



GCE

Critical Thinking

Unit **F503**: Ethical Reasoning and Decision-Making

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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

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

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

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















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

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

© OCR 2015

Annotations

Examiners should use the following annotations to assist them in deciding their marks. They do not, however, have to use them to annotate every instance seen.

Stamp	Description
	Key point
	Gap or flaw in reasoning. In combination, unsuccessful attempt at.....
Question 3	
	Criterion
	Evaluation of criterion
	Recognition of ambiguity
	Intermediate conclusion
	Hypothetical reasoning, example, evidence, analogy, counter argument/assertion with response
Question 4	
	Principle
	Evaluation of principle
	Relevant use of source
	Evaluation of source
	Alternative
	Choice/Conclusion (Resolution of issue)
	Intermediate conclusion

Q	Hypothetical reasoning, example, evidence, analogy, counter argument/assertion with response
SEEN	Blank/additional page seen

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The survey in Doc 4 has a higher number of respondents than Doc 5, • but the proportion in favour of improvement is higher in Doc 5, • although the options are set up in such a way as to favour the final answer. • Doc 4 has a wider age range than Doc 5. • Doc 4 has a wider range of education/employment than Doc 5 respondents, who all claim to be students. • The respondents to Doc 5 are self-selected/can answer more than once. • The survey in Doc 5 refers specifically to what should happen to the race • whereas Doc 4 asks whether respondents agree that it is cruel, which is less relevant, • although both surveys require some inference to draw the stated conclusion. 	6	1 mark for each valid point.
				6	

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><i>Specimen answers</i></p> <p>A dilemma is a situation requiring a choice✓ between equally undesirable alternatives✓. This situation does have some of those characteristics. Keeping the race under current conditions would endanger horses and riders✓, while ceasing to run the race would deprive many people of enjoyment and profit✓. But a compromise (making the race less dangerous) is possible, which would probably have less severe disadvantages than either of the extreme choices✓. So the choice facing the management of Aintree racecourse is not a dilemma✓.</p> <p>A dilemma is a situation requiring a choice✓ between equally undesirable alternatives✓. Keeping the race under current conditions would endanger horses and riders✓, while ceasing to run the race would deprive many people of enjoyment✓. Although in theory there is an intermediate option of making the race safer✓, it would still be subject to the disadvantages of endangering horses and riders. So the choice facing the owners of Aintree racecourse is a dilemma✓.</p> <p>A dilemma is a situation requiring a choice✓ between equally undesirable alternatives✓. The choice facing the management of Aintree racecourse is not✓ a dilemma, because a compromise✓ (making the race less dangerous) is possible.</p> <p>A dilemma is a situation requiring a choice✓ between equally undesirable alternatives✓. Both options available in this case (keeping the Grand National as it is or abolishing it) do have strong disadvantages. Keeping the race under current conditions would endanger horses and riders✓, while ceasing to run the race would deprive many people of enjoyment✓. Therefore the choice is a dilemma.</p>		<p>Definition of dilemma: 2 (1 if incomplete)</p> <p>Drawbacks of both options 2 (1 if minor)</p> <p>There are alternatives 1</p> <p>But these alternatives do not make a difference 1 Or So it is not a dilemma 1.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>c = Criteria: Application and evaluation of selected criteria to choice</p> <p><u>Descriptors of 1 mark</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valid simple assessment of issue (not stated choice) by reference to a valid criterion. Valid simple assessment of stated choice by reference to an inaccurately-stated criterion. Largely speculative assessment by reference to a valid criterion. Largely repetitive assessment by reference to a different valid criterion. Invalid/marginal/trivial assessment of stated choice by reference to a valid criterion. <p><u>Descriptors of 0 marks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entirely speculative assessment. Invalid/marginal/trivial assessment by reference to invalid criterion. <p>Suitable choices to be evaluated include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the Grand National in its present form. Abolish the Grand National. Make the Grand National safer. <p>Other valid choices (including more specific ways of making the race safer) should be credited.</p> <p>Suitable criteria which might be used to evaluate this choice include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Profitability Economic benefit Animal welfare Public opinion <p>Other valid criteria should be credited.</p>	12	<p>c = 9 marks – 3 marks for each of 3 answers:</p> <p>3 marks Valid assessment of stated choice by reference to a valid criterion including awareness of ambiguity and/or valid evaluation of criterion.</p> <p>2 marks Valid assessment of stated choice by reference to a valid criterion. Or weak assessment of stated choice by reference to a valid or inaccurately-stated criterion including awareness of ambiguity and/or valid evaluation of criterion.</p> <p>1 mark Weak or marginal assessment of stated choice or issue by valid or inaccurately-stated criterion.</p> <p>0 marks Very weak attempt at assessment of stated choice or issue by criterion.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie: 3c1 (Criterion 1) 3c2 (Criterion 2) 3c3 (Criterion 3) and enter a mark out of 3 for each of three Criteria answers.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p><i>Sample 3-mark answers:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The choice of keeping the race as it is satisfies the criterion of profitability, because (according to Doc 2) it attracts a larger attendance, more associated expenditure and higher television viewing figures than any other horse race. This is a very important criterion for the owners of the race course, because – like any other commercial organization – its aim is to make a profit. • The choice of making the race safer satisfies the criterion of animal welfare to some extent, because it reduces the risk that horses will be injured or killed. However, there will continue to be some risk, and so it does not satisfy this criterion completely. • The choice of making the race safer probably satisfies the criterion of economic benefit, because it is likely that people will continue to attend the race, stay in hotels and spend money on leisure activities in Liverpool during the event. In addition, it is unlikely that the people who place bets on the Grand National would be deterred from doing so because the race had become safer. However, it is possible that the uniqueness of the race would be perceived as having been diminished, in which case the numbers of people engaging in these economic activities might be reduced and this choice would thereby not be satisfied. <p><i>Sample 2-mark answers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The choice of keeping the race as it is satisfies the criterion of profitability, because (according to Doc 2) it attracts a larger attendance, more associated expenditure and higher television viewing figures than any other horse race. 		

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The choice of making the race safer satisfies the criterion of animal welfare, because it reduces the risk that horses will be injured or killed.• The choice of making the race safer does not satisfy the criterion of animal welfare, because all horse-racing, especially National Hunt racing, poses risks to the horses.		

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
			q = Quality of Argument		<p>q = 3 marks</p> <p>3 marks Evaluations well-supported by reasoning.</p> <p>2 marks Evaluations generally supported by reasoning.</p> <p>1 mark Evaluations clearly stated but largely unsupported. or Reasoning contains significant gaps or flaws.</p> <p>0 marks Evaluations not clearly stated or not related to criteria.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie: 3q and enter a mark out of 3 for Quality of Argument.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>p = Identification and Application of Relevant Principles</p> <p>General principles have implications that go beyond the case in point. Different kinds of principle a candidate can refer to might include legal rules, business or working practices, human rights, racial equality, gender equality, liberty, moral guidelines.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to respond to the issue by explaining and applying relevant ethical theories. This is an appropriate approach, provided the result is not merely a list or even exposition of ethical theories with little or no real application to the problem in hand. Candidates who deploy a more specific knowledge of ethical theories will be credited only for applying identified principles to the issue in order to produce a reasoned argument that attempts to resolve it. Candidates are not required to identify standard authorities such as Bentham or Kant, or even necessarily to use terms such as Utilitarianism etc, although they may find it convenient to do so; the word “however” is likely to deserve more marks than the word “deontological”.</p> <p>Credit must be given to any argument based on a principle in the sense outlined in the preceding note. Principles of that kind might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People may earn their living in any way they choose within the law; • People may make use of animals for their own pleasure; • It is wrong to gain pleasure from hurting other living beings. 	36	<p>p = 12 marks</p> <p>To be located in level 4, the use of principles must normally be all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrasting (in approach and/or outcome) • Plausible (supported by reasoning and/or generally accepted) • Applied (not necessarily at great length, but more than a brief summative judgment). <p>Level 4 – 10-12 marks Identification and developed application of at least 3 contrasting plausible ethical principles. Maximum bottom of L4 if no consideration of welfare (rights, etc) of horses.</p> <p>Level 3 – 7-9 marks Identification and developed application of 2 ethical principles or theories. or Identification and accurate application of at least 3 relevant ethical principles or theories.</p> <p>Level 2 – 4-6 marks Identification and developed application of 1 relevant ethical principle. or Identification and accurate application of 2 relevant principles.</p> <p>Level 1 – 1-3 marks Identification and accurate application of 1 relevant principle. or Basic application of 1 or more principles to the issue. or An unsuccessful or unsupported attempt to identify at least 1 principle and to apply it to the issue.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Many candidates are likely to make claims about the moral status of horses. These should be credited as principles, because they include statements of value which can be used to generate specific moral judgments. Extreme claims (that horses should be treated as morally equivalent to humans or that they are morally negligible) should be regarded as weak unless they are supported by reasoning.</p> <p>The best answers are likely to appeal to two or three of the following ethical principles and theories, which are susceptible of fuller development.</p> <p>Simple Consequentialism seeks to identify the choice which will bring about the greatest good of the greatest number. This may or may not include animals, but answers which assume or merely assert that animals should be included or excluded must be regarded as weaker than those which give some reason for this judgment.</p> <p>The most important ethical theory in relation to this topic is Hedonistic Utilitarianism, because Bentham insisted that pleasure and pain experienced by animals should be included in the Hedonic Calculus. Mill agreed, although he thought that the pleasure and pain of humans should be reckoned as qualitatively superior to that of animals. Because this theory is so important in relation to this issue, the best answers are likely to be those which discuss some of the weaknesses in Hedonic Utilitarianism. NB Discussions of Hedonic Utilitarianism which treat it as no more than the equivalent of public opinion cannot count as “developed”.</p> <p>It may seem intuitively unlikely that Preference Utilitarianism should apply to animals, since it seems</p>		<p>Level 0 – 0 marks No use of principles.</p> <p>Maximum level 1 for Identification and Application of Relevant Principles for anyone who only re-cycles criteria from question 3 as principles.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie 4p, and enter a mark out of 12 for Identification and Application of Relevant Principles.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>unlikely that animals can formulate preferences (eg for continued life in preference to painless death), but Peter Singer claims that Preference Utilitarianism does give reasons against killing at least some animals. Although Singer uses the title Preference Utilitarianism to describe his approach, he mostly focuses on interests rather than preferences. It can certainly be argued that it is contrary to a horse's interests to be put in danger of harm or death.</p> <p>Many candidates are likely to attribute rights to horses. In the absence of an equine equivalent of the UN Declaration of Human Rights, some reason other than mere assertion should be given for attributing such rights to horses. The most credible rights which may be attributed to horses are not to be harmed or killed without proportionate reasons.</p> <p>Kant's Categorical Imperative does not apply directly to animals. The only reason Kant gives in favour of treating animals kindly is that people who treat animals unkindly are likely to become unkind persons and thereby are more likely to treat persons badly.</p> <p>Behind Rawls's Veil of Ignorance, one might be someone who enjoys or benefits from the Grand National or someone who is upset by it. It is not easy to imagine how one could have been born a horse, and it is unlikely that Rawls himself would have envisaged his principle being applied in that way. However, Hindus, Buddhists and many other people who believe in reincarnation consider it possible to be born a member of a different species, and that line of reasoning must, therefore, be credited.</p> <p>The Christian Old Testament/Jewish Scriptures justify the use of animals for work and for food, but insist that they should be treated as kindly as possible within the</p>		

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>constraints of such use. It is a step further to identify entertainment as work. Religions which believe in reincarnation have even stronger reasons for treating animals humanely.</p> <p>s = Use and Critical Assessment of Sources</p> <p><u>Document 1</u> The Liverpool Daily Post is a reputable newspaper, but it may have a bias in favour of the Grand National, which is especially popular and profitable in Liverpool. It also has a vested interest in boosting circulation by stirring up controversy. Of the people quoted in the article, Animal Aid and FACE are biased against the Grand National, whereas the managing director of Aintree has a vested interest to support it.</p> <p><u>Document 2</u> The owners of Aintree racecourse have a vested interest to minimize any problems with the Grand National and to emphasize its value as a source of entertainment and economic activity. But they are highly unlikely to risk damaging their reputation by making statements which are factually false.</p> <p><u>Document 3</u> This appears to be a “comment” article, designed to provoke agreement and disagreement, and so may deliberately over-state its case. The first sentence may imply that this is part of a campaign against excessive regulation on the basis of health and safety. Para 5 consists of a slippery slope argument.</p> <p><u>Document 4</u> This survey was conducted by a reputable organization, but it was sponsored by a pressure group which wanted a</p>		<p>s = 8 marks</p> <p>Level 4 – 7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant and accurate use of sources to support reasoning. • Sustained and persuasive evaluation of sources to support reasoning. <p>Level 3 – 5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant and accurate use of sources. • Some evaluation of sources. <p>Level 2 – 3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some relevant and accurate use of sources, which may be uncritical. <p>Level 1 – 1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited, perhaps implicit, use of sources. <p>Level 0 – 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to use sources. <p>Except at Level 1, credit references to sources only if they support reasoning.</p> <p>Maximum level 2 for Use and Critical Assessment of Sources for uncritical use of sources.</p> <p>Typical indicators of L4 (any two of which normally locate an answer in L4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 2 evaluative references to sources • Nuanced evaluation • Strong support to reasoning

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
			<p>particular outcome, and the question may therefore have been designed to encourage respondents to express negative views about the Grand National.</p> <p><u>Document 5</u> The sample is small, self-selected and unrepresentative of the population. Whether intentionally or not, the format of the question and answers encourages respondents to adopt the final answer.</p> <p><u>Document 6</u> Because these are opinions expressed by children in open-access sites, it is not surprising that some of them are extreme and weakly supported.</p>		<p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie 4s, and enter a mark out of 8 for Use and Critical Assessment of Sources.</p>

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
			q = Quality of Argument		<p>q = 8 marks</p> <p>Level 4 – 7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claims well supported by clear and persuasive reasoning. • Consistent use of intermediate conclusions and/or reasoning supported by relevant use of some of: hypothetical reasoning, counter argument/assertion with response, analogy, evidence, example. • Few errors, if any, in spelling, grammar and punctuation. <p>Level 3 – 5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claims supported by clear reasoning. • Few significant gaps or flaws. • Generally clear and accurate communication. • Few errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation. <p>Level 2 – 3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claims mostly supported by reasoning. • Some significant gaps and/or flaws. • Some effective communication. • Fair standard of spelling, grammar and punctuation, but may include errors. • Maximum level 2 for candidates who have been awarded level 0 or level 1 for P and/or S <p>Level 1 – 1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little coherent reasoning. • Perhaps significant errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. <p>Level 0 – 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No discussion of the issue. <p>Capped at Maximum L2 if Principles and/or Sources mark is L1 or L0.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie 4q, and enter a mark out of 8 for Quality of Argument.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>r = Resolution of Issue</p>		<p>r = 8 marks</p> <p>Level 4 – 7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution of the issue on the basis of a persuasive account of the arguments in favour of a clearly stated choice and developed consideration of at least one alternative, including some awareness of why some people might favour it Perhaps an awareness that the resolution is partial/provisional. <p>Level 3 – 5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear identification of a choice. Some consideration of at least one alternative. Some attempt to resolve the issue. <p>Level 2 – 3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of the issue resulting in support for one choice. Perhaps mention of an alternative. Maximum level 2 for candidates who have been awarded 0 or 1 for P. <p>Level 1 – 1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of the issue without supporting a particular choice. <p>Level 0 – 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No discussion of the issue. <p>Capped at Maximum L2 if Principles mark is L1 or L0.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie 4r, and enter a mark out of 8 for Resolution of Issue.</p>

APPENDIX

PE's answer (1202 words) NB This is **not** the standard of response expected of candidates.

I am going to support the choice of continuing to run the Grand National, but incorporating various changes in order to make the race safer for horses, such as reducing the height of the fences and the number of runners. This is preferable to continuing the race under current conditions or cancelling it.

Most people would probably agree that animals have a right not to be hurt, harmed or killed without proportionate reason. However, there is no authoritative statement of the rights of animals, comparable to the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The alternative persuasive basis for attributing rights is by reference to objective criteria, the most plausible of which are life, consciousness and self-consciousness; all of these have been supported by moral philosophers as criteria for moral standing. Horses are certainly alive and conscious, and they may have some, limited, awareness of themselves as continuing subjects of experience. So it follows that they have some moral standing and hence some rights, although not inalienable rights.

The key question is, whether entertainment can constitute proportionate reason for putting animals at risk of distress, injury or death (*ie*, to over-ride their right not to be hurt, harmed or killed). The abolition of cock-fighting, bear-baiting and dog-fighting in the UK, together with the campaigns against bull-fighting in the late 20th century (the beginning of package holidays in Spain) suggest that most people in the UK do not support deliberately hurting or killing animals for entertainment. But (despite Andrew Tyler's exaggerated claim in Doc 1), the death of horses is not the aim of the Grand National, although it is a predictable outcome. Making the race safer protects the rights of racehorses as far as possible, while recognizing that those rights are not absolute, and from the perspective of rights this appears to be the best choice.

Most religions encourage their adherents to treat animals humanely. The Christian Old Testament (Jewish Scripture) allows that animals may be used for work, provided they are treated as humanely as possible. It can be argued that entertainment is one form of work, and that using horses for racing is therefore a legitimate activity. Retaining the race, while minimizing the risk of harm to the horses, is in line with this teaching from the Old Testament.

The only major ethical theory which explicitly takes account of animals is Hedonistic Utilitarianism. Jeremy Bentham claimed that animals should be included in the hedonic calculus because they can suffer. According to this theory, the goal in all ethical decision-making is to maximise the pleasure and minimize the pain of all beings which are capable of experiencing them. Even though the authors of Document 2 have a vested interest to show the race in the best possible light, they would not risk their reputation by making false claims. On the basis of these claims, it seems that the pleasure caused by the Grand National to participants, spectators, bookmakers, gamblers and television viewers far outweighs any pain or distress to horses or those who disapprove of the race. So Hedonistic Utilitarianism may support a policy of keeping the race unchanged. It is difficult to estimate the extent to which the pleasure would be diminished if the danger to horses were to be reduced, but there can be no doubt that a great deal of pleasure would be lost if the race were to be cancelled.

However, many objections have been raised against Hedonistic Utilitarianism, and some of those are very relevant to this issue. The objection that it is impossible to estimate or compare amounts of pain and pleasure under alternative scenarios is especially powerful in the case of animals. For several reasons, it is impossibly difficult to compare the pain and pleasure caused by the Grand National under current conditions with a hypothetical safer version. We do not know how much of the pleasure of spectators and television viewers is based on the risk that horses and riders might be killed or seriously injured in the race. It is even less feasible to quantify the distress experienced by horses in having to jump over high fences, particularly in the light of one of the opinions put forward in Document 6 that horses must enjoy racing, or they would not continue to run round the track when their jockeys have been unseated. We do not know whether horses are distressed by the possibility of being injured or killed in the race, and it is not possible to quantify the potential pleasure lost by horses which are humanely killed after being injured.

Another important objection to Hedonistic Utilitarianism is that it treats all pleasure and pain as equally valid. For example, Hedonistic Utilitarianism would approve of a large number of sadists gaining exquisite pleasure from torturing a single victim, but I consider that any theory which could lead to such a result is fatally flawed. Similarly, if part of the pleasure gained by some people who watch the Grand National is based on the likelihood of horses and riders being injured or killed, then many reasonable people would probably not want to include that pleasure in the hedonic calculus, even though Bentham's theory does not permit such an exclusion.

Because of these objections to Hedonistic Utilitarianism, the best choice is to make the race safer, which will reduce the pain and distress to horses while maintaining as far as possible the pleasure given to spectators.

The goal of Preference Utilitarianism is slightly different, namely to fulfil the preference of as many people as possible. If the findings of the Studentroom survey (Doc 5) have any validity and if they can be extrapolated to the population at large, then my proposal of making the race safer would fulfil most people's preference. However, the sample on which the survey is based is rather small, self-selected and drawn from a fairly narrow sector of society (students). In addition, the range and wording of the choices offered probably encouraged people to choose the moderate option. So the support is not very strong. Even so, the fact that significant numbers of respondents to both surveys approve and disapprove of the Grand National suggests that a moderate policy – namely, making the race safer – would satisfy most preferences. If horses could express a preference, they would probably prefer not to risk their lives by racing, and some people would argue that this attributed preference should be taken into account.

It is possible to argue that animals have no rights or that their rights are insignificant by comparison with the desire of humans to be entertained by seeing horses risk death or serious injury in the Grand National. At the other extreme, some would claim that entertainment is insufficient justification for over-riding the right of horses not to be harmed or killed. Similarly, some would argue that the physical and mental pain caused to horses in the Grand National is sufficient grounds on the basis of Utilitarianism for the race to be discontinued, while others judge that this pain is far outweighed by the pleasure gained by spectators. The most persuasive choice is also the one which avoids ignoring or over-riding any of these opinions, namely to make the Grand National safer.

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 2015

