

Principal Examiner Feedback Summer 2008

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 GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2008

Publications Code UA 020223

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2008

Contents

Paper	Title	Page
	Introduction	2
4A	Monarchs, Settlements and Challenges to Authority in Britain, 1558-1685	3
4B	The Triumph of Conservative Policies? Britain, 1832-1906	4
4C	Keeping The Peace & Fighting a War: Britain 1919-45	5
4D	Authority, Dissent & Revolt in Sixteenth Century Europe	6
4E	States Secured, Established & Challenged: France & Germany, 1815-90	7
4F	Dictatorships in Action: Italy & Germany in the Inter-War Period	8
4G	A Great Power Challenged at Home & Abroad: the USA in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century	9
4H	Individual Assignment	10
	Re-sit Papers for withdrawn options	12
	Statistics	13

Introduction

There were 11,431 candidates compared to 11,964 last year but 8,597 had entered in January 2008 compared to just over 7,000 in January 2007. The numbers entering for the seven papers varied as usual and 4F, an amalgam of old 12B (Mussolini) and 14B (German Foreign Policy 1933-39) attracted overwhelmingly the most takers, with 4,401 candidates. Paper 4D, (Calvin and the Revolt of the Netherlands) attracted the least with 179 candidates. As usual, the most popular were all addressing the twentieth century. There were only two letters of complaint, relating to option G 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 performance reflected the accessibility of the questions and the varying ability of the candidates. 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 varied from 48 for 4G and 4D to 44 for 4A. 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 last year, 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 time constraints, were able to write considerably more than four sides and at least some filled the fourteen pages of the booklet provided.

Too many candidates are still resorting to unacceptable abbreviations, such as 'ToV' 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 students, yet again, that a substantial conclusion is expected. Several very good candidates gained high level 4 rather than level 5 as a result of mistiming 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.

4A: Elizabethan and Restoration England

1259 candidates entered for this paper and of these, 80% entered for option 1, the Reign of Elizabeth.

Question 1 was overwhelmingly the most popular and was better answered than question 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 often did not respect the chronological parameters, spending too much time describing the religious settlement and events prior to 1566. The best candidates were aware that the term 'Puritan' covers a wide spectrum of Protestant belief, and were able to evaluate and explain the degree of challenge posed to royal authority. There were two fundamental approaches taken to this question. The first was to explain the puritan challenge using the different categories i.e. conformists, Presbyterians and separatists. The second approach was to present the material from the perspective of where the challenge occurred i.e. from within the church, from within parliament, from within the court and from other sources. Each method was handled with varying degrees of depth and range. The common analytical weakness lay in defining what royal authority actual means. The best answers did try to tackle this central issue, appreciating the importance to Elizabeth of Episcopal hierarchy and the royal monopoly of religious initiatives in parliament. There were surprising amounts of chronological inaccuracy.

Many responses to question 2 confined themselves to material early in Elizabeth's reign. This material was generally well presented and the focus was strong. However, material later in the reign generally lacked depth, particularly discussions relating to Morton and Esme Stuart. Weaker responses spent too much time on long, unfocused accounts of Mary Queen of Scots. Some candidates allowed themselves to over-focus on France at the expense of Scotland. Clearly the best answers set France as one issue against others influencing Anglo-Scots relations in these years. Other factors to be considered were religion, personalities, the Spanish threat etc. The very best did appreciate the complex inter-play of all these factors

Both questions proved popular in the small entry option, **Restoration England** and there were many excellent answers to both.

Many responses to question three were well contextualised with effective discussion on the nature of the restoration. The Clarendon code was well discussed. However legislation other than religion was generally less developed. Many candidates focused more, sometimes exclusively, on the word 'bigoted' at the expense of 'vengeful'. Again there were surprising amounts of chronological inaccuracy.

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. Responses were well structured and generally had a strong range of material. They also contained more examples of debate than those in answer to the other questions. This may have been a reflection of the wording which clearly invited an evaluative debate. The general themes were finance, foreign affairs and religion. Despite the fact that Charles, himself was the stated factor Less attention was often paid to Charles and his extravagance than to other issues. Chronology, on the whole, was stronger in responses to this question.

4B: Conservatives in Britain, 1832 - 1906

638 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. The overall standard of the responses to both questions was lower than last year and this is reflected in the lower mean mark for the paper. Information relating to question 1 was generally sound but many failed to escape L3 not so much from lack of information but because they could not address effectively, the two key phrases, 'transform and 'conserve'. The lowest scorers were fixated by "transform" and pursued it to disadvantage in attempting to shoehorn knowledge that would not fit the verb. Thus the 1844 Factory Act was said to transform working conditions and the Bank Charter Act to transform the operation of the economy. They tended to be on safer ground when addressing and illustrating 'conserve', but then they did not fully answer the question if only lip-service was paid to 'transform'. A number were clearly surprised to find no question directly encompassing the 1830's and offered the Tamworth Manifesto and constructive opposition in support of "conserve" to limited effect. Party, with a partial neglect of the reference to the election of 1841. Question 2 Attracted in general the stronger 'Peel candidature', a judgement supported by their ability to offer surprisingly detailed information on Disraeli and Bentinck. They found structuring an answer - around stated and other factors - more straightforward than did colleagues on question 1 where transform v conserve did not lend themselves to such a natural division. Most answers to Question 2 blamed, in part or in the main, Peel himself and often this opened a debate conducted at quite a high, even philosophical, level on the relative merits of loyalty to party or country in the circumstances of the 1840's.

Those attempting option II, Politics in the Age of Lord Salisbury, tended to go for question 4. A number of candidates attempting question 3 struggled to deploy sufficient knowledge of the electoral consequences of Chamberlain's rebellion. The obvious areas to explore was the dramatic loss by the Liberals of Birmingham. This apart, candidates were well prepared with sound knowledge of why the Conservative Party enjoyed electoral success. Question 4 attracted only 39 candidates and it lent itself to the stated versus other factor formula. Most candidates demonstrated a range and development of knowledge. Balfour remained rather anonymous as the author of measures rather than as a rounded political character whose attributes affected electoral fortunes. The best responses did bring his personality into play as well as referring to the Conservatives' upsetting of working class sensibilities through such issues as Chinese 'Slavery' and their refusal to address the implications of Taff Vale, the alienation of non-conformists as a result of the Education Act of 1902 etc. Clearly it was legitimate to deny Balfour's primary responsibility and argue that he faced an impossible situation in dealing with a legacy of past mistakes and new challenges raised by Joseph Chamberlain's Tariff Reform Campaign.

4C: Britain 1919 - 45

There were 1965 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 811 candidates tackling World War II. Many students knew and understood the 3 areas they were invited to consider in question 1 and were normally able to develop the idea of confusion evidenced in seemingly contradictory policies. The better students were able to go beyond asserting that confusion therefore led to ineffectiveness and could explain the logic behind the particular policies and initiatives in 1935 and assess their effect in both the immediate and medium term. Some weaker candidates sought to cover all they knew about British foreign policy between the wars without really addressing this question, and there was some evidence of misunderstanding, or no understanding, of who was being targeted by the Hoare-Laval Pact. There are still too many candidates who assume that Neville Chamberlain was the guiding hand throughout the 1930s. He was clearly influential as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1935 but not primarily responsible for any of the three diplomatic moves in question here.

Question 2 was the more popular by almost two to one but it was not, 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 1939. Some candidates were able to identify a range of vital interests and judge the extent of these in determining Britain's declaration of war in 1939. Too many candidates were good at developing the conditions allowing for a declaration of war, such as improved military preparation, but frequently they could not bring in vital interests to create a real debate and a direct answer to this question. It was clearly necessary to have an understanding of what constituted 'vital interests.' The better answers did focus on the growing threat posed by Nazi Germany to British security, both in terms of the balance of power in Europe and the threat from renewed German air power. Some saw the threat in ideological and moral terms. The best really did debate how far Nazi Germany did threaten Britain's vital interests i.e. the security of the British Isles, commercial and economic interests and imperial world power.

In option II, Britain at War, both questions had plenty of takers but question 4 was slightly more popular. Most candidates answering question 3 could discuss reasons for the British army's failures in 1940, with Norway and France developed effectively. There were good comments on the level of preparation and failings of equipment and strategy in Norway, and the very real issue of holding back RAF strength in France was debated. 1941 was less well addressed although some candidates were able to examine initial success in North Africa and the difficulties of the Greek campaign. The phrase "impossible tasks" was addressed to some degree although frequently it was the impossibility of defeating Hitler's war machine that was the main focus. The political masters' decisions about Norway, Greece and to some extent France were less often developed. Weaker students often missed the focus on the army and chose to describe the Battle of Britain or the Battle of the Atlantic in detail.

A good range of measures was often covered by candidates in answers to question 4 seeking to explain the ways that the government attempted to maintain morale. Some of these were developed in significant depth. The more able candidates were capable of investigating success by looking at the contrasts to popular images of unity and questioning the effect of government propaganda by references to the black market, resentment within heavily bombed communities and the occurrence of strikes. A few candidates were able to evaluate the success of mobilising the country using mainly democratic means and contrasting this with Germany or Russia. Weaker candidates looked to describe all they knew about the events of the war with excessive detail about Dunkirk and the Battle of Britain.

4D: 16th Century Europe

There were 179 candidates for this paper option, a considerable reduction on June 2007. 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 too many ignored the extensive resistance, he encountered in the 1540s and early 1550s. The better candidates placed Calvin firmly in the context of the political and religious structure of Geneva and pointed out that what effective authority he exercised was delegated to him by the Great Council of the city. The best did appreciate change over time. Even the weaker candidates were aware of the difference between his first stay in Geneva and the period after his return in September 1541 but they tended not to appreciate the continuing struggle necessary to exercise his authority up until the late 1550s. Only three attempted the question on Calvinism in France and there was some analysis of the strength of French Calvinism before and after August 1572.

Most of the answers in option II, The Revolt of the Netherlands, were in response to question 3, i.e. the issue of Margaret of Parma's responsibility for the outbreak of revolt in 1566. Most showed a sound knowledge of the causes of the crisis of that year and were able to set the stated factor against other issues such as economic factors. There was a tendency to neglect the impact of Margaret and after a perfunctory consideration of her mistakes and possibly her virtues, to move on to consider Philip's responsibility. It was, of course, perfectly legitimate to conclude that she was not essentially responsible but had been placed into an impossible situation by her step-brother.

Most answers in response to question 4 were able to gain a solid level 3 or level 4 by addressing the issue of Parma's skills and a range of other factors explaining Spanish success- the importance of more regular financial support, the ending of the war in the Mediterranean, divisions amongst the nobility of the Netherlands, the deficiencies of John Casimir and Anjou and the alienation of many moderates by fanatical Calvinists. The best answers really did try to evaluate Parma both as a soldier and a diplomat, in this latter category shining by comparison with Alva.

4E: France and Germany, 1815 - 90

470 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 the events of the reign of Louis XVIII. The better candidates did try to shape their material to the central issue of the effectiveness of the three named ministers. Richelieu was the better known and the most impressively dealt with and Villele the least. There was a rather simple tendency to equate effectiveness with a more liberal political stance and the undoubted abilities of Villele, despite his association with the Ultras, tended to be over-looked. There were some very good answers in response to question 2 and the best did evaluate the impact of the appointment of Polignac and his responsibility for the events of July 1830. 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 as important amongst 'other factors'. The best really did focus on the phrase 'the crucial mistake', either to deny or confirm the judgment

Candidates who elected to write answers in response to option II, Bismarck and Imperial Germany, tended to favour question 3 by a margin of two to one over question 4. Question 3 rightly elicited in the better candidates, a tendency to analyze the constitution of the Second Reich as a starting point. Weaker candidates failed to do this and simply offered accounts of the Kulturkampf and Bismarck's persecution of the Socialists as examples of his relations with the political parties. Far too many candidates failed to address 'short-term political interests'. The best answers ranged over both decades and assessed Bismarck's relations with both groupings of Liberals and both Conservative groups and set long term against short term interests. Some of the more interesting responses debated how far the Kulturkampf met long term as opposed to the short term interests of both Bismarck and the new Reich. Clearly candidates found it a demanding question.

Candidates, answering 4 had to tread the well worn path of Bismarck's diplomacy but although most avoided a simple narrative, few really evaluated effectively the domestic advantages of an alliance with Austria. Some were able to connect the break with Russia to the issue of tariffs and most were able to make rather confused links between closer relations with Austria and the ending of the Kulturkampf. Very few seemed to understand the preferences of the conservative elite within Germany for Austria and that the alliance can be seen as part of the more general conservative re-orientation of the Second Reich in 1879. Most candidates were clearly happier explaining the Dual Alliance in terms of classic diplomacy and the after-math of the Congress of Berlin. It was of course perfectly legitimate to assert the primacy of external factors but this does not negate the requirement to at least consider the domestic context.

4F: Italy and Germany in the Inter-War period

This as might be expected had the largest entry by some margin. There were 4401 candidates with more for Mussolini's Italy than for option II. Question 1 was the most popular with over 1500 takers. Those acquainted with the term "totalitarian" and able to define, then apply it, forged ahead of more descriptive colleagues. A surprising number omitted the application of political terror as a feature of a totalitarian state, perhaps because of Mussolini's relative lack of ferocity in this respect. Almost all candidates, however, noted the limitations on any claim of Mussolini to have established a 'totalitarian state' imposed by the presence of a King and a Pope, though fewer cited the armed forces and the social and business elites as alternative sources of power. Many did, however, offer useful if brief comparisons with Hitler and Stalin. The better answers to question 2 respected the chronological framework and struck a balance between foreign and domestic failings, the best establishing connections between the two. Thus the material cost of participation in the Spanish Civil War aggravated an already darkening economic prospect induced by the lack of success of various Battles and of the Corporate State. Many allowed foreign policy embarrassments to run away with them and wrote at excessive length on the Abyssinian imbroglio and the Spanish morass. Cooperation with Hitler was mostly judged the road to ruin but some noted that in Hitler's eyes, and not in his alone, Mussolini deserved respect in these years as a senior statesman. His role at Munich might be used to counter the quotation in the question was so used by some candidates who challenged the question and developed an effective debate.

Candidates addressing German Foreign Policy 1933-39 were very unevenly divided between the two questions on offer with over 1500 attempting question 3 and a mere 86 attempting question 4. As always the sheer volume of potential material combined with the temptation to tell the tale were the undoing of the weaker candidature tackling question 3. The stronger imposed a pattern on events and often wrote succinctly. The best separately addressed 'good fortune' (not quite synonymous with favourable circumstances) and 'diplomatic skill', and even attempted some basic definition of the latter. Some ingeniously argued that good statesmen made their own good fortune, or else needed the skills, notably a keen sense of timing, to take maximum advantage when it came their way. A surprising number saw the Saar plebiscite and the bullying of Schuschnigg as evidence of skill and consigned the Rhineland escapade to fortune as Italy was invading Abyssinia at the same time. Question 3 was challenging but it was pleasing that most remained within the timeframe of 1933-38. There seemed to be a pleasing improvement in the quality of many conclusions. This was not, however, the case for many introductions which often lacked quality and focus on the demands of the question. Question 4 required a grasp of Nazi ideology and detailed knowledge of the Nazi-Soviet Pact 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 answers. There were some high quality responses amongst the few who attempted this question. Clearly it was possible to set the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact of 1939 against the Anti-Comintern Pact of 1937 and point up a total volte-face. Many argued that the Pact of 1939 was simply a cynical piece of pragmatism that did not deviate from the fundamental long term goals of Nazi ideology. A few were able to argue convincingly that whilst Ribbentrop took the deal with Soviet Russia seriously, his master saw it merely as a necessary and unpalatable diplomatic move but one that was essentially temporary.

4G: The USA 1950 - 2001

2519 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 much less popular, with only 345 takers. It attracted the only letters of complaint on the unit as a whole. Both plaintiffs felt that the question was too narrow. The Teacher's Guide for the specification does, however, specifically spell out the sacking of MacArthur and the issue of extension of the war to China as areas for study and possible topics for questions. Inevitably, weaker candidates tended to offer a narrative of the Korean War, with MacArthur's dismissal covered in passing. The better candidates did offer a debate on the issues at stake, showing an awareness of the dangers to Truman of sacking a popular general but also the dangers of not sacking a General who had clearly exceeded his authority in writing an open letter advocating a policy different to that of the Administration. Truman's central concept of a limited war was essential to retaining allied support and many candidates argued that MacArthur was so clearly in the wrong and threatening to precipitate a Third World War that Truman had little alternative, despite the temporary unpopularity. Question 2 was very popular with over 2000 responses and it produced some excellent answers. Common errors included ignoring the timeframe of the question (dwelling too much on the period before Nixon came to power). No preconceived opinions to this question were expected but a debate was, and most candidates were able to offer one. Most chose to illustrate skill through the opening of diplomatic links with China and improving communication with the USSR. Others argued that the mix of withdrawal of ground forces and the escalation of bombing was a skilfully conducted military strategy. Many concluded that the mix was not ultimately skill-full but probably the best that could be managed in the circumstances. The extensions of the war to Laos and Cambodia were generally condemned as mistakes and few differentiated between the incursion into Cambodia in 1970 and the 1971 Laos incursion which was far less effective in inflicting damage on Communist supply lines.

There were very few answers to questions 3 and 4. Only 11 candidates attempted question 3. Very few were able to form a judgement on 'the standing of Black Americans' in 2001 although there was some knowledge of high profile Black American stars. 39 candidates attempted to answer question 4 and although some produced well-informed answers on the Clinton Presidency, it is clear that there is a dearth of suitable texts available to students.

6524H: Individual Assignment

Overall the standard of performance this year showed further improvement with many candidates continuing to rise to the challenge of engaging with historical debates. The studies produced demonstrated a wide range of ability and application. Those at the top were little short of excellent, benefiting from well chosen topics that lent themselves to a genuine question of historical controversy and debate and that were supported by clear sighted research and cogent planning. The three hour examination had a positive impact on the quality of the work with many candidates being more succinct in their analysis.

The best candidates, who produced sustained evaluative work, showed evidence of wide reading, careful preparation, and an ability to analyse complex historical issues. Often these candidates included footnotes, and made an attempt to evaluate different historical interpretations.

Key points for good performance:

Question style:

The quality of the questions tackled by candidates varied greatly. Indeed the varying quality of questions is a cause for some concern. Centres are reminded that to place 'To what extent . . .' in front of a meaningless statement, does not make for a good question. Some questions asked candidates to speculate whilst others were far too narrow in their focus.

Examples of good questions include:

How far did the Vichy government actively facilitate the Nazi occupation of France, 1940-44?

To what extent were the origins of the Henrician Reformation political rather than religious?

To what extent was the rise of fascism in Italy between 1915-25 a result of the failures of liberal governments?

To what extent was the introduction of the Poll tax the most important reason for the peasant's revolt of 1381?

All of these questions have a clear focus and timescale, there is ample historical debate and controversy surrounding these topics, and in most cases access to appropriate academic reading.

Some candidates did not appear to be well advised either about their choice of question, some were far too broad or about inappropriate historical issues. 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.

As in last year the most significant point to be made 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 for teachers to give candidates advice on the wording of their questions. All Centres are strongly advised to heed the advice regarding questions given in the *Edexcel History Teachers' Guide* which is available in hard copy and on the *Edexcel* website.

Resources:

The quality of the finished Study is also dependent on the use of appropriate academic reading. Too many candidates relied on websites which provided information which was at best speculative and at worse inaccurate. Further, many candidates tried to utilise GCSE,

and in some cases Key Stage 3 texts, which were unhelpful in deepening their understanding of complex historical issues.

Structure of response:

What the examiners are looking for in an Individual Assignment is a clear engagement with a historical debate or controversy. This should be clearly outlined in the opening paragraphs.

For example in answer to the question on the rise of fascism the candidate states;

The rise of fascism in Italy has allowed the birth of a debate that aims to essentially determine why fascism came to the fore and why Mussolini came to power. The question this study aims to address is the extent to which the failures of liberal governments were responsible for the rise of fascism and emergence of Mussolini, who led with one simple aim, 'to make Italy great, respected and feared.

Throughout the study the candidate engaged with this debate and maintained a sustained analytical focus exploring the relevant issues and drawing conclusions.

In addition a clear conclusion is also looked for, where there is an attempt to weigh the evidence and draw valid and accurate conclusions as in the study on Henrician reforms:

The causes of the Henrician Reformation were political rather than religious to a great extent. In examining the motives, necessity, extent and popularity of the Henrician Reforms, I have found them to have been unnecessary, limited, unpopular and motivated primarily by politics. Religion merely provided a means by which Henry VIII could achieve his political aspirations, specifically securing the succession, dissolving the monasteries, advancing the Royal Supremacy and conquering Anne Boleyn.

Finally, candidates answered questions on an impressive range of topics. Many chose subjects that were challenging and intellectually stimulating. It is recommended that if candidates chose to do more mainstream topics, the Vietnam War, Civil Rights etc, they are encouraged to select and read resources that are suitable for A Level study, explore historical debates and controversies that are sufficiently demanding.

In the words of many examiners on this Unit the Individual Assignment is an excellent test of the historical skills of candidates taking A Level History, and their efforts are to be commended.

6524 Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
4A	60	38.1	11.6
4B	60	38.5	11.3
4C	60	37.6	9.6
4D	60	45.4	7.3
4E	60	40.8	8.1
4F	60	39.9	8.0
4G	60	39.9	10.4
4H	60	40.6	10.1

Paper 4A

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	39	34	29	24
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		38.4	53.1	69.5	80.4	88.2

Paper 4B

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	40	34	28	22
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		35.9	52.7	63.7	79.4	92.2

Paper 4C

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	41	37	33	29
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		22.1	41.5	56.4	72.0	80.7

Paper 4D

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	43	38	33	28
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		48.0	74.3	86.0	93.9	96.6

Paper 4E

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	41	37	33	30
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		36.8	52.0	68.4	84.9	89.7

Paper 4F

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	42	38	35	32
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		25.9	41.8	64.7	78.7	86.3

Paper 4G

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	43	38	33	29
	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		26.5	46.0	64.9	77.9	83.9

Paper 4H

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	48	43	38	33	29
	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		27.2	43.8	63.3	79.7	87.5

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 020223 Summer 2008

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

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