

**History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F963/02**: Option B Modern 1815-1945

**Mark Scheme for June 2012**

---

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, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

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

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

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

© OCR 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

*Subject-specific Marking Instructions that apply across the whole question paper to be included here.*

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>AO2a</b>
<b>1</b>	13-14	15-16
<b>2</b>	11-12	13-14
<b>3</b>	9-10	10-12
<b>4</b>	7-8	8-9
<b>5</b>	5-6	6-7
<b>6</b>	3-4	3-5
<b>7</b>	0-2	0-2

**Notes related to Part A:**

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (iii) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

## Marking Grid for Question (a)

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness.</li> <li>• Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately.</li> <li>• Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>15-16</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts.</li> <li>• Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-10</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>10-12</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted.</li> <li>• A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence.</li> <li>• Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it.</li> <li>• Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8-9</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion.</li> <li>• Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-6</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit</li> <li>• Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6-7</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement.</li> <li>• Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context.</li> <li>• Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic.</li> <li>• Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-5</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance.</li> <li>• Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• No structure with extremely weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment.</li> <li>• Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>

**Question (b) Maximum mark 70**

	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>AO2a and b</b>
<b>1</b>	20-22	42-48
<b>2</b>	17-19	35-41
<b>3</b>	13-16	28-34
<b>4</b>	9-12	21-27
<b>5</b>	6-8	14-20
<b>6</b>	3-5	7-13
<b>7</b>	0-2	0-6

**Notes related to Part B:**

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level.</li> <li>• Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources.</li> <li>• Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>20-22</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of <b>all</b> the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation.</li> <li>• Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation.</li> <li>• Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>42-48</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance.</li> <li>• A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context.</li> <li>• Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>17-19</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouped analysis and use of <b>most</b> of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation.</li> <li>• Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent.</li> <li>• Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>35-41</b></p>



AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive.</li> <li>• Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing.</li> <li>• There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28-34</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>• Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>• May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>• An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-27</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>• Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped.</li> <li>• There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>• There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-20</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question.</li> <li>• Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Little organisation or structure with poor communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation.</li> <li>• A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content.</li> <li>• No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-13</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question.</li> <li>• No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context.</li> <li>• Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive.</li> <li>• No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately.</li> <li>• No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-6</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>The <b>context</b> is the increasing interest in public health issues in the 1840s. '1842' saw the first big move towards raising awareness of public health with Chadwick's famous Sanitary Report of that year (<b>Source A</b>); whilst by 1847 bills had been presented to parliament and had become government sponsored. Candidates may also be aware of the limited approach and jurisdictional authority of local authorities, even after the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 opened many to ratepayer suffrage which, in the case of health, could limit what was done by a more rigorous electoral control over what could and was spent.</p> <p><b>Both</b> reflect the need to do something and comment on the role of local authorities in this light. The similarities here outweigh the differences, partly because both come from sanitary reformers. They are convinced that local authorities (local corporations) are inadequate in their approach and there is a stress on the limited money and resources available to them. Chadwick in <b>A</b> comments on their inefficient operations whilst Guy in <b>B</b> goes further and points to their lack of sufficient scale (in terms of extended drainage and a lack of authority over a sufficiently large area to make a difference). Both stress the importance of drainage and the need for efficient administration through the appointment of salaried and professional officers of health, lacking according to both sources.</p> <p>The <b>differences</b> are ones of emphasis. Chadwick in <b>A</b> focuses on the revenue problem – rates are unequal in their distribution, of little value in practical terms (most would be absorbed in the new poor law rate) and inefficiently collected and administered. He promises economy and saving money, perhaps over optimistically. In contrast the problem for Guy in <b>B</b> is the local electoral system. Ratepayers were potentially removed from public health problems and were unlikely to appreciate the scale of action needed or be bold enough to demand action from their representatives. As a result Guy stresses the need for government appointment to sanitary office, not the local patronage that produced officers for whom local and political loyalties trumped health and administrative expertise.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> explains the critical approach to local authorities. Both sources are written by experts, both by committed sanitary reformers, especially Edwin Chadwick, for whom it had become something of a crusade in the 1840s. Both have an interest in stressing local authority inefficiency. Chadwick had become an object of local authority suspicion and hatred and he reciprocated. Both look to central government for the answers and the authority to over-ride local corporations,</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>although Guy does so with some reluctance. The purpose of both is to persuade, although their audience differs – Chadwick in <b>A</b> is seeking to mould intelligent propertied opinion (and stresses economy and saving money). He is seeking official sanction (a Report that went beyond its remit and was only published to a wider audience at his own expense). Guy in <b>B</b> is addressing a more specialist audience via a journal, although it reflects a widening interest in health issues by intelligent public opinion. The author is predisposed to oppose centralisation and is at pains to state a problem – local authorities simply lack the boundaries to deal with a problem that is beyond them. This explains the emphasis on election. In terms of <b>judgement</b> both are equally valid in the points they make on local authority limitation but both generalise. Neither acknowledges the admittedly few authorities that were seizing the initiative (Liverpool for example). Some may consider Guy the better source as he focuses on the institutional limitations whereas Chadwick rather speciously claims that savings could be made in the Poor Law bill to compensate for the health expenditure he claims is so necessary.</p>		
(b)	<p>The Sources provide a variety of views on the issue of what provided the major impetus to tackle health in the 1840s. The question asserts the centrality of Chadwick, his work and efforts. However, there were other factors at work – the role of cholera in panicking the political classes; public awareness and the state of knowledge on the issue; the issue of local government reform and the impact of the industrial revolution on the health of towns and cities. All of the sources are, to a greater or lesser extent, predisposed towards public health reform. Two sources, <b>A</b> and <b>B</b>, are self appointed experts on the issue whilst <b>C</b>, <b>D</b> and <b>E</b> are laymen, looking critically at the unfolding debate and those involved in it.</p> <p><b>The view that Chadwick’s work was the key</b> to what was achieved can be largely found in <b>A</b>, with some support from <b>B</b> and <b>C</b>. Source <b>A</b> is Chadwick himself and the provenance point here is obvious. This is an extract from his famous report of 1842, published under his own name and the product of his work as a poor law commissioner. By 1840, from poor law reports, he had concluded that the occupants of workhouses were often there because of poor health. Increasingly much of the continued expense was incurred in their role as unofficial local hospitals. Health was the key to the operation of a smooth and free labour market. However, he needed to convince both a suspicious public and government that the health of the poor</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>The sources can be read/analysed in different ways and as part of their judgement candidates will need to appreciate this.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>affected all, both in terms of infectious disease and in its indirect impact on the pockets of the employing classes. His 1842 report arguably did precisely that. He asserted the causes of disease (wrongly as it turned out – miasma and atmospheric causes were to be disproved in the 1850s) and succinctly summarised them in the opening sentences of the source. His analogies are striking – annual loss of life was greater than in Britain’s wars. Local authorities were not up to the job. Savings were promised (again rather speciously – the claim is a future reduction of one thirtieth in expenditure provided an initial large outlay was made on new, water flushed, drainage). New civil servants were in fact an economy! Thus he provided solutions and savings, all in one go. His theories fitted the facts that he deployed and he could claim that he had been asked to investigate by the Whig government. This had a considerable impact at the time (a Health of Towns Association with branches all over Britain was set up) and Peel’s government was forced further to consider urban health. 100,000 copies of his report were sold. Candidates however could point to the assertions in the source on the causes of disease and to the existing interests that were implicitly condemned to oblivion – improvement commissioners and often powerful water companies would have to be wound up. The result of his report was a polarisation into ‘clean’ and ‘dirty’ parties that arguably hindered health reform. Guy in <b>B</b> lends some support to the view of Chadwick’s pivotal role by echoing his 1842 findings – on drainage, local authority inadequacy and the need for proper sanitary officials, but his is the view of a minority, albeit an increasing one, and he is careful to voice appropriate caveats as to centralisation and officialdom This was a recognition of the opposition’s case against Chadwick. The author in <b>C</b> (Fraser’s magazine), also gives cautious recognition of Chadwick’s centrality in the debate. It is in the form of a warning to Chadwick based on an awareness of his controversial poor law role – his tendency to doctrinaire approaches (a perceived inhumane Benthamite utilitarianism) and compulsion.</p> <p><b>The view that minimises Chadwick’s importance</b> is to be found in a different reading of Chadwick <b>in source A (see above), in combination with C</b>, which points to negative public perceptions of him. A focus on <b>increasing criticism of local authorities is to be found in B</b> but <b>Sources D and E stress that the main factor was fear of cholera</b>. Sources <b>D and E</b> both provide telling evidence of the powerful fear of cholera, a fear far more concrete than from other epidemics (typhus) –arriving from Asia in 1830, it had not been seen before and government immediately took</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>action to hold ships in quarantine and set up a temporary Board of Health to deal with the first outbreak in 1832. Opinion was divided on causes –victim contact or miasma (as Chadwick believed in <b>Source A</b>) – and on treatments. Clearly it was behind early public health reform in the early 1830s when there had been little by way of Chadwick’s statistics, solutions and advocacy (the product of the 1840s) and Dickens in <b>Source E</b> claims that it was again the key in the 1840s. With another epidemic in 1848/9 he argued cholera lay behind the Public Health Act of 1848 (this time a permanent Central Board with power to act if death rates climbed and to appoint an inspector). The delays after 1842 and the timing of the Act would confirm Dickens’ view. Similarly his point about bulletins ceasing when cholera abated and the ‘buttoning of pockets’ to pay for health measures is corroborated by events – the Board was to be for a trial period of 6 years only and was to be permissive. It was closed in 1854 and Chadwick dismissed. Shopkeepers, labourers and ratepayers resented interference and Chadwick made enemies, as <b>Source C</b> warned. He seemed incapable of realising that it would take time and cooperation for large cities to build arterial systems. Dickens was a persuasive and engaged campaigner. His evidence is compelling and is indirectly supported by Punch in <b>Source D</b>. This, too, highlights action as a result of cholera and interestingly makes what turned out to be the correct link between it and the water supply. In this sense Chadwick’s new Central Board was guilty of making it worse – flushing the London sewers into the Thames and encouraging the continuance of rivers, sources of drinking water, as dumping grounds for waste. However, Punch in <b>Source D</b> had no scientific backing for this claim in 1849.</p> <p>Another view is the general raising of health consciousness in the period, a point stressed in <b>Source C</b> in relation to local government inadequacy but also in the form of the sort of publicity provided by Punch in <b>Source D</b> and Dickens in <b>Source E</b>, both more popular and arguably influential than Chadwick. The latter was regarded with suspicion by populace and government alike. <b>Sources like A and B</b>, once the implications were realised, may well have been counter-productive. The satire of Punch (a well known verse with obvious and popular targets in the form of corrupt vested interests) and the adulation commanded by Dickens may lead to a conclusion that marginalises the role of Chadwick in favour of cholera and corruption.</p> <p>Alternatively the elegance and persuasiveness of Chadwick, not least the savings argument, could well form the basis for an acceptance of the view in the question.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The context for both sources is the 1874 election. Both are liberal sources and comment from this perspective on Liberal achievements. <b>Both</b> talk of ‘enabling’ the British people and both refer to the achievement of moral policy and reform, on issues such as the Alabama arbitration. However there are considerable <b>differences</b>. For Gladstone in <b>A</b> the whole point of a Liberal government is fiscal rectitude – economy and debt reduction, a continued lowering of tariffs (Free Trade) and low taxation. His tone reveals considerable pride in the achievement of this and he proffers the hope that the Income Tax would finally be abolished should the Liberals be re-elected. He is also proud of liberal diplomacy abroad which brought peace and an end to factious disputes like the Alabama case. Halifax in <b>B</b> fails to even mention financial achievements, although he hints at unease at ‘what was going on abroad’. He doesn’t share Gladstone’s optimism as to what the Liberals had sought and achieved abroad. For him the key Liberal achievement had been the removal of abuse, privilege and corruption. Instead of focusing on tariffs and taxation he mentions the removal of the Irish Church (Disestablishment and Dis-Endowment in 1869) of army purchase (Cardwell’s Army reforms) and the Secret Ballot Act in 1872. This was political rather than financial and economic achievement.</p> <p>As regards <b>provenance</b> the key lies in the respective political positions of the two sources, and their dates. <b>Gladstone in Source A</b> is the Liberal leader and PM addressing his constituents immediately prior to the general election and aware that anything he said would be printed (the ‘Times’) and seen as a national Liberal election manifesto. For Gladstone the fiscal imperative was absolute. Always his own Chancellor he was determined to find a great mission to reunite the Liberal party and typically found it in a return to the basics of Free trade and low taxation. However this is a vote winning speech and the achievement of low taxation and a ‘sound economy’ and the proposed abolition of the Income Tax should be seen in this light. He hoped to counter the message of his Tory rival, a brewer who sought to exploit the Licensing issue that had recently bedevilled the Liberals. In contrast <b>Lord Halifax in Source B</b>, albeit from a liberal perspective, is more wide ranging in his assessment. As a member of the Lords, holding an honorary position as elder statesman in Gladstone’s government, he can afford to be more sanguine. His purpose is to console and commiserate immediately after the election defeat. He writes a personal letter to his leader. He studiously avoids the failure of Gladstone’s fiscal mission talking instead of a rebound in the thinking of the electorate, natural</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>swings to and from a party or government that had genuinely, and rightly, sought the removal of long standing abuses. He stresses that Liberal achievements may not, in the long run, have resulted in so negative a popular response as the electoral result would suggest. In terms of <b>judgement</b> candidates may consider Halifax to be the better guide on what the Liberals, as a whole, achieved, given his balance of positive and negative and the wider take on the reforms, although Gladstone, as liberal and PM, may well provide better evidence in terms of his own view of what Liberals did, and should, stand for.</p>		
(b)	<p>The sources support <b>three possible interpretations</b> – that the result was down to Conservative leadership and organisation; that the Liberals had, by their reforms and actions, lost it; that the result was the product of general social and economic trends in the country that advantaged the Conservatives, although candidates may see this as part of the reaction to Liberal reform. Three of the sources are from a liberal perspective, albeit different strands (Gladstone in <b>A</b>, a senior Whig in <b>B</b> and a radical liberal journalist in <b>D</b>). They are divided in their verdict, although no credit is given to Disraeli and the Conservatives. They either stress their own mistakes and policies, well intentioned or otherwise (<b>A</b> and <b>B</b>) or point to long term trends that favour Conservatism (<b>D</b> – suitably vacuous in its reference to Conservatism, as befits a radical assessment). Two of the sources are from a Conservative angle (the Queen in <b>Source C</b> reporting Disraeli’s views and <b>Gorst in Source E</b> commenting on strategies and organisation).</p> <p>The <b>argument for conservative leadership and organisation</b> is to be found in <b>sources C and E</b>, the Queen and Gorst, son of Disraeli’s electoral organiser, and indirectly in <b>D’s</b> implicit reference to Disraeli’s strategy of promising respite from harassing legislation – the preference of the electorate for ‘leaving well alone’. However <b>Sources C and E</b> have different conservative emphases. <b>Queen Victoria’s record of Disraeli’s conversation</b> with her on the results stresses, rather predictably, Disraeli’s own leadership of the party. He takes the credit for the strategy of 1873/4, refusing office when Gladstone sought to resign following the debacle of the Irish Universities bill and allowing him to struggle on with a divided party and no particular policy until January 1874. Candidates might refer to his speeches from 1872 carving out a philosophy for mid Victorian Conservatism and to his witty takes</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>on Gladstone's apparent interventionism ('volcanoes' etc.). Victoria is partisan but this is a factual record of what was said. It is given more validity by the initial comment on the result as a 'great surprise', Disraeli thinking the likelihood to be a small liberal majority. This is hardly an endorsement of a convincing and proactive Conservatism on Disraeli's part. In contrast <b>Gorst in E</b> almost entirely stresses conservative organisation, countering Disraeli's own view, in <b>C</b>, that organisation had nothing to do with it. The pro conservative sources diverge here. In 1874 (<b>Source C</b>) Disraeli is dismissive on organisational issues. From hindsight (Gorst wrote his pro conservative biography, <b>Source E</b>, in 1900) there is a melding of leadership and organisation, as befits the son of the man who later claimed the credit for victory. He suggests that the idea of bringing together local constituency and a central organisation was Disraeli's, despite no mention of its beneficial role in Disraeli's conversation with Victoria. From that alleged suggestion there followed the work of his father – ensuring the party was not caught on the hop by Gladstone's sudden and unexpected dissolution, targeting winnable seats and moving quickly to back 'agreed' candidates. There is no mention here of any other factor. Credit is given to Disraeli and Gorst whom, it is argued in E, would obviously realise the implications of the 1867 Reform Act with its need to mobilise, in new ways, an expanded urban electorate. Candidates may find this convincing given Gorst's work and calculations. They may be aware of Liberal deficiencies before Chamberlain got to work but Disraeli's tone and insouciance in C may lead them to consider the Conservative thesis to be unconvincing. They could also cite <b>Harrison's comments in D</b> on the limits of Conservative organisation – that the party could not control Manchester.</p> <p><b>Another interpretation, to be found in sources A and B, is that the Liberals lost the election.</b> This is given some weight by their liberal slant. <b>Gladstone in A</b> pins his hopes on fiscal rectitude and the promise of a bribe for the middle classes – the abolition of the income tax. His mention of the Alabama arbitration was, perhaps, unwise, especially its linkage to paying off debt. He studiously ignores the controversial legislation of his government and the precise context of the election in Greenwich (the Licensing Act). Candidates might consider his comments to reflect either desperation or an ill-conceived attempt to pin Liberalism back to its mid century hey-day. They certainly hid more than they reveal about the state of play in Liberal politics. However, <b>Harrison in D</b> challenges the importance of the Licensing Act and Forster's Education Act (beer having little influence on the London middle</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>class; the nonconformist ‘25<sup>th</sup> section men...not strong in London’). <b>Halifax in B</b> is similarly more measured. He is concerned to discern wider factors affecting the Liberal vote – an unpopular foreign policy (that could be pinned more squarely on Gladstone as the <b>reference in A</b> suggests) and a John Bright inspired Secret Ballot that rebounded on the Liberals by enabling the expression of private dissatisfaction. Again, however, Harrison is concerned to refute this in <b>D</b> (Halifax’s comments on master/men tension is criticised by the observation that there were few workers in the Home Counties). Halifax may well, as a Whig Liberal, reflect a more staid liberal approach to the perceived radicalism of Gladstone. Whilst acknowledging that the Liberals alienated vested interests, who protested loudly, he prefers to put it down to a swing of the pendulum.</p> <p><b>A third view can be constructed, using Sources B and D</b> (Halifax and Harrison), although this could equally be made part of the previous argument – that the Liberals lost by losing their grip on the middle ground for whom the tax promises in <b>A</b> would appear slight after reductions in recent years. This view stresses general trends and the swing of the pendulum. <b>Halifax’s thesis in B</b> stresses a general swing in the electorate, still propertied, based on fear. This was partly economic and partly foreign (a balance of power less favourable to Britain). The result, according to Halifax, was the ‘taking refuge in Conservatism’. As a liberal he considers this irrational but, alas, inevitable. <b>Harrison in D</b> presents a more sophisticated analysis but comes to much the same conclusion – that trends were underway which saw the middle class move away from Liberalism. He is concerned to refute short term analyses based on either particular liberal failings (licensing; trade unions; education and the nonconformists; the new electorate of 1867 – residuum; the Gladstone bribe of income tax abolition in <b>A</b>) or on Conservative organisation (controlling Manchester). He argues that the turnaround didn’t occur in areas where liberal issues might rebound against them but amongst the large middle class centres – London, its suburbs, the Home Counties and the big northern cities. Candidates could refute this, at least in the north, where the issues he dismisses, it could be argued, did have an effect.</p> <p>In terms of <b>judgement</b> candidates may find any one of these convincing, depending on their evaluation of the sources and the contextual use of their own knowledge.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>The sources agree on certain specific points about why votes for women was opposed. Firstly, opponents argued the woman's priority was the home, the assumption being that politics was not for them. However, each adopts a different slant on this. <b>Source C</b> is emphatic that 'Politics will go on without the help of women, but the home will not' implying they are indispensable in the latter but not the former, whereas <b>Source D</b> suggests the incompetence of women in the home – unable to 'sew, cook' etc is such that it would be foolish to 'introduce into politics these unsatisfactory creatures'. Secondly, opponents thought women lacked knowledge of politics: <b>Source C</b> accepting 'the special knowledge of men' in contrast to 'inexperienced women' and <b>Source D</b> concedes 'wives are without the smattering of newspaper information which their husbands exchange'. Thirdly, and related, is the view that women were mentally not equipped for politics. <b>Source C</b> asserts that 'women are not equal to men ... in intellect' and the third sentence in <b>Source D</b> makes it clear by inversion that the 'popular' view was that women were mentally inferior. Fourthly, opponents argued that women lacked stamina. As with the previous point, a careful reading of the fourth sentence of <b>Source D</b> makes it clear that men believed women lacked 'perseverance and resolve' which is stated in <b>Source C</b> which criticised women's lack of 'endurance or nervous energy'.</p> <p>In evaluating these sources candidates might highlight the different perspectives of the authors. In <b>Source C</b> the views expressed clearly represent those of the authoress which she claims are supported more broadly by women as a whole drawing on the results of the survey of women in East Grinstead to prove her point. By contrast, in presenting the views of opponents <b>Source D</b> is clearly interpreting the views of 'politicians', the press' and the public but the implication is clear that they are the views of men with which she disagrees. Candidates will likely assert that this is unsurprising given that Mrs Colquhoun was a member of the Anti-Suffrage League and Mrs Martin was a Suffragist. Mention of the integrity of the Empire in <b>Source C</b> might be used as more than simply an argument of opponents against the vote for women but an indication of the conservatism of Mrs Colquhoun which may help explain her resistance to political change. The typicality of these views might be verified as consistent with the organisations represented by the authoresses and a way of judging the reliability of the sources and the equality of their value as evidence.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b>This question is about the arguments for giving women the vote, not the reasons for doing it.</b></p> <p>In <b>support of the interpretation Source A</b> implies that the present system amounted to ‘tyranny’, the implication being that votes for women would check this. In addition, the record of municipal government is claimed to be ‘in advance of Parliamentary attitudes’, in part it is implied, because women play a part there. Candidates might elaborate on women in local government. It could also be claimed that the point about ‘women have to obey the laws’ suggests that the framing of laws would be better. <b>Source D</b> supports the view that women’s involvement would be a positive political development in stressing the attributes of women including ‘perseverance and resolve’, ‘mental superiority’, ‘commonsense’ and ‘knowledge of the workings of male human nature’. Knowledge of women who had proved these talents and of the hardships endured by many women would usefully re-enforce these claims. The logic of the arguments presented may commend <b>Sources A and D</b> as strong evidence in favour of the interpretation. However, candidates may question their reliability given the commitment of both women to the cause of women’s suffrage.</p> <p><b>Source C is helpful in developing the counter-argument.</b> The results of the survey suggest that only a minority of women wanted the vote implying a denial of the interpretation. Furthermore, the authoress argues that the political system would not be improved if women had the vote. Indeed, <b>Source C</b> is explicit in stating that ‘the problems of government can only be solved by ... men’. Although the survey quoted may represent the views of women in one locality candidates should note that the Anti-Suffrage League was national, stated in the introduction, and in 1911 the support for the women’s cause was limited: Parliament had dropped a Conciliation Bill and an upsurge of violence from the Suffragettes alienated many. Yet, her reference to women abroad having the vote might be used as support for the argument for giving the vote to women in England.</p> <p>Closely linked to the point that votes for women would improve the political system is the reason that women should be given the vote <b>as affirmation of their equality</b>. This point is made most forcefully, perhaps, in <b>Source B</b> which regards the vote as essential to validate women’s equality in every other sphere of life. This is made clear in ‘disenfranchisement brands women with a permanent mark of inferiority’</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>which will colour their view of themselves in 'education, work and social relations' and also perpetuate the view of men that they are 'superior'. The tone of <b>Source B</b> is critical of men's attitudes as a whole which might lead candidates to argue that the author represents the minority view of men. The theme of equality is made explicit in <b>Source A</b> in the first and fourth items listed which suggest women will not enjoy equality of security of interest or justice until they have the vote. The final point listed could be cross-referenced to <b>Source B</b> and its comments on inequality of 'social relations'. Candidates may dismiss the points made in <b>Source A</b> as the poster was clearly propaganda for the WSPU but given the proximity of <b>Source B</b> to the views expressed in <b>Source A</b> it could be argued otherwise. Indeed, <b>Source D</b> might be used to support the view that equality was the main reason why women should be given the vote. The specific qualities of women considered in the source suggest that women were the equal of men in most respects. Indeed, the final clause claiming women were 'invaluable as voters' stresses the point.</p> <p>Pre 1917 Women's <b>contribution to the war effort</b> and the <b>ending of militancy</b> is regarded as the main argument that they deserved the vote according to <b>Source E</b>, on two counts. In asking 'how could we have carried on the war without them' the author acknowledges that women were indispensable to the war effort and as a result he 'would find it impossible to withhold from women their right'. In addition, the author was impressed by the decision of the Suffragettes to suspend their 'detested campaign' of violence and the opportunity presented to politicians to concede to women's demands without appearing to do so as a result of pressure. Candidates will be able to add detail about Asquith's hostility to the suffrage movement, the violence of the WSPU and the specific contribution of women to the war effort. Speaking as a politician rather than as Prime Minister also allowed him to express his opinions more frankly than before and by 1917 there was little debate about the contribution of women in WW1.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p><b>Similarities:</b> Neither is very complimentary about his style. <b>E (Clementine Churchill)</b> sees an overbearing and sarcastic attitude to subordinates and <b>B</b> sees a lack of consideration, with admirals being brought into early morning conferences. <b>B (Kennedy)</b> sees him overworking and <b>E</b> suggests that rudeness and irascibility may be the result of pressure, though does not say it directly. Neither sees in Churchill a calm or professional approach, but rather both suggest vigour and energy which are not always well-judged.</p> <p><b>Differences:</b> There is no mention in <b>E</b> of the excessive drinking and dining that figures in <b>B</b>, and there is no mention of the popularity that Churchill enjoys in <b>E</b>. Though <b>B</b> sees a lack of consideration, it is not as direct about Churchill's rude and abrasive manner as <b>E</b>. This may well be because of the extreme pressure that Churchill was under by the time his wife warned him – he had certainly not had the rest that Kennedy thought was necessary</p> <p><b>Provenance:</b> <b>E</b> is of course after Churchill has the huge responsibility of guiding Britain in a time of extreme crisis, while <b>B</b> is concerned with speculation, detrimental to Churchill's claims on the leadership, in the period prior to Chamberlain's resignation. Neither source had direct evidence of Churchill's leadership and must have relied on reports from subordinates. <b>E</b> is much closer to Churchill as it had the purpose of improving his relations with others. <b>B</b> had no such purpose and was recording his private thoughts. Both have limitations as evidence – and both omit the charm that Churchill could employ and the devotion he often engendered among those who worked for him. Kennedy as a leading newspaper man would have had inside information and Clementine knew her husband and had been told by those close to him that he was going too far. However neither makes allowances for the exigencies of war and neither is from a current military background – though Brooke's diaries give a similar picture after 1941. In terms of <b>judgement</b>, it may well be that a close family member would be more reliable and truthful, but that someone like Kennedy who had contacts with the workings of government would have a clearer idea of leadership qualities. No set answer is required for a judgement about the relative usefulness of these sources – <b>E</b> is from the time of Churchill's premiership while <b>B</b> is not, but may reflect a particularly stressful period. On the other hand there is plenty of other evidence to support these defects of leadership as well as many examples of much greater strengths than this source suggests.</p>		<p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The issue is whether the view Churchill did not have many appropriate leadership qualities in terms of being trusted and offering good judgement and only came to office because Halifax did not feel he could accept the responsibility is sustainable. The alternative is that Churchill had those uncompromising, energetic war-like qualities that were needed, even if he did drink, bully and harass subordinates and lack the trust of some, if not all, establishment figures because he was a popular hero.</p> <p><b>A (Colville)</b> establishes the dilemma of 1940 – <b>Churchill’s reputation of untrustworthiness and instability</b> – borne out by poor judgement over the threat of Communism, India, his choice of associates like Bracken and Boothby and his unwise stance during the Abdication. However <b>against this was the confidence</b> he gave. He had wide experience of office, had direct experience of war and unbounded optimism (at least in public) about Britain’s will and ability to win and a record of urging governments to stand up to Germany.</p> <p><b>The view that Churchill was the best suited for the premiership in 1940</b> is to be found, with qualifications in <b>A and B</b> but particularly in <b>C (Boothby)</b>. Boothby, though hardly an unbiased observer, being close to Churchill and having worked to have him as leader, was justified in commenting on Labour’s lack of confidence in Chamberlain who was blamed for failures in Norway which Churchill, oddly, was not (though much of the disaster could be laid at his door). The sources do not, rightly, claim that Churchill had the confidence of most of the Conservatives but nevertheless refers to Churchill’s appointment as Prime Minister as ‘inevitable’. This must be seen as more of an encouragement to Churchill than necessarily accurate. The popularity of Churchill might support the <b>evidence in C and some aspects of A</b>. His pre-war stance on Appeasement, his journalistic writing and his speeches, together with the impression that he was leading the war effort (albeit, in reality with some lack of judgement, as in Norway and with some unrealistic ideas of a campaign to help Finland), suggest why he was best suited in the popular if not the official mind to be PM. Better candidates might make something of this distinction in their responses to the question.</p> <p><b>The alternative view is in B, D and E</b>. George VI in <b>D provides</b> the main corrective – Churchill’s qualities had not impressed the King and he still favoured Halifax who, by that time, had distanced himself from earlier appeasement and stood as a dignified and experienced politician. This useful source makes it clear that Chamberlain was a key figure in having Churchill accepted, once Halifax had made it</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>clear that he did not want to lead. The source is a personal record and consonant with the royal family's earlier distrust of Churchill. Some doubt is also cast on <b>C</b> by the opinion of a leading journalist, <b>Kennedy of the Times, in B</b>. The erratic and untrustworthy side referred to in <b>A</b> once again is apparent – with the heavy drinking and the unreasonable demands on subordinates and the military leaders. This continued during Churchill's premiership and is well-documented by sources such as Brooke's diaries. The heavy drinking is not just gossip but is referred to in many other memoirs. <b>E (Lady Churchill)</b>, in a personal and quite wounding letter, raises some of the issues of <b>B</b> and helps to explain the King's view in <b>D</b>. It does not mention the great charm that Churchill could deploy or the loyalty he could engender and it is written at a particularly difficult time for Churchill which might exacerbate some unfortunate traits of his leadership. However other evidence corroborates an overbearing manner and disregard for subordinates. Some might consider that the fact that such a letter could be written indicates that Churchill was a big enough man to take criticism – and this is justified. Those who stood up to him and questioned him often gained respect and he did listen to different views.</p> <p><b>Provenance:</b> <b>C</b> is the strongest source for Churchill being best suited to lead. Both <b>A and B</b> see his abilities and <b>B</b> refers to his popularity but neither thought him the natural choice at the time. <b>C</b> is by a strong supporter, part of a group of dissident Conservatives out of favour with mainstream Chamberlain supporters, Though written at the time, it is for the purpose of reassuring Churchill and does not present an unbiased view of the situation – there were plenty of people in Parliament and the country who had more doubts than are expressed here about Churchill's past record. He himself thought that the disasters of Norway might well have ruined his reputation. Labour favoured Halifax as the PM until Halifax's doubts and so did the King who was personally upset at Halifax's refusal. However even someone close to Chamberlain in <b>Source A</b> thought that Churchill was destined to be Prime Minister – but interestingly not in 1940, stressing both his instability and his untrustworthiness. <b>A</b> could well be influenced by his closeness to Chamberlain who was still very well-respected in the party in 1940 and <b>B</b>, though a leading journalist was not as close to the centre of power as <b>A and possibly C</b>. <b>E</b> was certainly personally close to Churchill, but may have been worried by the signs of strain which only she could see and by the reports she was hearing – though regrettable, some bullying in 1940 might have been necessary.</p>		



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Context:</b> Candidates might pick up on Churchill's previously poor reputation and why he might have been considered untrustworthy and unstable. This might be contrasted with knowledge of his own reputation as an opponent of Appeasement. The dangerous situation of May 1940 might be used as evidence to support the views in <b>E and B</b> for the need of someone of Churchill's energy and uncompromising demands. Alternatively knowledge of his unreasonable behaviour might be used to confirm the views in <b>A and B</b> that he was indeed too dangerous a choice and in <b>E</b> that he was difficult to work for. No set answer is expected here.</p>		

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2012

