

# **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F964/02**: European and World History Enquiries. Option B Modern 1774-1975

## **Mark Scheme for January 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)

**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)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question = 30	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.  Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<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
<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:**

- (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

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each 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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<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>

## The Origins and Course of the French Revolution 1774-95

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p><b>Similarities:</b> both <b>D</b> (the petition of 1792) and <b>E</b> (the speech of the President at the King's trial): see him destroying liberty; both refer to the violation of oaths; both refer to armed opposition outside France with <b>E</b> stating he has not repudiated it and <b>D</b> implying that his presence is a threat because of it.</p> <p><b>Differences:</b> <b>D</b> is more centred on Paris ('bloodthirsty projects against the city') and also refers to the flight to Varennes which <b>E</b> does not. <b>D</b> refers to the period of forgiveness after Varennes with the people willing to forgive – there is no indication of any popularity in <b>E</b>.</p> <p><b>Provenance:</b> The language is more radical in <b>D</b> because of its origins – intended to suspend the monarchy at a time of great suspicion in Paris. It could be seen in the context of popular fear and unrest resulting in violence and the later September Massacres and fears of foreign invasion as a result of a war which the King was suspected of using for his own ends. By the time of <b>E</b> the monarchy has been overthrown, there has been a move to the left with the creation of a national Convention and there is no need to rally parliamentary opinion emotionally against the king, but to make a case for his execution as a tyrant. So some of the themes of August 1792 appear – the mention of liberty, but the accusations are colder and more precise. The accusations are for the Convention not directly to the people as in <b>D</b>. Interestingly the radicalism of the Paris sections has found its way into the legislative body by Jan 1793 as a result of the strains of war and the influence of the 'Mountain'.</p> <p><b>Judgement:</b> in terms of national opinion, neither is typical and both are written with a distinct purpose by radicals in a time of heightened tension and in a radicalised city. Both have a purpose, one of ending the monarchy and the second of ending the life of the King.</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.....'</p> <p>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>debate</b> is whether the King's previous hostility to change, his use of the veto and then his flight and his hopes that war would restore his fortunes were to blame or whether his opponents were too extreme and the circumstances of growing radicalism and disorder made it impossible to maintain a moderate constitutional state. The clearest defence of the King is probably <b>C</b> (Louis XVI's letter to de Breteuil) which is supported by <b>A</b> (The Times Article) which sees the determination of the Assembly to get rid of the King and an unstable people ready to accept dictatorship. Both <b>D and E</b> are hostile and see the king as responsible for betraying oaths. <b>B</b> (The King's letter to his brothers) could be seen as evidence of moderation, but there is a strong implication that Louis has not accepted his constitutional role.</p> <p>In terms of <b>provenance</b> Louis in <b>C</b> could obviously be seen as defending himself – but the fact that Breteuil is a trusted former minister and agent in exile might indicate that Louis has no reason to deceive – this is not for public consumption and neither is <b>B</b>, his letter to his brothers. <b>D</b> has every reason to exaggerate the king's 'guilt' as it is by radicals in Paris eager to use the circumstances to create a Republic. Similarly, the circumstances around <b>E</b> do not suggest impartiality. Both of these sources are public utterances made for a specific political purpose. Some may know the King's weak and evasive replies. <b>A</b> is evidence for a hostility to the Revolution typical of some English opinion by this time but alarmingly insightful about the future. Putting the sources in <b>context</b> is helpful – <b>A</b> reflects the mood after the bungled escape to Varennes. <b>D and E</b> should be seen in the context of foreign threats and reverses in war and the need to create a 'nation in arms'. <b>D</b> might be put in the context of panics and extremism in Paris – the September massacres and the King's letters in the context of the difficulties in implementing a form of government unusual in Europe and of which few had any experience.</p> <p>In terms of <b>contextual knowledge</b>, it could be argued that the religious issue – the refractory priests (<b>C</b>) was a major dividing line between the King and those who feared counter-revolution. It could be argued either that the King simply did not see the threat caused by the catholic reaction in the provinces to the revolution OR that the anticlericalism and the state control of the clergy put the King into an impossible moral position. The external threats from émigrés and their foreign supporters (<b>D and E</b>) could be discussed in the same terms and the nature of the Constituent Assembly and the relations with the King culminating in the royal flight might be used to show that either the King had been forced to accept too rapid an amount of change or that he had showed his true feelings of hostility towards a constitution he had sworn to accept. The growing radicalism, in full flood by the time of <b>D and E</b>, might be used to argue that there was little chance of a moderate constitutionalism even had the King acquiesced; the activities of the royal family might be used to argue that they had no loyalty to the ideal of constitutionalism and were not prepared to make it work. No set line of argument is expected, but an attempt at judgement should be made for higher marks.</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>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The sources appear to agree more than they differ. Both stress the importance of Piedmont in dealing with the threat of revolution. In <b>Source A</b> it is argued that the expansion of Piedmont by her annexation of Lombardy and Venetia would make her 'strong enough to crush every attempt at revolution' and <b>Source C</b> states 'Piedmont is the only State ... revolutionary spirit'. Liberal and republican forces might be identified to explain this point further. An extension of this point relates to the importance of Piedmont to the stability of Europe. <b>Source A</b> claims that 'by strengthening of Northern Italy (Piedmont) by establishing constitutional government there you secure the stability of Europe' and <b>Source C</b> implies the same by arguing that the vulnerability of Piedmont 'disturbed by ... its position is uncertain' poses a 'real danger for Europe'. Knowledge of the rivalry of France and Austria in northern Italy might be explained. Both sources seem to agree that Piedmont not only had the support of, but to some extent was dependent on, both England and France for <b>Source A</b> begins by asserting the 'Italian Question' could not be resolved 'without the support of Piedmont' and, later, that England, at least, backed Piedmont by recommending she should sit at the Congress as an ally. <b>Source C</b> claims Piedmont has Anglo-French 'sympathy'. English support for constitutional government and Napoleon III's support for Italian nationalism could be considered. Differences are few but highly significant. In <b>Source A</b> it is made clear that Piedmont wished to weaken Austria by taking Lombardy and Venetia from her whereas in <b>Source C</b> Austria is said to have extended her 'power' and 'influence' to the extent that she might 'dominate Italy'. Well-informed candidates may be able to support this with reference to the terms of the Treaty of Paris and the gains made by Austria as a result of the constraints imposed on Russia rather than any significant changes in Italy itself.</p> <p>In evaluating the evidence of these sources candidates may emphasise the timing of them. The outlook of <b>Source A</b> was based on the anticipated outcome of the war whereas <b>Source C</b> was written after the Treaty had been concluded when the reality was rather different to the expectations evident at the time of writing <b>Source A</b>. Candidates ought to consider the authorship of the sources. Both authors favoured Piedmont; <b>Source C</b> is explicit in this regard presenting the views of the Sardinian government and <b>Source A</b> is the views of a diplomat who was very supportive of the Italian cause which the tone and ambition of the content indicates. Some may dismiss the judgements in <b>Source A</b> as those of one man and the reported position of Piedmont as unreliable because they were third hand. Yet, the thrust of <b>Source A</b> fits with the context and may be considered reliable for that reason. The position adopted in <b>Source C</b> may be regarded as more reliable as the views expressed were consistent with those of the political class following the revolutions of 1848 – 9 and the realisation by most that Italy needed foreign support. Some might query the motives of the authors. In this respect the reliability of <b>Source A</b> might be questioned</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>further as it is clear that the author was presenting a case whose purpose was to bring Piedmont into the war in order to secure the same from Austria. <b>Source C</b> on the other hand is motivated more by a sense of disappointment that her contribution to the war effort was not recognised sufficiently and is a plea for special pleading.</p>		
(b)	<p><b>Sources B</b> and <b>D</b> will probably be seen as most obviously supportive of the interpretation. <b>Source B</b> is an indication of French interest in Italy and Napoleon's desire to achieve change 'because its political structure is unsatisfactory'. It could be argued that Napoleon's plan offered a way forward and a degree of integration if only by establishing a federation. The sincerity of his views could be tested by comment on his support of the Pope and the presence of French troops in Rome. It could be argued that such a plan fell short of full integration of the peninsular and the Mazzinian ideal of a unitary state. Either way it could be considered academic given that these were the thoughts of Napoleon just before the signing of the Treaty which contained no reference to them. On the other hand it suggests Napoleon was at least aware of the imperative of doing something to resolve the Italian Question and candidates may refer to his ideological commitment to nationalism and his involvement with the Carbonari as a young man. <b>Source D</b> confirms how the National Society 'put its hopes in Piedmont, upheld and encouraged by France'. Candidates may know that Manin and other leaders of the Society were impressed by the initiative taken by Piedmont in entering the Crimean War and their recognition of the value of French help in the future. Cavour's warning against the 'senseless hotheads of the Mazzinians' might be regarded as a reflection of the fears of a conservative politician but given Mazzini's continued reluctance to accept Piedmontese leadership and his firm belief in 'Italia fare de se' Cavour's assessment of the situation may be considered reasonable. It could be argued that Cavour was merely intent on pressurising Napoleon into action.</p> <p>In many ways <b>Source A</b> supports the view that the Crimean War offered an opportunity to advance the cause of Italian unification. It anticipates it will 'commence the solution of all the Italian questions' which would be achieved by strengthening Piedmont and giving her outside support. This should be qualified by the fact that it is based on hopes about the future. Nonetheless, it could be argued that the situation presented Piedmont with the chance to assert herself and for the Italian cause to be treated seriously by the Great Powers even if for selfish reasons. The imperative of forging an alliance with Austria compelled England (and France) to consider the Italian Question. Some candidates may argue that it offered the prospect of a united north only with 'Lombardy and Venetia' going to Piedmont but the final reference to 'commence the solution of all the Italian questions' might be interpreted more widely.</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>A counter argument can be built on <b>Sources C, D</b> and <b>E</b>. In <b>Source C</b> the Government of Piedmont expresses its disappointment 'that the Congress did not concern itself with the affairs of Italy' and the rest of the piece is nothing more than special pleading which rather confirms the weakness of Piedmont and the lack of support she received from England and France at Paris. Cavour is reduced to stressing the danger of Austrian power to English and French interests the validity of which candidates might challenge by arguing that Austria's role in Italy since 1815 provided stability and that the revolutionary threat suggested by Cavour had been checked by Austria on numerous occasions.</p> <p>The reluctance of the English and French to commit to the Italian cause can also be drawn from <b>Source D</b>. Napoleon's hesitant, possibly ambivalent attitude to the Italian cause, could be highlighted as a major part of the counter argument. This is borne out by the references in <b>Source D</b> to Napoleon's apparent desire of 'postponing the war'. The further reference to the dangers of 'revolutionary activity in Italy' which would follow and the ruination of 'the plan so admirably built up by Your Majesty' could be developed by an explanation of the Treaty of Plombières and the subsequent suggestion of Napoleon that an international conference be held to discuss Italian affairs and so avoid the war agreed at Plombières. Candidates might refer to the Orsini bomb plot of January 1858 as an example of the frustration generated by the perceived dither of the French to intervene in Italy.</p> <p>Cross reference to <b>Source E</b> would be useful as it makes clear that the Piedmontese made no territorial gains and that Cavour's plans received no support and 'had no chance of success'. In addition, <b>Source E</b> argues that Clarendon's speeches 'attacking Austrian dominance of Italy ... brought no immediate benefit to Piedmont'. In evaluating <b>Source E</b> stock comments about the benefit of hindsight, for example, can be expected but some might recognise the reliability of the views expressed given the analysis still holds today which might be validated by reference to the war of 1859 when Austria found herself alone.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>Cotton is identified as the key interest of the South in <b>Source B</b> which is emphasised in the first line and <b>Source D</b> refers to the 'cotton states' which is clearly intended to be the southern States. Similarly, industrial activity is stated as the interest of the North, in general terms in <b>Source B</b> and <b>Source D</b> which specifically highlights the 'ship-building business' of the North. The sources agree that the North regard the tariff as essential to protect their interests whilst free trade is the policy preferred in the South. <b>Source B</b> makes this clear in suggesting northern interests have been 'sacrificed with the reduction of the tariff' whilst admitting that the South 'may benefit from free trade'. Similarly, in <b>Source D</b> tariffs are seen 'as protection for every trade they (the North) pursue' and 'at the expense of the cotton States': the tariff is dubbed 'atrocious' in the same source. In <b>Source B</b> 'free labour' is stressed as central to the northern economy in contrast to slavery in the South which is confirmed in <b>Source D</b> in the alarm inherent in the criticism of 'abolitionists'. It is clear that each section regards the other as a threat to their interests. This is made explicit in <b>Source B</b> in the line, 'in order to strike down the vital interests of the North ... they (the South) must extend the slave-holding territory' and it goes further to explain the political implications of this with reference to the admission of Texas as a State. In <b>Source D</b> the South are said to fear 'a coalition of protectionists and abolitionists' and 'the Treasury' which is described as biased to the interests of the North.</p> <p>In evaluating the sources candidates are likely to attribute the caustic nature of the comments in each source as simply a reflection of the sectional difference of the authors. The emotive language and dramatic claims of each author might be examined to substantiate the two perspectives. Indeed, such positions were typical of the period. However, the context in which these comments were made is important to explain their uncompromising tone. The annexation of Texas is the immediate backdrop to <b>Source B</b> which changed the balance of power between the North and South in the Senate, vividly demonstrated in the vote on the tariff. Equally, the author implies complacency in the North to the ambitions of the South and he is keen to arouse the North with his appeal to their sense of honour and duties. Toombs in <b>Source D</b> is clearly motivated by a revision of the tariff made in 'the last Congress' which brought in 'the most atrocious tariff ever' – a reference to the tariff of 1857 – and, also, Lincoln's election one week before, which heightened the fears of southerners, helps explain the anxiety evident in the speech in <b>Source D</b>. A judgement is likely to assess each source as partial but, nonetheless, representative of the conflicting interests of each section.</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
(b)	<p>Arguably, the evidence provided indicates that conflicting views on slavery were the basis of the tension between North and South. Indeed, <b>Sources A</b> and <b>E</b> confirm a consistency of southern views on this over a period of 30 years. These sources emphasise the defence of slavery as their main concern and their hostility to those in the north who threatened the system. <b>Source E</b> makes it clear that ‘questions relating to slavery were the immediate cause’ of secession. And, in regarding the inequality of the Negro to white men as ‘the cornerstone of our new government the great truth ... determined by the Creator’ <b>Source E</b> implies the overriding importance of this factor in the tension between North and South. Knowledge of the scale and significance of slavery to the southern economy would be helpful. Similarly, in <b>Source A</b> the fear that slavery would be undermined by the federal government and the efforts of the Colonization Society is clearly the main concern of the author. There is scope for candidates to elaborate on aims and activities of the society. In both sources the tariff is recognised as a cause of tension with <b>Source A</b> claiming ‘the present contest’ (over nullification of the tariff) to be ‘a battle’ but it is the implications of defeat on this issue for the survival of slavery that is most important, as with victory ‘the south would be safe’. Also, in <b>Source E</b> the tariff is described as ‘the cause of so much irritation’ but the implication is that attitudes to slavery were more significant in that they precipitated secession. Candidates will know that nullifiers in South Carolina were prepared to secede in 1832 unless their demands were met and that the same State was the first to secede in December 1860 when the threat to slavery was regarded as real there and in Georgia as suggested in <b>Source E</b>. The vested interest of the authors as leading political figures in the South should allow extensive evaluation of the motives and reliability of the sources. In short, candidates might argue that <b>Sources A</b> and <b>E</b> see the tariff as of secondary importance to slavery in causing tension between the sections. Some may read these sources differently, of course, along the lines presented below.</p> <p>In addition, <b>Source C</b> is explicit about views on slavery being the cause of tension but from the northern perspective. He implies that the economic success of the North, with its canals, railroads etc, was the result of a system of free labour there and the absence of such achievements in Virginia (and by implication the South) can be explained by the negative effect of slavery. Candidates may consider the views of <b>Source C</b> as little more than partisan bravado about the progress of the North rather than simply a reflection of the different nature of the economies of the North and South. This might be substantiated by the glowing references to ‘ingenious artisans’ and ‘merry agricultural labourers’ of the North which distorts the reality of urban and factory hardship for many workers and the fact that many, Southerners at least, would challenge the view that agricultural labourers’ (slaves) in the South were not ‘merry’. On the other hand the opening remarks of <b>Source C</b> suggest the author was well informed about the South and details about the</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>negative aspects of slavery could be mentioned, including discussion of the problem of fugitive slaves. <b>Sources B</b> and <b>D</b> also hint at the importance of attitudes to labour with the reference to ‘free labour’ and ‘free States’ in <b>Source B</b> invoked as a measure of the difference between North and South. <b>Source D</b> refers to ‘abolitionists’ and implies tension between North and South on this issue.</p> <p>The emphasis of <b>Sources B</b> and <b>D</b>, however, is on trade policy as the main reason for tension. <b>Source B</b> explicitly differentiates between the North that favoured protectionism and the South that wanted free trade. The reduction in the tariff is regarded as a threat to the economic and political interests of the North and is clearly concerned about the long term implications. Conversely, <b>Source D</b> claims the North pursued the tariff ‘at the expense of the cotton States’. There is an opportunity for candidates to explain how the tariff operated and why it was regarded differently in the North and South. <b>Source D</b> seems to think that industry in the North was favoured with ‘monopolies’. Additionally, <b>Sources A, D</b> and <b>E</b> argue that the Treasury used money from tariffs to spend on the North, building the infrastructure of the latter at the expense of the South. <b>Source A</b> is specific in identifying projects of ‘roads and canals’ completed in the North which may be what the ‘improvements’ mentioned in <b>Source E</b> are referring to whereas <b>Source D</b> conjures up a colourful analogy of ‘a perpetual fertilising stream’ to make the point. Does this, and the election of Lincoln, who received no support in the Presidential election from the South, help explain the tenor of the source? Given the description in <b>Source E</b> of the tariff as ‘the old thorn’ which was the basis of opposition over the previous years and that ‘questions relating to our peculiar institution’ were, it seems, merely a trigger for the ‘revolution’, it could be argued that <b>Source E</b> places emphasis on the tariff as the cause of tension.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content in that both agree that one role of women was in guiding the young and both emphasise the importance of their role. In <b>Source A</b>, official Nazi guidelines, they are the preservers of youth and in <b>Source E</b>, from Hitler himself, they are regarded as important in the training of youth. <b>Source A</b> sees them as of national significance and even Hitler in <b>E</b> considers them important. In <b>Source A</b> women care for the family and in <b>Source E</b> they are good at looking after the house. Both criticise women who step out of this role, competing with men in <b>A</b> and dabbling in politics or, even worse, in military matters in <b>E</b>, which are, again, seen as a male preserve.</p> <p>The Sources also <b>differ</b>. <b>Source A</b> says directly that the main task for women is to be mothers, while Hitler, in <b>Source E</b>, denies that the Nazis saw women only in those terms. <b>Source A</b> feels that the women's movement is misguided and blames women for being led astray. In <b>E</b> Hitler patronisingly says women should not be put in positions which do not suit them but is slightly more positive. <b>Source E</b> makes it clear how limited the part played by women in the Nazi party was.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both are Nazi sources. <b>A</b> is more official than <b>E</b>, even though <b>E</b> comes from Hitler. <b>E</b> is private conversations but where Hitler declaimed his views without fear of contradiction. One purpose of <b>Source A</b> was to discredit other organizations for women notably those working to increase the opportunities for women outside the home and its high-flown language reflects this. It is laying out a policy for the future, whereas <b>Source E</b> shows the policy has been put into effect and that Hitler is aware of some of the negative views that have been attributed to the Nazis and is eager to refute these, even within his inner circle. Candidates might feel that as a result, <b>Source E</b> is the better evidence.</p>	30	<p>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</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> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgements should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations, so they may be grouped according to their view. The <b>supporting</b> view that policies towards women were based on promoting state interests can be found in <b>Sources B</b>, Frick, <b>C</b>, the Supreme Court and <b>D</b>, an American journalist. The <b>opposing</b> view, that Nazi policy was more concerned with the welfare of women as it saw it is largely in <b>Sources A</b>, official guidelines, and <b>E</b>, Hitler.</p> <p>The <b>supporting</b> argument is found in Sources <b>B</b>, <b>C</b> and <b>D</b> which explain how the demands of the Nazi state took precedence over female welfare. In Source <b>B</b> the need to keep women, even married women who may well have families to bring up, in employment if they will otherwise be a burden on the state, is stressed. Their role in teaching and youth services, does reflect the priorities of <b>Source A</b> but the outcome is different, in that here they are to be employed and not dismissed on marriage. The latter policy had led to considerable protest from women, although it was not a policy unique to Nazi Germany. Even though the Source begins by saying men should have precedence in appointments, it then qualifies this dictum. <b>Source C</b> takes a similar line in that a divorced woman is expected to find work, whether she worked when married or not, for the good of the state. The judgement might seem harsh for women as the ability of her former husband to pay is clearly a consideration. <b>Source D</b> shows that the Nazi efforts to confine women to the home, which they saw as being concerned for their welfare, not only failed but led to a worse outcome for women who had to work longer hours in menial jobs.</p> <p>The <b>opposing</b> argument in <b>Source A</b> suggests that the domestic milieu was where their welfare was being promoted in the Nazi view. Candidates could discuss how far the interests of the state and the welfare of women could be seen as coinciding, with references to blood and race, nationhood and the German crisis. The view of <b>Source E</b> is that there was no place for women in politics and certainly not in the military sphere and candidate's knowledge of Hitler's own relationships with women could be used to support this argument. The tone of the source suggests that this was for their own good and it could be pointed out that the Nazis were not alone in 1930s Europe in their attitude. Hitler is careful to show his respect and care for women and to praise their attributes, but is basically confining them to the Children, Church, Cooking stereotype. Whether this did consider their welfare is open for candidates to explore. <b>Source D</b> backs up the idea that the Nazi aim was to stop women working, presumably for their own benefit, but makes it clear that this was not what happened.</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, and limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing on the terms of the the question, but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. <b>Sources A and E</b> as official Nazi sources are likely to promote the welfare of women as they see it. Hitler, even in 1942, when women were having to work to support the war effort, is still insistent that their domestic role is in their interests, as outlined in Nazi publications of all kinds. But <b>Sources B, C and D</b> show that there was a distinction between what the Nazis preached and what happened in reality. The needs of the state often took precedence and this was recognised as essential by the Supreme Court and a high-ranking minister under Hitler, which shows that Nazi policy was not that clear cut. Frick's observations are made in 1933 so this was an issue from the start of the Nazi period. The American journalist is obviously likely to be hostile, but has statistical support from the German State to support the case that the result of Nazi policies has been contrary to the welfare of women. Candidates might refer to Nazi efforts to increase the birth rate or to the education and training in youth movements as applied to girls and the stress on the ideal Aryan family to examine the conflict between the state and the welfare of women. They might feel that the welfare of women and promotion of the interests of the state were linked Nazi aims and not necessarily conflicting in theory but rather different in practice.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)	<p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in that they <b>agree</b> that the situation in Indochina is unstable and <b>both</b> authors state that the nationalist aims of the Indochinese people need to be fulfilled. <b>Both</b> suggest that imperialists are trying to seize control of the area. <b>Source B</b> states that there are 'communist plans to seize south-east Asia' and <b>Source C</b> that the USA wishes to 'enslave' the Vietnamese people. <b>Both</b> Sources claim that outsiders are supplying weapons to combatants inside Indochina. <b>Source B</b> claims that Ho Chi Minh manufactures weapons locally, directs guerrilla raids successfully and can disrupt French control of any area of Vietnam. Similarly <b>Source C</b> claims that the USA are supplying the French with 'airplanes, boats, trucks and napalm bombs' and are trying to take their place.</p> <p>They <b>differ</b> in that in <b>Source B</b> the imperialists are communist, whereas in <b>Source C</b> they are Americans who are incongruously trying to prevent the French restoring colonial rule. The outsiders supplying weapons in <b>Source C</b> are the 'US imperialists' aiding the French, while in <b>Source B</b> knowledge might be used to explain that the communist outsiders are China and the USSR supplying the Viet Minh. The <b>context</b> of Soviet nuclear capability, Viet Minh links with Communist China and the Korean War might be used to develop this point. <b>Source C</b> alone suggests that the US outsiders wish to replace their French allies and have displaced them economically. There is no mention in <b>Source B</b> of China or the USSR wishing to replace Ho Chi Minh, who is clearly seen as a nationalist leader, despite being a communist. <b>Source B</b> prioritises US security interests in south-east Asia, in <b>context</b> of Cold War fears, while <b>Source C</b> sees US economic interests and control of markets as attempts to enslave the Vietnamese. The <b>context</b> of US economic domination of Japan and defensive perimeter strategy to protect the trade of south-east Asia – 'oil, rubber and other natural resources' – might be used to develop <b>Source C</b> and evaluate this view.</p> <p><b>Provenance</b> should be integrated to bring out the ideological differences, limitations and subjectivity of both Sources, especially the obviously emotive <b>tone</b> and propaganda <b>purpose</b> of the pamphlet <b>Source C</b>, in comparison to the more objective and informative tone of <b>Source B</b>. The <b>nature</b> and <b>audience</b> of the Sources are different - <b>Source B</b> an internal, and therefore secret, NSC report to Truman informing him in <b>context</b> of the fall of China, McCarthyism, Dean Acheson's dependence on defensive perimeter strategy and tensions in Korea, while <b>Source C</b> is Ho Chi Minh, under a pseudonym, boldly issuing nationalist propaganda to arouse support among the Indochinese people in light of the success of Communist China in holding back UN forces in Korea. This might be cross-referenced with <b>Source B</b> which mentions his determination. <b>Source B</b> might be seen as more reliable evidence for the situation in Indochina, though <b>Source C</b> might be judged more useful evidence in context of the ongoing Korean War, where a stalemate existed by 1952 revealing weaknesses in US policy, not apparent when <b>Source B</b> was written.</p>	30	<p>Focus: a comparison of Sources</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 ...'.</p> <p>The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources argue in support of and against the interpretation, so they may be grouped accordingly. The <b>argument</b> that <b>opposition to French colonialism</b> was the main reason appears in <b>Sources A</b> and <b>B</b>. <b>Arguments against</b> the interpretation are in <b>Source B</b>, which prioritises US security interests, and in <b>Sources D</b> and <b>E</b> which introduces Cold War 'domino theory'. <b>Source C</b> sees the US as imperialists and has a defensive communist counter-argument. <b>Sources C</b> and <b>E</b> argue that US economic imperialism and French weakness were also significant reasons.</p> <p><b>Sources A</b> and <b>B</b> support the argument that <b>opposition to French colonialism</b> was the main reason for US intervention in Indochina. The context of <b>Source A</b> is the close of World War II and Truman's recent replacement of the more conciliatory Roosevelt as President. <b>Sources A</b> and <b>B</b> explain US policy to end European colonialism in Asia and 'to satisfy Indochinese nationalist aspirations'. <b>Knowledge</b> of British, French and Dutch control of parts of Asia might be used to develop this point, though some might evaluate US supply of the French in <b>Source C</b> and knowledge of US colonial control of the Philippines. The Cold War <b>context</b> of <b>Source B</b> reveals a change in US policy – 'nationalist' is modified by 'non-communist', revealing the clash of ideologies and communist expansion driving arousing fears for US security in south-east Asia. <b>Knowledge</b> of US control of Japan, the fall of China, defensive perimeter strategy and tensions in Korea might be used to evaluate leading to the second argument, ideological imperialism, US security and 'domino theory'.</p> <p><b>Source D</b> and <b>E</b> support the <b>second argument</b>, that the main issue was communist expansion – 'domino theory'. The <b>context</b> of the fall of China in October 1949 and its links to the communist Viet Minh is very relevant, but the Cold War in Europe is <i>not</i> relevant. The authorship and audience of <b>Source D</b> should be evaluated, linked to 'Soviet-Chinese communist bloc' and 'cruel communist dictatorship taking orders from Beijing and Moscow' to develop Eisenhower fears of a 'domino effect' in south-east Asia. His view of a cruel 'communist dictatorship' removing the right to self-government for 'other free peoples of the area' might be discussed. <b>Source E</b> develops this more fully and suggests that the imminent Viet Minh defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu also caused US intervention. However, a <b>counter-argument</b> appears in <b>Source C</b>, where Ho's propaganda pamphlet claims that <b>US imperialism</b>, as in Korea, is the danger to Indochina rather than French colonialism. However, the nature and purpose of <b>Source C</b> limits its reliability and usefulness.</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</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>The <b>third argument</b>, that <b>economic imperialism</b> was the main reason for US intervention in Indochina, is in <b>Sources C</b> and <b>E</b>. In <b>Source C</b> Ho refers to American companies controlling 'the oil, rubber and other natural resources' and US goods swamping the market. In <b>Source E</b> Eisenhower expresses fears that US dominated Japan will be 'deprived of non-communist markets, food and raw materials'. <b>Knowledge</b> of US preferential trade treaties with Japan might be used in evaluation of this fear and linked to Ho's argument in <b>Source C</b> that US imperialism was the main reason. In addition, using <b>knowledge, the view in Source E</b> is that French weakness and imminent defeat by the Viet Minh at Dien Bien Phu was an immediate reason for US intervention. <b>Provenance</b> should be integrated into the analysis throughout to assist evaluation and judgement. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.</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

