged.

Question Four

The data compared eight EU countries.

- (a) Nearly all candidates got both parts of the answer correct. Where they got it wrong it was because they either put the Czech Republic instead of Romania or they put the numerical value, e.g. 6.4% instead of Romania, (the right identification but wrong data).
- (b) There were two entirely different approaches taken here. Some candidates stated there was no relationship and correctly identified comparisons between say the UK and Romania or France and Germany. A few candidates unfortunately used data on growth in GDP rather than GDP itself which was not what the question required. An equal number of candidates said there was a link or at least a weak link by comparing France/Germany on one hand with Czech Republic/Hungary on the other. However, a minority of candidates also identified a link but made little reference to the data; instead stating, for example, the line that with more space for economic activity, e.g. farming, you would expect these big countries to have a higher GDP.
- (c) Over 90% of the candidates on this tier correctly identified Romania and the better candidates also referred to life expectancy and infant mortality rates and why these indicated a low standard of living. Quite a few candidates also referred to GDP but failed to express it in terms of per capita. A few candidates interpreted infant mortality as births, which led to incorrect comments.

- (d) This part of the question asked whether countries always benefit from a high growth rate and it was not well done on this tier. Most candidates chose to write about why countries might not benefit with little or no reference to benefits. Many candidates also used the data about the economic growth rate to state that a high growth rate was not a good thing since some countries, e.g. Romania/Czech Republic had high growth rates but lower living standards, whereas countries with low growth rates had high living standards. Some candidates came to the conclusion that a steady lower growth rate was better than a fast growth rate, with references to inflation or recession.

1985/02 Paper 2 (Case Study Paper) Foundation Tier

General Comments

Candidates were familiar with a range of aspects in the case study and were able to deploy economic concepts to varying degrees, alongside their general knowledge. The topic of tourism seemed to give candidates a greater ability to connect with the concepts. On the whole, candidates were well prepared for the case study topic. Weaker candidates used few, if any, economic concepts. The longer discursive questions threw up, as might be expected, the most difficulties as candidates struggled to construct an argument. Some candidates lost marks as they did not realise that 'discuss' requires more than agreeing or disagreeing with the proposition. Some candidates had gaps in their knowledge and, therefore, omitted some questions. Generally, candidates were entered for the correct tier.

Comments on Individual Questions

- Q.1(a) Most candidates achieved full marks on this part of the question. The most common answers were 'more disposable income' and 'more leisure time'.
- Q.1(b) Most candidates were able to achieve at least one mark on this part of the question. In order to achieve both marks candidates were required to explain rather than simply to identify.
- Q. 2 This question required candidates to give economic reasons for more people holidaying in Spain compared to the Czech Republic. Candidates who gave two non-economic reasons, such as 'the weather is better' or 'there are more beaches in Spain' gained only one mark. Candidates who talked about costs, exchange rates and demand influences did best.
- Q.3(a) Most candidates gave the correct answer of China. Some candidates, however, incorrectly gave an answer of France.
- Q.3(b) Most candidates correctly gave the answer of 12 million.
- Q.4(a) Only a minority of candidates were able to give a precise definition of economies of scale. Vague ideas of firms increasing in size and/or average/unit costs falling were rewarded with a mark for each comment.
- Q. 4(b) Candidates who responded positively to the previous part of the question invariably knew the answer to this part of the question. This question was, however, generally answered poorly. Few candidates were able to identify one of the types of economy of scale. Examiners rewarded candidates who described one of the types of economies of scale instead of just identifying.
- Q.4(c) This part of the question required candidates to give both benefits and costs of a merger to the customers. Few candidates were able to give convincing arguments from both angles. More able candidates were able to explain ideas, rather than simply make assertions.

Report on the Components taken in June 2009

- Q.4(d) As with part 4(c) candidates were required to give both benefits and costs of a merger, this time to the firms involved. Candidates tended to achieve similar marks in each of these part questions.
- Q.5 Candidates were required to discuss methods for firms competing. More able candidates were able to discuss both price and non-price competition. Candidates who gained lower marks simply copied large chunks of the text from the case study and gave little extra by way of explanation.
- Q.6 The majority of candidates were well prepared for a question of this nature. Many were able to gain all the marks for the diagram through careful and correct labelling. A few candidates lost marks by choosing from the wrong set of headlines. Explanations of the diagram tended to be good; however, candidates continue to forget to consider the direction of change of both price and quantity, instead choosing to write 'quantity went from q1 to q2'.
- Q.7(a) The majority of candidates correctly identified the private cost, private benefit, external cost and external benefit from the list.
- Q.7(b) As with other discursive questions on this paper, only the more able candidates were able to achieve the top level. Too many candidates could not go beyond simply identifying possible policy measures.
- Q.8(a) Candidates who gained full marks on this part of the question were able to give an accurate overview of the data backed up by figures along with a high or a low statement, again backed up by data. Some candidates simply trawled the data month by month. Some candidates lost marks by omitting precise data.
- Q.8(b) Both of these part questions required a three step approach from the candidate; better and (c) or worse, more or fewer units of currency and higher or lower prices. A number of candidates omitted one of the steps. Most candidates were able to show some understanding of how the exchange rate system works.
- Q.9(a) There were some concise, exact definitions which gained both marks. A number of candidates were able to correctly identify both characteristics of a public good. Weaker answers simply stated that they were provided by the government.
- Q.9(b) This part of the question resulted in a multitude of answers from the candidates. Some candidates mis-read the question and looked at it from a wider perspective and forgot about the holidaymaker. Some candidates simply copied out information from the case study. More able candidates were able to say why it was fair and why it was not.
- Q.10 As usual with this type of question, candidate answers were varied. The more able candidates were able to use the pointers in the question to analyse and, at the top end, to evaluate whether an increase in tourism was of benefit to the UK. Few candidates were able to make links between inflation and increased tourism. Some candidates made no direct reference to the data.

1985/03 Paper 3 Paper 3 Higher Tier

General Comments

The great majority of candidates were able to demonstrate a sound knowledge and understanding of economic concepts and apply them appropriately in order to achieve a good mark on this paper. There were rare examples of candidates not attempting answers to some questions. However, there was little evidence of time constraint problems, with little evidence of candidates struggling to finish the last question. Indeed, many chose to use the extra lines at the back of the booklet to extend their answers.

Overall, performance was better on questions 1 and 2 (mainly macro-economics) than on questions 3 and 4. Question 1 was found particularly accessible by candidates.

The Quality of Written Communication was assessed within two questions and the majority of candidates achieved full marks for this skill. Some ideas could have been expressed more clearly by some candidates, whereas others were very fluent and made full use of economic terminology.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

The data was in the form of an incomplete table of costs for a small pizza takeaway business.

- a) Candidates were asked to complete the table and the vast majority did this wholly correctly.
- b) Candidates were asked to draw and label a break-even chart from the data. Most did this for full marks. The most common reasons for failing to achieve all marks were not labelling the schedules and not plotting the fixed costs. There were a few incorrect schedules, but not many.
- c) The great majority of candidates were able to identify 600 as the break-even output of pizzas.
- d) Candidates were asked to discuss the extent to which a competitive market benefits the business owner and customers. The most frequent point made was that consumers would benefit from lower prices and higher quality, followed by variety and choice. Some candidates, however, failed to address the effects on the owner, but plenty did do so, discussing possible benefits and/or drawbacks. Some answers drifted into a discussion of monopoly or economies of scale but, on the whole, this part of the question was answered well.

Question 2

The data was in the form of a table showing the demand for car parking spaces in a town centre.

- a) Candidates were required to draw and label the demand curve and label axes. Most did this for full marks but there were instances where labels were missing.
- b) Candidates were required to draw and label the supply curve and equilibrium price. Most

did this correctly, although an incorrect (normal) supply curve was not uncommon where candidates did not appreciate that it was vertical.

- c) The supply was perfectly inelastic, but a lot of candidates said simply 'inelastic' or 'fixed'. These were, in turn, better than other answers. A fairly common response was 'scarce'.
- d) What would happen if the price was fixed at £3 per day? Many candidates recognised that this would lead to a situation of excess demand and the best answers used the figures in the table to help their explanation. Some candidates also discussed consequences such as the effect on revenue. However, there were a wide range of responses to this part of the question.
- e) The price elasticity of demand could be calculated as (-) 0.5. While a lot of candidates were able to calculate correctly, many were not.
- f) The demand and supply analysis question brought a wide variety of responses. Weak answers confused demand and supply factors; for example, stating that a tax on cars would shift the demand curve. There were also answers which reversed the curves on diagrams, although this is far less frequent than some years ago. Some candidates failed to put both curves on a diagram, so could not analyse what would happen to price and sales. Others did not relate text to diagrams and failed to explain what happens to price and sales.

Some candidates presented rehearsed kinds of answers which had poor application to the product in the question, such as changing fashion for public transport or bad weather affecting its supply. The best answers had accurate diagrams, clear written analysis and strong application. These, for example, discussed the price of substitutes such as cars, the price of complements (especially petrol) to cars which would affect public transport demand, and the population of non-driving age on the demand side. A lot of good candidates analysed that a recession/fall in income could cause a rise in demand as it is an inferior good. Various costs, taxes and technological advancements were discussed on the supply side as well as subsidies. (Note that a lot of candidates referred to corporation tax rather than indirect taxes on the supply side.) There were plenty of excellent answers, and many candidates achieved the top level. It is recommended that candidates apply at least three demand factors and three supply factors to achieve full marks.

Question 3

The data was in the form of a line graph showing the UK inflation rate between 2000 and 2007.

- (a) The weakest answers, when explaining inflation, did not mention prices at all. A lot of candidates achieved one mark by recognising that prices rise but did not give a sound enough explanation for both marks. It was often referred to as a general rise in prices rather than a rise in the general price level.
- (b) The line graph showed that prices rose at a lower rate. Some candidates stated this, but a lot did not. Many said prices fell and equally as many talked about the rate of inflation and did not answer the specific question regarding prices.
- (c) Many candidates correctly identified that an increase in interest rates would encourage people to save more and borrow less which would mean less spending resulting in less demand and producers lowering prices which lowers inflation. Many also referred to the fall in disposable income caused by greater monthly payments for (variable rate) mortgage interest payments. Some also referred to less business investment. On the whole this was answered well on this tier.

- (d) Is inflation always bad for an economy? This brought a whole range of responses, from those who did not seem to understand any effects at all of inflation to those who gave strong evaluative answers. Quite a few answers diverted to other issues such as the effects of unemployment or economic growth. Some answers stated that people would become worse off/lose spending power, while better answers specified who would be worse off, e.g. those on fixed incomes and savers. Good answers on the costs side discussed loss of competitiveness and effects on employment and the balance of payments. The best answers balanced such arguments with possible benefits of low inflation and pointed out that the government aims for 2% inflation, rather than none at all.

Question Four

The data compared eight EU countries.

- (a) Many candidates could calculate the Czech Republic GDP per capita of \$12 400, but some gave unrealistic answers such as \$12 400 million.

There were different approaches taken here. Some candidates stated that there was no relationship and correctly identified comparisons between say UK and Romania, or France and Germany, or Poland and Italy. Some candidates said there was a link or at least a weak link comparing France/Germany on one hand with the Czech Republic/Hungary on the other. Some found a relationship on the one hand, but evidence of no relationship on the other. A few, unfortunately, used data on growth in GDP rather than GDP itself which was not what the question asked for. A minority also identified a link but made little reference to the data instead stating along the line that with more space for economic activity, e.g. farming you would expect these big countries to have a higher GDP.

- (b) The vast majority of candidates correctly identified Romania and referred to life expectancy and infant mortality rates and why these indicated low standard of living, particularly poorer health care. Weak candidates referred to all the variables in the data, some of which were not relevant. Quite a few candidates referred to GDP but failed to express it in terms of per capita. Better candidates, however, calculated GDP per capita and pointed out this was much lower than in any of the other countries.
- (d) This part of the question asked whether countries always benefit from a high growth rate and answers varied considerably. Weaker candidates used the data about the economic growth rate to state that high growth rate was not a good thing since some countries, e.g. Romania/Czech Republic had high growth rates but lower living standards. whereas countries with low growth rates had high living standards. Some candidates chose to write about why countries might not benefit with little or no reference to benefits. Others identified some benefits but no costs. Better candidates discussed both potential benefits including higher living standards, better health, education, etc. and more employment; and costs such as possible inflation, environmental damage and the use of non-renewable resources. Some candidates came to the conclusion that a steady sustainable growth rate was the ideal scenario.
- (e) Should the UK keep the pound or adopt the euro? Candidates on the whole seemed very familiar with this issue and there were some excellent responses. However, there were also some weak answers along the lines of the pound is a strong currency. Therefore. we should keep it. Many candidates recognised the benefits of adopting the euro including greater price transparency, no commission costs of exchange for tourists, lower transaction costs for firms, increased certainty and greater competition. Some weak answers, however, referred to removal of other barriers to trade. Many also recognised the

disadvantages of the pound, especially the high menu costs of changeover and loss of sovereignty over interest rate policy. Fewer mentioned the possibility of rounding-up inflation and loss of exchange rate flexibility. Some good answers also referred to constraints on fiscal policy. The best answers drew conclusions based on the arguments presented, often along the lines that the loss of the UK government's ability to manage its own economy was too large a price to pay to change to the euro.

1985/04 Paper 4 (Case Study Paper) Higher Tier

General Comments

On the whole, candidates were well prepared for this examination paper showing a good knowledge and understanding of the case study. Candidates had a good understanding of the economic issues involved and a large number were able to use economic terminology throughout their answers.

A large number of candidates were also able to discuss both sides of an argument when required to do so by the question. Weaker candidates did not analyse and discuss issues and relied on case study material alone.

The topic of tourism seemed to give candidates a greater ability to connect with the concepts. On the whole, candidates were well prepared for the case study topic.

Comments on Individual Questions

- Q.1(a) Most candidates achieved full marks on this part of the question. The most common answers were 'more disposable income' and 'more leisure time'.
- Q.1(b) Most candidates answered this part of the question well and were able to explain their reason from part(a) through the use of economic terminology.
- Q.2 This question required candidates to give economic reasons for more people holidaying in Spain compared to the Czech Republic. Candidates who gave two non-economic reasons, such as 'the weather is better' or 'there are more beaches in Spain' gained only one mark. Candidates who talked about costs, exchange rates and demand influences produced the best answers.
- Q.3 The majority of candidates gave the correct answer. Some candidates, however, were unable to correctly calculate the percentage change and lost all the marks as the calculation was incorrect.
- Q.4(a) The majority of candidates were able to give a precise definition. Some candidates were only able to give vague ideas which tended to involve firms getting larger, such candidates only gained one mark.
- Q.4(b) This part of the question required candidates to discuss the costs and benefits of the merger to both the firms involved and the customers. Some candidates only gave the benefits to both groups or discussed one of the groups. Common ideas covered were a lack of competition, less choice and achieving economies of scale.
- Q.5 Candidates were required to discuss two or more methods of competition in this question. A surprising number of candidates lacked knowledge in this area of the specification and so copied large sections from the case study without any analysis.
- Q.6 A slight change to the usual question as candidates were required to discuss how the headline they chose would affect the UK tourism market. Many candidates did this successfully. Some candidates used economic terminology such as elasticity. A small number of candidates chose from the wrong pair of headlines and, therefore, did not gain any marks.

Report on the Components taken in June 2009

- Q.7(a) This part of the question was generally well answered. The majority of candidates were able to define private costs and give an example. Most candidates gave an example from the case study; some, however, gave an example unrelated to the case study and these were still awarded marks. Some candidates were unable to correctly and precisely define external costs and, therefore, lost a mark. However, these candidates usually were able to give a correct example.
- Q.7(b) The majority of candidates correctly identified taxes as a measure to reduce the external costs of tourism. More able candidates were able to analyse and then discuss this measure. Answers included subsidies, regulation and information.
- Q.8(a) Candidates who gained full marks on this part of the question were able to give an accurate overview of the data backed up by figures along with a high or a low statement, again backed up by data. Some candidates simply trawled the data month by month. Some candidates lost marks by omitting precise data.
- Q.8(b) Candidates tended to be at either end of mark range on this part of the question. A large number of candidates were able to explain clearly, with the aid of a diagram, how an increase in interest rates affects the exchange rates. Some candidates scored no marks on this question as they did not understand how interest rates affected exchange rates, although they did, however, try to make an educated guess, which was invariably wrong.
- Q.9(a) There were some concise, exact definitions which gained both marks. A number of candidates were able to correctly identify both characteristics of a public good. Weaker answers simply stated that they were provided by the government.
- Q.9(b) This part of the question provoked a multitude of answers from the candidates. Some candidates misread the question and looked at it from a wider perspective and forgot about the holidaymaker. Some candidates simply copied out information from the case study. More able candidates were able to say why it was fair and why it was not.
- Q.10 The majority of candidates scored well on this question. It was pleasing to see that candidates had a good grasp of the information in the case study and were able to apply their knowledge, supported by information from the case study. Some candidates used their own general knowledge to support their discussion. Weaker candidates simply trawled through the data - providing no discussion. Candidates tended to focus on the positives of tourism forgetting about the negatives such as inflation. At the top end candidates used a number of economic concepts to support their answer.

Grade Thresholds

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
Economics (1985)
June 2009 Examination Series**

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
01	100	n/a	n/a	63	54	45	36	27
02	80	n/a	n/a	47	40	33	26	19
03	100	73	60	47	37	n/a	n/a	n/a
04	80	63	55	48	39	n/a	n/a	n/a

Specification Options

Foundation Tier

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	n/a	n/a	n/a	121	103	86	69	51
Percentage in Grade	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.4	24.3	19.4	12.6	10.8
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.4	52.7	72.1	84.7	95.5

The total entry for the examination was 233

Higher Tier

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	169	152	129	107	86	75	n/a	n/a
Percentage in Grade	-	8.7	22.5	31.7	22.5	10.4	2.3	n/a	n/a
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	-	8.7	31.2	62.9	85.4	95.8	98.1	n/a	n/a

The total entry for the examination was 1080

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	6.9	17.8	25.1	23.7	13.4	5.8	2.6	2.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	6.9	24.7	49.8	73.5	86.9	92.7	95.3	97.6

The total entry for the examination was 1313

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

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