

**Religious Studies B
(Philosophy and Applied Ethics)**

General Certificate of Education **GCSE J621**

General Certificate of Education (Short Course) **GCSE J121**

OCR Report to Centres

June 2012

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

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

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

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

© OCR 2012

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Religious Studies B (Philosophy and Applied Ethics) (J621)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Religious Studies B (Philosophy and Applied Ethics) (J121)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
B601 Philosophy 1 (Deity, Religious Experience, End of Life)	1
B602 Philosophy 2 (Good and Evil, Revelation, Science)	4
B603 Ethics 1 (Relationships, Medical Ethics, Poverty and Wealth)	7
B604 Ethics 2 (Peace and Justice, Equality, Media)	9

B601 Philosophy 1 (Deity, Religious Experience, End of Life)

General Comments

The question paper allowed for a full range of responses and differentiated well. Questions 2 and 14 appeared to be the preferred questions. Rubric errors were few and far between. The majority of candidates answered from a Christian perspective, although the general consensus seems to be that there has been an increase in centres answering from another religious perspective. Islam and Hinduism seem to be the next most popular religions followed by Judaism and Buddhism. Some candidates are answering two questions from two different religious perspectives.

The best candidates addressed the specific question asked and considered all aspects of the question in a relevant way. Candidates who scored highly were succinct in their responses to parts a), b) and c) questions. Some candidates did not achieve marks for the point marked questions due to a lack of understanding of the religious terms such as 'deity, haram, and redemption'. With part d) and e) questions candidates demonstrated high levels of skill in analysis and evaluation of religious beliefs and practices and included a detailed, relevant, personal viewpoint. Some candidates used knowledge of other religions effectively to address the requirement in the question for 'different supported view points'. When candidates did not achieve higher marks it was usually because they did not address the issue directly and instead provided an answer for a question for which they had prepared, or stated several viewpoints that were unjustified.

Higher levels of response were evident in part d) where candidates had addressed the full wording of the question i.e. explaining 'why there are different beliefs about miracles' in question 2 or 'how fasting deepens faith' in question 8 and 'the importance of the soul' in question 14.

Many candidates are using their time effectively. Fewer candidates are ignoring the mark allocation for the parts of the questions and writing at length when responding to parts a), b) and c) which are only worth 1, 2 and 3 marks respectively. Many candidates are now answering the questions in the order set and completing the paper in the time allocated.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Belief about Deity

- (a) Most candidates were able to give an accurate definition of the term.
- (b) Most candidates identified two explicit miracles linked to the religion. Credit was not given to general references e.g. cured of cancer but was given credit if candidates said something like "cancer was cured because of praying to God for a miracle."
- (c) Caused no difficulties.
- (d) To get the higher marks for this question, candidates needed to show an understanding of differences of belief amongst faith believers about miracles and explain why there were differences. Some candidates wrote about beliefs in miracles but did not explain why there were differences.

- (e) Good responses were seen where candidates recognised the issue and included a breadth of knowledge about the nature of God (gods), creeds and key beliefs about God. Candidates were able to discern the difference between a physical description of God and the nature/attributes of God and relate this to the issue. Where an atheist viewpoint was included it only added to the response where the candidate was able to articulate the reasons for not believing in any God and therefore a description of God was irrelevant to them. Higher levels of achievement were evident where the personal response interacted with the views of the religions and none, with a conclusion to the issue.

Section B Religious and Spiritual Experience

- (a) Most candidates defined the term correctly. Some gave an example of a symbol. This was not credited.
- (b) Caused no difficulties. Where candidates did not gain a mark it was due to their lack of knowledge.
- (c) Most candidates gained three marks by giving an example of either a symbol, music or calligraphy, referring to an occasion when it is seen or used, and some development about how it supports worship.
- (d) It was encouraging that a number of candidates were able to make the link between fasting and how it affect one's faith which was what was required by the question. For example, some candidates explained how it made people appreciate their lives and food, others how it sharpened their reliance upon God, others a spiritual growth at such times. Some only selected relevant knowledge about fasting in the tradition and did not link it to the rest of the question.
- (e) Candidates recognised the issue and were able to identify the importance of prayer/meditation compared to other forms of worship and weigh up effectively the benefits of each to faith members. Higher levels of achievement were evident where the personal response interacted with the views of the religions and none, with a conclusion to the issue. Weaker responses tended to be where candidates said they were not religious and therefore prayer was meaningless without expanding upon the reasons for their views or comment upon the religious views on prayer.

Section C End of Life

Q13(a) Caused no difficulties.

Q14(a) There is still evidence of candidates misunderstanding the meaning of reincarnation and resurrection.

Q15(a) and Q18 (a) Caused no difficulties.

Q16 (a) and Q17 (a) Caused no difficulties.

- (b) Irrespective of the different questions for the religions, candidates were able to achieve two marks.
- (c) Irrespective of different questions on key beliefs for the religions, most candidates achieved full marks by either describing three distinct points about the belief or a combination of development and or exemplification. Some candidates muddled knowledge of redemption with confession and the sacrament of reconciliation (Q14(c)).

- (d)** This question differentiated candidates very well. The higher level responses were those which made the connection between what the religious members believed about the soul and articulated how important that was to the believers. Credit was given to responses which detailed beliefs about the soul but could not go to the highest level as candidates did not directly answer the question.
- (e)** Many candidates gave clear explanations of heaven, nibbana, nirvana or samsara and argued effectively whether all can reach such states. Differences of belief amongst faith believers were identified, especially amongst Christian views on heaven, hell, judgement and the role of the 'Saving Christ'. There was evidence of a very high level of religious and theological knowledge and candidates were able to engage personally very well, arguing whether or not they believed in an afterlife. Higher levels of achievement were evident where the personal response interacted with the views of the religions and none, with a conclusion to the issue.

B602 Philosophy 2 (Good and Evil, Revelation, Science)

General Comments

Overall candidates performed well on this paper, which allowed differentiation at all levels of ability. All available religions were represented across the entry, with an increase in candidates answering from a non-Christian perspective. Judaism and Islam, in particular, seemed to have gained in popularity.

Sections A and C seemed most popular. It was noted that many candidates who attempted section B seemed not to have been prepared for that section and misunderstood core concepts such as 'revelation'. By contrast, the other sections elicited detailed and technical responses with good use of philosophical and theological concepts.

Candidates had improved from the previous session in terms of writing short answers to parts a) and b); unnecessarily extended answers were seen to part c) questions.

Parts d) and e) appear to have produced the expected differentiation. Candidates of all abilities attempted all sections and gained marks. The assessment objectives require the ability to explain and analyse with knowledge and understanding and therefore, candidates who were able to apply their knowledge to the specific question asked, and (in the case of part e)) analyse or critique this knowledge did best. There seemed to be a tendency towards description in part d) responses, especially in section C, rather than the explanation which is required by these questions. However, performance in part e) seemed to have improved across the range, more candidates engaged in discussion and critique, or reflected upon the significance of the issue. This was true across the full ability range. Almost all candidates were able to engage with the part e) statements at a personal level and this showed in the quality of the responses given.

Many able candidates also made use of a range of religious viewpoints, including humanism and atheism, in their discursive part e) answers. While not a requirement for the highest levels, this did enable those candidates to engage fully with the discursive nature of the questions. It is important that candidates choosing to do this do not lose sight of the question itself, as reference to the religion specified in the question is required for the higher levels. As expected, those candidates who achieved most highly were able not only to justify differing viewpoints relating to the question but to engage with and challenge these viewpoints in original ways.

Rubric errors seemed less common, as were wholly blank scripts. Most candidates seemed to manage their time effectively and there were very few scripts left unfinished.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Good and Evil

- (a)** Most candidates were able to provide a creditworthy answer to this question, usually by offering some expression of extremes of badness or immorality. A large number of students were able to give the philosophical definition 'an absence of good' or an elaboration on this concept. Most students who did not gain the mark gave terms which were too ambiguous to be taken as synonymous without qualification, such as 'bad'.
- (b)** Candidates achieved full marks by paying attention to the wording of the question, which specified example of two actions which might be considered evil. Candidates who did not read this offered one example of natural and one example of moral evil and so limited

themselves to a single mark; this error was far more common than expected. Most candidates gained the mark by offering examples of a generic nature such as murder, rape and genocide but a large number were able to give religious specific examples of sins such as blasphemy or adultery.

- (c) Most candidates gained full marks for this question, which was interpreted broadly. Responses ranged from sources of religious teaching such as scriptures, through to general concepts such as sin/virtue or the eternal presence of God. Some candidates considered specific consequences of one's choices or offered explicit religious commandments, both of which were creditable. A significant minority of candidates also offered negative influences such as the devil or temptation which was unexpected but certainly acceptable. Some able candidates spent time explaining how their chosen examples might influence behaviour which was unnecessary to gain the marks. Where candidates did not gain the marks it was most commonly because they had given an example of moral actions instead of sources of moral behaviour.
- (d) This question differentiated well between abilities, with most candidates able to gain some marks but a clear distinction between those who fully grasped the concepts involved and those who did not. It also identified candidates who read the questions carefully before beginning their responses as the most common error was made in Christian focused responses where candidates wrote solely about coping with suffering without reference to the experiences of Christ. In more general terms the structure of this question, by identifying a specific concept and asking for it to be related to coping with suffering, seemed to guide candidates to more explanatory responses.
- (e) Candidates of all abilities engaged enthusiastically with this question and a really wide range of different approaches was seen. Some candidates drew on material from the ethics side of the course such as situation ethics or the principle of double effect, whilst others wrote philosophically about the purpose of suffering in the world, or theologically about original sin, karma or imperfect human nature. All of these approaches were attempted across the full range of ability, and illustrated with a range of examples from medical issues to testifying in court and going to war. Most candidates had good knowledge of religious concepts relating to evil and suffering, although some found arguing in support of the statement a challenge – however, they were not required to do so in order to gain top marks – many dealt with this difficulty by distinguishing between suffering now, which may well be outside our control, and release from it in the afterlife which is determined by our behaviour. All in all, many insightful and creative responses were seen and some candidates demonstrated a breadth of knowledge which exceeded the specification requirements by some margin.

Section B: Religion, Reason and Revelation

- (a) Many candidates who attempted this question failed to get this mark. A significant minority defined 'scared' instead of 'sacred', whilst a lot of candidates offered definitions which were far too ambiguous to be credited.
- (b) Most candidates gained the marks here, offering general responses such as prayer or pilgrimage. Answers which were more specific to religions were less common, although were credited when they were offered.
- (c) Most candidates were able to gain some marks for this question, and it differentiated well. Some candidates were able to give complex and detailed accounts of intelligent design or the cosmological and teleological arguments, often writing far beyond the point at which they had gained all the marks, by contrast, the less able seemed to struggle to find sufficient to say without repeating themselves.

- (d) Examiners reported that many candidates seemed to misunderstand the term ‘revelation’ despite it being the central concept of this topic and, consequently, struggled with this question. However, candidates who did understand it performed well. Where candidates had studied Christianity, some candidates discussed the significance of the book of Revelation in the Bible, which did gain them some marks. Overall, however, candidates who had studied other faiths seemed better prepared for this question.
- (e) Candidates engaged with this question well, although without the personal interest many showed in the other sections. Some candidates had sophisticated knowledge of the different approaches which can be taken to sacred texts although not all of them were able to relate this to the religions they had studied. A minority focused on the physical creation of books for sale rather than the origin of the words and a small, but significant, number of candidates seemed to be exploring the concept of a sacred text message.

Section C: Religion and Science

- (a) This question differed across the 6 religions in accordance with the specification terminology. However, there was no difference in the quality of responses offered. Most candidates gained the mark here; of those who did not it was usually because they had described the actions which might be taken by a steward/khalifah rather than the definition of the term which the question required – the focus of points marking has to be on answering the question as it is asked, with limited room for interpretation.
- (b) Almost all candidates gained both marks, offering a wide variety of means by which humans damage the environment.
- (c) This was another question where candidates who read it carefully gained full marks. The question asked for reasons for being eco-friendly and many candidates confused this with ways or examples of eco-friendly actions and therefore could not gain the marks. Many responses were general/sociological rather than specific to religion, these were creditable but many examiners expressed disappointment at seeing generic answers in an area so rich in religious content.
- (d) Many candidates interpreted this question very narrowly, with a focus solely on animal testing. This meant that they had to go into some depth to achieve the highest levels, and many candidates did so. Another way of achieving well was to consider the relative position of humans and animals more generally and some candidates took this route. A common error was to regard the treatment of animals as referring to whether or not they should be helped when they are sick, which led to very limited answers.
- (e) Candidates evidently felt strongly about this question and most were able to employ complex ideas such as interdependence to support the argument that humanity and the environment are equally important. For some candidates their own views took over the entire response, limiting religious content and thus the mark. However, most candidates were able to deploy religious material on both sides of the question and humanism was also commonly used to good effect. Some candidate focused exclusively on animals, which tended to limit their answers. A minority of candidates seemed to think that they were being asked to consider whether racism was a more significant problem than environmental issues, perhaps understandably they then struggled to produce a coherent and well-structured response.

B603 Ethics 1 (Relationships, Medical Ethics, Poverty and Wealth)

General Comments

The paper proved accessible to most candidates. Many candidates offered clear and appropriate responses to the questions in parts a) to c) of each section where short answers are required. Some candidates gave unnecessarily extended responses to part c) of the question which must have affected their overall time management.

In part d), where candidates are required to demonstrate their understanding of an issue, many candidates offered responses which demonstrated a sound grasp of the significance of the issue for the religion of their choice. Many backed their understanding up with useful reference to religious teaching and in some cases support from religious texts and/or the life and attitudes of key figures within the religion.

There were many excellent responses to part e) of each question. Responses from many candidates consisted of well presented arguments on either side of the debate and clear evidence of a personal viewpoint. The personal viewpoint was often offered as a distinct section of the response but many of the best responses showed the personal response as series comments, weighing the various arguments and woven into the discussion as a whole. There was evidence in the work of some candidates of a tendency to miss a key word in the stimulus and as a result to write a response which did not hit the mark as regards the thrust of the stimulus. Many candidates, as required by the rubric, considered the issue with clear reference to the religion of their choice. Others offered limited or general religious content and on some occasions no religious content at all. Some responses were well developed along one side of the issue but with no consideration of alternative views or shades of opinion. These latter types of response along with responses which did not offer any personal comment at all could not be given much credit.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Religion and Human Relationships

- (a)** The majority of candidates offered an appropriate account of the meaning of the term marriage, either in the sense of vows or legal contract.
- (b)** Very few candidates failed to offer at least one reason appropriate to the religion of their choice. The idea of purity and of sexual intercourse being reserved for marriage, were prominent responses.
- (c)** Candidates who focused their responses on the issue of remarriage rather than divorce did well in this part.
- (d)** Many candidates offered well informed accounts and explanations of the views to be found in the religion they had chosen. Some candidates, unfortunately, confused contraception with abortion.
- (e)** The stimulus provoked many excellent well argued responses which considered several aspects of the issue and a personal response in relation to the religion chosen. Other less creditable responses were more formulaic, consisting of statements of views, usually one for and one against the issue, rather than a discussion of them.

Section B: Religion and Medical Ethics

- (a) An appropriate response was given by most candidates.
- (b) Most candidates offered appropriate responses often focusing, depending on the religion chosen, on the idea that only God should end life. Many responses referred to the devastating impact of a suicide on family members and friends as a reason why religious people might be against it.
- (c) The use of bold text to highlight that only **one** reason was required was intended to indicate candidates to restrict their responses, as only 3 marks are available for this part of the question. Some candidates wrote at much greater length than required. Several examiners reported that candidates seemed to be unsure of the meaning of the word 'oppose'.
- (d) Candidates were well informed about types of euthanasia but were often less clear as to why members of the religion of their choice might have different attitudes about this topic. The best responses explained the underlying reasons for attitudes drawing support from traditions within the religion or sacred texts and authoritative figures.
- (e) Candidates found this to be an accessible topic. Discussions were often characterised by strong personal reactions which sometimes dominated the overall response to the extent that the views of the religion chosen were sometimes obscured or even omitted altogether. Some candidates strayed into a discussion about the use of animals to test cosmetics, which did not enhance their responses.

Section C: Religion, Poverty and Wealth

- (a) Appropriate responses to this question referred to the idea of an occupation being against the beliefs of a religion or being one which would lead to harm for others, rather than good.
- (b) Most candidates found little difficulty in offering two occupations which could be considered moral. Some candidates, sadly, misread the question and offered examples of two immoral occupations.
- (c) Good responses backed up the description of the attitude with reference to examples of teaching or the work of key figures in the faith. Some responses were very general and failed to tie the desire to give to charity to any aspect of the attitude of the religion chosen.
- (d) Responses referred to quite obvious ways in which money can be misused, for example by gambling. Some of the best responses also referred to how money can be misused by being hoarded or given to charity in a grudging way. Some candidates stated incorrectly that it was Christian teaching that money is the root of all evil, rather than the love of it.
- (e) Many candidates argued convincingly that the possession of wealth was not intrinsically wrong even for religious people. The judgment had to be about how any wealth possessed by a religious person was being used. Some responses referred to the idea that religious people should be and will be, wealthy but not in monetary terms. The best responses backed these views up with reference to traditions within the religion or appropriate textual knowledge or knowledge of the attitudes and actions of key figures within the faith.

B604 Ethics 2 (Peace and Justice, Equality, Media)

General Comments

As in previous years, most candidates answered from a Christian perspective with the majority of non-Christian responses being Islamic. However, there has been a noticeable increase in responses from other religions this year. The majority of Buddhist and Jewish responses, in particular, were of a very high standard, although there were also some excellent Hindu and Islamic responses. All questions were attempted by a good proportion of candidates although section A was the most popular.

The paper provided good differentiation between the candidates and produced a full range of marks. There were some rubric errors where candidates answered three, rather than two questions, but these were fewer than in the previous session. Where this did happen, however, it was often a large proportion of a centre which answered three questions and consequently limited themselves as candidates then had insufficient time to spend on individual questions.

Many candidates spent very little time on parts a), b) and c), allowing themselves plenty of time to attempt parts d) and e). However, a minority of candidates are still limiting themselves by writing far more than is required to earn the marks for parts a), b) and c). This is particularly true of part c) questions.

The part d) questions, which differentiated well, allowed the candidates to demonstrate their skills of understanding, application and analysis.

Answering part e) questions well requires the candidate to identify the issue and enter into a discussion with and between the views expressed, ensuring there are justified arguments presented for the opinions expressed. A minority of candidates are still writing far too little to allow themselves to do this and so are limiting themselves. However, there is evidence that candidates are being well prepared for these questions and there have been some outstanding responses this year.

Some otherwise very good responses failed to get out of Level 3 because they contained insufficient religious knowledge. Other responses contained a great deal of religious knowledge but were descriptive and did not enter into a discussion. For Level 4, evidence of both knowledge and evaluation is required. Some candidates were let down by the personal viewpoint which was stated but not supported or justified.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A: Religion, Peace and Justice

- (a)** Most candidates were able to give an accurate definition of the term. For question 2a), where candidates failed to get the mark it was usually because they merely rephrased the question ('a war that is just') or because their response was too vague to demonstrate their understanding of the term ('a war fought for particular reasons'). Some understanding of the moral dimensions of a Just War was required. In other religions, almost all candidates were able to gain the mark.
- (b)** Some candidates confused social injustice with criminal injustice and so failed to attain the marks. An awareness of the setting within a wider society was needed to gain the marks and so candidates who talked about examples of injustice or fairness between individuals were not successful. The most common responses which were credited were racism, sexism and poverty.

- (c) A small number of candidates did not know what pacifism means. Those who did, almost universally achieved the three marks available and there were some very good answers across all religions.
- (d) As with part b), some candidates confused social justice with criminal justice. These responses usually contained some creditable material but rarely achieved more than 3 marks. Where candidates who had correctly understood the question and failed to achieve Level 3 it was generally because their answers were descriptive; giving a great deal of information on how believers have worked for social justice but failing to explain why it was important to them.
- (e) There were some outstanding responses to this question across all religions. Candidates attempting the question from the Buddhist perspective in particular entered into some excellent discussion. The best responses looked at arguments and counter arguments before weighing up their strengths and weaknesses and coming to a well explained conclusion. Where candidates included plenty of religious knowledge, but did not progress into Level 4, it was usually because they listed arguments on both sides but did not enter into any genuine discussion.

Section B: Religion and Equality

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to answer this question correctly. Some confused 'prejudice' with 'discrimination' or even 'racism'. Other candidates who failed to gain the mark tended to provide examples rather than a definition.
- (b) Some candidates confused racism with discrimination in general and several gave examples of religious discrimination.
- (c) Where candidates did not gain 3 marks on this question it was usually because they misread the question and gave reasons to challenge inequality rather than examples of ways in which this could be done.
- (d) There were some excellent answers here across all religions. Where candidates failed to achieve Level 3 it was usually because they gave example of attitudes towards women but did not explain the reasons for them and, in particular, they failed to explain why not all members of a faith agree on the role of women. Some candidates focused on the role of women in society or in the family, others on the role of women in the religious community or in the place of worship. Both approaches were equally creditable.
- (e) Again there were some excellent responses with many of the best candidates concentrating on the implications of the word 'duty'. Weaker responses often concentrated on why it was not acceptable to force your beliefs onto others and so missed the main point of the question. Several responses brought a different religious viewpoint into the discussion, for example contrasting Christianity or Islam with Sikhism or Hinduism. This was often done very successfully. In question 8e) it was surprising that very few candidates made use of the 'Great Commission' in their discussions. Whilst some stated their opinion without much comment, there were some outstanding personal responses which showed a genuine sensitivity to viewpoints other than their own.

Section C: Religion and the Media

- (a) Where candidates gave a number of examples ('things like TV, radio...') this was credited. Almost all candidates were able to gain the mark for this question.

- (b)** This question was not generally well answered. Candidates tended to just give examples of different types of media rather than providing *different* examples of *how* they could be used by religious people. (For example, ‘programmes on radio and TV’ only gained one mark as it was only one way of using the media.)
- (c)** Where responses failed to gain three marks it was usually because candidates failed to give three clearly different reasons to object to the portrayal of religious figures.
- (d)** Whilst there were some excellent responses, many candidates failed to progress beyond Level 2 because they did not address the issues raised by censorship but instead, gave quite vague responses about why religious believers were likely to support or object to censorship.
- (e)** There was a small number of excellent answers. Many candidates talked about the portrayal of religious figures in general rather than the ones named in the question and/or media in general rather than films, resulting in quite vague and general responses. Personal opinions tended to be brief and poorly justified. Most candidates concentrated on the dangers of portraying the religious figure wrongly rather than evaluating the usefulness of different approaches to teaching the religion. Very few candidates were able to discuss specific examples of films, which was disappointing, as this would have allowed far more scope for discussion. Where specific examples were given, in question 14e) in particular, they were often only religious in a peripheral sense and many did not portray Jesus at all (such as ‘Bruce Almighty’).

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

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

