

Examiners' Report
June 2013

GCSE History 5HB03 3B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2013

Publications Code UG036211

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

This was the eighth series of this Schools History Project Source Enquiry on Protest, Law and Order in the twentieth century. The area of the enquiry was the Battle of Trafalgar Square. Its principal focus was on whether it was the action of small groups of extremists that were responsible for turning a peaceful protest into a violent one. Most candidates were able to demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the topic. A majority of candidates were able to produce responses that were worth at least some credit. There was evidence that more candidates were able to attempt all questions on the paper. As with earlier series, achieving Level 3 in question 3 and Level 4 in question 5 proved more challenging. This was especially the case with the latter on this particular topic.

There was further evidence that centres are responding to comments in earlier reports. Many candidates however struggle to demonstrate effective cross referencing using the sources in answers to question 3. Too many of the answers that commented on source utility focused on simplistic learnt responses with limited historical validity.

Timing was generally less of a problem for candidates than in earlier series. However some candidates still produced answers that were overlong in response to questions 1 and 2. This caused candidates difficulties completing developed answers to questions 3, 4 or 5. Failure to answer question 5 therefore cost candidates a potential 19 marks. This alone should encourage candidates to ensure that they deploy their time more effectively.

There were considerably fewer responses written in the wrong sections of the answer book. There were far too many basic and simplistic responses regarding the value and utility of sources to questions such as 1 and 5 that do not require it. Too many sources are dismissed as having no value because of bias or the person who wrote it was not there.

Question 1

Overall candidates answered this question well with very few staying at Level 1. Most candidates reached Level 3 with a minimum weak supported inference or Level 4 to 5 with a good supported inference or 2 slightly developed supported inferences.

Most candidates focussed on the following supported inferences

- it was a big national demonstration with a united message against the poll tax – coach loads poured in from all over the country, and there were about 145,000
- the organisers wanted the protest to be peaceful and fun and made preparations to keep it that way – they said it was ‘meant’ to be peaceful and a carnival atmosphere, they tipped the police off about possible trouble to keep it peaceful
- the police were prepared for trouble – wore riot gear - after being told about anarchists’ intentions but hid out the way so as not to increase tensions or start any trouble
- there was a mixture of types of protestors – some were peaceful and carnival-like others had intentions to challenge the authorities and riot
- stewards were to blame for trouble as they were badly organised/increased tensions – there were communications problems between the stewards and organisers – contradictory messages were sent to the stewards by the organisers.

Poor responses to this question often involved candidates repeating sections from the source without making an inference. Responses that only managed to reach the bottom of Level 3 were characterised by weak and poorly developed inferences.

Some candidates struggled to make good valid supported inferences based on the Poll Tax rather than the protest itself. Many students used the number of people attending as evidence for the assumption that the poll tax was an issue affecting many people; this was a good example of how they used the source. Others commented on the lack of organisation. Others identified that the stewards were not prepared.

There were some supported inferences that were not related directly to Source A. This seemed to be a problem of learned responses, as candidates were approaching the source with inferences that would be valid if the question were about Poll tax itself, but they did not focus on this London protest itself.

Some lower ability candidates seemed to really struggle with finding supported inferences. These unsupported inferences were often just facts that the candidate knew about the poll tax.

Candidates need to be reminded what this question is asking of them. There were a number of candidates who attempted to address the issue of reliability, but could be given no marks for it. Candidates would be well advised to answer the question posed, not one they want to see.

To perform better on this question candidates need to be reminded to only raise points in their answer that are supportable from the source. If they cannot see evidence of something in the source then it should not be used within their answer.

1 Study Source A.

What can you learn from Source A about the Anti-Poll Tax protest in London on 31 March 1990?

(6)

From Source A, I learn that the Anti-Poll Tax protest in London was a massive event, involving people all over the UK. The source uses the word 'poured' to suggest many people came from outside London. This shows that many people were not happy about Poll Tax. I also learn that it was an organised and planned event as 'police had been warned in advance', making sure they were prepared in every way for the actions of the protestors. I learn that it was supposed to be a peaceful protest as police 'kept out of sight', showing that they were only there in case something was to happen during the protest. However, the fact that the police wore riot gear, shows they were well prepared for the large number of protests and may have suspected it to get quite rough. I also understand from this source that it is a possibility that things went wrong due to the stewards.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a concise answer that makes several inferences and supports them with reference to the source. It is a solid Level 3 response.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Two inferences with support from the source can get maximum marks.

Do not answer using your own knowledge or make comments on source reliability.

Make sure you know the focus of the question asked.

Question 2

Overall candidates answered this question very well with very few staying at Level 1.

At Level 2 candidates had a good grasp of the author's message/impression – the protestors were bad/yobs/animals/uncontrollable and/or the police were just as bad as one of the 'groups'. Candidates were confident in using the source content and description of protestors' behaviour to make statements about the message. In this level the main focus was on how bad the protestors were and/or police as part of the 'groups' of protestors, and there was some reference to the origins of the source and the steward's bias but little analysis of selection/treatment to move into Level 3. Those that did combine descriptive content well with purposeful selection, due to the steward's bias moved into Level 3.

At Level 3 candidates demonstrated/analysed the authors impression through the selection/treatment of key words/methods of portrayal/selection and/or emphasised the biased nature of the source and treatment of protestors portrayed:

This is done purposefully to show they were uncontrollable/ignorant/unruly/provocative.....

He repeats the same word a few times.....to emphasise

He never says anything bad about the police or steward violence retaliating

He wants the audience to believe.....so he deliberately....

The tone is to show us.....

Although he says the police may have provoked, he still blames the minority groups by saying they just needed an excuse, and continues to focus on putting the protestors in a bad light.

The stewards (and/or police) are portrayed as weak and defenceless so that they are not blamed for the violence but the protestors are because of their harsh violence.

At the top of Level 3 the candidates systematically demonstrated how the author deliberately used a variety of techniques – negative words/tone/repetitive emphasis/lists/etc to build up and reinforce the impression given.

Only very few candidates secured Level 1 and had therefore been well taught – on how to avoid an overly vague and general approach to the question. The vast majority therefore understood how to attempt this generic type of question, especially demonstrating an understanding of how to elicit 'inference/s' from the source.

However too many candidates were stuck at Level 2 because they used a simple formulaic approach, and they failed to advance beyond 'listing' content from Source B or 'telling' the reader what Source B 'said' as a means of revealing the author's impressions. Additionally Level 2 and Level 3 answers were often over reliant upon use of content rather than the nature of the source, indicating that candidates might be better prepared for answering this and other questions on the paper (especially at the highest Levels), if they developed a better understanding of the value of 'provenance' when evaluating a source. A simple aide memoire or two along the lines: 'Who wrote this and why?' and 'What factors might have influenced the way in which the author wrote?' might be better used when addressing the issue of provenance.

2 Study Source B.

What impression does the author try to give of the behaviour of the protesters?
Explain your answer, using Source B.

(8)

The author of Source B gives the impression that most people came to cause violence.

The impression of the protesters being bad and ~~dangerous~~ anti-social is given off too. I know this because words such as 'extremist' and 'disgusting' are used to describe the groups.

I have a sense also that the author is trying to give the impression that these were not spur of the moment attackers but in fact planned and organised. The author describes them as 'various groups' leading to the impression that these 'various groups' may have been factions in themselves doing ~~at~~ different jobs.

This impression is pushed on me further because these groups end up doing different things at once. Some provoked the police and others provoked stewards.

Another impression the author of Source B may be trying to give is that the protesters are seemingly senseless in their behaviour.

~~It is~~ The actions some of these protesters do like 'missile-throwing', 'kicking', 'spitting' all have a common link to the ~~senseless~~ lack of sense people in

mob's have, where anything and everything is used in an act of violence.

The author tries to give the impression that the protestors were violent, ~~and~~ aggressive and without pride. The author brands their actions as 'disgusting' a 'disgusting antic', ~~protest~~ showing that the mob is doing it for fun.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a solid Level 3 response that focuses on the impression the author tries to give of the protestors' behaviour and makes effective use of the source in support.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Use information from the source to indicate how they create the impression or support the message.

Comment on relevant details of the language used or images created.

Be aware of the difference between how an image is created and what impression/message is given.

Question 3

A majority of answers were in Level 2 between 5 and 6 marks and made reference to all 3 sources. Most candidates concentrated on content rather than reliability of sources. However, some discussed the content for one or two sources mixed with the nature of others. At this level there was not a good attempt to select the detail of the content to show how there were differences or similarities through cross referencing and few signs of reasoning.

In Level 3 the responses went beyond matching content and most were at the bottom of Level 3 (7) through cross referencing in a final summary conclusion. Those that got 8 (and a few at 9 or 10) marks were able to provide more examples and detailed reasoning of how far to reach a judgement through cross referencing and discussed the strength of evidence via the nature of the sources in one or more of the sources.

In terms of nature the candidates mainly focused on the biased nature of the sources and how each was a different perspective:

Source B= biased as from stewards involved but they were eyewitnesses

Source C= biased from police to make them look good - prepared but not enough –sounds organised

Source D= limited perspective of a snapshot of one part or time of the protest

The key to this question is cross referencing. Candidates are not able to access Level 3 without it, and very few answers even attempted it, suggesting candidates are not at all comfortable with what this question is really asking of them or how to achieve it. The majority of candidates are taking the sources one at a time (eg 'Source B says... Source C says... Source D says...'), even extending this to their conclusion (eg 'Overall Source B says... Source C says... Source D says...'). Merely summing up what you have already said in a conclusion does not count as cross referencing.

Candidates are also often using connectives while still in Level 2, which suggests they are getting good at technique, but still do not have the actual skill of cross referencing. This is a question that would benefit from repeated practise with teachers, because there is a significant portion of marks available (10) and the majority of answers stay in Level 2.

The same is true of some detailed answers which thoroughly deconstruct the content and the NOP of the sources in quite a sophisticated way, but fail to cross reference.

Some candidates attempted to cross reference each source with the question. This was not a valid approach, and candidates should focus instead on cross referencing the sources with each other.

The majority of Level 2 answers on this question were descriptive, whereas Level 3 answers were using the sources to support an argument they were making. This is a skill which centres would benefit from teaching their candidates, as it will help candidates access higher levels in not only this question, but also question 5.

Where only NOP or content was addressed, it was nearly always content that candidates covered. Candidates are clearly still very unsure how to effectively deal with NOP in a way that goes beyond simple statements of reliability based on primary/secondary evidence being reliable/not. It would benefit candidates on this question, and later questions, to be made more familiar with how to effectively look at the reliability of a source.

There is still some confusion over the layout of the paper, with question 3 pages being filled with question 4 answers. Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with the paper before the exam takes place to help avoid this.

3 Study Sources B, C and D.

How far do Sources B, C and D suggest that the police had made preparations to deal with a violent demonstration? Explain your answer, using these sources.

(10)

Source B demonstrates that the police had made preparations in quite significant detail as they appeared to have had an order in how to deal with the protesters which is shown by them having two sets of police men on the day of the protest. In particular the use of plain clothed policemen shows that the police knew how the demonstration would end up and so didn't want to provoke the demonstrators into something possibly dangerous therefore were plain clothes to not appear challenging or threatening therefore easing the tension of the protest. Also how the police had excellent timing on the day of switching their two sets of police force over in exactly the right time so that they were there was no commotion shows preparation of organisation. This is backed up by how they had riot police so that if things got out of hand there was police there to stop danger occurring. Although also using two completely different dressed police force shows they were prepared for either a peaceful demonstration or a non-peaceful demonstration. However Source

(Question 3 continued) C demonstrates that although there may have been organisation "many men were badly shaken by the use of violence" this shows that the police were not prepared to deal

with the level of violence ~~at~~ although as source B suggest they were wearing riot police uniform which is specifically designed for violence showing they were in fact prepared to deal with violence. However as source C suggests maybe they were prepared to deal with violence as a force but the police men were not expecting to deal with violence. This idea is backed up in source E as it says "many of them openly admitted that they were frightened for their own safety" which shows that they weren't prepared for violence as the level of violence frightened them. Although this is later in the article it is mentioned that the police "knew beforehand" that there would possibly be some violence which suggests that maybe they knew violence would possibly occur and therefore as it was only a possibility did not prepare as they should have.

However source A demonstrates that the police did prepare and backs up source B in saying that the police were riot gear, as in source B riot

(Question 3 continued) police are shown on horse back with helmets and visors showing that they were fully prepared for the strike. Although source D also demonstrates that the police weren't prepared for the violence as on the ground and the police the floor is littered with glass and broken pieces of rubble showing the police weren't prepared for the high level of violence which

occurred. This idea is backed up by source C suggesting "no-one expected that level of violence" and also this idea is backed up by source B with the use of plain clothed police men and the riot police were hidden showing that no one expected the level of violence as therefore did not prepare for that amount of violence but did prepare for some violence. Just not the level which occurred.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This well-argued Level 3 answer effectively cross-references all three sources to produce a balanced judgement. In doing so the response makes use of content only which restricted the marks it could attain at this level.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Do not just describe each source in turn.
Cross reference between the three sources not just the question posed.
Look at the overall impression provided by all three sources.

Question 4

A good number of candidates answered this question well and produced some sound responses. Most responses were in Level 2 mid to top range. The majority focussed on what the source tells us ie content as opposed to reliability/nature.

Source E

Candidates found it easy to explain the value of Source E content - in terms of it telling us what happened to cause the violence – the police charge and the fact that this was a spark for all to feel angry and show strength of feeling and/or the 'militant idiots' maybe were out to cause trouble but it wasn't all their fault. In terms of nature and origin a typical Level 2 answer would focus on the source being biased - one opinion so it could be limited - or that it was a primary source and its value was good as it reflected how people were likely to have witnessed the police on the ground and/or the source was non biased as it was neutral and both sides were presented as to blame even if she may overall have been sympathetic to the rioters.

Source F

The majority of answers focused on what the photo could tell us and not tell us with regard to content. It could tell us that the police were in a row defending a burning building but not who had caused it and so it is implied it is the protestors and that they had been very violent. In terms of nature/origin there was emphasis of the photos value being limited because it was produced by a journalist and we don't know for what reason and could be biased as newspapers were often supporting the government in Thatcher's era. There were also discussions on the nature of the photo in terms of provenance and when it was taken – at what point it was taken of the protest and if it was staged to show the police as protectors against the violence to make them look good and the protestors deliberately made to look bad.

The majority of candidates were in Level 2 between 4 and 6 marks and were typically producing good content for both or discussed nature/authorship of both or a mixture.

At Level 3, the responses used good mixture of content and reliability and made good effort to test value of the sources. However it was largely the nature /authorship of Source E and F that was mainly responsible for moving a response into Level 3.

A significant number of candidates are clearly struggling with both technique and time on this question, as there were a number of blank, Level 1, and low Level 2 answers, more than on the other questions. As this question is worth 10 marks, it may benefit centres to work with candidates on finding a technique for approaching this question that works for them.

The mark scheme for this question requires students to address the content and the NOP of both sources to L2 standard for Level 3. Candidates are really struggling to meet this requirement, and most often fall down on their ability to address the NOP of both sources. While a number of good answers are able to address the content of both, and the NOP of one, examining the NOP of the second source often seems just beyond capability.

For candidates who are able to achieve Level 3, the integration of content and NOP required for 10 marks seems beyond reach of many. It would benefit these higher ability candidates to move beyond the formulaic answer of a paragraph on the content of each and another paragraph on the NOP of each and move towards a more fluent and integrated essay style of writing on this question.

Some high level candidates were able to pick out the use of language in Source E as having definite implications for the reliability of the source. This sort of high level reasoning and analysis should be encouraged to help candidates to do as well on this question, as others on this paper.

A number of high Level 2 answers left a lot of questions when read through, which, if answered, could lead to the candidate making Level 3 (eg 'E is a from an interview and could therefore be problematic', leaving the question of why would this make it problematic?). If candidates could be encouraged to search their work for these it may help them move answers from a high Level 2 to a Level 3 response.

4 Study Sources E and F.

Which of Sources E or F is more valuable to the historian who is investigating the violence in Trafalgar Square on 31 March 1990? Explain your answer, using Sources E and F.

(10)

The content of E is much more detailed than in Source F. It describes the position of the troublemaker, who charged first, and what reaction the police's actions caused. Text is more useful than a photograph because a longer timespan is covered, rather than just one moment. On the other hand, the photograph just shows a row of police, with buildings burning behind them. The photograph does not show the protestors, only the police. Furthermore, the moment captured shows no violence - perhaps it was when no charges or attacks were being made. The buildings burning show the vandalism of the protestors, which implies the violence was more against property than people, especially as no policemen are being attacked in the photo.

Based on content alone, the text is more useful as it is more detailed - the photograph shows only the police's actions, not the protestors.

Source E is from an interview by someone who was an anti-poll tax demonstrator, so her aim could be to make people sympathise with the demonstrators, and turn people against the police. She

(Question 4 continued) would be bias, which could be why she said the police made an "unnecessary show of force". The redeeming factors are that it is an interview, so the truth is more likely to come out than if she had had time to sit & write a description of events. Furthermore, it was only a day after the event, so she is not as likely to forget things. Source F is a more reliable source as it is a photo, so it is objective. As it was taken for a newspaper, so it is also less biased as the purpose is to inform, rather than to persuade people of their view.

Overall, although Source F is less subjective than Source E, I think Source E is a more reliable source. It explains why the rioters used violence, whereas Source F can only offer one example of a violent action (arson).



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response looks at what each of the sources show and examines how its nature can determine its value. It achieved a Level 3 mark.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Do not just describe what the sources show. Comment on their nature, origin and purpose.

Make sure you relate your answer to that set in the question.

It is better to give strengths and limitations of sources rather than simply stating they are good and reliable.

Question 5

It was clear from the number of incomplete or blank question 5 answers that candidates struggled with time management on this paper. It should be stressed to them that this question is worth 16+3 marks, and should be reached with plenty of time to ensure they have the best opportunity possible of gaining those marks.

Candidates need reminding that while their own knowledge is required for higher level answers, so is use of sources. Some otherwise excellent answers full of their own knowledge were let down by the fact they had not used the sources even implicitly.

This could possibly suggest that candidates are much less familiar and comfortable with knowledge about the Poll Tax protests than they are about other elements of Protest, Law and Order in the period.

Most candidates were able to answer confidently at Level 2 using supported answers with sources or own knowledge and typically at Level 3 with both. As usual there were well written answers with excellent reasoning and analysis but no ARK and these responses had to stay at Level 3. A minority of candidates answered using their own historical knowledge of the event and sustaining their argument and reached a good balanced conclusion to reach Level 4.

At Level 2 candidates used the sources to make supported answers or statements from the sources.

A - Yes the police were warned and ready or No the stewards were to blame

E - No – it was the police or Yes – militant idiots

G - It was street war due to protestors or No it doesn't really say

There was no weighing up of each source against the hypothesis or attempts to reason and analyse to come to a conclusion. Sources were taken at their face value. Some candidates used their own knowledge without references directly to the sources or used other sources on the paper.

At low to mid Level 3 there tended to be a focus mainly on a conclusion that it was both the police and protestors as Source E says that and the other sources also hint that in different ways. Other responses at Level 3 developed and supported a more unbalanced judgement by stating it was the protestors or the police and explaining why.

At the top end of Level 3 and bottom of Level 4 - ARK and good reasoning was used to support detailed source evidence for and against the hypothesis that the extremists were to blame and came to a conclusion that it was more than likely both. Other factors were also explored such as the role of the stewards, the role of the APTF organisers and the size of the demonstration being unexpected and poor policing such as refusing to move the march and consequently the kettling of protestors in Trafalgar Square.

Few responses reached top marks in Level 4 by providing weight of reliability or testing strength of evidence of sources in their conclusion.

Higher level candidates were able to use the sources to support an argument they already had in their heads. Lower level candidates often seemed to describe the sources and then decide on their answer at the end of their descriptive answer. Finding ways to teach candidates to use the sources to support an argument as opposed to describing them could benefit some pupils who are on the cusp of higher levels. Centres need to encourage students to have debates that are driven by points and **then** supported by evidence from source/ARK, rather than lead with the sources.

Of the answers thought to be Level 4 standard, the majority did not attain the key point,

and were stuck at Level 4, simply because there was no weighting of evidence. This was, in general, the only block from attaining 15 or potentially 16. Students awarded the highest marks brought in reliability of evidence eg Source G being only one anonymous protestor does not mean all protestors regarded the fighting and looting in the same way. For those students looking to attain the highest marks, teachers need to remind them that effectively all of the skills being assessed in the previous four questions are being tested here, and they must not forget to look at the nature of sources, and explore how the strengths of one can be used to support their argument, acknowledging those that do not whilst pointing out their weaknesses to negate it.

***5 Study Sources A, E and G and use your own knowledge.**

Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in this question.

'The actions of small groups of extremists were responsible for turning a peaceful demonstration into a riot on 31 March 1990.'

How far do you agree with this view? Use your own knowledge, Sources A, E and G and any other sources you find helpful to explain your answer.

(16)

There are possibly many reasons as to why riots burst out not only the cause from extremists

~~Firstly~~ Firstly the tax to everyone was unfair as some working class people paid much more than rich people. This alone angered ~~the~~ the majority of the public.

Secondly many did not pay. By 1990 18 million did not pay the tax - which shows the tax was not taken seriously.

However the extremist groups were not the public we are to blame for the riots. Source Source E states

"...until that first police charge caused panic... finally anger."

This proves that the police also provoked the demonstrators. Source G explains that the police were prepared for the fights and riots. The source states

"...some on horse [police men] and others in 'snatch

squads'." Therefore these two sources imply that the extremist groups were possibly provoked by police authorities in riot gear and intimidation.

On the other hand all three sources state the dangerous and violent methods used by the demonstrators.

Source E explains anger rose from protestors because of

the "unnecessary showing ~~of~~ force", that the miners acted... "not just militant idiots, showing... feelings against the police". Source B explains how violent the protestors became, "... Loads of shops attacked... Cars wrecked... Armani sunglasses... looting". Lastly Source A states "~~a carnival~~ "... a carnival atmosphere". Therefore by this all sources share that the violence used by the protestors was not needed and that the anger built up was uncalled for.

Whereas source D shows thousands of people at the bank were looking helpless, proving that not all people were violent but a large majority was.

From my own knowledge it was not the extremists that were the only ones fighting the police or having rage. To conclude it was the public's emotions pouring out, their anger towards the unfair treatment from the police and the non-logical poll tax that made the poor even more poor and made the rich rich not lose a penny. My judgment is that the police firstly provoked the protestors by crowding them in Trafalgar Square. Secondly by crowd boxing them in will only make people anxious and panic, causing rage. The main reason However

the main reason for the riots to burst out was because of lack of control from the police and stewards. The stewards should have controlled the protestors better

and the police should have tracked the troublemakers and put them to one side from the rest of the demonstrators.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A reasonable lower Level 4 answer, which explored support both for and against the hypothesis. This response was given 3 marks for SPAG.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure you have enough time to do justice to a question which now has with SPAG 19 marks.

Analyse the question, plan your answer, review the sources required and add your own ARK on the topic.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance in this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- make sure you attempt all five questions, especially question 5
- spend more time and thought on question 5, which has many more marks than earlier questions
- remember to make two inferences and support them using the source in question 1
- make sure you use all three sources and cross reference them in question 3
- comment on both sources in response to question 4, using source content and nature.

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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE