

Examiners' Report Summer 2009

GCSE

GCSE History (1336/3336)

Contents

1.	Paper A1 Principal Examiner Report	3
2.	Paper B1 Principal Examiner Report	6
3.	Paper C1 Principal Examiner Report	10
4.	Paper P1 Principal Examiner Report	14
5.	Paper Q1 Principal Examiner Report	17
6.	Paper 21 Principal Examiner Report	20
7.	Paper 22 Principal Examiner Report	25
8.	Coursework Principal Moderator Report	30
9.	Statistics	32

1336 Schools History Project 2009

A1: Britain: c. 1815 - c. 1850

General Comments

The overall performance of the candidates this year was better than 2008. This was due to improved use of time and more confident grasp of the content. There was evidence that timing issues had been addressed and the majority of candidates completed essays which demonstrated a logical approach.

Understanding of factors and arguments were strengths, precise knowledge of Acts of Parliament and e.g. poor law systems remain weaknesses.

Differentials were due, mainly, to the candidate's ability to recognise the focus of the question asked.

All questions proved accessible with equal numbers for Q2 and 3 and slightly more choosing (c)(ii) over (c)(i).

Question 1

(a) Study sources A, B and C.

What can you learn from these sources about the activities of the Chartists?

- The majority of candidates were able to identify relevant information from 2 sources or make a supported inference, thus gaining L2.
- Fewer were able to use the sources in combination without bringing in their own knowledge of moral and physical force.
- Own knowledge was a complicating factor and candidates must remember that marks for this question are gained for interpretation of the sources.
- Source A was not well used. Very few picked up the fact that the violence was from the authorities or developed the information in the caption: 'said to have been'.

(b) Use your own knowledge to explain why people joined the Chartist movement?

- A pleasing number of candidates were able to explain a range of motives for why people joined the Chartist movement therefore enabling them to move into L3.
- There was widespread recognition of economic and social reasons and the best answers could cite problems specific to the 1830s and 1840s.
- Most had secure knowledge of the 6 aims of the chartists and thus gained L2, but a failure to link these demands to reform of conditions held them there.

(c)(i) Explain how the Reform Act changed the electoral system in Britain.

- The majority of candidates were able to identify some changes in the 1832 Act from what existed before.
- Those who went further and examined the extent of these changes could reach L3.
- The influence of last year's examination was apparent in the strong knowledge of the problems before 1832 and some candidates had difficulty holding focus on this year's question and reverted to a previous question on why the Act was passed.
- There were, as always, some who confused the demands of the chartists with the Reform Act and claimed that it solved all problems.
- It remains a wide spread misconception that the secret ballot was introduced in 1832.

(c)(ii) Explain why the Chartist movement had collapsed by 1850.

- Overall this question was well answered. The majority could describe the divisions within the movement and the failure of the petitions.
- There were a number of excellent answers which explored a range of reasons beyond the internal weaknesses of the movement – looking at the economic conditions, the forces ranged against them and the actions of the government in terms of both repression and social reform.
- There was a good sense of historical context in many answers.

Question 2

How important was the work of George Stephenson in the development of the railways in Britain ? Explain your answer.

- Those candidates who attempted this question showed knowledge of Stephenson's involvement with the Rainhill trials, Liverpool to Manchester and Stockton to Darlington railways.
- Stephenson's importance was widely asserted but less often was it demonstrated.
- There was awareness of the competition with Brunel but often this was not developed sufficiently to form a sustained argument about relative importance.
- There were disappointingly few answers which considered other factors. Despite the bullet point almost no answers referred to the investment required. Occasional credit was given to the navvies or, surprisingly, Henry Hudson.
- Some answers focused more on the social and economic impact of railways than on their construction.
- Subject knowledge was less secure than that shown in Q3.

Question 3

Why were the systems of poor relief used in Britain before 1834 failing to solve the problems of poverty ? Explain your answer.

- This question produced more successful responses. Many candidates had a developed knowledge of the Old Poor Law and the problems associated with it. Indeed, many reached L3 by demonstrating the failings of the system, perhaps, again, a legacy of the 2008 paper.
- Most answers focused on the poor themselves and did not consider the impact on the wider community/economy. This held down marks.
- Weak candidates were insecure on the specifics of the different schemes in use and there remains a tendency to accept the everyman response to the poor - they were lazy/had lots of children.
- There were, however, some excellent answers which did address the question precisely. These were able to look in detail at the reasons for poverty in the context of the early nineteenth century: 'people were no longer ashamed to be poor'; 'they were not encouraged to get out of poverty'; 'the government was not tackling the causes of poverty but the problems that arose from it.'

Question 4 (3336 Short Course Only)

Was fear of disorder the main reason why the Parliamentary Reform Act was passed in 1832 ? Explain your answer.

No candidates answered this question.

1336 Schools History Project 2009

B1: The American West: c. 1840 - c. 1895

General Comments

Candidates timed the examination better this year and there was little evidence of work being rushed.

The overall performance was disappointing with many scripts lacking precise knowledge and others not using the knowledge they had to good effect.

The requirements of the questions are clearly spelled out and students need to practice to recognise what is required and then ensure that they can bring supporting detail into their answers.

C (i) was chosen by over 70% of the candidates. Q3 was the more popular of the essay questions - but not by a great margin.

Question 1

(a) What can you learn from sources A, B and C about people's attitudes to the Mormons ?

- Most candidates reached level 2 with developed statements or supported inferences.
- There was very little use of sources in combination and there were fewer L3 answers than usual.
- The majority who reached level 3 did so by making 3 separate inferences.
- Only the most able were able to draw inferences from the cartoon.
- Many candidates wanted to show what they knew about the Mormons. Own knowledge is not needed nor rewarded in this question and so their efforts did not gain marks. It also replaced inference with statement, again not rewarded.
- Poor focus on the wording of the question also affected marks. A number of answers dealt with the attitudes of the Mormons instead of the attitudes of others towards the Mormons.

(b) Use your own knowledge to explain the dangers for those travelling West by wagon train in the 1840s.

- Overall this was disappointing as so few had a clear sense of the nature of the journey or the time period.
- Many answers stayed in low level 2 as candidates could not go beyond a listing of problems in general terms, e.g. Indian attack, lack of water, disease, distance.
- Those who could 'flesh out' their answers moved into a secure level two with discussion of the types of terrain, weather, and diseases suffered.

- Analysing the problems of distance and timing was the most common way of accessing L3. These candidates often cited experiences of the Donner or Sagar party to support their argument.
- Poor geographical knowledge was widespread.
- A significant number of answers interpreted 'train' as locomotive, again demonstrating 'lazy' reading of the question.

(c)(i) Explain why the building of railways increased the number of people settling in the West after 1869.

- A great many answers were of the 'everyday' variety, seizing on the speed and safety of railways. These included answers which tried to repeat the difficulties listed in 1(b) to show improvements in travel.
- This high number of weak answers was in part explained by the fact that this question was chosen by those who lacked knowledge of the Mormons and saw this as an easier choice.
- Most answers concentrated on the benefits or consequences of the railways with insecure links to settlement.
- Answers reached level 2 with more precise detail of the benefits of the railway for homesteaders.
- There were, however, some clear L3 answers which analysed the role of the railway companies in promoting settlement.
- Even more pleasing were those answers which were time specific and mentioned the end of the Civil War, the Homestead Act or the development of 'cow towns'.
- Only a very few considered the improvement to law and order and the use of railways by the army.

(c)(ii) Explain how the Mormons overcame the difficulties of building a settlement at the Great Salt Lake.

- Fewer candidates chose to answer this question, but those who did so had secure knowledge and therefore responses were better than for (c)(i).
- There was good knowledge of Brigham Young's role, decisions, the Perpetual Emigration fund and the role of faith. If these were described, the student gained Level 2: if analysed -level3. It was pleasing to see understanding of not just the practical problems but also of the more complex relationships with the church and with the US government.
- There were answers which did not focus on Salt Lake but described the movements and problems of the Mormons before this.
- Some lost focus and described the problems faced by the homesteaders.

Question 2

Why was the boom time for cattle ranching on the Plains so short ? Explain your answer.

- This question produced a full range of answers but very few at the higher end.

- The bullet points were heavily used but poorly understood. In particular the reference to the Civil War did not trigger the expected response in many candidates who did not recognise this as signalling the beginning of demand and tried to relate it to the end of ranching.
- Chronology is always an issue in this paper and it was a glaring problem here, despite the dates offered.
- Although there was evidence of knowledge of the topic with references to Goodnight/Loving, Abilene, Illiff, Longhorn cattle, etc. there was no general understanding of how this fitted together into a narrative of events.
- Those who managed to provide some coherent pattern of events usually concentrated either on the growth of the industry or its collapse. Either could reach Level 3 if the reasons were examined.
- It was pleasing to find a few excellent answers which understood the economics of supply and demand. These answers also considered overstocking and pressure on land as reasons for 'bust' as well as the weather.
- Although a minority, there was the inevitable confusion for some between cattle and buffalo.

Question 3

Was the role of the United States army the most important factor in destroying the Plains Indians way of life after 1865? Explain your answer.

- This question was answered by the majority of candidates as the topic was more familiar from previous papers.
- Candidates are comfortable with a question which asked for comparison of factors and were able to organise their replies well.
- However, again only the best candidates could recognise the importance of the chronology of the question.
- A large number of answers concentrated on the familiar issue of the destruction of the Indians' way of life. The Dawes Act was widely known and factors such as the destruction of the buffalo, the railroads and reservations were discussed. However these answers were not fully focussed on the question as asked.
- Only a few were able to examine the role of the army with confidence. Even here there was some blurring of the roles of army and government.
- The role of the army in this period is dealt with specifically in the text books and it was pleasing to find some answers which showed that this later period had been studied, with references to winter campaigns, etc.

Question 8 (3336 Short Course only)

How successfully had the Homesteaders overcome the problem of living on the Plains by 1890? Explain your answer.

- All three essay questions were answered by a similar number of candidates. This is a familiar and well known topic and attracted a full range of candidates and produced a wide range of responses.
- Many candidates used the bullet points to scaffold an answer with varying degrees of development. They could reach level 3 with sufficient expansion.
- There was, pleasingly, considerable knowledge of machinery, new methods and Acts to support the answers. Therefore the organisation of the answer was significant in the achievement of higher levels and there were a number of well crafted essays.

1336 Schools History Project 2009

C1: Germany c.1919 - c.1945

General Comments

This year's paper worked well and the general performance was a considerable improvement on last year. Candidates used the time effectively and there were a number of strong scripts with well structured essays.

The ability to interpret questions is an issue with some candidates but for others problems were not caused by their literacy ability but by careless reading of the questions. These candidates had good knowledge of detail but then wasted it due to misidentifying the period required by the question. This topic is divided by dates as well as themes and so the basic chronology should be known.

(C)(ii) was chosen by two thirds of the candidates but the essays were more evenly split with a narrow majority favouring q3.

Question 1

1(a) What can you learn from Sources A, B and C about the methods used by the Nazis to get themselves well known in Germany ?

- Most candidates achieved L2 by drawing inferences from individual sources.
- Those who reached L3 did so by using each source separately in most instances. There were very few who even attempted to use the sources in combination. Those who did so produced some excellent analytical responses.
- Source A was problematic for many and led to the use of own knowledge to interpret it. Own knowledge was a real issue this year and candidates must remember that this question is about the use of sources - there are no marks for bringing in other knowledge.
- Source B was interpreted correctly by most but some thought the reference to school related to children.
- Little use was made of the captions to the sources, particularly the reference to police monitoring the Nazis.

1(b) Use your own knowledge to explain the change in Nazi party tactics in the years from the Beer Hall Putsch in 1923 to 1929.

- This question produced the full range of answers
- Unfortunately there were some candidates who did not recognise the reference and did not answer the question at all.
- However, those who did answer displayed considerable own knowledge.
- Some provided detailed accounts of the Putsch or of the period 1923 - 29, often with reference to propaganda and violence to back it up. These candidates reached L2.
- There were many answers which could explain why Hitler changed from violent to legitimate tactics as a result of the failure of 1923. There was widespread and detailed knowledge of the content of Mein Kampf

- A pleasing number of answers recognised the historical context and explained that all the efforts of the Nazis meant little as the Weimar was strong during this period. These scored full marks.
- Unfortunately there were also those who did not recognise the specific period given and wrote about a longer period or described tactics after WSC or even after 1933. This was knowledge wasted.

(c)(i) Explain why events in Germany in the years 1929 to 1932 led to the growth of extremist political parties.

- Again a full range of responses.
- Most answers showed confident knowledge of the Wall Street Crash and its effects on Germany. These gained L2.
- However, there were also answers which displayed a confident command of events during this period –economic, social and political. These could make secure links to the appeal of the extremist parties including the Nazis use of fear of communism. Disappointingly few made the link back to Hyperinflation as a reason for fear.
- Again much knowledge was wasted because of a poor grasp of dates with detailed answers dealing with the Stresemann period, or 1933/4.
- There were a significant minority who did not recognise that the term ‘extremist political parties’ referred to the Nazis while those who did understand this did not always mention the Communists.
- As ever, there remains much confusion between hyperinflation and the depression.

(c)(ii) Explain how Hitler was able to destroy the power of the other political parties in Germany in the period January to July 1933.

- This was a very popular question and again it produced a wide range of responses.
- Most candidates had some of the chronology for this period and there were a lot of narrative answers.
- At L3 candidates began to consider the methods used. They dealt well with the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act, but few showed understanding of the use of the Emergency Decree and the alliances with other parties. Indeed in most cases only the Communist party was named.
- Lack of precise detail was also shown by the frequent references to Hitler’s popularity, to speeches, rallies, promises and violence as reasons for his success in this period.
- Dates were again an issue and answers wandered outside the period given with many references to the Night of the Long Knives and Hindenburg’s death.

Question 2

Why was the Weimar republic weak in the period 1919 - 1923 ? Explain your answer.

- Slightly fewer candidates chose this essay but it produced by far the better answers. The subject was widely known and students are comfortable with questions which require them to consider a range of factors. Therefore, many of the essays were both pertinent and well structured. This question produced some exceptional L4 answers.
- There were a high number of narrative answers based on the bullet points but an encouraging number brought in other knowledge such as the uprisings.
- Not only was there detailed knowledge of the treaty of Versailles and the events of 1923, but many students were able to explain fully the problems of the constitution and even the attachment to the old authoritarian regime.
- Others had plenty of information of the problems in the period but simply asserted that these were reasons for weakness. To reach L3 it is necessary to explain the link between the two.
- Some candidates lost marks by answering a slightly different question which had been set in a previous paper and concentrated on the unpopularity of the Weimar.

Question 3

Explain the ways in which Nazi rule changed the lives of many young people in Germany after 1933.

- A popular topic which, as usual, offered the opportunity for students to write with enthusiasm about the activities of the Hitler Youth and to describe lessons in Nazi schools. There were a great many of these L2 answers full of detail but lacking purpose, concentrating on what happened instead of why it happened.
- The idea of change proved challenging and in many answers simply adding a statement that 'this changed their lives' was considered sufficient. It seems that many had little understanding of young people's lives before the Nazis came to power and so could not draw meaningful comparisons even about the quality of education.
- Better answers recognised that the young were being 'moulded into the perfect Aryan race', were losing individuality, were being taught to discriminate/hate, and the word 'control' appeared a lot.
- However some excellent answers came from those students who could articulate the impact of Nazi teaching on the young: 'young people who lived by nazi rules did not see this as a negative thing'; 'instead of following their dreams, they were taught to follow the dream of Hitler.'

Question 4 (3336 Short Course Only)

Were the Nazis successful in removing all opposition in Germany in the period 1933 -1939 ? Explain your answer.

- This question was answered in equal numbers to the other choices and students did not have problems understanding the focus or dates required .
- Those who used the bullet points could relate these to the question and thus gain L2 marks.
- Others took a chronological approach which worked well.
- The best answers were well organised and wide ranging - not only showing the methods used to deal with opponents (political parties, the church, Trade Unions, student groups) but also the limitations of these actions. There was much precise detail to support these answers.

1336 Schools History Project 2009

P1: Medicine

General Comments

The examination seemed accessible to nearly all candidates and most answered all the necessary questions. There were very few blank pages and very few candidates appeared to have run out of time. There were some exceptionally impressive responses; especially to questions 1c and 2. This was the third year that epen was used for this paper. Occasionally a different box (or no box at all) was crossed than the actual extension unit answered. It is worth reminding centres that although this will not affect the candidate's final mark, it does mean that the response then appears in the wrong question "pool" and this may distort the centre's results if they use the epen question analysis feature to check their candidates' performances.

- It is worth stressing again the issue of unnecessarily lengthy answers for question 1a and then writing brief responses for the higher mark questions. Somewhat surprisingly, some students still continue to use additional paper for 1a, and either copy or paraphrase the source material (sometimes including Sources D and E). It would be very helpful to remind students concise answers which score high marks are perfectly possible on 1a.
- Candidates should also be reminded to keep a clear focus on the actual thrust of the question and to avoid drifting into irrelevance. This was particularly noticeable in questions 3 and 4 (see comments below). Where candidates clearly underline, circle or highlight the key words in the question they frequently produce high-level responses. Centres should be careful to familiarise themselves fully with the changes of content for the new specification and the respective examinations for Units 1 and 3 for teaching from September.
- It is also worth reminding centres about the rationale behind the use of bullet points in the Extension Units. They are not intended to provide a framework for the answer or to indicate the required content. It is indeed possible to gain full marks without using them. They are meant to serve as a reminder to the candidate to develop argument and/or the timescale of the question. Centres should note that bullet points and stimulus material will be used in the examination questions for the new specification for questions 3 and 4 (core content) and in questions 5b and 6b (extension units). The specimen examination papers are available on the EdExcel website.
- Most examiners still comment on some candidates' lack of chronological understanding. This was most evident in question 4 (see below).
- There was the occasional candidate that had attempted all three Extension Unit questions.

Question 1

1(a) The vast majority of candidates did very well on this question. Nearly all candidates used and linked all three sources as a chronological framework to write about developments in the understanding of the link between hygiene and disease. Most candidates noted continuity between A and B (some using their own knowledge to make references to miasma) and commented that this was before the Germ Theory. Most then commented that Source C showed that rapid change had now occurred and some commented on the increased role of government in increasing public understanding. Some wrote very little and gained high marks, whereas again some candidates wasted time with lengthy descriptions or attempted to all five sources. There were however very few that wasted time writing about source reliability or utility.

1(b) There were some impressive responses which linked various factors together (chance, influence of Jenner, Pasteur's scientific approach, government funding, and rivalry with Koch) to analyse the reasons for Pasteur's success with vaccines. Answers in level 2 often gave some general comments or listing of factors (such as individual genius, teamwork) without specific references to Pasteur. Others remained in Level 2 by concentrating solely on germ theory or by "telling the story" of Pasteur. In some cases it was clear that these candidates did not understand the term "factors" which is a crucial aspect in teaching the Development Study effectively. Compared to previous years there seemed to be very few blank pages for Some candidates however confused Pasteur with Jenner and occasionally Fleming. They therefore produced sometimes lengthy irrelevant responses on smallpox and penicillin.

1(c) There were some very impressive Level 3 answers and most candidates had more secure knowledge of Harvey compared to Curie. Candidates were therefore sometimes very reliant on source E to make any comments on Curie. There were some very high-scoring responses which used very detailed knowledge of Harvey to analyse his contribution to medicine and relating it to the significance of Galen's ideas being challenged, how Harvey's work led to new ways of thinking, and how he laid vital foundations for later developments rather than his work being accepted at the time. The implications of Source D as evidence of Harvey's importance was frequently noted - although some high level answers remained in low level 3 for no use of sources D and E. Although there seemed to be less specific knowledge of Curie there were some successful arguments about the importance of radium in the development of medicine and the immediate application of her discovery. Those in level 2 tended to "tell the story" of either Harvey or Curie or both.

Question 2

This question was the highest achieving of the three extension units. There were a significant number of confident, clearly-structured responses which were awarded level 4. These candidates had a high-level grasp of continuity and change between the Greek and Roman periods and one examiner commented on the “overwhelming” knowledge displayed in some responses. Many had clear and precise knowledge outside of the three bullet points - primarily on public health in the Roman period. Many developed a clear argument on different approaches to medicine and health between the two cultures. Level 2 responses often narrated or described the work of Asclepius and Hippocrates rather than explaining change and continuity, and those in Level 1 relied on the bullet points. There were some candidates who confused Galen with Hippocrates.

Question 3

The vast majority of answers for this question were low-scoring and remained in Level 2. There were some candidates who used their knowledge of Elizabeth Garrett Anderson to show the role of women as doctors. Unfortunately a significant number wrote lengthy but irrelevant general descriptions on hospital conditions (with references to television hospital dramas), Nightingale and Seacole.

Question 4

There were some Level 4 responses that commented on reasons for the rapid developments in surgery since 1900. These candidates showed an analysis of the interaction of factors such as war, technology, research teams, the government, and the establishment of the NHS. Level 3 responses often commented solely on war as a factor. Unfortunately some candidates misread the question (or were unprepared for a question on the twentieth century) and wrote at length on surgery during the Renaissance or produced a stock response on developments during the 19th century (bleeding, pain and infection) and on key individuals such as Lister and Simpson.

1336 Schools History Project 2009

Q1: Crime, punishment and protest

General Comments

The examination seemed accessible to nearly all candidates and most answered all the necessary questions. There were very few blank pages and very few candidates appeared to have run out of time. There were some exceptionally impressive responses; especially to question 2. This was the third year that ePen was used for this paper. Occasionally a different box (or no box at all) was crossed than the actual extension unit answered. It is worth reminding centres that although this will not affect the candidate's final mark, it does mean that the response then appears in the wrong question "pool" and this may distort the centre's results if they use the ePen question analysis feature to check their candidates' performances.

- It is worth stressing again the issue of unnecessarily lengthy answers for question 1a and then writing brief responses for the higher mark questions. Somewhat surprisingly, some students still continue to use additional paper for 1a, and either copy or paraphrase the source material (sometimes including Sources D and E). It would be very helpful to remind students concise answers which score highly are perfectly possible on 1a.
- Candidates should also be reminded to keep a clear focus on the actual thrust of the question. This was particularly noticeable in questions 1c and 4 (see below). Where candidates clearly underline, circle or highlight the key words in the question they frequently produce high-level responses. Centres should be careful to familiarise themselves fully with the changes of content for the new specification and the respective examinations for Units 1 and 3 for teaching from September.
- It is also worth reminding centres about the rationale behind the use of bullet points in the Extension Units. They are not intended to provide a framework for the answer or to indicate the required content. It is indeed possible to gain full marks without using them. They are meant to serve as a reminder to the candidate to develop argument and/or the timescale of the question. Centres should note that bullet points and stimulus material will be used in the examination questions for the new specification for questions 3 and 4 (core content) and in questions 5b and 6b (extension units). The specimen examination papers are available on the Edexcel website.
- Most examiners still comment on some candidates' lack of chronological understanding. This was most evident in question 1b (see below).
- There were some candidates that attempted to answer all three of the Extension Questions.

Question 1

1(a) Level 3 responses used the sources to show a progression from state intolerance to state protection of different faiths and some showed contextual understanding such as the battle for Church supremacy and the growth of scientific understanding. Weaker candidates failed to understand that Source C showed a complete change in the treatment of religious beliefs and seemed to believe that the government continues to persecute religious groups today. There was however a significant number of candidates who wasted time by offering extensive paraphrasing of the sources (sometimes all five) and some commented on the reliability or usefulness of the sources. This invariably led to over lengthy answers with little rewardable content.

1(b) There were some Level 3 responses which showed an impressive knowledge of factors specific to the 18th century. These candidates commented on demobilised soldiers, the availability of pistols, and the lack of a banking system. The majority of responses were Level 2 with general descriptions of highwaymen, their characteristics, and of Dick Turpin. Some scored level 1 by writing general comments on robbery. A number of candidates tried to turn the question into other aspects of 18th century crime and punishment by discussing smuggling, poaching, enclosures, transportation, or the Bloody Code. There were also some candidates who referred to trains, car and motorways.

1(c) High-scoring candidates addressed 'how far' and offered responses that made supported their judgements as to the extent of change and seemed clear about the "role" of the police. These candidates tended to show that there had been a change from Peel's original intentions. They had specific knowledge to support their response on specialist units and the use of technology (very few mentioned women police officers) and commented on the evolving role of the police in detecting and preventing crime. The majority of responses remained in Level 2 by writing often lengthy descriptions on changes in policing since 1829. Very low scoring responses tended to range from candidates own personal opinions on the police, long descriptions of the Poll Tax riots or why a police force was set up in 1829.

Question 2

This remains a popular option. The highest level responses discussed and reached a judgement on how fair Roman law was for its time. At level 3, candidates tended to focus on the fairness between rich and poor rather than making comments on fairness for slaves or women. Many in level 2 described the court system and the policing system of ancient Rome but did not make any links with fairness. The weakest responses tended to confuse Roman law with Saxon law, referring to Wergeld and Hue and Cry or even discussed the introduction of the Bloody Code and the use of transportation.

Question 3

The best candidates were able to demonstrate links between government actions and the effects of these actions in limiting the impact of the strikers and eventually ending the strike. Many talked about the role of the volunteers and the government's preparations as the main causes for the defeat of the strikers, and were able to discuss the importance of propaganda and control of the media. A few were able to show how the actions of the TUC itself helped the Government to succeed. Very few explained the role of troops and if it was discussed it was mainly that they were brought in to attack the strikers. Level 2 responses tended to give a lot of details about the strike itself. Weaker candidates were confused and made simple errors, for example suggesting that The British Gazette was a paper run by and supporting the strikers, some believed that the government ended the strike by giving them all large pay rises or by shooting those on strike.

Question 4

Stronger candidates were aware of changed government attitudes regarding the treatment of COs, the notion of defending freedoms and new tactics in the form of new jobs for COs and were able to make direct comparisons between the wars and the reasons for the shifts in attitudes. There were some references to the emergence of organisations that supported pacifism in general and COs in particular such as the Peace Pledge Union. The overwhelming majority of responses were in level 2 with descriptions on the treatment of CO's rather than recognising the thrust of the question. Some only mentioned World War One and made no comment at all on the situation in World War Two. Weaker candidates made limited additions to the bullet points. Quite a few students seemed very confused and stated that Dartmoor Prison opened in World War Two in 1916, that there were actually less COs in World War One and that claiming exemption from conscription meant they joined up voluntarily.

1336 Schools History Project 2009

21: Medicine

General Comments

It would be helpful if students could be reminded to write in black - answers on pale ink do not show up well onscreen.

Time management remains a problem for some students. It was noticeable that many of the students who took additional paper, did so on question 1, which only carried 6 marks. They should also be reminded that more space has been provided than they should need. Examiners felt that students recognised the high mark tariff on question 8, leading to fewer blank answers to question 8 than previously but an increase in blank answers for earlier questions, especially question 7.

Many candidates provided lengthy quotations from the sources or descriptions of the source content. Whole pages consisted of "This source says ... It also mentions ... Another thing it tells me .. and I quote .." This is Level 1 at best but also wastes time. The higher marks are always reserved for analysis, where the student comments on the significance of the source content or origins and only brief references are needed to support these comments. Candidates also wasted time by discussing source reliability when it was not appropriate.

A number of candidates still respond to the topic and do not analyse the question. This was particularly noticeable in question 3 where many students wrote about surgery rather than the sources and in question 4 where students often explained why surgeons opposed Lister, which was more appropriate for question 6.

Although a formulaic approach does not often score highly, students would benefit from understanding the different elements of the target objectives. For example, the usefulness or value of a source must consider the way source content can be used in an enquiry but also consider how the strength of that content is affected by the source nature / origins / reliability. In the same way, when considering how a written source conveys a particular impression, it is helpful to clearly differentiate between the language and the selection or treatment of content in a source.

Many students recognise the need to sum up their comments in a conclusion but often this is just a re-statement of their comments rather than actually weighing up one side against another.

There were the usual problems of difficult handwriting and poor expression.

"Would of" is still very common but there was relatively little slang or "text speak". However, the biggest problem is where students do not make clear which source is being used in their answer - in a question where the use of different sources is required, this can restrict students' access to the higher marks.

Question 1

Some answers remained in level 1 because students simply repeated the content of the sources or stated an inference without identifying the support for it in the sources. However, most students were easily able to make inferences about the success of chloroform as an anaesthetic or about the significance of its discovery from the source content or from the fact that it was being publicised in a newspaper and by Simpson himself. A pleasing number of answers linked the sources to use them in combination.

Some students discussed what could not be learned from the sources, provided information from their own knowledge or evaluated the sources for reliability - none of these approaches was asked for and therefore no additional marks were gained but time was wasted.

Question 2

Students used the information from the sources to comment about the benefit of pain relief and the danger of increased infection and blood loss but it was disappointing to see that many of them ignored the instruction to use their own knowledge in this question and therefore they were not able to gain the higher marks. Centres should remind students that this is a nominated topic and they are expected to bring contextual knowledge to this paper. Where students did include own knowledge, this often became a general explanation of the 3 main problems of surgery and how they were overcome, rather than a focused explanation of the impact of the use of chloroform.

Many spotted the comment in the source about the increased dangers of blood loss but assumed this was because chloroform increased bleeding during an operation, rather than explaining that it was a consequence of the increased time taken and more internal operations being carried out. Other answers included information about the death of Hannah Greener or described a typical operation before the use of anaesthetics but without linking the details to the problems and benefits to surgery from the use of anaesthetics.

Good use of own knowledge included an explanation of the need for speed before the use of anaesthetics, exemplified in Liston's famous mistakes, the benefits of chloroform over ether, the problems associated with chloroform, the development of John Snow's inhaler, an explanation of the "Black Period" of surgery showing that infection was not understood in the period before Pasteur and an explanation of the problem of blood loss linked to the reasons why transfusions were not developed until later.

Question 3

In some ways there have been clear improvements in the responses to questions about the value of sources for an enquiry. Although many answers remain focused on the idea that a source's value depends solely on the information it contains, there were good explanations showing how that information would aid the historian in his enquiry rather than simply stating that a source is useful because it tells you something. There also seemed to be an increase in the number of answers which recognised that a source's origins affect the value of the information. However,

too many answers simply repeated the provenance of the source without explaining how that affected the way the historian would use the content.

A disappointing number of candidates were not able to score highly because they interpreted the question as asking them to use the sources to write about surgery and in some cases there was an attempt to use the sources in combination. This sort of question features every year and candidates should be expecting it yet the same problems are reported regularly and there was also a number of blank answers where the question had not even been attempted.

There were relatively few good answers which weighed up the value of someone with medical knowledge, speaking in hindsight, against a patient's personal record of her experience. Too many students dismissed Leeson's comments because, writing 56 years later, his memories would not be accurate, or dismissed his account because he was writing a book and therefore his purpose of entertaining his readers and his desire to sell large numbers of his book would have led him to embellish and exaggerate. Matthewson's views tended to be accepted completely because she was reporting her personal experience or dismissed because she was asleep during the operation; there was little appreciation that her clear sense of relief and gratitude might create a positive impression in her account, or that the insight her account gave into a patient's fears could be valuable despite her lack of knowledge of the actual operation.

It is clear that many candidates are trying to weigh the sources in order to answer the question but they do not always think their answer through before they begin to write. A sizeable number of answers suggested that one source was better than the other and then contradicted themselves at the end. This was particularly disappointing in cases where it was being suggested that D was a very strong source but ended by saying E was better because it was written at the time.

Question 4

Students have become familiar with this style of question and most of them responded well to the source but some attempted to explain the author's intentions or why he disapproved of Lister, anticipating question 6, while others were sidetracked into discussing the reliability of the source.

Many candidates easily identified the negative tone of the article but they did not always provide a specific reference to the source to support their comment or copied extracts from the source without explaining how they created a negative tone. Answers tended to be better explained when they showed how the author created the impression that Lister was not successful through comments about "successful surgeons" giving up on Lister's ideas, the repetition that Lister's methods were not successful, and the use of statistics.

The best answers focused on both what was said (surgeons had given up on Lister's ideas, surgeons should not be concerned with theories) and how it was said (the emphasis that Lister's methods were "certainly not" more successful than previous methods and the repetition that the antiseptic system was "less successful").

There were excellent comments pointing out that the article was negative from the very first sentence, that the author attacked Lister's methods, his success "and the very basis of his work", and that the author made Lister's work seem useless.

Although the reference to Mr Lister probably reflected the way surgeons were addressed rather than intentional disrespect, this comment was also rewarded

Question 5

Cross referencing is a difficult skill and examiners noted a number of blank answers where students had not attempted this question. However, there were relatively few very weak answers even though many students did not go beyond matching the sources. They tended to either match each source's overall view of Lister's methods with F, or select specific details to compare but there were a number of answers which presented the examiner with lengthy quotations from the sources and very little comment or analysis from the student. Candidates should also remember to make it clear which source is being used in their comments since examiners need to see evidence of all 3 sources being used.

There is also the tendency for weaker students to assume that "support" must mean approval - centres should ensure that students recognise the use of the word can mean that one source confirms or provides evidence for a negative view expressed in another source. Some students lost sight of the question and discussed Lister and his techniques or whether the Queen's example would have swayed public attitudes towards Lister. A few candidates confused the events in Source H with the better known royal approval of chloroform or thought the "terrible" treatment was Lister's spray, and some answers explained why surgeons opposed Lister, anticipating question 6 but scoring no marks on question 5. At the highest level, there was a recognition that "How far" in the question, required a discussion covering areas of both support and challenge in order to reach a judgement. This could be done through careful examination of the content and implications of all 3 sources, so that candidates noted that different reasons were offered in F and G to explain why surgeons opposed Lister's ideas, or they explained how the perspective of a patient (in H) was unlikely to match with the surgeons' views in F. It was also pleasing to see a number of answers where the origins, nature or reliability of the sources were taken into consideration as the sources were weighed. In this approach many answers used the evidence of Source H to challenge the view in F that successful surgeons did not use Lister's ideas, since the surgeon treating the Queen was likely to be the most eminent surgeon. Equally acceptable was the answer which did not weight H heavily because this was single example and the Queen's doctor may not have been representative of the general views of the medical profession reported in F and G. There were also some answers which noted that Source H, Queen Victoria's comments, actually dated from before Sources F and G, while others made good use of G by discussing whether the German surgeon who wrote these comments was reporting the views of British surgeons with approval or whether he was condemning them.

Question 6

This question called for own knowledge and unfortunately, many candidates who could not provide it were limited to half marks. Where additional knowledge was included, it often focused on the practical difficulties of carbolic acid such as its effect on the surgeon's hands but some students could develop an explanation based on surgeons' lack of understanding of the germ theory linked to a general resistance to new ideas, or showed that Lister's experimentation in order to find the best technique created the impression that he himself was unsure of his own ideas. There were also some very good explanations of the fact that many surgeons recognised the value of Lister's antiseptic methods but rejected them because speed was still a key issue until the problem of blood loss was solved.

Some candidates confused antiseptics with anaesthetics and talked about religious objections or surgeons preferring to have their patients screaming in pain.

Question 7

There were a number of blank answers here, probably reflecting time management issues for those students. However, it is useful to note that many answers which scored full marks were relatively brief - often just half a side long. Most students readily understood that J presented a negative view of Lister while K was positive and they could select details or phrases from the sources to support their comments. A pleasing number also recognised the focus in the question on the impact of Lister's work rather than simply identifying different attitudes towards Lister. Although some answers simply repeated the phrase from K that he "revolutionised surgery" or saw the sources in absolute terms as being for or against Lister, there were some excellent answers which did recognise the subtleties in J. Good answers were able to explain that by stressing other developments in surgery the effect of J was to present a diminished view of Lister's importance while K suggested that he "single-handedly revolutionised surgery" and saw his work as a turning point. Answers also gained Level 3 which suggested that J saw Lister's work in the short term whereas K took a long term view.

Question 8

As always, there were a number of blank and unfinished answers here and students should be encouraged to develop time management skills so that they have time to write a proper answer to this question. Candidates were confident about the importance of antiseptics in surgery and there were very few weak answers, although some answers simply went through the sources named in the question, commenting on each of them, often using them to show that Lister was important but not discussing how important he was. Nevertheless, the majority of students did begin to construct some kind of argument about Lister's contribution to surgery. Unfortunately, many answers remained trapped at the bottom of Level 3 because they did not include additional knowledge. Many students used Source L to recognise that Lister's work was linked to Pasteur's germ theory but they could not always develop this by the inclusion of additional knowledge while a number of students thought that Pasteur was a surgeon or involved in medicine. Other inaccurate comments included the idea that Lister's work predated Pasteur's germ theory and that all surgeons remained hostile to antiseptic techniques until the 20th century. The work of Semmelweiss was sometimes used to challenge Lister's importance but few candidates recognised that Semmelweiss could not provide a theoretical basis for his work and that his ideas were not accepted. Although some good answers did explain the links between the work of Simpson and Pasteur, there were also a number of prepared answers focusing on who made the most important contribution to surgery or what factors helped Lister, or which went on to discuss surgery in the twentieth century- candidates should be reminded to answer the question that was set.

1336 Schools History Project 2009

22: Crime, punishment and protest

General Comments

It would be helpful if students could be reminded to write in black - answers on pale ink do not show up well onscreen.

Time management remains a problem for some students. It was noticeable that many of the students who took additional paper, did so on question 1, which only carried 6 marks. They should also be reminded that more space has been provided than they should need. Examiners felt that students recognised the high mark tariff on question 8, leading to fewer blank answers to question 8 than previously but an increase in blank answers for earlier questions, especially question 7.

Many candidates provided lengthy quotations from the sources or descriptions of the source content. Whole pages consisted of "This source says ... It also mentions ... Another thing it tells me .. and I quote .." This is Level 1 at best but also wastes time. The higher marks are always reserved for analysis, where the student comments on the significance of the source content or origins and only brief references are needed to support these comments. Candidates also wasted time by discussing source reliability when it was not appropriate.

A number of candidates still respond to the topic and do not analyse the question. This was particularly noticeable in question 3 where many students wrote about suffragettes rather than the sources and in question 6 where students often discussed the issue of forced feeding rather than explaining why it was introduced. Although a formulaic approach does not often score highly, students would benefit from understanding the different elements of the target objectives. For example, the usefulness or value of a source must consider the way source content can be used in an enquiry but also consider how the strength of that content is affected by the source nature / origins / reliability. In the same way, when considering how a written source conveys a particular impression, it is helpful to clearly differentiate between the language and the selection or treatment of content in a source. Many students recognise the need to sum up their comments in a conclusion but often this is just a re-statement of their comments rather than actually weighing up one side against another.

There were the usual problems of difficult handwriting and poor expression. "Would of" is still very common but there was relatively little slang or "text speak". However, the biggest problem is where students do not make clear which source is being used in their answer - in a question where the use of different sources is required, this can restrict students' access to the higher marks.

Question 1

Some answers remained in level 1 because students simply repeated the content of the sources or stated an inference without identifying the support for it in the sources. However, most students were easily able to make inferences about the type of tactics used by the suffragettes, their determination or the use of the media. A pleasing number of answers linked the sources to use them in combination.

Some students discussed what could not be learned from the sources, provided information from their own knowledge or evaluated the sources for reliability - none of these approaches was asked for and therefore no additional marks were gained but time was wasted.

A mistake based on the use of own knowledge was to state that the sources showed tactics becoming more militant and violent over time - in fact the source about non payment of taxes came from the later date.

Question 2

Many candidates found this question difficult. Partly this was due to lack of own knowledge but many also became confused because Source D was chronologically before Source C and they became confused about the conditions and reforms in prisons. Centres should remind students that this is a nominated topic and they are expected to bring contextual knowledge to this paper. A disappointing number of candidates thought that Elizabeth Fry was a contemporary, or even a member, of the Suffragettes, that prisoners were still kept in the conditions described in Source D during the early twentieth century, or stated that prison reform was a key aim of the suffragettes.

Good use of own knowledge included excellent detail on the work of John Howard and Elizabeth Fry, (with a small minority also mentioning Alexander Paterson), changes in the prisons, especially Peel's Gaol Act, changes in the penal system resulting in an increase in the prison population, and the use of the silent or separate systems. The best answers linked these changes to the shift in attitudes towards reform and rehabilitation.

Question 3

In some ways there have been clear improvements in the responses to questions about the value of sources for an enquiry. Although many answers remain focused on the idea that a source's value depends solely on the information it contains, there were good explanations showing how that information would aid the historian in his enquiry rather than simply stating that a source is useful because it tells you something. There also seemed to be an increase in the number of answers which recognised that a source's origins affect the value of the information. However, too many answers simply repeated the provenance of the source without explaining how that affected the way the historian would use the content.

A disappointing number of candidates were not able to score highly because they interpreted the question as asking them to use the sources to write about suffragettes. Other candidates discussed the use of the march and the song as tactics, considering how effective they were likely to be in raising support. This sort of question features every year and candidates should be expecting it yet the

same problems are reported regularly and there was also a number of blank answers where the question had not even been attempted.

There were relatively few good answers which weighed up the value of a photograph of a single march against the lyrics of a song written specifically to express suffragette ideas. Far too many accepted the photograph at face value without questioning whether this peaceful and large scale image was a typical march or if the angle of the photograph had been selected, while others dismissed it completely because it was just a photograph and didn't provide explanations and details. In the same way, candidates found it difficult to see the value of F without knowing how many people sang the song and did not consider that was a deliberate expression of suffragette aims, explicitly stating their frustration after 40 years of campaigns for votes for women.

It is clear that many candidates are trying to weigh the sources in order to answer the question but they do not always think their answer through before they begin to write. A sizeable number of answers suggested that one source was better than the other and then contradicted themselves at the end.

Question 4

Students have become familiar with this style of question and most of them responded well to the source but some attempted to explain the context, especially forced feeding, or discussed whether the suffragettes were right to use such tactics, while others were sidetracked into discussing the reliability of the source.

Many candidates easily identified the sympathetic tone of the article but they did not always provide a specific reference to the source to support their comment or copied extracts from the source without explaining how they created a sympathetic impression. Answers tended to be better explained when they showed how the author created the impression that suffragettes were brave through a comparison with soldiers and the mention of torture.

The best answers focused on both what was said (that the suffragettes were physically weak, they fulfilled their promises, care was taken to avoid injuries) and how it was said (the comparison to soldiers on a battlefield, the use of the word "torture" and the suggestion that this was a certainty in prison). They also commented on the fact that Brailsford deliberately omitted any emphasis on their illegal actions or the fact that hunger strike was the suffragettes' own choice.

Question 5

Cross referencing is a difficult skill and examiners noted a number of blank answers where students had not attempted this question. Many students did not go beyond matching the overall view of forced feeding shown in sources G, H and I rather than establishing what impression was given in G of treatment in prison and relating details of H and I to that impression. Candidates should remember to make it clear which source is being used in their comments since examiners need to see evidence of all 3 sources being used.

There is also the tendency for weaker students to assume that "support" must mean approval - centres should ensure that students recognise the use of the word can mean that one source confirms or provides evidence for a negative view expressed in another source. Some students lost sight of the question and

discussed suffragette tactics, hunger strikes and forced feeding or went on to explain why forced feeding was stopped.. There were also some answers which quoted Source H at length without relating it to Source G.

At the highest level, there was a recognition that "How far" in the question, required a discussion covering areas of both support and challenge in order to reach a judgement. This could be done through careful examination of the content and implications of all 3 sources, so that candidates noted that G spoke of the certainty of hunger strike and forced feeding while H made it clear this was a choice made by the suffragettes. It was also pleasing to see a number of answers where the origins, nature or reliability of the sources were taken into consideration as the sources were weighed. In this approach many answers discussed the fact that Source I was a reconstruction created by the suffragettes to gain public sympathy.

Question 6

This question called for own knowledge and unfortunately, many candidates struggled to provide it and were therefore limited to half marks; there was also a relatively high number of blank answers on this question. Where additional knowledge was included, it was not always relevant - it is possible that candidates were confused by the comment in J's caption explaining that some hunger strikers had been released to avoid death, but far too many students wrote about the Cat and Mouse Act and explained why forced feeding was ended. A number of answers repeated the term "martyr" from H but could not expand upon it.

Some good answers explained the difficulty posed for the government by allowing middle class women to starve themselves and become martyrs, showed how the escalation of militant tactics forced the government to take action, or explained how the government was fearful of appearing weak and setting a precedent of lenient treatment, especially in view of the Irish Home Rule movement.

Question 7

There were some blank answers here, probably reflecting time management issues for those students. However, it is useful to note that many answers which scored full marks were relatively brief - often just half a side long.

Most students readily understood that K presented a negative view of the suffragette campaign while L suggested these tactics were successful in many ways and they could select details or phrases from the sources to support their comments, although the negative / positive view was often attributed to the gender of the author. A pleasing number also recognised the focus in the question on the impact of the campaign rather than simply identifying different attitudes towards the suffragettes. Good answers were able to explain that K judged the impact of the campaign purely in terms of gaining the franchise while L took a wider view and recognised the growing public support as a result of the campaigns.

Question 8

As always, there were a number of blank and unfinished answers here and students should be encouraged to develop time management skills so that they have time to write a proper answer to this question.

Answers here tended to fall mainly into Level 2 and Level 3. Some answers simply went through the sources named in the question, commenting on each of them and making some link to the question. Nevertheless, the majority of students did begin to construct some kind of argument about the suffragettes but unfortunately, many answers remained trapped at the bottom of Level 3 because they did not include additional knowledge. It was also disappointing to see a number of answers full of excellent own knowledge about suffragette tactics and Emily Davison's death, which could not be highly rewarded because they wrote about the role of publicity in suffragettes getting the vote rather than the government's difficulties in dealing with them. A number of answers also included an explanation of women's contribution to the war effort as an explanation of why suffragettes got the vote - candidates should be reminded to answer the question that was set.

1336 Schools History Project 2009

Coursework Units Report

The process once again worked well this year with moderators once again commenting upon the impressive standard of work displayed by many candidates. Students obviously enjoyed their courses and were able to respond to the objective questions. As we near the end of this particular specification the points below, many of which were made in 2008, should be followed.

The majority of tasks set by centres are Edexcel designed which enabled students to respond satisfactorily. Many of the centre designed assignments followed the Edexcel format and these performed well in practice as well. It does need to be noted that all centre assignments need approval by the Board using form HG1 which should be sent to the moderator along with all the other details for moderation purposes. These forms only give some comment about the possible workings of a particular question and any advice from a moderator on the E9 should be taken as a course of action that should be followed in order to improve the tasks set. It is particularly important that the format of 5 questions for Objectives 2 and 3 are followed so that a spread of marks can be achieved and level 4 can be demonstrated. Where some centres did disadvantage their students is by changing this format and consequently candidates could not demonstrate the requirements for the top level 3 and level 4 descriptors. If any changes are made to the assignments centres should inform the board so that they can be checked.

Centres should also take into account the quality of written communication when deciding at standardisation where a particular piece of work falls in a level. Some moderators did comment upon centres over rewarding students for a poor standard of English with the objective 1 assignment. With objectives 2 and 3 moderators did raise a concern about the lack of understanding displayed by students with utility of source. It is crucial that students are able to demonstrate the context of the sources when explaining their thoughts. One requirement for objective 1 that moderators are becoming increasingly concerned about is the lack of ability to select, organise and deploy information. If this objective is followed correctly students should be able to produce concise answers instead of, in one case 10,000 words! The Board does suggest a word limit for assignments of 1,500 words for each assignment.

The most worrying development this year was the lack of adequate annotation and little evidence provided for internal standardisation. A few centres provided work to moderators with little indication of how the marks have been arrived at. It is a Board requirement that work is annotated by providing a level and a comment to support this decision. It would also help if any comments that are made are directed towards the moderator and not the student.

In 2008 the coursework report gave a list of requirements for the moderation package. This year moderators did encounter many problems, and had to send letters requiring extra information, so it is timely to remind centres that they need to supply the following items for moderation;

- All work should have form HG2 (the front sheet) attached to the work of the student with the marks and exam number details fully completed
- An authentication form should also be attached to the students work. It should be noted that this form does NOT replace form HG2. Both forms are required because one is signed by the student and one by the teacher. This is a QCA requirement
- Assignment details and mark schemes are necessary as moderators do not have a stack of all the different assignments
- The class notes of a students work is a crucial item so that moderators can see the context for the coursework and understand where the background information comes from
- The top and bottom candidates work has to be included with the sample. It is important to note that the bottom candidate will probably only have produced one piece of work.
- Some evidence for internal standardisation.
- Form HG1 for centre designed assignments.
- Centres that send their marks by EDI should also send the optems so that moderators can check the asterixed candidates.
- It would be extremely helpful is large centres could indicate the teaching groups on the Optems form.

Moderators do take their role seriously and offer advice on the E9 in order to improve the standardisation and moderation process. It is the responsibility of the centre to act upon this advice so that any errors do not occur the following year.

Statistics

1336 Option 1 (A1, P1, 21, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	83	74	65	56	47	38	29	20	0

1336 Option 2 (B1, P1, 21, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	79	71	63	55	46	37	29	21	0

1336 Option 3 (C1, P1, 21, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	81	73	65	57	47	38	29	20	0

1336 Option 4 (A1, Q1, 22, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	83	73	63	54	45	36	27	18	0

1336 Option 5 (B1, Q1, 22, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	75	67	59	52	43	35	27	19	0

1336 Option 6 (C1, Q1, 22, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	77	69	61	54	45	36	27	18	0

1336 Paper A1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper A1 grade boundaries	40	32	22	10

1336 Paper B1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper B1 grade boundaries	40	29	20	10

1336 Paper C1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper C1 grade boundaries	40	31	23	11

1336 Paper P1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper P1 grade boundaries	40	33	24	14

1336 Paper Q1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper Q1 grade boundaries	40	29	21	12

1336 Paper 21 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 21 grade boundaries	60	44	34	18

1336 Paper 22 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 22 grade boundaries	60	41	32	16

1336 Paper 3 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 3 grade boundaries	100	73	54	25

3336 Option 2 (12, 02) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	84	73	62	52	43	34	25	16	0

3336 Option 3 (13, 02) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	89	77	65	54	45	36	27	18	0

3336 Paper 12 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 12 grade boundaries	55	40	28	14

3336 Paper 13 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 13 grade boundaries	55	43	32	15

3336 Paper 2 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 2 grade boundaries	100	73	54	25

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 UG021448 Summer 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on
0870 240 9800

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