GCE

Critical Thinking

Advanced GCE **A2 H452**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H052**

OCR Report to Centres

June 2012

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Critical Thinking (H452)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Critical Thinking (H052)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Overview

Answers at grade A were cogent as well as coherent and candidates at grade E were gaining marks across a number of questions, suggesting that they had grasped a good range of basic reasoning skills.

Specific issues across AS and A2 units:

Specialist terms
There was evidence both of strong performance with tightly focused answers using specialist terms effectively to convey reasoning precisely and of answers devoid of these key terms that relied more upon innate ability. The latter could not progress beyond the lowest levels of marks.
- In Unit 1 Section B it is essential that candidates use appropriate credibility criteria in their answers and that in Unit 3 principles are explicitly applied in the final question (this session Q5).

Focus
The strongest answers focused on the precise characteristics of the question. Available marks were limited where more general answers were given e.g. Unit 1 Q10 assessing the impact of nursing degrees upon nursing recruitment instead of upon the healthcare of the patients; Unit 4 Q4 justifying whether or not we should judge people by their clothing, rather than whether we can avoid such a judgement.
- To access the greatest range of marks, candidates need to focus their answers upon the precise details of the questions asked.

Skills
At AS level analysis questions tended to be answered more strongly than those on evaluation and at A2, evaluation tended to be the least well developed area.
- A02 carries a significant number of marks across all units. If centres are looking to raise marks in general across all grades, this may be one of the most needy areas to focus upon.

Quality and length of answer
Overall, answers were suitably focused and fitted within the available lines or continued and were clearly identified on the continuation sheets. Where questions required developed reasoning, some candidates were tempted to give disproportionately long answers e.g. Unit 1 Q 10, Unit 2 Q24, 26, and Unit 3 Q4.
- Candidates need to give focused answers. Exemplar answers are given in the mark schemes as a guide to what answers need to include to target the marks. Quality of answer is more important than lengthy justification.

Legibility
In general the quality of handwriting was good. Occasionally illegible key words and more often handwriting that deteriorated when some candidates were in a rush to complete the last question impacted upon marks.
- Handwriting needs to remain clear throughout and where legibility is known to be a problem, exam dispensation for typewritten scripts may be possible.

F501 Introduction to Critical Thinking

General Comments

There was a good spread of marks, with those in the higher mark ranges evidencing very focused reasoning and effective use of specialist terms. Quality of performance was particularly robust in middle mark ranges, where candidates often accrued full marks to some Section A answers and made a good attempt at Section B questions. This mark range included a number of candidates who were eloquent and confident in their reasoning, but who did not use the credibility criteria in their answers. Section B focuses upon credibility, so it is important for candidates to recognise that these criteria need to be employed throughout this section to gain higher marks.

Candidates performed evenly across both sections, but were more accurate in Section A. The strongest performance was seen in Q1(a) to (d), Q3, Q5 and Q7. Q1(e), Q2 and Q6 differentiated well, with the strongest answers to Q6 being very precise.

Most candidates used specialist terms and the strongest answers used them appropriately. Unit 2 terms were used incorrectly in Q2, Q6 and Q10. Where credibility criteria was absent, use of 'reliability', 'trustworthiness' and 'weight of evidence' received no credit.

Candidates engaged empathically with the issues; completed the paper within the time allowed and responses remained focused. On occasion, the quality of handwriting limited access to marks.

Overall, the answers evidenced better analytic skills than those of assessment, but where assessment was strong it was very precise and clearly expressed. Some excellent Q10 responses had the ability to weigh up both sources and issues and reach measured judgements.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

1   Candidates identified the correct part of the text and good responses did this without omission or addition of introductory phrases.

   (a)   Inclusion of *'for a nursing career'* was essential to the conclusion.

   (b)   Where candidates identified the second of the two reasons, *'after two to three years'* was frequently missed. The argument indicator words *'such as'* were correctly identified and few candidates included the addition of the examples.

   (c)   A number of candidates added in the examples. It is important that candidates take notice of the rubric preceding Q1 *'You must give only the argument element asked for and include no other material.'*

   (d)   Most candidates identified the evidence without addition.

   (e)   This question differentiated well. Most identified *'should'* and good responses added *'such as'* and *'like'*. Weaker answers identified *'should / would / could'*.

2 **(a)** To get marks for this question, candidates need to identify this as the conclusion. *'Hypothetical reasoning '*did not get marks. Unit 2 argument elements such as *'intermediate conclusion'* and *'principle'* and flaws such as *'straw man'* and *'slippery slope'* were used.

(b) Focused answers gave both the characteristics of a conclusion.

3 Candidates ably identified a multitude of alternative causes. Those that identified increases or decreases in alternative causal factors such as 'a rise in admissions' or used a comparator such as in *'complaining might have got easier'* gained both marks. Partial credit was awarded for alternative causal factors which did not relate to a rise, such as *'poor hospital food'*. Very few did not pick up on the instruction in the question of *'other than….'* or merely recycled material from the text.

4 Answers were polarised into recognising the exact assumption or incorrectly stating the complete opposite.

5 Candidates avoided circular reasoning which tended to restate the given claim and focus upon ability rather than training, education, or knowledge. Candidates managed to provide a reason without including other argument elements; they used the claim to suggest a further conclusion.

6 Candidates who referred to the reasoning in their answer gained basic marks. Those who focused upon irrelevance often did little more than state that the reason was irrelevant to the conclusion, not explaining why this was so. Many also gave a generic answer that the author hadn't given evidence or examples to support the reason. Answers gained no marks if they assessed problems with the conclusion itself, without including any reference to the reasons.

Section B

7 The most successful answers focused on ability to see, expertise or a vested interest, either to maintain professionalism or to protect patients' interests. Reputation was handled well in many cases, where it was linked with working with major contributors in the field.

The question required candidates to make appropriate credibility assessments about the Patients Association as an 'independent charity'. Successful answers explained that as the association was not controlled by universities or the government, they would have no vested interest on the issue of nursing degrees. Answers that made over generalised claims about charities being neutral, or this charity having no vested interest or bias, or having an excellent reputation would not be credited without further justification.

Candidates chose 'textual references' carefully, ensuring that these supported their chosen criteria. Very few assessed the Director of the Patients association, not relating this to the actual document.

8 Good responses accurately identified the two sources and their claims. Responses that shortened the claims so that they did not refer to the key elements that were inconsistent were not able to access full marks as were those that gave correct claims without any source or thought two pairs of inconsistent claims were required.

9 **(a)** This question differentiated well, with the potential of full marks going to those that correctly applied the credibility criteria to the claim rather than the person, referring to the Minister's ability to comment about nursing degrees, or similar in their assessment. There were many generic answers referring to expertise or 'good reputation' without justification, as if it were self evident. A number missed the fact that the Health Minister was a registered nurse and claimed that they lacked expertise in this field, whilst others assumed that the Minister would have a degree.

(b) Candidates gained two marks by explicitly saying whether the claim had weak or strong credibility and then justifying this with an explanation about one credibility criterion. A few went on to state one criterion as opposed to others was more important but answers rarely made the next step in explaining why this was so, by weighing up opposing criteria.

10 Answers had been well planned at all levels, these being well structured and systematic in the way they dealt with the different elements of the task

Candidates who tackled credibility and plausibility as two separate tasks tended to make more explicit and clearer assessments than those who tried to tackle these at the same time. Similarly, those who assembled the sides involved and assessed these directly tended to make more creditable points than those who went through the documents chronologically looking for isolated credibility and plausibility points.

Those candidates who correctly assessed a number of sources on each side of the credibility divide, gained 'credibility strong'. These tended to be full bodied and quite incisive about the roles within universities, unions and employment agencies. Assessments tended to be measured and reflective. Those who assessed only one source on a side could only gain 'credibility weak' as they were assessing an individual rather than a side. Others made uncreditable assessments which were too broad and lacking in specific reference, making such points as *'All the sources in favour have expertise…'* which could not be credited. Reputation continued to cause problems for some, where all officials were intimated to have good reputations and that these would be better than those reputations in lowly occupations.

Candidates showed imagination in their plausibility assessments, building on the information given in the resources but moving effectively beyond it, recognising that they had to stick closely to the question of compulsory degrees affecting the quality of healthcare. Those that developed plausibility points which dealt with the details of student funding or the effect of degrees upon those going into nursing could not be credited, unless this was related to an impact upon healthcare.

Candidates needed to draw a conclusion and relate this with precision to the question.

F502 Assessing and Developing Argument

General Comments

Very few questions were not attempted by candidates which is clear evidence that candidates had enough time for the paper in general. Arguments were seen to be more concisely written and well planned than in the past with fewer candidates requiring additional pages for Further Arguments. It is recommended that candidates take a couple of minutes to plan their Further Arguments before committing to paper.

Candidates continue to find the evaluation questions on Section B difficult, whether it is of reasoning, evidence or analogies. Many candidates describe what the author is doing rather than giving a justification of why that is a problem in their answer.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A – Multiple Choice Section

The multiple choice questions discriminated across candidates well.

Feedback on some individual questions:

Note that the mark scheme has guidance on the correct and incorrect options for each question, and this should help to make this paper a good teaching aid for future exam sessions. The comments below do not reproduce this guidance.

Q2 Although most candidates answered this correctly, some chose option B which is not necessary for the conclusion to be drawn. Candidates are advised to ask themselves the question: *Is this <u>necessary</u> for the conclusion to follow from the reasoning?* In this question, this would point towards D being correct rather than B.

Q4 Nearly all candidates were split between options A and B, with the slight majority incorrectly choosing A. The first paragraph has no conclusion but is an explanation for why the group are campaigning. The author's argument is against this campaign with the conclusion of the author's argument being the element as stated. This question differentiated candidates well, with those who got this right doing well on the paper as a whole.

Q9 Although most candidates identified the correct option, each of the other options was widely chosen. This implies that a number of candidates got confused between the flaws, or did not understand what the flaw labels meant or how to apply them.

Q10 The majority of candidates correctly chose option D although many did choose option A. Those choosing option A possibly confused the statement in the text of '*finding gum being disgusting'* as supporting the idea of chewing gum being a nuisance instead of an example of the unhygienic nature of the gum.

Q11 Although the majority of candidates got this right, the rest of the candidates were very evenly split amongst the other options. This implies some misunderstanding of what an intermediate conclusion is and how to test for it.

Q13 This was a challenging question because the main conclusion is a small part of a sentence, candidates would do well to ask themselves an overall question, *"what is this passage trying to tell me",* when answering main conclusion questions, as well as then having a closer look at what the structure within the passage might be.

Q14 This was the most challenging question of the fifteen, it may be that the term "false cause" was not recognised by many or that its application to the passage was not clear. Centres need to make sure they cover all the flaws as listed in the specification.

Section B & C – Written Answer Section

Q16 Most candidates were able to identify and state precisely the main conclusion, although some incorrectly identified the intermediate conclusion at the beginning of paragraph 2 for their response.

Q17 Most candidates could correctly identify the principle as asked for. It was very rare for candidates to lose marks by paraphrasing or by leaving out necessary information. Some candidates did lose marks by copying out the whole sentences from the resource booklet.

Q18 (a) Better candidates actively broke down the analogy stating which items were being compared with which. From the mark scheme, many candidates scored item Y with good candidates also giving the additional detail required for item X. It was common for answers to include "banning" for both sides, thus missing out on item W. Item Z was rarely seen. A number of candidates left the "car" detail off their answers, and thus did not score for item Y.

Q18 (b) This was one of the most challenging questions on the paper, perhaps due to the analogy being harder to identify in part (a) making it more difficult to evaluate. Those who did well in part (a) often scored well in (b). This suggests that the skill of breaking down an analogy into its identified part is in many cases the necessary first step to evaluating its use in the argument.

Many candidates gave answers to Q18b which attempted to evaluate strengths but were actually more like narratives of what the analogy was trying to do, candidates needed to explain which aspects of it made it strong in its use. Due to this, generally, candidates evaluating weaknesses were often more successful. Candidates need to give a comprehension-style answer for evaluation questions.

Candidates who answered that the difference was that people need to pass a test to drive a car whereas this was not true in extreme sports did not show a sound understanding of the analogy and how it is working. Candidates who did this only gained partial credit as it was a subtle point but did not weaken the analogies effectiveness, it in fact strengthened it.

Q19 This question discriminated between candidates well. While most candidates correctly chose 'explanation' in (a), there was a great range in the quality of answers in (b). The best candidates were able to clearly justify why they had chosen their answer with a clear statement showing the understanding of the element in context. Answers often lacked clarity due to how candidates used the term 'reason'. The best candidates clearly understood the differences between explanations and arguments and could communicate it. Indicator words can not always be used to justify the element choice as several elements can share indicator words.

Q20 This assumptions question discriminated well where candidates had to look carefully at the passage, those who scored well on this question seemed to score well on the paper. The passage attempts to claim that it is wrong to say that extreme sports are the new ones. The reasoning is that snowboarding is in the Winter Olympic Games and we are also told that snowboarding is a new sport. In order to draw the claim we need to assume that being in the Winter Olympic Games stops a sport from being an extreme sport.

A number of candidates answered that snowboarding is new, which is stated so is not an assumption, or that the Winter Olympic Games does not contain new sports, this is directly refuted in the passage itself.

Some candidates added an extra point that it is only 'a significant number' or 'most' of the sports in the Winter Olympic Games that are not extreme. Although generally for assumptions it is correct not to assume 'all', in this particular case we do need to assume all for the claim to work so this received partial credit only. To get full marks on assumptions questions candidates need to write with precision after thinking carefully about what exactly they wish to say. Answers which referred to the 'Olympic Games' instead of the 'Winter Olympic Games' lacked precision to their cost.

Q21 This differentiated between candidates well and a range of marks were seen. In part (b) some candidates evaluated the element rather than explaining it, whilst others described the role of the element in the passage, rather than giving a justification of why they considered it to be that element; however in most cases this approach did receive partial credit. An explanation that verifiable fact was offered was expected for defending evidence. Some candidates were clearly concerned at the lack of numerical data, but that is a simplistic view of evidence which is not always correct, as in this case. Better candidates talked about the illustrative nature of the element for justifying examples. Candidates stating that the element supported the passage's reason or claim in (b) should also give detail as to why it should be classed as either example or evidence.

Q21 (c) Many candidates gave answers relating to the unfair comparison with the number that horse-ride in comparison to the number sky-diving, with good answers explaining with clarity that this is only a problem if the number horse-riding is more, not if the number sky-diving is more. A number of candidates focused on the lack of clarity of the word 'fewer', giving good answers which scored well. Candidates were not credited for answers which generalised from this to other cases of extreme or non-extreme sports or stating differences between the two sports in question like in answering the analogies question.

Q22 The best answers focussed on evaluating the use of the evidence and the support it gave to the reasoning. Points regarding the veracity of the evidence or the credibility of the source do not generally get credit and were seen much less this series than previously. Many candidates evaluated in a way which clearly referred to the claim in their answer, following the "what-why-how" model of the mark scheme with the best embedding the 'how'.

Q23 Ad Hominem / Attacking the Arguer was seen correctly by most candidates. To score full marks in part (ii) it needed to be explained that lack of addressing the argument was the problem. References to show where the attack was taking place were made more effectively then in previous series.

Where candidates did identify the Straw Man flaw the explanations were very good and clearly communicated the idea that a misrepresentation of an argument was taking place. This was commonly mistaken as a Hasty Generalisation with explanations that the author was suggesting that all people against extreme sports do it for the reasons given. This was given partial credit as the notion of other arguments not considered here was within this answer.

Q24 Most candidates wrote to support the claim and the majority gave two good reasons to support their conclusion with nearly all candidates including counter-arguments. The responses however were wide-ranging with some responses just statements of the opposite without much detail or justification. Better responses gave a point which directly responded to their counter-argument with a fresh point which disagreed with it. It is important to note that the question asked for two reasons in addition to the response to the counter-argument. Some candidates gave the response to the counter-argument and also tried to use it as one of their reasons for their main conclusion. Candidates needed to write with the correct focus, not just supporting or challenging competition and with the necessary addressing to young people

Q25 Candidates lost credit if they gave answers which challenged rather than supported, or vice versa. Candidates who gave principles or hypothetical reasons which were reworded statements of the claim attained no marks for the principle question and limited marks for the hypothetical reason. Candidates who only talked about extreme sports limited their answers as the claim was more generally about activities.

Principle – The most common answer was to use the principle of free will or liberty, which scored well when given succinctly. Ethical statements were accepted as principles. Candidates were not rewarded if they gave reasons instead of principles or added another element on to their answer after their principle, such as explanation or an intermediate conclusion.

Hypothetical Reason – Good answers did not limit their responses by the consequences being extreme and followed on from the premise, allowing a challenge to the claim. Additional argument elements were rarely given.

Q26 Candidates seemed to have difficulty producing three good reasons for their conclusion and producing an intermediate conclusion that is not just a summary statement of reasons given for this question. Most candidates wrote to support the claim and argue toward a wide range of sports although some candidates chose to make a counter, often about cost, and then address this. Those attempting a counter were normally well done and in this question did contribute to the number of reasons demanded. Many reasons were given which relied upon assumptions, in these instances candidates need to develop their reasoning so that their reasons give sound support and are not made limited by the presence of these assumptions.

F503 Ethical Reasoning & Decision-making

General Comments

Most candidates seemed to find the topic of the use of CCTV in schools interesting and to have engaged well with it. Candidates could have considered the issue from the teachers' point of view with use of the resource documents but some only considered the perspective of students. Clear handwriting aided markers with their interpretation of the scripts. Candidates who chose a vague or wide choice for questions 4 and 5 found it more difficult to evaluate a choice in question 4 and argue coherently in favour of it in question 5 as the focus tended to slip.

Comments on Individual Questions

Q1 This question focused on weakness in reasoning, with most candidates rightly focusing on either the claim that the weakest teachers had left or that the monitoring scheme was voluntary. Complete explanations of the point were required for full marks. Candidates who evaluated credibility instead of reasoning did not receive marks. Candidates who discussed the head teacher in paragraph 4, instead of the deputy head in paragraph 5 as requested, were not credited.

Q2 This question focused on evaluating inference and was generally well answered. Better candidates recognised that there was limited support for the headline but a lot of evidence against it, whilst weaker answers supported only one side of the question.

Q3 This question was about the definition of privacy, with candidates needing to think about what privacy is so that they could judge whether CCTV in a classroom did or did not breach it. Answers focused on consent or knowledge performed better. Candidates who claimed a classroom was a public place were expected to qualify this claim. No marks were given if a candidate assumed that CCTV was a breach of privacy and discussed whether the breach was justified or not.

Q4 A slightly wider range of marks was awarded to this question than in some previous sessions. Candidates achieved high marks by evaluating a specific choice by three pertinent and different criteria and recognizing ambiguity in their evaluation and/or evaluating the criteria. Good candidates also avoided choosing criteria which overlapped or had little relevant to say about their choice in relation to their criteria. Weaker candidates discussed a negative choice such as not using CCTV without stating where, if anywhere, they would use it. Nearly all candidates used 'security' as one of their criteria with better candidates avoiding interpreting it as equivalent to safety or welfare. Good candidates using 'cost' evaluated it as cost-effectiveness.

Q5 Good candidates understood that the nature of this task is to apply principles to the issue in support of a particular choice. Good candidates also applied a selection of principles whilst indicating which might be more relevant or persuasive than any other. Many candidates made persuasive use of relevant and plausible free-standing principles, including that the most fundamental duty of schools or of teachers is to keep their students safe.

Hedonistic Utilitarianism was the most popular ethical theory and better candidates used it persuasively to support their choice with complete discussions and without becoming superficial.

Some candidates attempted to apply the Principle of Universalizability to this issue. It was important for candidates to express the principle, with some correctly pointing out that according to this principle, head teachers, parents or governors should argue or vote in favour of CCTV in classrooms only if they would willingly accept CCTV in their own place of work. Good candidates applied the second version of the Categorical Imperative correctly, realizing that although filming students in order to improve the standard of teaching would be using the students as means to an end, it was beneficial for the students that the standard of teaching was hypothetically being improved.

Candidates who referred to alleged rights needed explore the nature or basis of those rights. Candidates who appeal to rights should support their appeal by briefly stating why they believe in those rights. For example, the rights listed in the 1948 United Nations Declaration are supported by international consensus, while it is possible to infer some rights, such as education, from such fundamental rights as 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness' (United States Declaration of Independence) or 'life, liberty and security of person' (United Nations Declaration).

Good candidates who referred to Paternalism explained why it was relevant. The opposite principle, Libertarianism, was also deployed by many candidates, with better candidates not assuming that this principle applies to people below the age of majority, as this is a large and disputable assumption.

The resource documents were used by many candidates in answering this question, with better candidates forming balanced and nuanced evaluations of sources. Weaker candidates used sources without raising issues of evaluation which led to sometimes led to ill-judged interpretations and claims. Clear identification of sources was important with better candidates distinguishing between the East London and West Essex Guardian with the national newspaper The Guardian without confusion.

Good candidates structured their answers well, setting them out clearly in paragraphs and using intermediate conclusions to sum up each step in the argument.

Most candidates did resolve the issue to some extent by choosing one possible policy, and many also considered and rejected an alternative. Better candidates strengthened their argument by explaining why they had rejected more than one alternative. Good candidates avoided vague choices and alternatives as these would have lowered the mark for Resolution of Issue and also weakened the quality of the reasoning. Good candidates used alternatives which were not simply the other side of the choice; they used different reasons for rejecting it than those identical to the reasons in favour of the preferred choice.

F504 Critical Reasoning

General Comments

Candidates responded well to the issue of clothing. There was evidence of thoughtful response to the issues and strong critical thinking skills from many candidates. Weaker candidates produced mechanical answers or answers which demonstrated minimal critical thinking or reflection on the issue.

Comments on Individual Questions

Q1   Most candidates correctly identified that Grumpy Old Man did not provide an argument, and that his contribution was emotive and ranting. Better responses came from candidates who had mastered the basic definitions of terminology, such as that an argument is an attempt to persuade others to accept a conclusion on the basis of reasons which support that conclusion, and use this knowledge appropriately. Candidates also needed to be able to understand that part of the definition of a conclusion is that it is supported.

Most candidates were able to identify that Fashion Queen did provide an argument, with better candidates being able to identify the conclusion. Better candidates realised that Fashion Queen offered an argument even if they disagreed with her or they thought that her argument was weak. It was unnecessary to spend time analysing the contribution in detail to gain the marks.

Candidates needed to know the language of reasoning which is covered in unit 1. Candidates needed to realise that the question only asks for analysis of kinds of reasoning present, so they did not spend time evaluating the quality of reasoning in the contributions.

Q2   This question asked candidates to analyse a paragraph of the stimulus material in detail. Most candidates did analyse the paragraph, although some evaluated the reasoning. Better candidates set out their answers in an appropriate way, avoiding lengthy passages of prose for this question, with a number simply paraphrasing the gist of the paragraph.

Good candidates correctly identified the conclusion, with those who accurately identified the main conclusion generally performing well in other questions. Candidates need to remember that the only reliable test for a conclusion is to ask whether it is supported, and if so, whether it is supported by everything, in which case it is the main conclusion.

Q3   This question tested whether candidates can decide if the reasoning in one passage is stronger than in another, and whether they can justify this decision with reference to key strengths and weaknesses in the reasoning. The strongest candidates went straight to the heart of the matter, making key points, comparing and weighing up strength and weakness.

Most candidates correctly identified that either Vampire Nemesis or John Flower provided the strongest reasoning, with better candidates being able to justify their judgement with incisive evaluation including strong development and discussion of the issues. Good candidates realised that Grumpy Old Man and Polar Opposite expressed opinions but did not support them.

Candidates needed to know a range of flaws to identify correctly the flaws within Grumpy Old Man's and Polar Opposite's contributions. Sweeping generalisation and stereotyping were accepted for Polar Opposite's comments but not hasty generalisation. Candidates were credited at an appropriate level for this kind of attempt to make evaluative comments.

Candidates needed to articulate their justification correctly, with better candidates looking past simple analysis such as being 'balanced and neutral', analysing or paraphrasing reasoning and adding a comment stating it is strong or counting the number of arguments.

Q4 Candidates seemed comfortable with the topic of clothing and had opinions to express. Good candidates produced strong, logical, coherent and thoughtful answers which considered what we mean by judgement and used this to inform their argument. These candidates tended to distinguish between first impressions and thoughtful judgement, conscious and subconscious judgement, prejudice, stereotyping and rational judgement. These candidates tended to conclude that we could not avoid first impression type of judgement based on clothing, but that we could avoid limiting our longer term judgement only to what people are wearing. Candidates who argued whether we should judge people by their clothing rather than whether we can avoid such judgement received more limited their marks.

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

www.ocr.org.uk

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

PART OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT
GROUP

UKAS
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS
001