

GCSE (9-1)

Latin

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J282**

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice 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.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/>

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on the [OCR website](#).

Further support from OCR



Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/getting-started/>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education Latin (J282)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
J282/01 Language	4
J282/02 Prose Literature A	10
J282/03 Prose Literature B	13
J282/04 Verse Literature A	16
J282/05 Verse Literature B	20
J282/06 Literature and Culture	24

J282/01 Language

General Comments:

Examiners considered the first paper of the new specification to be of an appropriate standard, though intentionally more challenging in one or two questions than last year's. The standard of candidates' performance was generally high, but there were some very effective discriminators, which meant that only the strongest candidates were able to achieve full marks. There were very few marks below 50.

Examiners felt that the paper was accessible to the full range of candidates, while differentiating very well, particularly in certain questions. Both the translation question and the comprehension questions revealed a sound understanding of the two storylines, in most cases. There were very few examples of 'No Response', suggesting that candidates of all abilities were able to engage with the questions.

Despite the fact that this was the first live paper, which meant that candidates did not have the benefit of past papers, Examiners were pleased to note that errors of examination technique were relatively few. However, as has been noted in previous reports on the legacy language papers, some candidates showed a tendency to provide alternative answers, using either brackets or an oblique stroke. In Q19 (b), for instance, the response: 'He was not afraid/didn't care.' would be credited no marks. Teachers should discourage candidates from this practice; since an incorrect alternative response negates the mark they would have been credited. In addition, occasionally candidates did not read questions carefully enough, and gave a response based on Latin elsewhere in the passage, but not in the lemma for the question.

Most candidates were well-acquainted with the Defined Vocabulary List, though there were some errors with the meaning of some common words, such as *gravis* and *auxilium*. In addition, there were occasional errors in understanding the gender of the characters. Candidates should therefore be reminded to make use of the glossary provided, noting in particular the genitive case and gender of proper nouns. Easily confused words were a challenge for some: prime examples are: *descendo/discedo*, *iaceo/iacio*, and *pugno/oppugno*. This year Examiners also noticed some confusion between *Roma* and *Romani*, and *Troia* and *Troiani* (even though the latter words were both glossed).

Candidates' knowledge of syntax was judged to be generally sound, though one or two areas caused particular problems: indirect statements; passive tenses and deponent verbs; participles.

Noun number and case caused problems for some candidates: *fratres* and *oculos* were commonly translated as singular, and the case of nouns such as *vulneribus* and *consilio* was not always recognised.

Participles and irregular principal parts (eg *esse*, *iecit*, and *confecti*) caused considerable difficulty for some candidates (indeed, most of the trickiest sections in Q.20 involved participles). Examiners also noticed some issues with accuracy with tenses (eg *potero*, *habent*, *morieris*, and *potuerat*). Teachers are reminded that the testing of verbs in forms other than the present tense (eg *potero* rather than *possum*) is good practice.

Q.10 and Q.11 (the new optional element) were considered by Examiners to be a very welcome addition to the paper. Both options were generally managed well, with a pleasing number of candidates gaining full marks. The majority of candidates opted for the questions on grammar, though a good number attempted both Q.10 and Q.11, which is entirely acceptable. Examiners mark both questions, and the higher mark is credited. Thus, if candidates have enough time, it is probably a good idea to answer both questions.

The new five-mark band for the translation question was welcomed by Examiners. Valuable marks, however, were lost through the omission of 'little' words such as *simul*, *iam* and *ita*. Candidates should therefore be advised to check they have translated every Latin word in the passage. With the passage printed above the space for the answer, it is an easy matter to look at the answer and tick each of the Latin words translated.

Candidates generally managed the longer time allowance of an hour and a half very well, and appeared to have had sufficient time to complete the paper. Many were able to produce a rough draft, followed by a neat copy, of the translation question, and a good number attempted both Q.10 and Q.11. The number of corrections elsewhere in scripts suggested that candidates had plenty of time to check their work. Examiners noted, however, that often correct answers were changed to incorrect responses. Any alterations need to be clear and unambiguous, and the rough version of the translation should be crossed out.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q.1: candidates found this a straightforward beginning to the paper.

Q.2: this was generally answered well, with the majority of candidates gaining at least the first mark. Some had problems with recognising the subject of *amabat* and therefore offered the response 'They loved each other', which was not accepted.

Q.3: the main issue here was vocabulary, with a number of candidates not knowing *paucis* and/or *aliis*.

Q.4 (a): this was mostly answered well, the only issue being vocabulary with a few candidates confusing *discedere* with *descendere*. Examiners felt that this was a good question for testing candidates' knowledge of easily confused words.

Q.4 (b): this was considered to be an effective question for testing candidates' ability to select the most appropriate meaning of *peteret*. *auxilium* was occasionally treated as a verb, which usually resulted in responses such as 'To help Evander', for which no marks were credited. Teachers are reminded of the importance of referring regularly to the fourth column of the Defined Vocabulary List (parts of speech).

Q.5: a straightforward question designed to be accessible to all candidates, and almost always answered correctly. The only errors encountered by Examiners involved *Troianos* translated as 'Troy', the tense of *esse* and incorrect translations of *magno*.

Q.6: this was an excellent discriminator, with only the strongest candidates able to recognise *referri* as a present passive infinitive. It is very good practice to test candidates' knowledge of verbs in forms other than the present tense (eg different tenses, moods, voices, participles and infinitives). Candidates are also expected to be familiar with compound verbs formed by using the prefixes in the Defined Vocabulary List).

Q.7: most candidates coped well with *Rutulos dormientes*, but a good number lost the other mark by failing to recognise the superlative *plurimos*.

Q.8: another good discriminator, since, although many candidates were credited the second mark for *in corpus amici*, only the strongest were able to handle *se iecit* correctly, with *iecit* and *iacuit* frequently confused.

Q.9: this question is designed to be accessible to candidates of all abilities, and it was pleasing to see that plenty of candidates achieved full marks. Many candidates were able to give two correct derivatives, often including an example to support their answer. However, particularly in the case of *invenerunt*, some candidates gave English words, which began with the same letters as the Latin word, but which are not derivatives (eg 'investigate'). Note also that in the new specification an incorrect derivative cannot score a mark for a correct meaning (eg 'investigate' – to examine something to discover the truth = no marks).

Q.10 (a): almost always correctly answered.

Q.10 (b): answered correctly by the majority of candidates. A few offered additional incorrect information, such as 'imperfect passive', which negated the mark. In questions such as this, the only detail required for the mark is in bold type.

Q.10 (c): most candidates identified the infinitive for the first mark, but not all were able to offer a sufficiently detailed explanation (vague responses such as 'It follows another verb' were not accepted). Examiners were pleased to see that many of those who did earn the second mark also offered a translation to support their explanation (eg 'It follows a modal verb – they wanted to destroy the Trojans').

Q.10 (d): this was a good discriminator: most realised that the use of the subjunctive had something to do with *ut*, but were not always able to refer to a purpose clause, sometimes referring instead to a result clause or indirect command, or, more commonly, to a vague *ut* clause.

Q.10 (e): this was usually answered correctly, though some wrote 'pluperfect'. Candidates are reminded to give precise references to past tenses, as the vague term 'past tense' is not accepted.

Q.10 (f): as in the other 2-mark question (Q.10 (c)), almost all candidates gained the first mark for identifying the case of *periculo*, but not all could offer an accurate explanation, with frequent references to other uses of the ablative. The best responses not only referred to *periculo* following the preposition *in*, but also clarified that *in* here means 'in' and not 'into', meaning that the noun must be in the ablative case.

Q.10 (g): most candidates correctly identified the dative case (and sometimes gave a translation to support their answer), though some referred to the ablative case. One or two thought that *Euryalo* was in the nominative case, and had clearly not made full use of the glossary.

Q.10 (h): most candidates correctly identified a present tense verb, with all four options listed in the mark scheme seen by Examiners. Some gave the answer *dixit*, suggesting a need to work on principal parts as well as tense endings.

Q.11: this question was attempted by just over 15% of all candidates. Examiners felt that almost all these candidates were familiar with the Restricted Vocabulary List, as there were very few vocabulary errors.

Q.11 (a): this was the most successfully answered sentence, with the majority of candidates scoring at least two marks. The main issue was the verb ‘arrived’, which was commonly translated as *advenivit*.

Q.11 (b): a few candidates confused ‘why’ with other Latin question words; ‘the slave girls’ were sometimes translated as accusative; the wrong tense or person was occasionally given for ‘were working’.

Q.11 (c): this seemed to be the most challenging sentence, with ‘of the women’ sometimes translated as genitive singular and ‘the letters’ occasionally put into the nominative case.

Q.12: a straightforward question, with most candidates achieving full marks.

Q.13: most candidates scored at least one of the two marks, though not all recognised that *necarentur* was passive, and there was some confusion between ‘kill’ and ‘die’.

Q.14: this was a good question for testing agreement, with several candidates making *novissimo* agree with *bellum* (‘a very new war’), and others linking *bellum* and *modo* (‘a way of war’). Many had the right idea about settling the war, but did not always recognise the use of the gerundive with *ad* to express purpose.

Q.15: most candidates managed to achieve at least one mark in accordance with the mark scheme’s acceptance of ‘They were brave’, if only one valid point is made. The most common errors included the mistranslation or omission of *paene* and failure to see that *paene* applies to both *annis* and *virtute*.

Q.16 (a): most candidates gained the mark for ‘fight’ (though some confused *pugnarent* with *oppugnarent*). Incorrect handling of *eorum* was the main reason for losing the second mark.

Q.16 (b): most candidates gained at least one mark for *diu*, but *locuti* was unknown to some, who confused it with the noun *locus*.

Q.17: Examiners were impressed by the number of candidates who gained full marks on this challenging question. The question was considered to be a good discriminator, as the full range of marks was credited. The most common errors were: failure to take *bellum* as the object of *decernere*; omission or mistranslation of *poterimus*; not knowing the meaning of *sine*.

Q.18: this proved to be an excellent discriminator, with only the strongest candidates handling the indirect statements correctly. In addition, *suos* was commonly mistranslated or omitted, and *fratres* was sometimes treated as singular. In the case of the second bullet point, many translated *gravissimo* as ‘great’ and/or missed the superlative.

Q.19 (a): a straightforward question for most, though some notion of *tantam* was required for the mark.

Q.19 (b): answered correctly by almost all candidates, though a few confused *rem* with *regem/reges*, which was treated as a harmful addition.

Q.20: the translation question proved, as expected, a very good discriminator, though the overall standard was high. Candidates are reminded that a thorough knowledge of the Defined Vocabulary List is crucial to successful translation. Good responses also demonstrated attention to noun and verb endings, and rarely omitted words in the Latin (see General Comments).

Q.20 (i):

This first section was straightforward enough to allow the majority of candidates to gain a sense of the storyline. It was usually handled very well, with many candidates gaining full marks. The indirect statement caused problems for very few, though several candidates rendered *se* as both '(that) he' and 'himself'. Occasionally *simul* was omitted or mistranslated as 'as soon as', and some candidates were not familiar with the meaning of *quamquam*.

Q.20 (ii):

Most candidates coped well with the first half of this section, though a few omitted *numquam*, which distorted the sense of the sentence. In the second sentence some struggled with the indirect statement and the meaning of *passos esse*. Vocabulary was another issue, with only the strongest offering a correct translation of *dira*. Nevertheless, Examiners were pleased to see that the majority of candidates scored at least three marks.

Q.20 (iii):

The majority of candidates scored at least two marks on this section, with the indirect question in the first half generally handled very well. Most errors occurred in the second sentence, involving the recognition of the first person singular ending on *fugiam*, the handling of the adverbial phrase *quam celerrime* and the pronoun *sibi*, which was often omitted or mistranslated.

Q.20 (iv):

Most candidates dealt quite well with this section, with many scoring at least three marks. The first sentence was the best differentiator here, with some not recognising the indirect statement, and others having problems with the forms of the deponent verbs *sequi* and *conaturos esse*. In the second sentence the tense of *potero* was sometimes incorrect, and some did not recognise the pronoun *eos*.

Q.20 (v):

This section, although the shortest of the ten, proved to be the most challenging to candidates, and there were relatively few scores of five marks. The most common mistake was not recognising the participle *confecti*, which was a pivotal word in the section. The misplacement of *quod* and *iam* was also frequently seen, and *habent* was occasionally translated as future.

Q.20 (vi):

This section was well done by most, but some candidates were caught out by the participle *oppugnati*, which they translated as active, not noticing the additional clue provided by the preposition *ab*. Others confused *iaceo* with *iacio*, resulting in translations such as 'were thrown to the ground'.

Q.20 (vii):

This relatively short section was another good discriminator, with plenty of candidates scoring full marks. Others, however, did not grasp that *Horatius* was the subject and *oculos* the object of the verb *vertit*, which was itself sometimes mistranslated. Other errors included translating *oculos* as singular and not knowing the meaning of *interea*.

Q.20 (viii):

This section was generally done well, though some did not recognise the second person singular ending of *moreris*. Candidates are advised to take note of the punctuation used in the passage, as the speech marks here are a clear indication of direct speech. The adverb *saeve* caused problems for a few, and candidates are reminded that they are expected to be familiar with all the regular adverbs formed from the adjectives in the Defined Vocabulary List. *exclamavit* translated as ‘shouted’ resulted in an inconsequential error for some (see Q6 for earlier comment on compound verbs).

Q.20 (ix):

This proved to be the second most challenging section, with the handling of the ablative absolute and the tense of the participle *regressum* being the main issues. Candidates are reminded that it is perfectly acceptable to give a literal translation of an ablative absolute. Some candidates also struggled with vocabulary in this section, with *ita* and *ceteri* often not known and *Romam* was occasionally translated as ‘the Roman’. Finally, *nunc* was sometimes misplaced.

Q.20 (x):

Most candidates understood the ‘gist’ of this sentence, and many were credited 4 or 5 marks. The most common error was making *consilio* the subject, and some made *audacissimo* refer to *vir* rather than *consilio*. There were also some vocabulary issues with *nam* and *servare*, and not all spotted the pluperfect *potuerat*, confusing it with the imperfect *poterat*. Once again, the omission of words cost some candidates marks, as both *nam* and *urbem* were missed out fairly often.

Most candidates performed well on this paper, and many scored high marks, which reflected the hard work done by both the candidates and their teachers.

J282/02 Prose Literature A

General comments

The overall standard of candidates' answers was generally high and candidates had a good understanding of the texts. The best differentiators in the paper were the extended writing 8 and 10 mark questions. Candidates must be careful to follow instructions given on the paper, for example some did not quote the Latin where they were asked to do so, and marks were lost accordingly. In the overarching 10 mark question, candidates must be sure to make a broad range of points in their answer. Candidates should also ensure that their answers are specific and of sufficient depth and refer to a clearly identifiable section of the text. Vague answers did not score as highly. Candidates must ensure they look carefully at the line references given in the lemma of the questions. Points that are made from Latin outside these line references will not get credit.

Comments on individual questions

Section A

Q1(a) Very well answered. Some candidates omitted the reference to *duxit exsequias*.

Q1(b) Very well answered. Some candidates only made one point, rather than the required two.

Q1(c)(i) Most candidates understood the meaning of the phrase *quid ageret puer*.

Q1(c)(ii) Mostly well answered, but a fair number of candidates did not give all the required information, omitting the meanings of *bene* and *libenter*.

Q2 The 8 mark question was the best differentiator of the paper. The most common error was for candidates to write a narrative of what happened in the passage, with no reference to Pliny's use of language. The question asks for reference to the Latin, and so every point the candidate makes should have a corresponding Latin quotation. Candidates should also show that they know the meaning of the Latin and comment on how the Latin makes the passage dramatic and moving. Basic quotation and translation of the Latin is not sufficient to answer the question fully. For the top levels, candidates should give a wide range of points. Some candidates, whose marks were low in this question, often omitted the Latin or merely stated what had happened in the Latin, rather than referring to Pliny's style of writing.

The passage of Pliny was packed full of stylistic points that could be made and many candidates excelled in this question. An example of a lower ability content point that was made by many candidates was that Arria had held back her tears for a long time '*diu*'. This point was a weak point, although it could be strengthened if reference was made to the emphatic placement of *diu*. In a passage with so many possible points, candidates should plan their answer carefully and pick the best points, rather than writing down the first few points that they come across in the passage. In a question

that is worth sixteen per cent of the marks on the paper, sufficient time should be spent on the preparation, planning and writing.

- Q3 The phrasing of this 4-mark question required style points to be made. Candidates generally answered well on this question. On these 4 mark style questions, for each bullet point, one mark is allocated for a valid point and another mark for accurate, relevant and suitably explained reference to the Latin. Candidates should be careful to ensure that their quotation is focused and not too long. As this was a style question, references just to the content will not get credit for the analytical part. Candidates should try to make points referring to the word order of the Latin, repetition, sound effects, use of the plural, use of tenses etc. Content points, such as saying she embraced the friends of her father, will not get credit for the analysis. Where possible, candidates should look to analyse a short phrase of Latin, rather than just one word of Latin.
- Q4(a)(i) Generally well answered.
- Q4(a)(ii) Some candidates omitted to answer the first part of the question about Tacitus' feelings. Some answers about the reasons behind the decline were vague and didn't get credit.
- Q4(b) Most candidates answered correctly.
- Q5 There were many excellent translations with candidates clearly having a firm understanding of the text. Many candidates however omitted some of the smaller words, such as *nam* and *pridem*. The meaning of *emptae* also caused problems, with some candidates thinking the nurse's room was empty.
- Q6 Candidates found this question marginally more difficult than question 3, the other four mark style question. Many candidates did not really engage with the Latin, and commented on the content rather than the style. A small number of candidates did not know the meaning of the Latin at all and scored either 0 or 1 mark.
- Q7(a)(i). Generally well answered. There were some mistranslations of *furoribus*.
- Q7(a)(ii) Very well answered. Only a very few candidates did not get this question correct.
- Q7(b) Mostly correct. Some candidates omitted *civem*.
- Q7(c) Despite there being three possible answers, a fair number of candidates scored one mark out of two.
- Q7(d) Very well answered.
- Q8 The ten mark overarching question was generally well answered, with candidates giving a wide range of points. Some candidates, however, did not refer to all three authors. Where the names of the authors are referred to in the question, the candidates should make every effort to refer to all three in their answer. There were plenty of points to choose from and most candidates found plenty to write about. The main reason why candidates dropped marks was due to vague references to the text. Candidates are not required to quote the Latin in their answers, but they should refer closely, in English, to episodes within the text in order to back up their answers. Some candidates' answers were too vague and did not refer closely enough to the text. Candidates need to ensure

that they include a wide range of answers which refer closely to the text. Obvious though it sounds, candidates must ensure that they answer the question and in this case refer to the qualities the authors admired in an individual.

J282/03 Prose Literature B

General comments

The overall standard of candidates' answers was generally high and candidates had a good understanding of the texts. The best differentiators in the paper were the extended writing 8 and 10 mark questions. Candidates must be careful to follow instructions given on the paper, for example some did not quote the Latin where they were asked to do so, and marks were lost accordingly. In the overarching 10 mark question, candidates must be sure to make a broad range of points in their answer. Candidates should also ensure that their answers are specific and of sufficient depth and refer to a clearly identifiable section of the text. Vague answers did not score as highly. Candidates must ensure they look carefully at the line references given in the lemma of the questions. Points that are made from Latin outside these line references will not get credit.

Comments on individual questions

Section A

- Q1(a) Generally well answered, although a significant number of candidates scored one mark out of two. Omission of *summam* or incorrect translation of *auctoritatem* were common errors.
- Q1(b) Well answered. Some candidates only gave one way in which a successor could be chosen.
- Q1(c)(i) There were mixed responses to this questions. Some candidates did not look carefully at the Latin and gave a vague answer relying on their general understanding of the text. Candidates must be sure to look at the lemma in the question and take their answer from this part of the Latin. A significant number of candidates missed the comparative in *diligentius*.
- Q1(c)(ii) Well answered.
- Q2(a) Well answered. The commonest error was to omit reference to the verses.
- Q2(b) Generally well answered. *vulgum* caused difficulties for some. The comparative *minus* was often omitted.
- Q2(c) Very well answered.
- Q2(d) Generally well answered.
- Q3 The phrasing of this 4-mark question required style points to be made. Candidates generally answered well on this style question. On this type of question, for each bullet point one mark is allocated for a valid point and another mark for accurate, relevant and suitably explained reference to the Latin. Candidates should be careful to ensure that their quotation is focused and not too long. As this is a style question, references just to the content will not get credit for the analytical part of the question. Candidates should

try to make points referring to the word order of the Latin, repetition, sound effects, use of the plural, use of tenses etc. Content points, such as saying the images were huge, will not get credit for the analysis. Where possible, candidates should look to analyse a short phrase of Latin, rather than just one word of Latin.

- Q4(a) Generally well answered. Some candidates omitted to answer the part of the question about how the Romans felt. Candidates should think about what emotion the Romans are feeling at this point.
- Q4(b) Generally well answered. A significant number of candidates did not refer to captives / prisoners. The word *fibris* caused difficulties for some.
- Q5 This four mark question allowed both content and style points. It was generally well answered. Common errors were the omission of the Latin, incorrect understanding of the meaning of the Latin, or partial / incorrect quotation. There was a wide range of possible answers and this question was generally well answered.
- Q6 This translation question effectively differentiated which candidates knew the text well and which candidates had not learnt sufficiently. There were fewer completely correct answers than in previous years and there were a small number of candidates who really struggled with the meaning of the Latin. Common errors included the omission of *iam*, incorrect translations of *decima* and *vicensimae*, omission of *ferme* and *armatorum* and *-que*.
- Q7 The 8 mark question was the best differentiator of the paper. The commonest error was for candidates to write a narrative of what happened in the passage, with no reference to Tacitus' use of language. The question asks for reference to the Latin, and so every point the candidate makes should have some Latin quotation. Candidates should also show that they know the meaning of the Latin and comment on how the Latin makes the passage dramatic and moving. Basic quotation and translation of the Latin is not sufficient to answer the question. Some candidates, whose marks were low in this question, often omitted the Latin or merely stated what had happened in the Latin, rather than referring to Tacitus' style of writing.

The passage of Tacitus had many stylistic points that could be made and many candidates excelled in this question. An example of a lower ability content point that was made by many candidates was that the Romans had their spears outstretched and they broke through the British forces. This point was purely a content point, although it could be strengthened if reference was made to the intensifying prefix of *pro-* and *per-*. In a passage with so many possible points to make, candidates should plan their answer carefully and pick the best points, rather than writing down the first few points that they come across in the passage. In a question that is worth sixteen per cent of the marks on the paper, sufficient time should be spent on the preparation, planning and writing.

- Q8 The ten mark overarching question was well answered, with candidates giving a wide range of points. In the mark scheme the following guidance was given to ensure that all valid interpretations of the question were given due credit.

'Full credit should be given to candidates who refer to the description of the Druids by Caesar who states that the disciplina of the Druids originated in Britain and spread from there throughout Gaul. Full credit should also be

given for the interpretation that Caesar's words are not applicable to the Britons, although they may refer to Caesar's words about the disciplina originating in Britain. Candidates who felt they could not mention Caesar should not be disadvantaged for only referring to Tacitus. Full credit should be given for references to the Druids' Last Stand in Anglesey (Mona).'

Candidates generally gave a wide range of points in their answer and referred closely to the text. There were plenty of points to choose from and most candidates gave a full range of answers. The main reason why candidates dropped marks was due to vague references to the text. Candidates are not required to quote the Latin in their answers, but they should refer closely, in English, to episodes within the prescribed text in order to back up their answers. Some candidates' answers were too vague and did not refer closely enough to the text. Candidates need to ensure that they include a wide range of answers which refer closely to the text. Obvious though it sounds, candidates must ensure that they actually answer the question and in this case refer to the qualities the authors admired in an individual.

J282/04 Verse Literature A

General Comments:

Candidates who sat this paper had obviously enjoyed the varied range of poems in this selection, whether it was Ovid's depiction of the countryside, the spring of Bandusia with its welcome coolness on a hot day or Horace's reflections on the passing of the seasons and the shortness of human life. On all these candidates showed detailed knowledge and a thoughtful response as well as a grasp of some of the literary techniques deployed by the authors. Horace's fable of the town mouse and the country mouse elicited appreciative descriptions of the contrasting characters of the protagonists and impressive translations of the effect on them of the Molossian hounds. A number of candidates showed familiarity with the Epicurean philosophy of the town mouse and ably discussed what in fact might constitute a good or happy life. Practically all candidates produced some reasoned discussion of the poets' attitudes to life in the town versus life in the country.

There were many good answers to all the different types of question but where candidates fell short it was often in not fully appreciating what was required of them. This new specification, examined for the first time this summer, has two Assessment Objectives for Literature: the first is to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of literature; the second to analyse evaluate and respond to literature. It is important for both objectives that candidates answer the question set rather than just translating bits of the text and hoping for the best. The questions themselves give some clear indications as to what candidates need to include in their answers: Latin must be included where the question says 'Refer to the Latin' as in Q2(c), 3, 7(b); points of style must be included where the question asks for 'stylistic features' or 'style of writing' (Q3 on this paper). Where candidates did less well on the extended answers, Q3 & Q9, it was often because they did not meet all the requirements of the question. The Guidance provided by the Examination Board for applying the marking grids for Q3 & 9 offers some clear indications as to what is expected of candidates in the longer answers and how Examiners will approach the marking. These Guidance notes can be found on p6 and p12 of this year's mark scheme but will apply to the comparable questions in future years of the specification. Comments on these questions will highlight some of the detail.

Several questions specifically ask for quotation of Latin and full marks cannot be gained if no Latin is included. Where Latin is not asked for there is nothing to be gained by quoting Latin and, as it takes up valuable time, it is as well to leave it out. To gain credit candidates also need to show that they understand what their Latin references mean, whether this comes via literal translation or by paraphrase and accompanying explanation.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q1(a)(i) Nearly all candidates got 'apple' or 'fruit' here, though the (holm) oak crept in occasionally from a different poem.

Q1(a)(ii) Nearly always correct.

Q1(b) The information here (nearly always known) had to come from line 4 rather than line 3; those who translated both *aspice* lines were allowed the marks.

- Q2(a) Nearly always correct; ‘more splendid’ was accepted for *splendidior* but not other adjectives which had no connotations of being ‘clear’.
- Q2(b) Candidates came up with good suggestions here. Some thought that the kid’s incipient horns were used by the Romans for divination but this is not justified by the context as it is the kid’s own future as an adult male that is cut short by its sacrifice.
- Q2(c) There were many good answers but some candidates found it hard to assess what was an acceptable point and how best to express it. Candidates need in this type of question to select 2 pieces of Latin and to explain how each emphasises the specialness of the spring. The points may refer to the content (‘no matter how hot the day, the spring is unaffected’) or to the style (the heat is emphasised by using the Dog star to indicate the very height of summer **or** by the enclosing word order **or** by the lexical choice of *flagrantis* &/or *atrox*). In each case an appropriate piece of Latin must support the point.

There was a very good range of valid points overall but those who noted the alliteration of *praebes...pecori* usually did not find a convincing explanation as to how this makes the spring special. As noted above, candidates must show that they understand the piece of Latin that they use as their example. Good points were the emphatic position of *amabile* stressing how welcome the spring’s coolness is on a hot day, and the emphasis on the weariness/hard work of the bulls (*fessis vomere tauris*) showing how much needed the spring’s waters are.

- Q3 This 8-mark analysis question requires several things of the candidates. Most importantly, perhaps, they must answer the question set which in this instance focuses on the **character** of the two mice. The bullet point suggestions provide some guidance as to what aspects of the passage to consider but they are not obligatory. It **is** obligatory, however, to include some Latin quotation and to include some points of style. The best approach to this question is made clear in the Guidance notes to the marking grid (p6 of the mark scheme): the candidate needs to select a number of examples from the text and to show how each example reveals the character of the mice; the examples may be of content or of literary style but there must be some of each for the answer to score in levels 3 or 4. The second criterion in each level makes this clear: only at level 2 does ‘and’ give way to ‘and/or’.

Candidates clearly enjoyed writing about the distinctive characters of the mice and showed an appreciation of the country mouse’s generosity and hospitality in strong contrast to the snooty and inconsiderate fussiness of the town mouse. Many scored less highly than they might have done because they focused too much on details in the first two lines which concern the circumstances (wealth/poverty), location (town/country) and relationship of the mice rather than their **character**. Chiasmus in these lines was a feature often quoted but it could only be credited where it was related to the character of the mice. Some candidates succeeded in doing this (enclosing word order highlighting the welcoming nature of the country mouse) but many didn’t. Other stylistic features were rather sparse but candidates successfully deployed the assonance in line 4, the emphatic *neque...nec* and the lexical choice of *invidit*, the list of food items, the striking metaphor of *vincere* and the emphatically-placed ‘transferred epithet’, *superbo*. Several candidates mis-read *frusta* in line 8 as *frustra*.

- Q4(a) Nearly always correct. ‘Night’ on its own was not adequate.

- Q4(b) Most got two details though some gave 'red dye' which was not enough on its own.
- Q4(c) Some candidates did not grasp what was being asked here, though many gave sensible suggestions about behaviour (wastefulness and greed being common answers). Unexpectedly the evidence was often provided in Latin only, which could not receive credit; reference to 'food piled up in baskets', 'food left over', 'many dishes', 'a large dinner' as appropriate earned the 2nd mark. Some misunderstanding of the scenario (rich man's house where work done by slaves) and of *fercula* resulted in the suggestion of 'laziness' as plates had not been cleared away but this was not accepted.
- Q5 There were many impressive and vivid translations with very few errors. Even the multiple 'fear' words were successfully incorporated. Common omissions were of *cubans* and *valvarum*. The marking grid on p9 of the mark scheme shows how marks were allocated.
- Q6(a) There were some slight errors here but no problems for the most part.
- Q6(b) Almost always right.
- Q7(a) Most realised that the first three words give the answer.
- Q7(b) This question is of exactly the same type as Q2(c), albeit that a translation of the lines is provided. Again, candidates must choose 2 pieces of Latin and explain how they emphasise the quick passing of the seasons. Both content and style points were equally acceptable. Many candidates focused on the personification and violent action of *proterit* or on the time words *simul* and/or *mox*. Some were aware of the underlying 'running' meaning of *recurrat* and used this to make a good point. The observation that the seasons pass in one sentence or a mere 4 lines is a good one but some Latin was needed to back it up: picking out the words for each season or the words for winter at the start and finish was enough to give candidates their full mark.
- Q8 There were very few errors here but one Latin word only is required. As there are two possible answers candidates who put both were not in this instance penalised but those who quoted the whole of the last line scored nothing, even if it was correctly translated.
- Q9 The Guidance on this 10-mark extended response is very helpful in making clear what is expected. 5 marks are credited for Assessment Objective 2 (demonstrate knowledge and understanding of literature) and 5 marks for AO3 (analyse, evaluate and respond to literature). The ideas which candidates put forward in answer to the question need to be backed up with detailed textual support in order to score at the higher levels. Similarly, an answer heavy on textual detail but with little analysis will score less highly. Candidates need to produce an overall argument in answer to the question, well supported by detailed references to the text. They might consider, for example, the beauty of the countryside, its peacefulness and safety, or its hard work and lack of resources in comparison to the town. Another approach is to write a paragraph on each of a series of poems: this can work equally well provided that the candidate keeps a clear focus on the question set. Some candidates discussed all the poems in the selection but there is no necessity for candidates to do this; it is sufficient to focus on those poems which provide the best support for the candidate's argument.

There were interesting points concerning Ovid's 'Sights, sounds and seasons'; some were captivated by his picture of the countryside though others thought it over-romanticised and doubted that he was really a fan of country living. Textual evidence varied from the barest mention of the repeated *aspice* to a good range of detail from the rest of the poem. Some candidates showed an awareness of the possibly darker side of country life in the sacrifice of the kid to Horace's spring.

'The town mouse and the country mouse' yielded some very interesting and perceptive observations about the advantages and disadvantages of town and country; many quoted the country mouse's final choice of the safety of his mousehole with its 'meagre vetch' over the luxury and dangers of the city (which incidentally provided a good reference beyond the passages printed on the paper). The handling of Martial's poem (which not all candidates included) was more mixed as both the wording of the poem and the thrust of the poet's argument were sometimes poorly understood. Some argued convincingly, however, that Martial's 'happiness' was most likely to be found in the countryside whilst a few noted, quite reasonably, that his 'recipe' could be pursued in an urban just as much as a rural location. All arguments which are supported by the text are credited by the Examiners.

J282/05 Verse Literature B

General Comments:

The general standard of work on this Latin Verse Literature B paper was very high. Candidates had impressive knowledge of the sections of Virgil, *Aeneid* 4 & 6 that they had studied and had a good appreciation of the wider background to the relationship of Dido and Aeneas and its tragic outcome. Most had strong and clear views about how Aeneas handled the difficult situation of leaving Dido in his quest for Italy. Their analysis of the poignant meeting between Aeneas and Dido in Hades nearly always showed empathy with the characters while a good formal understanding of the techniques of Virgil's poetry was apparent in many answers.

There were many good answers to all the different types of question but where candidates fell short it was often in not fully appreciating what was required of them. This new specification, examined for the first time this summer, has two Assessment Objectives for Literature: the first is to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of literature; the second to analyse, evaluate and respond to literature. For both objectives it is important that candidates answer the question set rather than just translating bits of the text and hoping for the best. The questions themselves give some clear indications as to what candidates need to include in their answers: Latin must be included where the question says 'Refer to the Latin' as in Q1(b), 3, 7; points of style must be given where the question asks for 'stylistic features' or 'style of writing' (Q7 on this paper). Where candidates did less well on the extended answers, Q7 & Q8, it was often because they did not meet all the requirements of the question. The Guidance provided by the Examination Board for applying the marking grids for Q7 & 8 offers some clear indications as to what is expected of candidates in the longer answers and how Examiners will approach the marking. This Guidance can be found on p9 and p11 of this year's mark scheme but will apply to the comparable questions in future years of the specification. Comments on the questions below will highlight some of the detail.

Several questions specifically ask for quotation of Latin and full marks cannot be gained if no Latin is included. Where Latin is not asked for there is nothing to be gained by quoting Latin and, as it takes up valuable time, it is as well to leave it out. To gain credit candidates also need to show that they understand what their Latin references mean, whether this comes via literal translation or by paraphrase and accompanying explanation.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q1(a) Almost all candidates gained 2 marks here.

Q1(b) There were many very good answers. Two points are required: each must quote a (coherent) piece of Latin and explain how this **emphasises** Aeneas' confused feelings. The point may draw attention to an aspect of content or highlight a point of style. The series of questions (rhetorical, deliberative, in tricolon form) was a popular and successful example. Some candidates did not include a Latin quote or did not say how the questions emphasise his confusion. Good, if simple, explanations were that 'he didn't know what to do', 'he was worried about how to tell Dido he was leaving' and so on. Referring just to one question is much less likely to be accepted as it can hardly be said to emphasise confusion. Candidates also noted the T alliteration in *attonitus...* and gained full marks if they said that this emphasised his shock on hearing Mercury's

- message. Examiners did not accept the suggestion that Aeneas is stuttering here as it is contradicted by the previous lines (*obmutuit, vox...haesit*).
- Q2(a) Most gained full marks. 'Keep the preparations secret' is outside the lemma and gained no credit.
- Q2(b) Nearly always correct.
- Q3 This question asks for three points to be made but it is otherwise of the same type as Q1(b), albeit no translation is provided. Most candidates focused well upon the idea of 'persuasion' and showed a very good understanding of the text. Some noticed the repetition of *per* in lines 1 and 3 but were less clear about its force in the context and how it is persuasive. Popular, and usually more successful, answers referred to the doublet of marriage words in line 3 and the meaning/emphatic position of *oro*. There were some very good explanations in the form of appealing to Aeneas' pity or to his sense of duty. A few candidates took *miserere* to mean the same as *miseræ* but most who used this example were aware of its true meaning.
- Q4(a) This was generally well answered. A paraphrase is the best way of making the second point but a translation of *praetendi taedas* etc was accepted as long as it contained some reference to marriage or being a husband. Only a few focused on *ne finge*; the problem here is that many of the common translations ('do not imagine it', for example) do not yield any idea of Aeneas' defending himself – for this the essential meaning of 'do not invent' is needed.
- Q4(b) Most candidates had no trouble with this straightforward question but those who put in remembered points from outside the lemma (and the passage) did not gain marks.
- Q5 There were many very impressive translations of this testing passage. There is a wide range of acceptable translations which accurately convey the sense of the Latin but all words must be accounted for. Examiners did not insist upon the genitive of *patris Anchisæ* provided that his *turbida imago* appeared somewhere; they were also happy to credit a variety of attempts to bring *puer Ascanius* into the syntactical context. *capitis iniuria cari* was the phrase perhaps least well understood. The grid on p7 of the mark scheme shows how Examiners allocated marks.
- Q6(a) This was nearly always correctly answered.
- Q6(b) This proved a testing question for many candidates. Good answers distinguished well what was happening in the simile and showed how this applied to Aeneas. Some did not realise that it is the moon in the simile, not Dido, who is seen through clouds. Quite a few scored at least one mark through the idea that Aeneas 'saw or thought he saw' Dido. Stylistic observations (polyptoton, repetition of *aut*) are not relevant here and gained no credit.
- Q6(c) Most scored 2 marks. Reasonably accurate references to *amore* were accepted for the second mark.
- Q7 In this question, worth 8 marks, it is very important to note what the question is asking and what is required in the answer. Useful pointers can also be found in the Guidance to the marking grid which forms part of the mark scheme (p10). The question asks how

Virgil emphasises Dido's lack of forgiveness of Aeneas: most candidates had plenty to say about this but they sometimes gave examples without showing how they showed her lack of forgiveness. Most candidates followed the bullet point suggestions but they are not obliged to do so. They are, however, required to include Latin references and to comment on stylistic features as well as aspects of content if they are to achieve levels 3 or 4: the second criterion on the marking grid makes this clear as it is only at level 2 that 'and' gives way to 'and/or'. The most successful answers followed the Guidance in selecting a range of suitable examples as a basis for answering the question. There is no hard and fast rule as to the number of examples needed to reach a particular level as much depends on the quality of the examples and of the discussion based upon them. For instance, in line 1 her fiery and fierce look (*ardentem et torva tuentem*) suggests that she is still furious with Aeneas. To add that this is emphasised by the hard 't' alliteration (maybe suggesting that she will not change her mind) would develop the basic point further.

The passage was well understood by most candidates who offered a range of (mostly) content points and related them to the question of forgiveness. A few did not really grasp that Dido's facial expression does not change throughout Aeneas's speech (lines 3–5), so that she cannot be crying, stuttering or hissing (as various sound effects might otherwise suggest). Overall candidates did not offer many stylistic features though the emphasising alliteration in line 1, the lexical choice of *corripuit*, *refugit* and *inimica*, and the emphatic position of *amorem* were good examples which appeared quite frequently. Nearly all candidates mentioned the simile/comparison in lines 4–5 and had something appropriate to say about it and this, of course, qualified as a stylistic reference. It was often the only stylistic reference in the answer and whilst it was credited as such, it did seem to be included almost inadvertently by some candidates.

- Q8 This was answered with gusto by most candidates who provided some very interesting and varied arguments about Aeneas' (and less relevantly Dido's) handling of the situation before them. There was no shortage of 'response to literature' here. Most noted that Aeneas was caught between Dido and the gods/his duty but that his duplicity made the situation worse. Some felt that he merely procrastinated in telling Dido, others that he never intended to tell her at all, though this rather ignores his self-questioning when he hears Mercury's message. There were some very good observations about Aeneas' suppression of any feelings he might have for Dido and his use of legalistic language; some saw this as a complete failure of empathy, others as an attempt to spare both their feelings. The best answers kept their focus on how Aeneas behaved to Dido before leaving Carthage but quite a lot of candidates also discussed their meeting in the Underworld and made acceptable points. Many highlighted how in that context Dido and Aeneas appeared to have reversed roles but this observation was generally not made relevant to the question and for this reason did not gain credit. The question does indeed refer to 'the parts of *Aeneid* 4 and 6 that you have read' but this does not mean that it is essential to refer to both books: candidates are free to focus on whatever parts of the text best support their argument. The occasional misunderstanding was apparent, such as that Aeneas had gone down to the Underworld in order to see Dido.

As with the previous question the Guidance on the marking grids supplies some valuable pointers to the best approach for this extended response question. The Guidance makes clear that 5 marks are available for 'knowledge and understanding' of the text (Assessment Objective 2) and 5 for 'analysis, evaluation and response to literature' (AO3). Providing detailed textual evidence is just as important as presenting ideas and

constructing an argument. Where candidates fell short on this particular question it was usually in not providing enough detailed textual evidence to support what they had to say. It was much less common to read extensive textual/narrative detail with little or no analysis, though on a different question that might well happen.

J282/06 Literature and Culture

General Comments:

The emphasis of this component is on demonstrating knowledge and understanding and the skills required in analysing, evaluating and responding to ancient sources. Questions are set on both sources from the prescribed booklet and unseen sources with related subject matter.

It was felt that further practice in discussing unseen material was needed. Centres might also consider developing discussion of archaeological material and art. A handful of candidates did not know the prescribed sources booklet. They relied on general knowledge, which had no sources support and thus excluded themselves from the higher levels in the marking grids. Such responses were, though, very few.

Candidates are also expected to study additional ancient sources covering similar content to help illustrate the topics they are studying and provide opportunities for comparison (see specification p9). For example, the prescribed booklet gives examples of two stock characters from Roman Comedy – the miser and the parasite, so the study of other stock characters would develop this idea further. This is the approach that most Centres had taken. Similarly, with the Baucis and Philemon story, most candidates knew beyond the booklet that the old couple were transformed into trees – which they used in question 13 and gained credit. Alternatively, candidates might be encouraged to explore other myths about the gods, from Ovid. This might usefully form a homework assignment or part of independent research. Indeed, many candidates had done just this, with the story of Daphne and Apollo and Jupiter and Io being commonly cited in question 13.

It was clear that several Centres had utilised the source booklet from the previous specification (A405) to supplement material. Reference to this was of course given credit. Centres might find some use for this as a starting point for questions requiring discussion of “other sources”.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q1 The passage featured two stock characters (a term frequently mentioned by candidates): the cunning slave and the old man. There were detailed responses discussing details of the different masks, the beard of the old man and the red hair of the slave.

Q2 This question was assessed under AO3. In these types of question, candidates are given a suggestion (Romans found this scene funny) and will need to find elements from the source showing their understanding of cultural context.

It was evident that a good number of candidates had studied extracts from Plautus' plays (the most common named being *Casina*) and understood the role reversal of the cunning slave trying to outwit the master. The dramatic irony and comic aside were easily identified by candidates. The question differentiated well. All candidates could identify some comedic elements with better responses identifying three.

Q3 Most candidates were aware of what a Roman audience would have seen on stage. The important fact was that this was an exterior scene (street scene, outside of houses).

- Q4 Circus Maximus was known to most though not all candidates.
- Q5 Candidates had a great deal of knowledge about chariot racing but too many ignored the instruction to *Use Source B*. The source was a prescribed source and some discussion was expected. Candidates, by not taking heed of this instruction, excluded their response from the top level. Other sources were expected and the main ones offered by candidates were:
- Relief of Circus Maximus
 - Epaphroditus
 - Coin of Caracalla showing the Circus Maximus
 - Pliny the Elder NH 7.53
 - Poem by Sidonius Apollinaris

Ovid “At the races” was used as the counter argument. A counter argument is required in questions starting with “How far” and “To what extent”.

- Q6 This question type is marked using a grid. Six points are not required so candidates should be discouraged from answering in bullet points. The marks are credited for AO3 and so focus should be on the range of points made, argument and evaluation. Bullet points tend to limit evaluative discussion.

This was a familiar question from the legacy specification. Many fine responses gained full marks. Candidates should not be discussing the use of punctuation (commas, full stops) though the use of ellipsis was given credit when linked to the creation of suspense/tension.

- Q7 Many candidates knew of the entertainment provided by Trimalchio in detail beyond the prescribed source booklet and had studied other sections. Credit was given for reference to food (not just “food”) provided that the entertainment by it was made clear – exploding saffron cakes being the most common example.

Candidates were asked to make two points. Where candidates make more than two points only the first two offered are considered. Examiners are not permitted to choose the best answers from a selection offered.

- Q8 Again, the question needed careful reading. Candidates were asked to name officials at a sacrifice. Unfortunately, the animal/cow/pig/sheep, though of course important, was not given credit.

- Q9 There was a big range of relevant reasons given and most gained credit.

- Q10 Source E was an image of a tombstone. The ability to translate the inscription on it was not required or expected. However, as almost all candidates could point out, much information could be derived about the person’s life from it. Many suggested that as a freedman Publius Sextilius Fortunatus was proud of his achievements and “had a lot written on his grave”. Some used the image of him and suggested that he wanted to be seen as educated. Some candidates looked at the material from which the sculpture was made (marble) and commented on the impression such “elaborate graves” would give. All these responses gained credit. A few candidates identified and discussed the phrase *Dis Manibus* and *libertus*. These points again gained credit but were not an expectation.

Again though, some candidates ignored the instruction to *Use Source E* and also offered no other sources. Such responses cannot expect to score marks in the higher levels.

Other sources used were:

- Ovid *Fasti* Parentalia
- Images of tombs from Pompeii (most commonly named: Naevoleia Tyche)
- *Aeneid* 6 – the unburied
- Other inscriptions – particularly *Mus* and *Amabilis*

Candidates need to remember the question, such as here, “important” and consider the link to the sources.

Q11 Almost all candidates were able to find two points.

Q12 Although most candidates responded well to this question again too many ignored the instruction to *Use Source F*. One mark was allocated to reference to Source F. The most common example from elsewhere was when Persephone/Proserpina spent in the Underworld explained winter/seasons. Neptune being the reason for earthquakes was the next most popular.

Q13 Examiners felt that candidates might reasonably be expected to discuss:

- Source F
- Gilt bronze head of Minerva
- Ovid *Metamorphoses* 8: The Gods visit Baucis and Philemon
- Ovid at the Races

Or equivalent.

It was found that most candidates had plenty to say on the gods/goddesses looking and behaving like humans. Examiners were looking for both looks and behaviour (which covered powers and emotions). The term *anthropomorphism* was certainly not expected but was used effectively on several occasions. A huge range of sources was used together with many well-argued points such as:

- Source F– Gods have far more power than humans
- Bronze head of Minerva – with detailed discussion of features and even hairstyle
- Images of Jupiter – bearded/ older gods are more senior / taking on the role of the *paterfamilias* / king of the gods / represents the emperor of Rome
- Statues of Diana – a woman doing manly activities / unusual in a Roman woman
- Baucis and Philemon visited by Jupiter and Mercury / changing form / taking on human form / in disguise
- Lullingstone Villa: Europa Mosaic – gods “morph” into animals
- Ovid at the races – parade of gods / gods representing areas of human life
- Literary references from Virgil Book 1,2,4,6, Tacitus, Livy
- Temple of Jupiter, Pompeii/ home for a god / larger than life cult statue
- Deification of Emperors / temples to what had been humans
- Venus and Mars and their children (Aeneas; Romulus and Remus)

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

© OCR 2018

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)

The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

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:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2018

