

**History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

**Mark Scheme for June 2013**

---

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

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

This 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 2013

**Annotations**

Annotation	Meaning

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions****Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

	A01a and b	A02a
1	13–14	15–16
2	11–12	13–14
3	9–10	10–12
4	7–8	8–9
5	5–6	6–7
6	3–4	3–5
7	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)

<b>A0s</b>	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>A02a</b>
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>

<b>A0s</b>	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>A02a</b>
<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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<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**

	A01a and b	A02a and 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	A01a 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	A01a 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	A01a 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 that despite the initial stress on child labour by the 1840s female factory labour had become an issue. How far should it be restricted (the Mines Act of 1842 and the Factory Act of 1844 had imposed restrictions on female hours, ten and a half, and, in the case of the Mines, the type of work allowed women – not underground)? How far was female factory labour desirable?</p> <p><b>Both</b> agree on the general need to improve the hours and conditions for women and girls in the factories. Both want to protect family life and agree the impact of factory labour has been the neglect of wifely duties– Ashley’s ‘details of domestic life’ and Jameson’s ‘needlework, cleanliness, and the management of wages to provide homely comforts’. There is some agreement on the dangers for women. Jameson refers to those who survive to adulthood, implying many do not, whilst Ashley, although more vague, does imply danger in the competition with more vigorous adult men.</p> <p>The <b>differences</b> are that Jameson argues that factory labour is preferable to other forms – agriculture and domestic service – because of comparative freedom, independence and the stated and regulated hours (after 1844), something missing from the other occupations. Ashley disagrees on the grounds that factory work is cruel for women, although he is careful to say he is talking of 13-18 year olds, not those regulated by the 1833 Act. Ashley doesn’t mention female education in the factories but does refer, in general, to nothing having been done to address 13-18 year old females. Jameson does, citing the Factory Commissioners who comment on the particular neglect of girls’ education in the factory schools. Jameson also stresses the independence that factory work can provide, something significantly not mentioned by Ashley.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> is similar. Both are writing/speaking in the context of the 1846 10 Hour Bill. Both appear to want to protect family life. Ashley was known to dislike independent women who demanded the same as men and neglected traditional female roles. Yet neither seems to want equality. There are differences in their backgrounds. Ashley was an aristocrat, a social conservative and one of the key parliamentary factory reform leaders. He was mainly concerned with men and the issue of 10 hours, especially whilst introducing the 10 Hour Bill in this parliamentary speech. His audience was a male one, although the speech would be widely reported. Jameson in Source D was a middle class female and early feminist writing in a journal of memoirs and essays. Her audience was probably more intellectual, middle class and perhaps female. As such she is more accepting of the independence available for some. Nonetheless she too is concerned with morality, family and traditional roles.</p> <p>In terms of <b>judgement</b> both are equally valid in the points they make. Source D provides a middle class female and early feminist slant (the attack on the lack of education for factory women and the awareness of independence), Source E gives a paternal, male, Tory and aristocrat reformer’s view. Jameson may be the more informative and perceptive of the two but she shares a conventional and middle/upper class view of working women, seemingly unaware that work was, usually, not a matter of choice.</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
(b)	<p>The Sources provide a variety of views on whether the Factory Acts (1833 and 1844) did more harm than good. Most of the sources are capable of being interpreted either way as they contain a variety of perspectives. <b>Sources A and C</b>, McCulloch and Hyde, are pro factory, an economist and mill owner, but both are worried about the harm that will be done. <b>Sources D and E</b> are factory reformers but can also see the negative aspects, especially on women, and they continue to push for reform. <b>Source B</b> is from a respected and formidable factory inspector, Leonard Horner, who is convinced that the 1833 Act is sensible and doing good. <b>Generally sources B, D and E</b> are more convinced of some good, the ones from the employer perspective still uncertain and resentful at the unprecedented interference. However even the Inspector and the reformers are aware of loopholes and problems, the latter (Ashley and Jameson), especially aware of the negative impact on women.</p> <p><b>The view that the Acts did more harm for children can be found in Sources A and C, whilst Sources D and E argue that some harm has been done to women.</b> McCulloch in <b>Source A</b> considers that the restrictions on children under 9 will have resulted in them being thrown onto the streets and, by suggesting that factories are places of misery, confinement and ill treatment will have harmed the competitiveness and employment opportunities offered by factories. He angrily refutes the image painted by Sadler's Report. However as an economist his was a more abstract view, although there is much evidence to suggest that the report and its evidence was deliberately slanted against the factory. Knowledge might suggest that parents, children, campaigners and employers alike would conspire to render it ineffective unless it was properly enforced. Such points are borne out by the reports of the factory inspectors, like that of <b>Horner in Source B</b>, who refers to prosecutions of those who broke the new rules (usually for failing to register child workers and their hours or a failure to provide education) and to a stubborn minority of employers. Here other developments such as registration of births did gradually ensure more 'good' came of the act and it became more difficult to evade its educational, safety and working hour clause. Nonetheless it could be pointed out that the 1844 Act actually adversely affected the very young, bringing 8 year olds back into employment. <b>Greg in Source C</b> is convincing evidence. It comes from a noted employer with a firm but sound reputation at Styal Mill in Cheshire. He opposed 10 hours and in this pamphlet, written to refute factory reform, he argues, as McCulloch did, that the consequence of 1833 has been to throw children into a worse situation, either onto the streets, or into the mines where nothing was done until 1842. He also alludes to the educational effects of this. Such children would receive none and he asks the rhetorical question - are they better physically and mentally than before? He assumes not, although it is worth pointing out that he can only be talking of those below 9, or those whose</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>restricted hours above 9 had led to dismissal. He would be in a position to know, at least in the North. <b>Sources D and E</b> both consider that the factories and acts have harmed young poor women. Jameson in D argues that the attraction of regular factory work encourages girls and women to go into it at the expense of morality and the nation's domestic life. They become too independent and have no idea how to manage a home. Ashley makes a similar point but the thrust of his point on the existing factory acts is that too many loopholes exist and little has been done for the 13-18 age groups. Both sources are making a point with a view to change. The variety of viewpoints here might suggest that the Factory Acts did little good and, in the case of those sacked and women, much harm.</p> <p><b>The view that stresses the good can be seen partially in Source A, but particularly in Sources B, C and D.</b> The key source for 'good' is <b>Horner in B</b>. As the most influential and hard working of the 4 inspectors set up by the 1833 Act, active in its enforcement, his evidence is especially telling. He is convinced that it has changed attitudes for the better. He argues that most employers accepted the moral and practical points of the act in relation to children, their health and education. He also comments that workers also did – important given that deception about age, given the reliance on children's wages, was a key element in undermining the Act. The fact that he was actively prosecuting demonstrates that the Act had teeth when it came to age and hours worked. However candidates may point to his lack of typicality and to his vested interest in pushing for more reform. <b>McCulloch in Source A</b> usefully points out, in an otherwise negative source, that no one under 9 is now employed, although it might be argued that most of those employed before were already 9-14. He is supported in this by <b>Greg in Source C</b> who points to the general satisfaction that any child aged 9-13 would now only be working an 8 hour day. Both McCulloch and Greg point out that the bad had been exaggerated by Sadler and they are convinced that factories 'are our best schools' in the sense of training children that would otherwise be on the streets. Knowledge would suggest that the educational provisions of the 1833 Act were, at least, something (2 hours a day, after work, for 9-13 year olds). Both McCulloch and Greg seem to accept the point about very young children and possibly the educational aspects of the Act. Their worry is the extension to older children and particularly adults. <b>Jameson in Source D</b> points out factories are now regulated and preferred places of work. Both 1833 and 1844 stated hours for children and the latter extended these to women, so much so that they were attractive to young girls. <b>Source D</b> is also a useful corrective to the grim view similarly refuted by <b>A and C</b>, as it compares factories to other sources of employment and finds their regulated nature, by comparison with domestic service, potteries, sweatshops et al, attractive to workers. Knowledge of the two Acts and the inspectorate could also be used to argue either way.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The <b>context</b> for both sources is Bruce's proposed 1872 Licensing Bill which sought to achieve a balance between two powerful but opposed liberal interests, the Nonconformists and the Brewing industry. The Nonconformists wanted a variety of restrictions put on alcohol but particularly wanted the local option that would allow local voters and thus local councils to close down pubs and off licences in a locality (local prohibition). The Brewers opposed restrictions, preferring instead a few closures where there were too many.</p> <p><b>Both</b> sources dislike this particular licensing reform proposal – in <b>B</b> a 'wretched bill'; in <b>C</b> 'the strongest dislike'. Both agree that sobriety is desirable and both come from a religious background, one nonconformist, one Anglican. They are similar in that both see the importance of Licensing reform as an issue, agreeing that it raised issues of freedom and social reform. The <b>Advocate in B</b> puts it at the top of Nonconformities reform priorities.</p> <p>However there are considerable <b>differences</b> in attitude but their dissatisfaction arises from different grounds. The Nonconformist <b>Advocate in B</b> wants society protected from the evils of alcohol and sees licensing reform as the key to tackling society's ills – health, poverty and crime. Society needed to be protected from itself. This is not the issue for <b>Bishop Magee in C</b>. The issue for him is freedom, the principle of minimal intervention in adult choice. Individuals should not be compelled by the State. He ventures the opinion that, through freedom and persuasion, individuals might be led to sobriety but, if compelled, they would lose freedom and would be more likely to find consolation in now illegal drink. The Bishop doesn't mention the Brewers or indeed any vested interest. The basis of his attitude is the principle of choice. The <b>Advocate</b> does refer to them, scathingly, and would not accept that the poor are free agents given that the Brewers devote themselves to the 'demoralisation of the people'. For the Advocate society is not a level playing field. It believes that Bruce has been 'got at' by the Brewers</p> <p>As regards <b>provenance</b> the key lies in their respective political positions. <b>Source B</b> is from a liberal and nonconformist perspective, specifically a temperance newspaper pushing a particular line (the local option). Its tone makes it plain that the bill is an unwelcome compromise that clearly satisfies the Brewers more than the 'religious and virtuous' part of the community. It ignores any of the other arguments against – class, local unfairness if one area was to proceed and another not, and the issue of freedom. It seeks to persuade, particularly amongst its own community and wishes to apply pressure to a Liberal government where it had more influence than usual. <b>Source C</b> is a very different context, a Conservative and active political Bishop speaking in the House of Lords where nonconformist arguments would rarely be heard. He considers any form of compulsion to be wrong. Potentially he is speaking to the converted but he could expect his speech to be reported and taken up by opponents of the Bill, as indeed it was.</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>Although a friend of sobriety and morality (his final line points to the potential incongruity of his position) for him the principle of freedom is absolute and he puts it eloquently and with some wit. In terms of <b>judgement</b> candidates may consider both equally useful on the issues and attitudes to licensing reform. The <b>Advocate in B</b> may be better for the wider social issues and attitudes towards vested interests like the Brewers, but <b>Bishop Magee in C</b> is telling on the political and freedom issues raised by licensing reform. Both represent particular constituencies of opinion.</p>		
(b)	<p>The sources support <b>three possible interpretations</b> – that <b>Disraeli's 1874-80 2<sup>nd</sup> Government</b> did more for living and working conditions , either in terms of legislation or rhetoric and in the extent and focus of their reforms; that <b>Gladstone's 1<sup>st</sup> Government</b> did more <b>or that both were very similar</b>, differing only in emphasis. Candidates may focus on arguing for either government, although some may consider the third option.</p> <p>The <b>argument for Disraeli's Government doing more</b> is to be found in <b>Sources B, C D and E</b>. Sources <b>B and C</b> both focus on criticising liberal licensing legislation. That they come from different political and religious agendas is telling. <b>Source B</b> opposes, on the grounds that, merely to limit quite extensive opening hours and close down some pubs where there were too many, was a compromise too far. It would continue to expose the working class to the 'evils of alcohol'. As far as it was concerned the working classes had been betrayed by the Liberal government. <b>Source C</b> opposes compulsion and knowledge would suggest that the measure was indeed disliked by the working class, who considered it to be unfair in every sense (upper class clubs were immune; middle class magistrates would close down the working man's pub and control his only pleasure ). They would agree with Bishop Magee. The Conservatives would reverse the measure in the Intoxicating Liquors Act of 1874, which increased pub opening hours with compensation for landlords who had lost their licences, a popular act amongst the working classes. <b>Cross in Source D</b> focuses on insanitary housing, arguing that the State had a right to interfere and compel in this area, one where there 'was much to be done to take the working class out of miserable conditions'. His Artisans Dwelling Act of 1875 allowed local councils to devise improvement schemes and compel slum owners to sell to them with cheap loans from government to demolish and allow commercial rebuilding. <b>Source E</b> appears to confirm the effectiveness of this, the slum landlord in the cartoon (Bumble) drowning his sorrows at the 'regular cross' (burden) he now has to bear (a pun on Disraeli's Home Secretary Richard Cross) and at the prospect of more 'harassing legislation'. Mention could also be made to Conservative legislation on Factories (1874 and 1878), Public Health (1875), Food and Drugs (1875), Pollution,</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>Agricultural Holdings, Trade Unions and education, although candidates should remain focused on the sources.</p> <p><b>The view that Gladstone's 1<sup>st</sup> Government did more</b> can be found in <b>Sources A, D and E</b>. Bright in <b>Source A</b> publicly contrasted the different approach to reform of working and living conditions between the Liberal and Conservative governments. As an old middle class radical liberal and mentor of Gladstone it is unsurprising that he considers Gladstone especially to be concerned with 'measures for the good of the people'. In contrast Disraeli and the Conservatives are said to see social reform purely as a matter of token gesture rather than genuine reform. To Bright this is patronising, treating the workers not as responsible and equal adults but as 'indulged children', voting fodder for a condescending conservative aristocracy. Bright's liberal stress is upon helping the working class to achieve justice and civil equality in a society based on mutual respect. He argues that what they really want is – protection of Trade Union property, the right to strike and equal liability for employers. Bright's Liberal emphasis is on institutional and legal reforms rather than health and housing, and mention could be made of the Trade Union Reforms (the Act of 1871 and the Criminal Law Amendment Act) to support this. However candidates may point out that it was the Conservatives that allowed peaceful picketing and, in 1875, achieved employer liability in the Employers and Workmen's Act. <b>Cross in Source D</b> could also be said to be more Liberal than Conservative in approach. The emphasis of his introductory speech on the Artisans Dwellings Act is on the limits of State responsibility and the importance of not impinging on private building or allowing charities or local government to undercut market rents. He does not see the job of government as the provision of necessities like housing and education for the working class. As a statement of conservative principle on working class social reform this is effective evidence of limitations and the importance of liberal type moves on legal equality for the working man. His legislation was permissive, the burden falling on local authorities. <b>The Punch Cartoon in Source E</b> suggests that the Liberals had struck at drink and landlords – the 'harassing legislation' of the last session, although by implication they had been less inclined to pursue slum landlords. Candidates could point out that this may have been because of nonconformist pressure. They might also point out that this particular landlord seems none the worse for wear.</p> <p><b>A third view can be constructed, that both governments were similar in their approach to working and living conditions.</b> Sources <b>D and E</b> strongly suggest this. In <b>Source D</b> Cross merely carries on from where the Liberals had left off. Torrens Act of 1868, allowing local councils to demolish slum houses, had been weakened and Cross' Act strengthened it. Both were permissive and neither saw much of a take-up of powers. Gladstone's 1872 Public Health Act</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>created sanitary authorities, recognised as a legitimate area by Cross in D. His 1875 Act merely gave clearer statements of what local authorities were expected to do. <b>Source E's</b> overall thrust is that vested interests were under attack from both – 'it was our turn last session and now it's yours'. However, which of these interests harmed the working class more is a moot point.</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. All, except possibly <b>Cross in D</b>, are partial in their approach. Thus <b>Bright in A</b> takes a particular liberal slant before any legislation is underway, although his emphasis is borne out by what ensued. <b>Source B</b> is also liberal but outraged at betrayal, seeing licensing from a middle class viewpoint. <b>Sources C and D</b> are conservative, arguably C touching a working class chord, albeit of the sort that Bright condemns (token gestures, in this case the freedom not to be sober). <b>Cross in D</b> is more matter of fact and could be said to provide convincing evidence of limitations and similarity. <b>Source E</b> exaggerates but clearly vested interest was under attack in the social reforms of both governments in the 1870s.</p>		



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>The sources share some common ground but also differ. In general terms they agree the reforms did bring benefits. With the words 'every improvement' <b>Source C</b> accepts the reforms as positive but emphasises the limitations of them. <b>Source D</b> is more effusive about the impact of the reforms and makes great claims for them without any reservations. More specifically, both regard pensions as a benefit albeit <b>Source C</b> does so grudgingly with the words 'at least' and the complaint that workers are only eligible at 70 years whereas <b>Source D</b> considers them to be 'on higher ground' which 'will help millions'. Similarly, <b>Source C</b> seems, in theory, to support insurance. <b>Source D</b> is convinced that insurance will address the problem of an unemployed father being unable to feed his children and will 'abolish that state of things for ever'. However, <b>Source C</b> is critical of the costs attached, complaining of 'the irritating conditions and a burdensome payment' of which <b>Source D</b> makes no direct mention although the reference to the opposition of the Tory Press who regarded 'the Insurance Bill as an act of tyranny' obliquely acknowledges the compulsion involved and, by implication the contributions that workers will have to make. <b>Source C</b> refers to the introduction of the minimum wage which he seems to imply had a negative impact as the prices charged to consumers were increased to cover the extra expense incurred by employers: indeed, that it was the capitalist class' that gained not the workers. <b>Source D</b> makes no mention of the minimum wage.</p> <p>The critical and rather disappointed view of <b>Source C</b> might be considered to be typical of Keir Hardie, a radical socialist, who favoured the redistribution of wealth illustrated by his preference for the cost of insurance to be met by 'a small addition to income or land tax'. Equally, unsurprising is the optimistic and positive stance of <b>Source D</b> as the author was the architect of the reforms and who had battled hard to implement them. Reference might be made to the struggle of Lloyd George with the House of Lords and the Budget of 1909 to pay for pensions. The industrial context against which these speeches were made could be evaluated. The remarks of <b>Source C</b> are presented as a contribution to a debate on the causes of industrial unrest and in doing so suggests that the strikes and disruption of the time indicate the failure of the social reforms. In contrast, <b>Source D</b> is convinced that the reforms are a means of protecting workers at a time of hardship which given the context implies that the Insurance Bill offering help for those out of work at a time when the level of unemployment was high was less a cause of unrest than a remedy for it. The audiences addressed by the two speakers could be assessed. Hardie was talking in the House of Commons and although his remarks were meant to persuade and were recorded in Hansard his purpose was limited to making a contribution to a motion asking for an investigation into unrest. By contrast, Lloyd George was addressing the public and it would be odd for him to adopt anything other than a positive note on the impact of reform. He is</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u> 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>clearly intent on persuading people to support the reforms because of their intrinsic value but also their political benefit to the Liberals. The final line illustrates his lofty, perhaps idealistic, vision of the way ahead.</p> <p>In <b>judgement</b> candidates may emphasise the contrast in the political positions of Hardie and Lloyd George (in terms of policies and power) to explain the difference between them yet despite that highlight the general similarity of their ambition for social reform.</p>		
(b)	<p>The sources provide evidence that show support for the Liberal reforms but also that they aroused opposition. Arguably, each source presents evidence of opposition and only three sources show the support they enjoyed. However, the evaluation of the quality of the evidence will be important in reaching a judgement.</p> <p>Reforms concerning <i>child welfare</i> is confined to <b>Source A</b> which is critical of the Children Act. Opposition is based on the denial of shelter (at times of bad weather) and a place of rest (the name of the refuge) as well as the termination of one strand of the way of life that had been long accepted. There is little doubt that this restriction was unpopular and created problems, not least the abandonment of children at home when their parents went to the local public house. Many parents objected to their liability to prosecution for dereliction of care for their children. Many did not consider it the business of the State to interfere in the affairs of families. However, this was only one of several parts of the Act many of which were applauded, for example, in treating child offenders differently to adults, the registration of children's homes and so on. The poster ignores this. Further, as a Conservative Party poster it is clearly designed to inflame opposition to the Liberals as the dialogue in the corner makes clear. The poster appears to be aimed at the middle class woman (given the clothes worn by the women), perhaps on holiday at the seaside, who had time and money to spend on leisure and in contrast to working class women who were either at work or too poor to spend money on themselves. Candidates might broaden the discussion by consideration of other reforms affecting children: school meals, medicals.</p> <p>Reforms to improve the lives of <i>the elderly</i> are assessed in <b>Sources B, C</b> and <b>D</b>. Opposition to pensions based on principle is registered in <b>Source B</b> which explains that some argued that pensions would 'dishearten the thrifty ... and encourage the idle'. Such attitudes were consistent with the 'self-help' and 'laissez-faire' philosophies of the 19thC and were widely held, not least amongst many of the poor who were too proud to accept support and the tax payers who resented paying for pensions. This suggests the view that there was opposition 'from both middle</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>and working classes' could be reliable. Further, some believed the consequences could be even greater and 'might even deal a blow at the Empire which could be almost mortal'. This might be dismissed as the view of one man, Lord Rosebery, and a very rich one too, albeit a Liberal, but at a time of increased economic competition and international rivalry this view was widely shared. In <b>Source C</b> the opposition to pensions is not based on principle but the mean scale of them. Hardie considers them to be a distraction from the real issue of low wages and the age of eligibility to be too late.</p> <p>However, <b>Source C</b> backs pensions as a matter of policy as do <b>Sources B</b> and <b>D</b> and also that pensions enjoyed considerable support. <b>Source B</b> confirms that 'the small sums involved meant life itself for many elderly poor'. Indeed, so welcome were they, many recipients regarded Lloyd George 'as if he were a saint'. As the author was a small boy at the time pensions were introduced and able to recollect his mother's assessment of the response to them the evidence of <b>Source B</b> might be considered reliable especially as it conceded that others thought differently. <b>Source D</b> might be considered less reliable as it outlines the views of Lloyd George who introduced the pensions but cross reference to <b>Source B</b> and the reverence with which Lloyd George was held could be made to support his claims and his dismissive views of the Tory Press are perhaps not unreasonable given the nature of the poster in <b>Source A</b>.</p> <p>Reforms designed to help <i>workers</i> are also assessed. On insurance the evidence would appear to be divided. <b>Source C</b> believes the contributions workers have to pay are 'a burdensome payment'. Candidates could expand on the details of the insurance schemes and the efforts the government made to convince workers their contributions were small in return for the benefits. However, the author fails to acknowledge the contributions that employers and the State were also to make. The political views of Hardie might be assessed and the context in which the scheme was being introduced to explain his critical position. <b>Source E</b> opposes Part II of the Insurance Act as 'workers who come within its scope are obliged to register with the exchange'. The author objects to this on two counts. He seems to think individuals should have the freedom to decide if they want to register with the labour exchange and by tying a worker to the exchange he was condemned to a system of exploitation. This is explained by the tendency of the exchanges to place non-union labour in jobs rather than unionised workers. In assessing these charges candidates might judge the language of the piece as indicative of a rather prejudiced attitude: phrases like 'shackles of slavery', 'exploited wage-slaves' and the 'venomous' nature of the system, for example. The author was a spokesman for a left-wing group. On the other hand, the exchanges had been in place for four years and his views could reflect practice. <b>Source D</b> is</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>clearly supportive of the Insurance Acts. Again, the claims made might be tested against knowledge. Lloyd George is right to claim that the OAPs and Insurance legislation 'will help millions' as at least 15 million were covered by them. However, given the limits of the benefits and the time within which it was possible to claim them it is debatable as to whether they were enough to prevent them 'from stumbling into wretchedness'. The fact that people in the audience cheered Lloyd George specifically by saying the reforms 'will win many more (elections)' suggests popular support: election wins in 1906 and twice in 1910, albeit with lower margins, might be considered a fair reflection of the support in the country for the Liberal reforms. Comments on the problem of low wages might be addressed using <b>Source C</b>. The minimum wage might be considered to be counter-productive but was he right to ascribe the rise in the price of coal to that alone?</p> <p>At face value the sources might lean more to the view that the reforms attracted more opposition than support. However, certain sources are blatant 'propaganda' such as <b>Source A</b> or they represent the views of the more radical left like <b>Sources C</b> and <b>E</b>. Although in support of the reforms <b>Sources B</b> and <b>D</b> do allow that there was opposition. Candidates' judgement will depend on how they view the quality of the evidence and how representative it is of the nation as a whole.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>The main difference is in the optimism of <b>Source A</b> and the pessimism in <b>Source B</b> about Britain's military ability to meet a threat from Germany. Churchill in 1948 thought that Britain could have created a strong enough air force in 1933 or 1934 to restrain Hitler. The Chiefs of Staff in <b>B</b> thought that there was not a time which could be foreseen in which Britain's defences, including her air force would have been strong enough to even defend British interests against Germany. Churchill in <b>A</b> sees an enhanced military capacity as allowing effective international action against Germany; the Chiefs of Staff in <b>B</b> see the state of Britain's armed forces as not empowering active diplomacy to restrain Hitler but rather forcing Britain into making concessions. Churchill does not consider the whole context of Britain's imperial defence, whereas the Chiefs of Staff do. Churchill is concerned with air power, but the Chiefs of staff are considering British Imperial defence as a whole, including the army and navy. There is some similarity in that both Churchill and the Chiefs of Staff value France as a source of military support for the armed forces (<b>A</b>: based on superior air power Britain and France could have invoked the aid of the League; <b>B</b> without overlooking the assistance we might obtain from France)</p> <p>The difference can be explained by the nature of the Sources. Churchill in <b>A</b> had raised the issue of air power repeatedly in the 1930s and in 1948 he was looking back and was anxious to show how right he had been and if his advice had been followed, war could have been prevented. As the war had been won by a grand alliance based on superior air power then it was easy to project this back to the 1930s. <b>B</b> on the other had had no benefit of hindsight and was concerned with the wider responsibilities of Empire – something that Churchill does not refer to here. The cuts that Churchill had actually begun in the 1920s left British armed forces in a weak position to meet the triple threat from Germany, Italy and Japan – Churchill in <b>A</b> makes no reference to Britain's Far East responsibilities.</p> <p>In terms of <b>judgement</b>, the military chiefs in <b>B</b> were doing their job – to warn government about the actual situation; they were in a position to know the state of the armed forces, but may have been cautious. Churchill in <b>A</b> was not in this position and could therefore speculate, and crucially at a much earlier date than <b>B</b> where Britain can act if she were to have undertaken large scale air rearmament. It is not likely that in the Depression climate of the 1933-4 period there would have been much chance of a massive increase in air power to meet a threat from a Germany which had not yet massively re-armed, so this is really being wise after the event. However, the Chiefs of Staff may be naive to suggest 'reducing the number of our potential enemies' given the militaristic and ambitious nature of the leadership Italy, Japan and Germany in place of a rapid expansion of armed forces. Nonetheless, this is what Chamberlain tried to do in the case of Germany through appeasement in 1938.</p>	30	<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 <b>support</b> for the realism of gaining international support comes from the two Sources from Churchill, <b>A and C</b>, one looking back after the war and the other in 1938 and in part from Churchill's US appeal in <b>E</b>. The case against the realism of international support is put by Chamberlain in Source <b>D</b>, though it was a policy that he had considered and had confirmed by Source <b>B</b>. The evidence in Source <b>E</b> is not conclusive, and candidates could use it either to suggest that there was some public support in the US for support for collective action and thus realistic, or that there was little unanimity in the US.</p> <p><b>A like C</b> assumes that France was a firm ally and that war was preventable by an alliance of nations with the moral authority of the League of Nations. Both link this to the build up of forces – <b>A</b> postulates the effects of a British air build up and <b>C</b> refers to forces being marshalled, but essentially the policy is to deter Germany by international agreement. <b>A</b> might be influenced by what actually did happen, when Germany was defeated by a sustained alliance – the 'united nations' of the second world war. However, this is a post-war justification for the type of policy Churchill is seen to be advocating in <b>C</b>. It is easy to see <b>C</b> as relying on a great many 'ifs' – if states assembled; if France were a firm ally; if there were sufficient forces to be marshalled; if there were a 'moral sense' in the world. By 1938 it was clear that Germany was a threat and clear that Britain was not likely to resist, so Churchill was proposing the best policy in difficult circumstances which did not involve appeasing Hitler rather than a very realistic alternative. Candidates may use contextual knowledge of the Anschluss with Austria. Troops had entered Austria on 12 March. In context, with British rearmament in its relatively early stages, with a prime minister committed to appeasement, with France weakened by internal disputes, with Russia undergoing domestic turmoil, the USA committed officially to isolation and a League weakened by the Ethiopian crisis, all this did not seem very realistic. The key point in the speech was the warning about approaching war and the need to take some sort of proactive policy, but the reality was that no such policy would emerge.</p> <p><b>The counterview</b> Churchill's unrealism, is neatly expressed by Chamberlain in <b>D</b>. In a personal letter he had no need to offer any false optimism, as was the case in the case of the public utterance by Churchill in <b>C</b>. The Chiefs of Staff had rejected the idea of a Grand alliance, probably considering the limitations of France as an ally and the problems faced by Russia whose leading generals were being purged by Stalin and whose military equipment was seen to be weak, The foreign office was sceptical of any agreement with the USA or Russia. The divisions in Eastern Europe with the Poles resentful of the territorial boundary of Czechoslovakia, for instance, would have made effective allies in the east difficult and geographical reality, now that Germany had taken Austria, would indeed have made a campaign to save the Czechs problematic. However, what is not considered here is the alternative – that proposed by the</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>Chiefs of Staff in <b>B</b> of international agreements with potential enemies. Was this any more realistic, given the volatility of the Hitler regime, the alienation of Mussolini over Ethiopia and the pressures to expand to gain raw materials and markets that were affecting Japan, already at war with China? <b>C</b>'s plea for alliances to contain Germany seems to be supported by <b>B</b>'s expressed hope in the final line that action needs to be taken to reduce potential enemies, presumably by alliances or by appeasing Germany and Italy. <b>C</b> seems to be supported by <b>B</b>. If British imperial commitments were too great for Britain's armed forces, then what could it bring to any proposed Grand Alliance and why should other nations take a role in defending Britain's Empire? A grand alliance would have had to have had some military 'teeth' and it was clear from <b>B</b> that this was not the case. It may be that the Chiefs of Staff, anxious to get more resources and fearful of being drawn into a conflict prematurely were exaggerating the situation and overestimating Germany's strength and any possibility of coordinated action by the Axis powers. However in the context of economic difficulties and constraints in spending dating from the 1920s, their view could be seen as realistic.</p> <p>Much turned on the possible attitude of the USA and <b>E</b> shows Churchill after Munich appealing directly to its people in the hope of engendering support for cooperation in defence of democracy. Chamberlain, however, had little faith in the USA and given the Neutrality Acts and the strength of feeling against another European conflict, this may have been wishful thinking on Churchill's part. However the letters do show some support; but they were mixed. There is a telling point about Britain having betrayed her friends by the appeasement policy, something about which Churchill agreed but could not really refute. The letters do not offer sufficient evidence to draw conclusions about the chances of US intervention; but Roosevelt had to bear in mind the USA's economic problems, the need to maintain the New Deal and the dangers from the Pacific as well as a mass of isolationist opinion. The limited aid given in 1939-41 may be seen as evidence for Churchill's lack of realism 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 2013

