

GCE

Edexcel GCE

History (6521)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark
Scheme Publication Code: UA017990

Summer 2006

Examiners' Report

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2006

Publications Code UA 017990

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

Contents

| Paper | Title | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| | Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1A | Securing the Tudor Dynasty: The Reign of Henry VII..... | 3 |
| 2A | The World Turned Upside Down: Monarchy and Republic in England 1642-53. | 4 |
| 3A | Poverty and the British State, c.1815-50..... | 5 |
| 4A | Votes for Women c.1880-1918..... | 6 |
| 5B | Russia in Revolution, 1905-17..... | 7 |
| 6B | The Seeds of Evil: the Rise of National Socialism in Germany to 1933..... | 8 |
| 7B | Boom and Bust: Economy and Society in the USA 1917-33..... | 9 |
| | Statistics..... | 10 |

Introduction

This was the sixth June Advanced Subsidiary examination of GCE History. This particular Unit attracted an entry of approximately 29,000 candidates. Within this figure there were wide variations in the number of candidates entering for different papers. Paper 6B, 'The Seeds of Evil: The Rise of Nationalism in Germany to 1933', had 9,579 entries and at the other end of the scale, Paper 3A, 'Poverty and the State: c1815-50', attracting 1,020 entries.

All papers differentiated effectively and this produced a full range of marks. Whilst comparability across all papers was achieved by the range of questions asked, some adjustment to the grade boundaries was made at awarding where questions proved to have created particular difficulties. The grade boundary marks published at the end of this Report should be read with this in mind. A high grade boundary does not indicate that the paper was difficult, nor does a low one suggest that it was easy to attain high levels - indeed; the opposite may be the case. With these mechanisms available for fine-tuning, comparability of standards and demands across the different papers can be assured.

The well-established use of key mark points within levels and the inclusion of indicative content for each part question on every paper led to greater examiner reliability and accuracy of marking.

Comments specific to each of the Papers will be made later in this Report. There are, however, some comments that relate to the Unit as a whole and to all 7 Papers.

- Five sub-questions were set on each paper and followed an identical pattern: (a), (c) and (d) assessed AO2, interpret, evaluate and use a range of sources, (b) assessed AO1, knowledge and understanding, whilst (e) was intended to enable candidates to demonstrate understanding of both assessment objectives AO1 (12 marks) and AO2 (12 marks) within an historical explanation.
- The sub-question (a) was intended to test candidate ability to comprehend and draw inferences from a given source, however, some candidates continue to insist on contextualising the source which is not necessary and which leads to a loss of focus in their answers. A significant number of candidates were simply trawling the source for any inference they could draw. The best answers can now draw out clear inferences and back these up by clear support from the source. Every (a) question asks for an inference about something specific, and candidates should pay attention to this when formulating their answer.
- Centres are reminded that the subject of the (b) question, which assesses AO1, may be taken from anywhere within the content described in the Specification and expanded in the Teacher's Guide. The subject whether an individual, event or issue does not have to be specifically mentioned if it is integral to the teaching of the Paper.
- Sub-question (c) is intended to assess candidates' skills in cross-referencing for a **purpose**. Examiners noted that these skills continue to improve, and many candidates are now going confidently beyond simple matching/mismatching of the surface features of the sources. An increased minority of candidates now go so far as to consider the purpose for which the sources are being cross-referenced, as a result of which we are seeing more

candidates reaching Level 3. On the other hand a minority of candidates continue to write out each source separately, commenting and drawing inferences and then writing a concluding paragraph about the extent to which challenge or support could be determined. Such answers, lacking detailed referencing to specific phrases in the sources, could not score highly because they were in effect, little more than generalised assertions.

- Sub-question (d) is intended to assess candidates' skills in determining the use of two sources for a specific historical task. Far too many candidates adopted a very simplistic approach to utility by focusing solely on the content of the sources and failed to consider their purpose, nature, provenance or origin in any detail at all. Responses of this nature cannot score more highly than Level 1. More candidates try to address the given task and do make some attempt to evaluate utility and there has been some improvement. However, only a minority access Level 3 on this question. This pattern is reflected across all the Papers for Unit 1.
- In responding to the (e) question candidates were expected to use the two specific sources and their own knowledge in addressing the stated factor within the question. Weaker candidates still ignore the question or their response is based on their own interpretation of what they believe the question to be. Alternatively they use the sources as a quarry for information on the topic with limited own knowledge to further develop points. These candidates are unlikely to move out of Level 2. Nevertheless this year examiners reported having marked excellent answers, with the sources used as the basis for a structured explanation, skilfully blended in with the candidates' own knowledge to create a sustained argument.

The quality of written English is a factor taken into account by examiners. Candidates continue to incorrectly spell terms and names with which they should be familiar. Further, the quality of written English does, of course, extend beyond spelling. In general, sentence construction was good, but for a significant number of candidates, paragraphing was an unknown skill, and their answers resembled a stream of consciousness rather than a planned, logical approach.

Centres are reminded that as of **January 2007** the format for Unit 1 will be different with candidates being asked to answer **two source based questions**; (a) 20 marks and (b) 40 marks. It is essential that centres continue to encourage candidates to read the given sources very carefully before attempting to answer the questions and to ensure candidates are aware of the need to use the sources as the basis of their argument.

1A: Securing the Tudor Dynasty: The Reign of Henry VII

- (a) Candidates were here required to consider what could be learned from a given source (an extract from Philippe de Commynes, *Memoirs*) about his attitude to Henry Tudor's claim to the throne. A tiny minority of candidates simply paraphrased the source without making an inference. Most candidates, however, were able to draw out inferences from the source and these centred on the fact that he had 'no right' to the throne or that God had chosen him to be the instrument of Richard's defeat and therefore he claimed the crown by divine right.
- (b) This question asked about the importance of Henry VII's use of the Exchequer and Chamber in raising revenue. Many candidates focused solely on 'raising revenue' with little focus on the importance of the Exchequer or Chamber. A small number of candidates attributed advantages to the wrong Institution or, confused the Chamber with the Star Chamber and Privy Chamber. The majority of candidates did attempt to produce responses that clearly stated the importance of the Exchequer and the Chamber and supported these with examples from their own knowledge that included Henry's personal involvement and his need to access funds quickly, that customs duties were left in the jurisdiction of the Exchequer and to increase revenue from crown lands.
- (c) Candidates on the whole found this cross-referencing question straight forward. The majority of candidates were able to show areas of agreement. These included Source 2, the desertion of Richard's soldiers and suspected treason, whereas Source 3 points out the treason of Northumberland etc. Areas of disagreement included Source 2, Richard would not leave the battlefield willingly, whereas in Source 3 it is hinted that Richard had no choice that he was 'piteously slain and murdered'.
- (d) Because there was so much useful content in both sources many candidates did not go beyond looking at the value of this. Nearly all answers referred to the enquiry set in the question rather than utility in general. Many wrote at great length drawing on the content of the sources, but failed to address nature, origin or purpose of the sources. When candidates did address provenance etc, comments tended to be generalised, eg Commynes must be biased because he was French. There were very few answers that achieved Level 3.
- (e) This question seemed to provide candidates of all abilities the opportunity to show what they knew about issues relating to Henry's security. One good feature of the question was that it forced even the weaker candidates to disagree with the stated factor, and therefore they were forced to argue. In terms of Source 4, few picked up on the fact that Surrey had his own agenda for his new found loyalty to the Tudors. Source 5 was used to form the framework of an explanation, with many candidates viewing good fortune as 'luck' (January 2006 question). Examiners reported that many candidates were able to access Level 3, by integrating the sources with their own knowledge and produced excellent, reasoned and well supported answers.

2A: The World Turned Upside Down: Monarchy and Republic in England 1642-53

- (a) This question required candidates to consider what could be learned from Source 1 about the attitudes of the Rump Parliament to the House of Lords. Most candidates found this to be a very accessible question and had few problems finding and supporting valid inferences. Some of the best responses recognised the hostility of the Rump to the Lords. Some also recognised that the Rump was selective about who should be excluded; those who had conducted themselves with honour etc to the Commonwealth should remain. A surprising minority misread the Source and claimed that the Rump's attitude to the Lords was positive.
- (b) A significant number of candidates knew little about the role and importance of Thomas Fairfax in the period 1647-49 and simply resorted to ignoring the dates and writing about Naseby, Self-Denying Ordinances etc. Whole centres struggled with this question despite Thomas Fairfax being named in the amplification of content in the Teacher's Guide. Very few appeared to know of his role in the retaking of Colchester in 1648, or the restoring of order within the army after the attempted mutiny at Burford in 1648 (*Civil War: The Wars of the Three Kingdoms 1638-1660*, by Trevor Royle, 2005). They completely ignored his refusal to sign the King's death warrant and hence his opposition to the establishment of the Republic. Many did suggest that after 1649 Fairfax did withdraw from political life but failed to explain why.
- (c) Many candidates found the two sources readily accessible with many addressing 'challenge'. The views expressed in the sources allowed students to clearly identify areas of agreement; 'the dissolution of the Rump Parliament was viewed with admiration', 'the issue that taxes were great'. Responses also addressed differences; Source 2 viewed taxes in a positive way, whereas Source 3 viewed them in a negative manner. Further, Source 3 goes onto argue that Parliament had broken faith with those who had advanced money to it during the civil wars. Candidates who were able to focus on the question and who explored similarities and differences were able to access high Level 2 or Level 3.
- (d) Many candidates found the sources readily accessible, with many engaging with the reasons for the dissolution of the Rump. However, too many candidates are using the content of the sources to address utility. An amazing amount of responses that viewed the Venetian ambassador as being 'unbiased', (Source 3) but with no explanation about why. When dealing with utility candidates must address the content, provenance, purpose and origins of the sources, in this way they can access the higher levels.
- (e) This question proved challenging and many candidates clearly used the sources as a quarry for information on the topic that they clearly did not themselves have. There were very few examples where students were able to deploy their own knowledge in a well structured manner. Good students made use of the factors given in the sources and their own knowledge and constructed a sound argument.

3A: Poverty and the British State, c.1815-50

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to reach Level 2 by making and supporting an inference from this accessible source. Most inferences centred around the harsh but fair rule and the presence of authority.
- (b) This was an accessible question for all candidates most of whom described the workhouse test but few focused on the purpose of the test - this kept many out of Level 3. In general the question was well answered, with many candidates drawing on a range of accurate knowledge in the construction of their responses.
- (c) The majority of candidates were able to compare the sources by looking at the content of the sources and using them as evidence. Possible areas where doubts could be seen included the belief that the bread had been poisoned and the belief that the Guardians had lied to them about their intentions. However, both sources agreed that once the intentions of the law were understood then the reforms continued in a peaceful way. Many candidates are now going beyond the surface details of the sources and beginning to consider how far.
- (d) This question was answered well by many candidates attempting to consider provenance and purpose, in particular *The Times* article, where candidates suggested that it had exaggerated the reactions because it was anti the Poor Law Amendment Act. Many commented on the localised nature of the reports. However, many candidates still fail to come to some conclusion on 'how useful' at the end of their responses.
- (e) The essay question was straightforward. The candidates were asked to assess the view 'that critics of the Poor Law Amendment Act were unable to prevent its implementation because they could not suggest an alternative way of giving relief to the poor'. Many found the word critics difficult to engage with and these tended to focus on criticisms of the Act and hence overlooked the link to implementation. Others tended to look at the old Poor Law and show how criticisms of this led to the new and asserted that this was the best way to give relief. Some even tried to work in the Andover scandal, often with little success. Most candidates used the sources as a quarry for information on the topic that they did not have themselves.

4A: Votes for Women c.1880-1918

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to extract inferences from the sources that focused on opportunities for women in 1916. Many focused on the new employment opportunities for women and only mentioned the slightly more subtle inference 'funny little ways' to demonstrate the limitations of opportunity through the continuation of old attitudes.
- (b) The question asked about the importance of the Speaker's Conference in promoting women's suffrage and this proved daunting for the majority of candidates. Whole centres struggled with this question despite the Speaker's Conference being named in the amplification of content in the Teacher's Guide. Many omitted this question altogether. Some candidates extrapolated relevant information from Source 4 about the Conference so were able to access Level 1, some were able to extrapolate to the Representation of People Act and remark on the limited franchise. A significant minority of candidates managed to discuss the true purpose of the conference to enfranchise men, its composition, outcomes and reaction of suffrage campaigners.
- (c) This question was generally answered well and most candidates were able to draw out similarities; Punch praises the activities of the women and the contribution of women to war work. However, only a small minority picked up the negative opinion of Punch to 'women's funny little ways' and the view implied in Source 1 that this change in attitude was only temporary, 'in the hour of need'.
- (d) Disappointingly, a large number of candidates are still using the content of the sources to address utility, instead of exploring their provenance, purpose and origins and the relevance of the sources to the set task. A worrying amount of candidates seem to think that just because a statement is from a Prime Minister it must be reliable. A minority of candidates misread Source 4 and stated that (i) women did not want the vote and (ii) the source was from Lloyd George. Overall, there was greater focus on the issue of utility and an increase in the number of responses awarded at high Level 2 into Level 3.
- (e) Candidates found the focus of this question difficult; 'even before 1914' was intended to permit candidates to assess the impact of women's suffrage up to 1914 and then to weigh the evidence from after 1914 to see if the war was the main factor that gave women the vote. However, despite some concerns, candidates did engage very well with the question because they were forced to offer an argument on whether the women's activities before 1914 was the critical factor, or women's war work in winning the vote. There were some excellent responses to this question with candidates making clear judgements based on the sources; Source 4 showed that there was still hostility to votes for women after 1914 as there was still a limited franchise, and Source 5 argued that women had already won the struggle before the war broke out. This together with an impressive range of own knowledge allowed more candidates to access Levels 3 and 4.

5B: Russia in Revolution, 1905-17

- (a) Most candidates were able to make clear inferences from the source about Ermolov's attitudes to the events of January 1905. The best responses showed how he sympathised with the workers, and criticised the government's lack of attention to the workers demands.
- (b) The question asked about the importance of Father Gapon before and during the 1905 Revolution. Whole centres struggled with this question despite Father Gapon being named in the amplification of content in the Teacher's Guide. Those candidates who did attempt this question tended to either focus on Gapon's role pre 1905 as a priest in St Petersburg, therefore he was trusted and relied on by the workers to articulate their demands. Or they had depth of knowledge about his role with the Assembly of Russian Factory Workers and his intervention on behalf of the dismissed Putilov workers in December 1904. Many then went on to discuss his role in the events of Bloody Sunday and its importance as a trigger for the rise in discontent and strikes post January. Many correctly stated that Gapon's role then fell into insignificance as he fled from Russia. Those responses that dealt with some of these factors were able to access Level 2.
- (c) Candidates were able to make detailed comparisons, focusing both on agreements and disagreements. A significant minority misread Source 2 by stating that Bloody Sunday marchers had political demands, when in fact the source refers to 'political agitators'. The majority of candidates were able to see the divisions between the workers and the peasants shown in Source 2 and 3, and how ultimately both sources highlighted the reasons for unrest amongst the workers and the peasants. Candidates who were able to focus on the question and who explored similarities and differences scored highly.
- (d) Because there was so much useful content in both sources many candidates did not go beyond looking at the value of this. Some, indeed, did this very well, especially when they looked at the value of the two sources treated in tandem. However, the question really requires candidates to go beyond an extensive examination of 'what do the sources tell us'. Most candidates appreciated the need to discuss the provenance and origins of Source 4 but failed to engage with its purpose. On the other hand candidates found it difficult to focus on the provenance of Source 3 other than to say it was an official/government document and therefore reliable. However, examiners reported having seen some excellent responses to this question.
- (e) This question was generally well done, but it was apparent that for many candidates knowledge of this early period was limited forcing them to use the sources as a quarry for information on the topic that they did not have themselves. Many examiners reported that answers were thinner on own knowledge than in previous years. Centres are reminded that the 1905 Revolution is the first bullet point for this paper in the specification and needs to be addressed in the teaching of this topic. Nevertheless, a large number of students were able to integrate their own knowledge with the sources and produced focused, analytical and well argued work.

6B: The Seeds of Evil: the Rise of National Socialism in Germany to 1933

- (a) The vast majority of candidates found this source very accessible and were able to identify inferences effectively and to support them by direct reference to the relevant phrases in the source. Most picked up on the view that Hitler's desire to become Chancellor was undermining the NSDAP's cohesiveness and that it was unlikely that Hitler could achieve his goal because he is being refused by everyone.
- (b) Candidates found it difficult to explain the reasons for the passing of the Enabling Act. Firstly, a great number of responses confused the Act with the Decree for the Protection of People and the State, issued in February 1933. Secondly, a large number of responses discussed at great length the Reichstag Fire and attempted to link this to the Enabling Act. Some responses stated the reasons for the Act were to provide Hitler with total power, but then provided little context as to why he needed total power. The best answers were those who put the Enabling Act firmly in context and focused on the reasons for its passing by the Reichstag in March 1933.
- (c) Candidates on the whole found this cross-referencing question accessible and there were some excellent responses. Sources were used to elicit differences, but many candidates found it difficult to identify similarities. Source 2 'in the foreseeable future there is no prospect of his attaining this goal', is reflected in Source 4, which states that 'von Papen finally won Hindenburg over to Hitler', hinting that there was a reluctance to appoint Hitler as Chancellor. Overall the examiners were very impressed with the quality of work on this question.
- (d) Many candidates fell well short of exploiting this question to its full potential. Many responses misunderstood the term 'elite', mistaking industrialists in Source 1 with industrial/factory workers, and unable to link von Ribbentrop with the elite in Source 3. Many examiners felt that this was a utility question which gave candidates a real opportunity to draw out provenance, purpose and origin/nature, but they were on the whole disappointed with the answers. However, the majority of candidates did recognise that they had to go beyond the content of the sources, but some did this by simply acknowledging that a diary entry was reliable because 'the author would not lie'.
- (e) This question discriminated well with candidates drawing on the sources and a range of own knowledge to address the question. Those candidates who appreciated the significance of Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in January 1933 tended to stay focused on the question. However, many responses focused on Hitler's rise to power and tended therefore to place more emphasis on why he came to power as opposed to taking advantage of 'chance events and conservative miscalculations'. Many candidates failed to understand 'conservative miscalculations' and tended to lump it together with 'chance events' to mean the same thing. Given that Source 5 could have been used as the basis of a structured argument, many examiners reported that source use on the whole was poor. There was also a great deal of generalised comments on Hitler's personality, propaganda etc. A substantial number of candidates went as far back as the period of hyperinflation, the Munich Putsch etc without linking this to the question. Those responses where candidates had planned their work, utilised their own knowledge of the relevant political and economic events and integrated the sources were very impressive.

7B: Boom and Bust: Economy and Society in the USA 1917-33

- (a) The majority of candidates found this source accessible and were able to draw out inferences with clear support focused on the state of law and order in the USA in the 1920's. However, a small minority of candidates misread the question and opted for Source 1 as opposed to Source 4. This further highlights the need for candidates to read all the questions carefully.
- (b) All candidates were able to engage well with this question and offered a good range of own knowledge about why Prohibition became law throughout the USA. Examiners reported that candidates were well informed on this topic with Level 2 within reach of most candidates.
- (c) Well prepared candidates were able to make detailed challenges about what Kramer says about the enforcement of prohibition. The best candidates picked up on the secrecy of drinking at the White House. Very few candidates were able to show the similarities in the Sources, 'Source 1, the belief that the law would be enforced and in Source 2 the recognition that politicians were aware of this because they drank in secret. Examiners also reported that a number of candidates confused Alice Roosevelt's father Theodore Roosevelt with Franklin D Roosevelt and attributed her remark to dislike of a political rival.
- (d) Disappointingly a large number of candidates were still addressing the content of the sources to address utility. Many made simple comments on the nature of Capone's business and how this impacted on the relationship between Prohibition and organised crime. Many examiners reported that a large number of candidates still seem to see utility as what it tells me, without considering purpose, nature/origin and provenance in a meaningful way. Those candidates who considered the sources as evidence pointed out that Source 3 was indicative of the way criminals like Capone viewed their activities as a public service, whereas Source 4 revealed the explosion of crime related to Prohibition and the failure of the law to make any impact.
- (e) The nature of the question invited an analytical approach, but even so, a significant minority of candidates persisted in describing the impact of Prohibition and its contribution to the loss of respect for the law in the USA. Too many responses scored modest marks due to unstructured writing, the lack of support for comments made on 'lost respect for the law' and the failure to extrapolate from the sources in a meaningful way. In fact many examiners reported that the opportunity to show understanding by effective extrapolation from the key sources was missed by many candidates. However, there was some good to excellent writing, well informed, focused and authoritative which achieved reward at the higher levels, but examiners commented they would like to have seen more.

Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

| Paper | Maximum Mark (Raw) | Mean Mark | Standard Deviation |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 1a | 60 | 39.7 | 9.4 |
| 2a | 60 | 34.4 | 8.6 |
| 3a | 60 | 33.5 | 10.0 |
| 4a | 60 | 34.2 | 8.5 |
| 5b | 60 | 34.5 | 8.8 |
| 6b | 60 | 32.6 | 8.8 |
| 7b | 60 | 37.9 | 8.0 |

Paper 1a

| Grade | Max. Mark | A | B | C | D | E |
|-------------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw boundary mark | 60 | 46 | 41 | 37 | 33 | 29 |
| | 120 | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 |
| % Candidates | | 27.5 | 46.9 | 63.1 | 76.3 | 87.1 |

Paper 2a

| Grade | Max. Mark | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----------------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw boundary mark | 60 | 40 | 36 | 32 | 29 | 26 |
| Uniform boundary mark | 120 | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 |
| % Candidates | | 27.5 | 43.9 | 62.6 | 74.4 | 85.0 |

Paper 3a

| Grade | Max. Mark | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----------------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw boundary mark | 60 | 43 | 38 | 34 | 30 | 26 |
| Uniform boundary mark | 120 | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 |
| % Candidates | | 19.0 | 34.4 | 48.9 | 64.1 | 77.6 |

Paper 4a

| Grade | Max. Mark | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----------------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw boundary mark | 60 | 42 | 38 | 34 | 30 | 27 |
| Uniform boundary mark | 120 | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 |
| % Candidates | | 19.6 | 32.4 | 52.0 | 71.3 | 82.3 |

Paper 5b

| Grade | Max. Mark | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----------------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw boundary mark | 60 | 42 | 38 | 34 | 30 | 27 |
| Uniform boundary mark | 120 | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 |
| % Candidates | | 21.6 | 37.9 | 55.4 | 72.1 | 81.7 |

Paper 6b

| Grade | Max. Mark | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----------------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Raw boundary mark | 60 | 41 | 37 | 33 | 29 | 25 |
| Uniform boundary mark | 120 | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 |
| % Candidates | | 18.6 | 33.2 | 50.6 | 67.7 | 82.0 |

Paper 7b

| Grade | Max. Mark | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----------------------|-----------|------|-----|------|------|------|
| Raw boundary mark | 60 | 45 | 41 | 37 | 34 | 31 |
| Uniform boundary mark | 120 | 96 | 84 | 72 | 60 | 48 |
| % Candidates | | 19.6 | 3.9 | 59.1 | 72.6 | 82.7 |

Advanced Subsidiary award

Provisional statistics for the award

| | | | | | |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | A | B | C | D | E |
| Cumulative % | 18.4 | 39.0 | 61.3 | 79.7 | 91.7 |

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced UMS grade boundaries

| | Max. Mark | A | B | C | D | E |
|---------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Advanced Subsidiary | 300 | 240 | 210 | 180 | 150 | 120 |
| Advanced | 600 | 480 | 420 | 360 | 300 | 240 |

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA 017990 Summer 2006

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no. 4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

edexcel 
advancing learning, changing lives

A PEARSON COMPANY

