

Examiners' Report Summer 2007

GCE

GCE History (6524)

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 2007

Publications Code UA 019223

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2007

Contents

Paper	Title	Page
	Introduction	4
4A	Monarchs, Settlements and Challenges to Authority in Britain, 1558-1685	5
4B	The Triumph of Conservative Policies? Britain, 1832-1906	6
4C	Keeping The Peace & Fighting a War: Britain 1919-45	7
4D	Authority, Dissent & Revolt in Sixteenth Century Europe	8
4E	States Secured, Established & Challenged: France & Germany, 1815-90	9
4F	Dictatorships in Action: Italy & Germany in the Inter-War Period	10
4G	A Great Power Challenged at Home & Abroad: the USA in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century	11
4H	Individual Assignment	12
	Re-sit Papers for withdrawn options	14
	Statistics	15

Introduction

There were 11964 candidates entered for examined units compared to just over 7000 who entered in January. 187 entered for the special re-sit papers provided for the withdrawn options. The numbers entering for the seven papers varied as usual and the new 4F, an amalgam of old 12B (Mussolini) and 14B (German Foreign Policy 1933-39) attracted overwhelmingly the most takers, with 4669. Paper 4D, (Calvin and the Revolt of the Netherlands) attracted the least with 248 candidates. As usual, the most popular were all addressing the twentieth century. There was only one letter of complaint and it is to be hoped that this reflects a general feeling that the paper overall was fair, accessible but capable of differentiating between candidates of very varying abilities.

Between the papers, the mean mark varied between 38.2 (4E&F) and 43.4 (4D), primarily reflecting the accessibility of the questions and the varying ability of the candidates. There was a wider range over the re-sit papers as might be expected from very small entries. In all of the papers it has been possible to raise the mark for the A/B boundary over the years, closer to the ideal of 48. This year it ranged from 42 for 4E to 48 for 4D, all the others being 45-47, a pleasingly small variation. It must be stressed, as last year, that this does not mean that this year it was harder to gain an A, only that examiners were more willing to use the full mark range.

As in January, most candidates do not appear to have had difficulty in coping with the reduced time allowed, one hour instead of one hour and fifteen minutes. It has always been recommended that they should use some of the time writing a brief plan, although this is not of course marked. It is notable that those candidates who decided to jettison a plan, possibly in response to less time, frequently lost direction in their essays. As a rough guide, perhaps ten minutes should be spent on planning and fifty on writing the essay. Many candidates, even under the new time constraints, were able to write considerably more than four sides and at least one candidate filled the fourteen pages of the booklet provided. The comments made in the January report relating to the quality of written communication remain relevant and unfortunately appropriate to this latest unit 4 examination and are therefore repeated below.

Too many candidates are still resorting to unacceptable abbreviations, such as 'T oV' for Treaty of Versailles. It is to be hoped that candidates do understand that the final mark does take account of their quality of written communication. This does not mean the deduction of marks for every spelling mistake. The use of appropriate paragraphing is a crucial part of the structure of the argument advanced. As stated in the last two years, paragraphs should be substantial and the decision to start a new one not arbitrary but a reflection of a candidate's ratiocination. A typical essay of 3-4 sides should contain some 7 or 8 paragraphs. Finally it is worth reminding centres, yet again, that a substantial conclusion is expected. Several very good candidates gained high level 4 rather than level 5 as a result of mis-timing their efforts and offering only a perfunctory conclusion and some so mistimed their efforts that no conclusion at all was offered. This is a serious omission and attracted an inevitable penalty.

Paper 4A: Monarchs, Settlements & Challenges to Authority in Britain 1558-1685

1247 candidates entered for this paper and of these, 75% entered for option 1, the Reign of Elizabeth.

In Option I there was a fairly even split between questions 1 and 2. Most knew some details of the religious settlement and could relate it to some aspects of Puritanism, but as usual weaker candidates struggled with the doctrinal issues and some were not even aware of basic terminology mixing up parish clergy and bishops, a confusion revealed in the sentence - '*37 bishops were forced to resign for refusing to accept Parker's Advertisements*'. The best candidates were aware that the term 'Puritan' covers a wide spectrum of Protestant belief, and were able to evaluate and explain the Queen's success in dealing with the 'hotter sorts of Protestants', Presbyterians and Separatists, and to weigh the Queen's responsibility against that of her agents such as Whitgift. The question on deteriorating relations with Spain, was answered rather better and a relatively few candidates fell into the trap of a simple narrative of the changing relationship of Philip and Elizabeth, with the odd reference to religion as a source of discord. The best candidates were able to appreciate the interplay of power politics and religious belief and the impact of enhanced Spanish power in the 1580s-Portugal, peace with the Ottomans, reconciliation and alliance with the Guise in France and Parma's steady advance in the Netherlands.

In Option II both questions proved popular and there were many excellent answers to both. The chief weakness in the responses to question 3 was a tendency to focus simply on the events of 1660 rather than ranging over the broader context but the role of Monck appeared to be well known and the better candidates were able to set his actions against other factors, notably the fracturing of the Protectorate regime after Cromwell's death and the fundamental political and financial weakness of both the Army and the Republican Rump. The behaviour of both Charles and Clarendon was also evaluated. It is perhaps worth drawing the attention of centres to the excellent short study of Monck by Mark Urban, in his collection of essays on British Generals. Weaker candidates, of course, did little more than describe the events of 1660. Those dealing with Question 4 were usually able to access at least level 3 and many reached level 4. There was an impressive display of relevant knowledge with the better candidates setting Charles' personal weaknesses-extravagance, French/Catholic sympathies etc against the hard financial problems arising from the Restoration Settlement. The key to accessing the higher levels was address to the key phrase, '*so sharply*'.

Paper 4B: The Triumph of Conservative Policies? Britain, 1832-1906

505 candidates attempted this paper overall with option 1, the Age of Peel, very much the more popular. Here the first question attracted far more takers than the one on the fall of Peel but the overall standard of the responses to both questions was high and this is reflected in the high mean mark for the paper. Information relating to question 1 was generally very sound. There was adequate knowledge Whig weakness both in terms of party- political fissures and of budgetary management and, even more impressively, a grasp of the thrust of the financial criticisms launched by Peel. The best answers, of course, set the stated factor against other factors such as the electoral management of Bonham. The most notable weakness was a tendency to rely on the pre-prepared answer on the revival of the Tory Party, with a partial neglect of the reference to the election of 1841. Those answering the second question demonstrated that Party tensions appeared to be well known and not just confined to 1846 and the Corn Law split. There were references commonly made to controversy over sugar duties, factory reform and the Maynooth Grant. The best candidates were able to discuss Peel's concept of the role of party and how this conflicted with the views enunciated by Disraeli in his philippics against his leader.

Those attempting option II, Politics in the Age of Lord Salisbury, tended to go for question 3. A number of candidates attempting this question struggled to deploy sufficient knowledge of 'the electoral performance in urban areas,' a key phrase within the stated factor. Much should have been made of the Conservative hold on the North-West, dating back to 1868/74, the growing Conservative hold on London and the dramatic loss by the Liberals of Birmingham, clearly a consequence of Chamberlain's rebellion. This apart, candidates were well prepared with sound knowledge of why the Conservative Party enjoyed electoral success. Question 8 attracted only 31 takers and the few who attempted it tended to confine themselves to predictable accounts of the rise of the Labour Party. The best referred to the Conservative's upsetting of working class sensibilities through such issues as Chinese 'Slavery' and their refusal to address the implications of Taff Vale, and the importance of the Lib- Lab Pact in allowing the nascent party to develop and expand.

Paper 4C: Keeping the Peace & Fighting a War: Britain 1919-45

There were 2135 candidates for this paper and the greater number, as expected, were engaged in responding to option 1, British Foreign Policy between the Wars as opposed to the 805 candidates tackling World War II. Question 1 was competently addressed with most reaching level three by clearly addressing the reasons for the policy of appeasement in these years. Few attained the higher levels. The 'opposition' part of the question tended to be neglected and where there was any coverage it tended to be confined to Churchill and Eden. Very few dealt with the subtleties and contradictions shown by the Labour Party. Those who addressed 'realistic alternatives' were able to access higher levels but very few seemed to be aware of Barthou and the British response to his initiatives. In general candidates did not do really badly but few displayed flair. Question 2 was the more popular by almost two to one and it was on the whole very well done. A minority fell into the trap of writing an extended narrative of events from 1933 to 1939 but most did focus on 1938-39, although in some cases, changes in public opinion was asserted rather than demonstrated. Reference was typically made to Kristallnacht in November 38 and the invasion of Bohemia in March 1939 as decisive events in transforming public opinion. Most candidates were able to cite the evidence of opinion polls and/or make reference to the press. Other factors were well covered, notably accelerating British rearmament and growing support from the Dominions. The best were able to explain that government and public opinion were not separate but both changed and evolved together, perhaps both most heavily influenced by an awareness of the growing threat posed by Nazi Germany.

The minority who went for option II, Britain at War, were similarly divided. Question 3 was the more popular but not the better done. Candidates were able to illustrate the proposition for debate by reference to the land campaigns in Norway, France and North Africa, usually using them to support it. The Battle of Britain was commonly used to refute it and thereby provide debate. Too few appreciated the military success against Italy in 1940 and the Navy's success in Norway in inflicting considerable damage on the German fleet and its heroism and professionalism in lifting the British Field Force from the beaches of Dunkirk. The answers to question 4 were often impressive with candidates able to debate the proposition, balancing a large number of issues to reach a judgement. The weaker answers tended to be very generalized and focus on the moral issues of the campaign which was not essentially the question. The best responses called upon a wealth of detail and balanced the inadequacies and cost of area bombing against the undoubted indirect gains that resulted, notably the massive diversion of German resources and the destruction of German air-power.

Paper 4D: Authority, Dissent & Revolt in Sixteenth Century Europe

There were 248 candidates for this paper option and the greater number addressed option II. Of those answering questions 1 and 2, Calvin and Calvinism, the first question proved overwhelmingly the more popular. Most displayed a sound knowledge of Calvin's life and work in Geneva but the importance of 'his writing and the power of his preaching' was often asserted rather than evaluated in terms of its contribution to his success. Too many ignored the very important flood of French refugees to Geneva, which had a great impact. The better candidates placed Calvin and his various attributes firmly in the context of the political and religious structure of Geneva. Only two attempted the question on Calvinism in France but both displayed considerable detailed knowledge, although not enough was made of a comparative analysis of the strength of French Calvinism before and after August 1572.

More of the answers in option II, The Revolt of the Netherlands, were in response to question 3, ie William the Silent's responsibility for the outbreak of revolt in 1566 and 1572. Most showed a sound knowledge of the causes of both crises but there was a tendency to neglect the immediate causes of the outbreak of 1572 for a much broader survey of factors going back to 1559. Whilst this was legitimate up to a point, it was not acceptable to miss out all reference to the Sea Beggars, Orange's invasion and Alva's initial treatment of challenge and revolt in the Spring and summer of 1572. On the whole most were able to identify ways in which William contributed indirectly to the revolt of 1566 and very explicitly to that of 1572. The best answers appreciated his role in the propaganda war and his importance as a figure-head of resistance. They were able to contextualize his individual contribution, appreciating his limited capabilities as a military leader of insurrection. The vital importance of the resentment that Alva's rule had stirred up was rightly pointed up by a comparison of the failure of the 1568 invasion in contrast to the events of 1572.

Most answers in response to question 4 were able to gain a solid level 3 or level 4 by addressing the issue of foreign aid and a range of other factors explaining Dutch success- the importance of the commercial wealth of the rebel provinces, Philip II's financial problems, the contribution of Maurice etc. The best answers really did try to evaluate foreign aid by pointing up the deficiencies of John Casimir, Anjou and Leicester but appreciating the skills of de Vere and the indirect consequences of foreign involvement, producing the diversion of Spanish efforts to England and France. Very few appreciated the financial assistance of both Elizabeth and Henri IV.

Paper 4E: States Secured, Established & Challenged: France & Germany, 1815-90

472 were entered for this paper. A slight majority of these addressed option I, the Restored Bourbons. Of these, many more candidates chose question 2 and those attempting question 1, tended to do less well. Many candidates approached the first question within a narrative structure in which they offered a simple survey of events. As a result of timing problems, events after 1824 were often hastily glossed over, producing very unbalanced responses. The better candidates did try to shape their material to the central issue of the popularity of and support for Bourbon rule. This was often more sharply focused in consideration of Louis XVIII but very few attempted to differentiate between popularity and support. The best really did draw attention to war weariness and exhaustion as the crucial underpinning of the regime. There were some very good answers in response to question 2 and the best did differentiate between the long term and short term causes of the July Revolution, evaluating the latter as required by the question. As expected there were many general causation essays which failed to address the stated factor and these were inevitably confined to the lower half of level 3. Economic factors were often suitably developed, though not always with sharp enough attention to the circumstances in 1830.

Candidates who elected to write answers in response to option II, Bismarck and Imperial Germany, were evenly divided between the two questions. Question 3 rightly elicited in the better candidates, a tendency to analyse the constitution of the Second Reich as a starting point. Weaker candidates failed to do this and simply offered resistance to the Kulturkampf and Bismarck's persecution of the Socialists as examples of opposition. Far too many candidates failed to address opposition at court. The best answers ranged over both decades and assessed the 'effectiveness' of opposition, as required by the question. Candidates, answering 4 had to tread the well worn path of Bismarck's diplomacy but although most avoided a simple narrative, few really addressed the phrase 'a capacity to deceive'. 'Skill' was addressed, usually with regard to the isolating of France and sometimes challenged by reference to the 'War in Sight Crisis'. One of the key weaknesses is lack of knowledge of developments in the 1880s. Very few seemed to understand the subtle use of Britain, in both attempting to use a common hostility to British colonial power as a bridge to better relations with France in 1885 and as a surrogate support for Austria via the Mediterranean Agreements, making possible Germany's own reconciliation with Russia in the Re-Insurance Treaty.

Paper 4F: Dictatorship in Action: Italy & Germany in the Inter-War Period

This as might be expected had the largest entry by some margin. There were 4669 candidates with more for Mussolini's Italy than for option II. Question 1, the most popular with nearly 1500 takers, proved problematic to those who failed to stick to the chronological parameters or chose to turn it into a survey of domestic issues. Too many wandered into the highways and byways of Mussolini's foreign policy in the 1920s. Of those who stuck to 1933-39, too many simply offered a narrative without focus on the wording of the question set. The best really did focus on image and reality but very few showed a real grasp of the economic and consequent military weakness of Italy. Question 2 required a focused knowledge and understanding. Knowledge of the three distinct parts of the Lateran accords-treaty, concordat and financial arrangements-was not as thorough or as detailed as would assist the opening stages of an answer in many cases but in others, detailed specific knowledge was evident and the topic had clearly been well-taught by these centres. High quality scripts showed a nuanced and perceptive understanding of the complexity of the nature of the accords and the significance of consequences for both Church and State.

Candidates addressing German Foreign Policy 1933-39 were evenly divided between the two questions on offer. Question 3 was challenging but it was pleasing that most remained within the timeframe of 1933-37 although some did drift to 1939. There were inevitably many who offered a chronological survey of these years with nods to the question by mentioning 'nationalist' and 'Nazi' from time to time, without really understanding the difference. The best answers offered an analytical assessment in terms of the key words, accepting that a Nazi foreign policy could travel part of the journey of aggrandizement with happy nationalist companions. The importance of 'nationalists' like von Neurath, Schacht and Blomberg in the execution of policy in these years was demonstrated in these better answers as were the hints of a more radical Nazi agenda. Question 4 also required a grasp of ideology but given the short period of study in this option and the central importance of Nazi ideology there is no excuse for candidates not having the requisite understanding and detail to support their answer. The better candidates were able to focus on both the similarities and important differences between National Socialism and Fascism, and evaluate its importance in terms of other factors such as shared clash with Anglo-French hegemony. Too many had only vague knowledge of the Axis Agreement of 1936, the Anti-Comintern Pact of 1937 and the 1939 Pact of Steel, (referred to by one candidate as the Balls of Steel). The best responses understood these in detail and made great play with cooperation in the Spanish Civil War.

Paper 4G: A Great Power Challenged at Home & Abroad: the USA in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century

3382 candidates attempted this paper, an increase once again on last year. This is despite the fact that there was only a tiny number of entries for the new option II. Question 1 proved to be the most popular. Inevitably weaker candidates tended to offer a narrative of US escalation 1954-65, whilst the better responses were able to discuss the extent that successive Presidents had clear choices over Vietnam and those factors which may have influenced a conscious decision to escalate. A surprising number skirted over Johnson's critical decisions or even failed to discuss Johnson at all. Question 2 was also very popular and required students to discuss the role of the stated factor, 'limited commitment of military resources', in the US' lack of success. Common errors included ignoring the timeframe of the question (dwelling exclusively on the period before Nixon came to power), failing to appreciate what was meant by limited commitment, merely describing the limited commitment rather than explaining its significance, or attempting to tackle the stated factor by describing how the USA actually increased military commitment 1968-73, without any attempt to argue positively for the stated factor. Many responses after a nod in the general direction of the question, focused on the anti-war movement, with some comment on the role of the media.

There were very few answers to questions 3 and 4. Those who attempted question 3 often offered a President by President outline narrative rather than an analytical overview of improvements in race relations. Very few were able to form a judgement on race relations in 2001. Those attempting to answer question 4 often produced well-informed and literate answers.

Candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the period 1980-88, particularly where economic policy was concerned. Unfortunately, the most interesting timeframe of the question tended to be ignored by most students. The clear influence of the New Right on the 1994 mid-terms, the battle with Clinton 1994-96, and the sudden collapse of several key groups within the New Right were barely dealt with by any of the candidates. Given that this material lends itself so well to this particular question, it is a pity that it was so neglected.

Paper 4H: Individual Assignment

The Individual Assignment examination produced a full range of responses from the candidates. At the top end of the mark range there were some penetrating, focused, interesting, well-written (and sometimes concise) Individual Assignments. At the other end of the spectrum were responses which consisted of little more than generalised description.

The better Individual Assignments were those that focused on a genuine historical debate. However, far too few candidates were prepared or able to consider and weigh the pros and cons of a debate before coming to a substantial conclusion. Centres are urged, when approving their candidates' proposed titles, to ensure that they do address an area of genuine historical debate. Too many candidates adopted a more formulaic approach, taking a factor per paragraph approach with limited analytical comment. Some candidates ended their assignments with little more than simple assertion. In summary; candidates should attempt to debate the relevant issues throughout the response coming to a weighed and full conclusion.

The new three hours examination (rather than the four hours allowed previously) had a positive impact on the quality of the work with many candidates being more succinct in their analysis.

Candidates answered questions on an impressive range of topics. Many candidates chose topics that were challenging and intellectually stimulating. Often the better quality assignments were written on relatively challenging topics which, by their nature and the wording of the question, demanded relatively complex responses. Many candidates answered on the Vietnam War or Civil Rights in the USA, often producing responses that were, at best, of middling quality. It is recommended that, if these more mainstream topics are chosen, candidates are encouraged to select and read resources that are suitable for A Level study and sufficiently demanding.

The quality of the questions tackled by candidates varied greatly. Indeed the varying quality of the questions is a cause for some concern. Whilst some Centres had clearly encouraged candidates to select topics that have provoked scholarly debate, others were less circumspect and seemed to allow candidates virtually free rein not only in their choice of topic but in the phraseology of their question. Centres are reminded that to place 'To what extent ...' in front of a meaningless statement does not make for a good question or assignment. Some questions asked candidates to speculate whilst others were far too narrow in their focus. Others strayed far too close to AO2 by demanding an assessment of evidence whilst some were asked to respond to questions that stated the obvious and did not in any way facilitate an argued analytical response. Too many candidates did not include a timescale as part of their question and, as a result, their responses were often unfocussed and vague.

The most significant point to be made in the light of this year's examination is this; far too many candidates were disadvantaged by answering badly worded and structured questions that hindered rather than promoted a successful response. It is acceptable practice for teachers to give candidates advice on the structure and wording of the question. It is the strong recommendation that all Centres look to give advice to candidates on the questions that they propose to answer. All Centres are strongly advised to heed of the advice regarding questions given in the *Edexcel GCE History Teachers' Guide* which is posted on the *Edexcel* website.

The quality of the resources used by the candidates varied. Whilst many had used a variety of resources ranging academic texts to articles, too many relied on internet based resources that provided the candidates with neither depth nor quality of analysis or information. In some cases, the internet sites used provided information which was at best speculative and at worse inaccurate. Some candidates chose to rely on GCSE and, in some cases, Key Stage 3 texts.

Candidates attempting a historiographical debate too frequently copied out vast chunks of opinion from various historians. Historiographical debate, done well, can result in a very effective assignment but done badly can become a tangle of unresolved contradictions. Some candidates placed too much emphasis on historiography to the point that their understanding of the issues at hand hardly showed.

Some candidates submitted detailed bibliographies, appendices and completed full and appropriate footnotes. However, many candidates failed to use footnotes effectively and there is still confusion as to what constitutes an appendix. Guidance as to what is expected in the appendix can be found in the *Edexcel GCE History Teachers' Guide*.

Centres are reminded that all of the new paperwork that should accompany the Individual Assignment can be found in the Specification which is posted on the website.

The Individual Assignment continues to produce some historical writing of a very high standard. It was clear that many candidates had worked very hard indeed to produce an assignment of real quality.

Re-sit Papers for Withdrawn Options

04B Enlightened Despotism

There were 86 candidates. The standard over all was impressive. The responses to question 1, the more popular question, were rarely poor and often very good. The best really did deal with opposition by means of an analysis of the responses to a broad range of policies, rather than simply describing the reforms. A smaller number addressed the subject Joseph's enlightenment and largely agreed with the statement in the question.

6A The Age of Lord Liverpool

24 candidates attempted this option with two very accessible questions on offer. The standard in consequence was high.

11A British Foreign Policy 1889-1914

5 candidates entered for this paper and there was a roughly even split between the two questions.

15B Europe at War

There were 77 entries. There was a roughly even split in question choice but the standard of response overall was poor. Detailed knowledge of the campaigns of 1939-41 was lacking in those attempting question 1 and many of those answering question 2, included much irrelevant material on the events of 1941-43 rather than 1944-45, as demanded by the question.

16B Russia 1945-64

14 candidates attempted this paper and the responses ranged from poor to competent with few of high standard.

6524 Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
4A	60	39.9	10.4
4B	60	43.0	8.1
4C	60	38.4	10.2
4D	60	43.4	8.6
4E	60	38.2	8.0
4F	60	38.2	9.3
4G	60	39.0	9.3

Paper 4A (1225 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	41	36	32	28
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		36.4	52.4	70.8	80.2	87.0

Paper 4B (478 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	42	38	34	30
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		45.7	61.1	81.6	88.5	93.8

Paper 4C (2061 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	42	37	33	29
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		24.5	41.6	60.1	73.9	81.7

Paper 4D (244 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	43	38	34	30
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		37.2	65.7	78.1	86.0	89.7

Paper 4E (466 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	39	36	33	30
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		31.8	45.9	62.1	78.6	88.3

Paper 4F (4418 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	41	37	33	29
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		26.4	40.9	58.7	77.2	86.7

Paper 4G (2291 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	42	38	34	30
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		22.8	42.7	60.8	75.3	83.6

Paper 4H (5089 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	42	37	32	27
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		28.2	43.0	59.6	74.2	86.0

Paper 6A (24 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	40	33	26	20
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		45.8	75.0	95.8	95.8	100

Paper 11A (5 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	41	36	31	26
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		.0	25.0	50.0	75.0	75.0

Paper 04B (86 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	36	32	28
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		54.8	67.9	76.2	88.1	96.4

Paper 15B (71 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	42	38	34	30
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		7.4	16.2	25.0	32.4	51.5

Paper 16B (1 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	37	33	30	27
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0

9264 A2 Cashin (20450 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Uniform boundary mark	600	480	420	360	300	240
% Candidates		23.9	50.5	74.2	91.1	98.2

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 019223 Summer 2007

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