

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report January 2011

### GCE History 2 6HI02 C

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results

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.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Subject Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on [HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk](mailto:HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk).

You can also telephone [subject advisory team number] to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

## ResultsPlus

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

January 2011

Publications Code US026450

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## Introduction

There were many good responses seen in this examination series, with many candidates achieving marks at Level 3 or above in all of the assessment objectives. Such candidates generally offered a considered analysis of the given source evidence, focused towards the demands of the questions, allied to strong contextual understanding and with effective deployment of well-selected own knowledge. Some of the issues raised in the summer report had been addressed. The purpose of these comments is to help to achieve further improvements in the levels of attainment.

1. There are three specific assessment objectives that are tested in this examination and it is important that candidates understand how these should be tackled in their responses to particular sections of the examination.

Question a requires the application of AO2a. This requires candidates to analyse, cross-reference and evaluate source material.

Question b requires the application of both AO1 (the selection and deployment of historical knowledge) and AO2b (the analysis and evaluation of how issues have been interpreted and represented, in relation to historical context).

An understanding of what each assessment objective tests would help candidates to focus their comments more securely. For example, candidates who spend considerable amounts of time exploring the provenance of sources in question b may very well be addressing AO2a which is not rewarded in this question.

2. Although there was a significant improvement in the understanding of the sources for question a, there remains a minority of candidates who would benefit from spending more time reading the sources to ensure that they understand both the content and the provenance fully. Many candidates have understood the requirement to cross reference, although they do not universally understand exactly how to do it. For some candidates it amounts to little more than merely asserting similarity or difference or matching up quotes from the sources.
3. In question b, many responses were characterised by a strong understanding of the sources and the issues that they related to. Examiners were impressed by the extent of own knowledge that a number of candidates brought to their arguments so that well argued responses were seen. It is important that candidates remember to integrate the sources and their knowledge and not to treat them discretely. There were however a number of scripts which demonstrated no knowledge beyond what was offered in the sources. Where this material was well used, it was possible to achieve top level 2 in AO1, but in many cases it was linked to limited understanding of the sources.
4. In both a and b questions, candidate should be encouraged not to approach their answers on a source by source basis. Where candidates take this approach in question a, they are unlikely to have engaged in substantial cross referencing throughout their answer. Where this approach is taken in part b, candidates may have addressed the key issues within the approach, but it is unlikely to be the most effective approach in enabling them to fully engage in an argumentative and analytical response, and thus is unlikely to achieve the top level.

## Question 1

## Question C1(a)

Virtually all candidates could appreciate the challenge that existed between sources 1 and 2 and the anchor, source 3, and they were able to provide some support through relevant selection. Fewer spotted the areas of reconciliation ('not the six hundred' - Source 2) and although the need to address the source attributions was recognised by most, only the very best developed their examination to weigh up the evidence and, hence, the extent of the challenge.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) Challenge impression in source 3

Plan

Challenge - 1+2 patriotic + brave/heroic  
1+2 positive action / results

1 Bad foe

Agree - ~~1~~2 formidable foe

2 many deaths

A first hand account.

Source 3 (From serjeant-major Timothy Gowing, who served in the Crimea) gives an impression of the charge of the Light Brigade in 1854 as a disaster for the British army, "field presented a ghastly sight" Here he indicates that the British assault failed and that the men were not giving a full attack due to the force of the Russians who they opposed. This indicates that the charge of the Light Brigade was a disaster for the British Army. This agrees with the statement which Gowing makes of one dead and wounded men. "Few escaped the bloodthirsty assaults of the Russians". From this we can

((a) continued) Under that the charge resulted in huge casualties on the British side thus the impression of the battle is a very negative one. It suggests that the British were powerless under the Russian attack and were unable to attack let alone escape sources ~~2~~ 1 and 2 do in some ways support this view of the attack, however they also challenge this view in aspects.

On one hand, the charge of the light brigade in sources 1 (A cartoon from the magazine Punch) and 2 (from Alfred Tennyson, the charge of the light brigade) portray the battle in a way that quite challenges the view in source 3. They both portray the battle as one of bravery and heroic endeavour in the face of battle, source 2 states, "Sabring the quinnas there" From this we can under that the troops acted heroically in the battle and through this bravery were able to reach the Russians and cause casualties on the enemy side. This is a very positive

((a) continued) description of the battle quite different to the one in source 3. In agreement with this source 1 portrays the British bravely facing the Russians and heroically charging into the smoke and guns. From this cartoon we can infer that the battle was one of brave soldiers and a strong British line it indicates a sort of success in the charge. The fact that the text reads 'A Trump Card (irony)' indicates that Punch viewed and wanted to portray the battle as a success on the British side despite some criticism of mismanagement which surrounded the battle. The magazine is one of a patriotic nature and therefore it is likely that they would want to portray the army in the best light possible.

Further challenging the view in source 3, sources 1 and 3 also indicate some positive results from the battle, source 1 states, "the line they broke". From this we can infer there was some positive action and

((a) continued) results in the battle as although there were casualties there was also some positive action involved. Source 1 agrees with this, portraying covering Russians on their line, contrasting the strong British line. This suggests that the Russians were in some ways subdued and beaten in the 'Charge'.

On the other hand, source ~~2~~ 2 agrees with source 3 ~~in~~ in that the Russians were a formidable foe, "Keel'd from the sabre stroke". From this it can be inferred that as it was said in source 1 the Russians were a worthy enemy who fought the British very strongly and effectively. This suggests a negative view of the battle. The fact that the source is from Alfred Tennyson who was the poet laureate indicates that the battle must have been disastrous in some aspects, as it would have been his patriotic duty to portray the battle in its best light yet he still mentions the formidable foe.

((a) continued) In agreement with this is the fact that source 2 states, "they rode back, but not the six hundred". From this we can infer again agreeing with source 3 that the British sustained many and horrific losses from the battle and in this way it is portrayed very negatively.

To conclude, although source 2 does seem to agree with source 3 in some aspects overall sources 2 and 3 are challenging the view of the charge, indicating there was bravery, results and positive action on the British side.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response was awarded a top level 3. Similarities between Sources 1 and 2 are highlighted and these are then contrasted with the evidence of source 3. There is a partial reconciliation between sources 2 and 3 on the number of casualties. There is then a developed attempt to weigh up the evidence of Source 2 through its attribution. Unfortunately, this is linked to a misreading of the content of the source and so does not merit a level 4.



**Question C1(b)(i)**

This was the slightly more popular of the part b) questions and many candidates displayed an impressive range of contextual knowledge. Those performing at higher levels were aware of the need to use the sources as a platform for their own knowledge and utilised the points raised in the sources 4 and 5 to explore the political objections to the war as well as the impact of the economic and human costs. The counter-view was presented in source 6 and many could advance this line of argument by exploring such areas as Mafeking Night, the Khaki election and volunteerism. The very best picked up on the reference to 'as the war dragged on' in source 4 and examined the shift in attitudes over the course of the war.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

\* (b) Some would argue that the ~~Boer~~ Second Boer War resulted in imperialism being 'discredited', as the high social and financial cost took its toll and the view supposedly became more widespread that the Empire was at the expense of the many for the benefit of the few. Others would disagree.

Source 4's assertion that 'the effect [of the war] was to turn a large section of ~~the~~ British public against imperialism' is somewhat backed-up by the statement of Source 5 that 'few benefited from the Empire,' as if few benefited it must mean that many suffered and were hence against Imperialism. It is plausible to assume that J.A. Hobson's book was a response to the Boer War as it was published ~~at~~ <sup>towards</sup> the end of the war. These two sources corroborate that the Boer War reduced support for Imperialism. However, Source 5 is only relevant to this point if indeed 'few benefited from the Empire'. If this was an unfounded statement by Hobson then it ~~is~~ does not corroborate with Source 4.

I know, from my own knowledge, that the Empire produced huge opportunities for trade but that even so, food ~~from~~ from the Empire was not necessarily cheaper than ~~the~~ food from elsewhere — for example when Joseph Chamberlain tried to impose tariffs on America.

(b) continued) raw materials in order to make Canadian equivalents relatively cheaper. This would appear to suggest that the ~~Empire~~ British Empire was not hugely beneficial for those in Britain. Therefore Hobson's argument has some substance and by ~~possibly~~ ~~the~~ cross-referring with Source 4 ~~it~~ seems to suggest that the Boer War did 'discredit' Imperialism.

However, it could be argued that the 'great patriotic feeling there was in Britain towards our imperial possessions and the very idea of Empire' ~~directly contradicts the~~ ~~earlier point~~ of Source 6 directly contradicts the earlier point. On the other hand, the provenance of the source limits the usefulness of this source. It comes from a speech by a senior officer of the Boer War at a memorial of the casualties of the war. Therefore French was unlikely to criticise the war or the Empire for which the ~~casualties~~ had died, particularly in an audience likely to be full of the family of those who had died for a far-off corner of the Empire. As a result, Source 6's authoritativeness is slightly diminished. Nevertheless, it represents a viewpoint that my own knowledge somewhat supports. If Imperialism was so discredited then why did millions of young men from across the Empire sign up for WWI? - a war as much about preservation of the Empire as 'gallant Belgium'. Although it could be countered that this was not how the

((b) continued) ~~recruitment was pre~~ war was presented in recruitment offices, ~~and~~ civilians must have been aware of the layered reasoning behind the going to war. This appears to contradict the statement that the Boer War 'discredited' Imperialism.

On the other hand, it could be argued that French's position as a <sup>senior</sup> military leader meant that he was both out-of-touch with public opinion and unlikely to hear about unpatriotic tendencies. This somewhat lessens the status of that source.

It is almost possible to suggest a degree of corroboration between all 3 sources and my own knowledge that ~~support~~ support for Imperialism dropped as a result of the second Boer war but remained high. Source 4 says that 'as the war dragged on...'; Source 5 talks of 'New Imperialism'; and my own knowledge contrasts the mass public rejoicing at the relief of Mafeking (an obviously Imperialistic action) with the public scandal of the concentration camps that Emily Hobhouse exposed, which came after ~~the~~ the relief of Mafeking. The chronological ordering of these events corroborates with the delayed deterioration in support for ~~the~~ the Imperialism but ~~is~~ support still remaining as exhibited by Sir John French in Source 6.

f.t.o.

(b) continued) Source 6 is also backed up by the political events of the time - shortly after the Boer War the 'khaki election' was held, in which the incumbent Conservatives did very well, gaining a large ~~big~~ majority. If the Boer War really discredited Imperialism in Britain then it would have been embodied by a political rejection of the architects of ~~the~~ the Imperialistic ~~war~~ Boer War. However, the resounding success of the Conservatives in the 'khaki' election suggests a degree of popular support for the war and hence Imperialism and a rejection of the pro-Boer Liberals such as David Lloyd-George. This suggests that the Second Boer War did not discredit Imperialism.

In conclusion, the sources as a set have some aspects of corroboration but on the whole disagree, ~~with~~ with Sources 4 & 5 agreeing that Imperialism was discredited and Source 6 disagreeing. Although there is evidence from my own knowledge for both sides, it is heavier ~~on the~~ and more statistical ~~data~~ on the side that ~~disagrees~~ that does not believe that the Second Boer War discredited Imperialism - such as the 'khaki' election result.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response exemplifies his latter point although a lack of precision in the contextual knowledge deployed, especially in the chronology of the war, pushed the marks down to the bottom of level 4.

**Question C1 (b) (ii)**

Virtually all candidates picked up on the debate embedded in the three sources and could reason from the evidence of the sources through cross-referencing and drawing inferences. However, fewer could extend this analysis through the application of precisely focused and detailed contextual knowledge. Marwick's claim that 'tribunals could hardly be expected to treat the claims of conscientious objectors with sympathy' in conjunction with the overall attitude displayed by the military representative in Source 9 enabled higher performing candidates to situate the treatment of conscientious objectors in the cultural context of wartime Britain. The very best drew a distinction between the frivolous objector in source 4 and the absolutist and UDC member in sources 8 and 9.

Plan

Disagree treated fairly by authorities

Agree - 7, 8, 9 - fair tribunals

knowledg etc

- Military Services Act

+ adv. fair

7 - even every fair

Disagree - 8, 9 - not fair for prisoners

but for own good

8 - not fair due to

diff understanding

- treated badly by

Police

- executed at front

9 - still had to work

There are various opposing and

agreeing views on whether

conscientious objectors were treated

fairly during the war by authorities

All sources 7, 8, 9 would agree with

((b) continued) the view that they were treated fairly. However sources 8 and 9 would also disagree with this in part.

On one hand all sources, 7, 8 and 9 agree with the view that conscientious objectors were fairly treated through the use of tribunals. Source 7 <sup>(From 'The Conscientious Objectors', published 2008)</sup> states, <sup>2</sup> they were careful, sympathetic and thorough. From this we can infer that the tribunals treated the objectors' views with respect and that they behaved very fairly when hearing their cases. It indicates that the authorities were interested in fair treatment for objectors. The fact that this source was written by a historian would indicate that the judgement is balanced and an overview of the situation - including from past evidence.

Source 8 <sup>(From 'The Conscientious Objectors', published 1983)</sup> agrees with the view in source 7 indicating that the tribunal authorities were very attentive to

((b) continued) objectors, "simplest attention to the letter" ~~of the~~ ~~Act~~ we can infer that the tribunals were very focused on achieving fairness as set down by the Military Services Act which stated that all objectors were allowed to go before a tribunal. This again indicates that objectors were treated fairly and positive actions were taken to let them voice their views.

Source 9 (From Frederick Peacock - Lawrence's autobiography) further agrees with his statement saying he "was awarded exemption". This suggests that the fact that exemptions were given indicates that objectors were treated fairly as they were not ignored when they went to a tribunal and positive results were possible for objectors. It indicates that the authorities were interested in their welfare and wanted to help them in some way.

Further in agreement with this is the fact that the government acted on protests from people like the 'no conscription fellowship' and in one



((b) continued) Military Services Act allowed for tribunals to be used in the case of objections, such as Fenner Brockway. This would suggest that the authorities were interested in their fair treatment and giving them an opportunity to air their concerns. They even later, added in the second Act a clause which allowed for total exemption. This would indicate the authorities were very concerned with their fair treatment.

In further agreement with the view that objections were treated fairly by authorities is source 7 which states, "audacity of some appeals almost defies belief". From this we can infer that the authorities were very fair towards those with real objections. It also suggests that perhaps they were in some cases even lax in their judgements - being 'too' fair. All of this evidence would suggest that conscientious objectors were treated fairly by the authorities.

((b) continued) On the other hand, source A indicates that the authorities didn't really act fairly towards objectors, "he did not particularly 'want this man'". This suggests that the authorities didn't allow exemptions for the good of the prisoners, but for the army's good - because the army didn't want to deal with objectors. The ~~tone~~<sup>tone</sup> of the quote suggests a contempt for objectors in the military as well as tribunals and we can infer that perhaps objectors' views and opinions weren't really treated well by the authorities. The fact that this source is a first-hand account from someone who went through the tribunal process would indicate that it is a true portrayal of what actually happened in them. It also indicates that it was probably a common reaction to objectors at the time. In agreement with this, is the fact that in some cases objectors who weren't exempted from military action were sent anyway to the front. As they upheld the objection and refused the

((b) continued) commands of their officer they were then sentenced by the military courts and executed. This would indicate a very unfair treatment of detainees and a total dismissal of all their views and opinions. However, it is worth noting that this process was subsequently changed by government action. However, it does suggest in agreement with source 9 that there was a contempt and unfair treatment of detainees by the military authorities.

Source 8 agrees with this and source 9, stating that the 'elders or tribunals' could hardly be expected to treat the detainees (...) with sympathy. From this we can infer an unfair treatment of detainees as they were not met sympathetically by tribunals who did not and could not understand their cause. This suggests that actually detainees' views were not taken into account and their objections were not given a fair judgement as tribunal members

((b) continued) had added viewpoints this would further suggest unfair treatment of objectors, although perhaps not deliberately, by authorities. The fact that this source comes from a historian again suggests an overview of the situation, taking into account many different aspects of tribunals this suggests a fair and 'large' picture of events.

Finally in agreement with sources 8 and 9 in that conscientious objectors were not treated fairly by authorities one account of objectors being arrested and beaten by the police some were kept over night in jail after attending objection meetings this would suggest that the police authorities treated objectors with little respect and contempt and their views were not taken seriously. This indicates their unfair treatment.

To conclude, although there are arguments which would suggest the fair treatment of troops by

((b) continued) authorities, on the whole, after approaching all the evidence I would disagree with the view that detainees were treated fairly, as there is much evidence to indicate that they were abused, misjudged and their opinions not taken seriously. However, this perhaps depends on which type of authority was dealing with them as the military authorities seemed to deal with the particularly harshly.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response received level 3 for both Assessment Objectives. Selection from the source material is considered and relevant, and the points raised are integrated with contextual knowledge. However, this knowledge lacks depth and, hence, any reasoning from the evidence of the source material is limited. It is also worth noting that the stereotypical comments on the objectivity of the authors of the secondary sources does not help to weigh up the strength of the evidence and is misplaced in a part b) question which is addressing AO2b not AO2a.

## **Question 2**

### **Question C2(a)**

For many candidates, this proved to be a challenging question with only the very best fully appreciating the contrast between party interest (source 10) and women's pressure (sources 11 and 12). However, many candidates picked up on the fact that Conservative self-interest had at least some role in the political decision-making and successfully contrasted this with the opinions of Eleanor Rathbone and Ray Strachey in sources 11 and 12. There was still a tendency among a significant minority of candidates to tackle the sources in sequential order. Such an approach is unlikely to lead to developed cross-referencing.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

(a) ~~Do you agree with the view that the suffrage movement made substantial progress during the first decade of the~~  
Sources 11 and 12 suggest that it was primarily the pressure by women that resulted in the Equal Franchise Act being passed in 1928, whereas Source 10 suggests that it was not the main reason.

Source 10 does not suggest that the reason pressure by women was the primary reason that the Equal Franchise Act in 1928 happened. It states that 'We depend at elections upon masses of women with few really definite convictions; suggesting that this was not the reason that the main reason that the act was passed. However, the reliability of the source can be questioned it is taken from ~~the~~ part of a letter written by Lady Curzon who succeeded her husband as Conservative MP, ~~was~~ the Conservative party ~~was~~ were concerned with women getting the vote, however did not really mind if it was not an equal

((a) continued) terms as men therefore the source can be seen as bias as getting the vote equally was not one of their primary concerns. In addition to this, it was written

Source 11 on the other hand, does suggest that pressure from women was the primary reason that the Franchise Act of 1928 was passed. Source 11 states that 'Enfranchised women do not adequately represent the unenfranchised in this matter. The majority of the enfranchised are wives and mothers, who may look at these questions of sex competition from the point of view of their husbands rather than of unenfranchised women' suggesting that those who can vote may simply vote for the same people that their husbands are voting for and therefore do not represent the women who cannot vote. This contrasts to the Conservative party which states that 'their instincts are in the main naturally conservative' suggesting that those who can vote will vote for a party whose main concern is not with the vote equally. Similarly, Source 12 also agrees with the view that it was primarily



((a) continued) The pressure by women which resulted in the Equal Franchise Act being passed in 1928. It states that 'The precincts of the House of Commons, which had been closed to women ~~because~~ since the early days of militant agitation, were now opened, and access to members became wonderfully easy'. The agents of women's societies were positively welcomed at Westminster. This suggests that pressure by women was the primary reason as should it not have happened the ~~vote~~ act would not have been passed. It also states that '... House of Commons discovered that every bill which came before it had a 'woman's side' suggesting that the government ~~had~~ too realised that it was the pressure by women that caused the passing of the Act. However the reliability of the source can one again be questioned as it is written by Ray Storer Strachey, The Cause: A short History ~~for~~ of the women's movement and was a member of the NUWSS which could mean that he is biased as he is saying that ultimately the passing of the Act happened because of his group, and could be trying to portray the NUWSS in a

((a) continued) *positive light.*

To conclude, sources 11 and 12 suggest that it was primarily the pressure by women that resulted in the Equal Franchise Act ~~was~~ being passed in ~~1928~~ 1928. ~~the~~ source 10 on the other hand does not suggest that this was the primary reason.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response successfully identifies the debate contained within the sources, although there is some confusion in the finer detail of cross-referencing, especially between sources 10 and 11. There is an attempt to weigh up the strength of the evidence in the light of the attributions but this is not fully developed and misapplied in the case of source 10. It received a mid-level 2 award.

### Question C2(b)(i)

This was the more popular of the two options and many candidates displayed an impressive range of own knowledge. Many picked up on and developed the points about the growth of the NUWSS, the impact of militancy and the increasing support at Westminster. Weaker responses, however, found it difficult to keep with the date parameters set out in the question. All who attempted the question identified the debate contained in the sources, although the subjectivity of Pankhurst's assertion that 'no progress has been made' was recognised by only a few. In the following extract, the candidate correctly explores the attribution of source 13 in order to weigh up the validity of the representation contained within the evidence.

*Nevertheless there was clearly opposition to the suffrage campaign as in arguing against the view that the suffrage movement made substantial progress, one could argue that there was little real progress made. For instance, in contrast to source 14 we could use source 13 from Pankhurst, the leader of the WSPU, to argue that regardless of all the energetic campaigning 'still no progress had been made'. However, as this source was written by the leader of the WSPU, the weight that should be attached to the view is limited as she would have been trying to gain sympathy and support for her cause and methods. In order to do this she may have been downplaying the extent of the progress actually made.*

### Question C2(b)(ii)

Most candidates appreciated the outline of the debate contained in the sources but a sizeable proportion relied almost exclusively on the source material to drive their analysis. Without some valid contextual knowledge to develop the issues raised in the sources, reasoning from the evidence was, by necessity, severely restricted. Most candidates could place the debate in the wider context of the 'angel in the house' and 'separate spheres'. However, many struggled to deploy specific knowledge of the development of educational opportunities for girls in this period and only the very best stressed the incremental character of the progress signalled by the Act, and developed both sides of the argument. An excellent succinct introduction was provided by the following candidate. Not only is the debate from the sources highlighted but, from the candidate's own knowledge, the importance of class is also introduced.

Although sources 17 and 18 point towards a significant improvement in the educational opportunities for girls as a result of the 1870 Act, source 16 argues the opposite. Rees says that the Act 'was now going to fill in the gaps' and this is supported by the extract from the Act itself but Turner says that there were still frequent absences from school despite the Act. This is in part supported by the Act in source 18 which does allow girls to miss school if 'there is some reasonable excuse'. It is also important to remember that the Act really only affected the poor and that middle-class girls did not rely on state schools.

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>



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](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US026450 January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

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

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

