

**GNVQ**

**Chief Examiner's Report**

**GNVQ Intermediate Full Award  
Information & Communication Technology**

**June 2004**

**G015293**

**edexcel** 

London Qualifications is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. It incorporates all the qualifications previously awarded under the Edexcel and BTEC brand. We provide a wide range of qualifications including general (academic), vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, our centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk)

June 2004

Publications Code G015293

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© London Qualifications Ltd. 2004

## Contents

1. Chief Examiner's General Comments	4
2. Unit 1: Presenting Information	7
3. Unit 5: Information Resources	15
4. Grade Boundaries	19

London Qualifications Ltd holds the copyright for this publication. Further copies of the **Examiner's Reports** may be obtained from Edexcel Publications.

# Chief Examiner's Report

## General Comments

This report provides detailed individual feedback for the units externally examined in the summer 2004 series.

The examination might include questions on any part of the unit content as defined in the Assessment Evidence Grid and the What You Need To Learn section of the unit specification. It was clear that candidates in some centres were ill-prepared to answer such questions. In particular, they were unable to use, identify or understand technical terms as used in the subject specification.

There was also evidence of some candidates being entered for Intermediate GNVQ when the Foundation level would have been more appropriate. Such candidates have more opportunity of demonstrating their ability when entered at the correct level for their abilities.

Some candidates are too immature to answer some questions. Candidates from some centres are being entered in years 7, 8 and 9 when this is a course equivalent in standard to GCSE grades A to C, more suited to candidates in years 10 to 12.

These general points on the performance of candidates across all units apply.

- It was apparent that some candidates were entered before they were ready.
- Some candidates limited their answers to stating/ naming/ identifying when the question asked for descriptions or explanations.
- Many candidates did not read questions carefully enough. Key words were often missed with candidates seemingly answering the question they would like to answer rather than the actual question on the examination paper.
- Some candidates appeared to have learnt specific answers which they then used in response to the best-fit question. Often these were responses to questions in the January examination paper.

The following points are again made to help in the preparation of students for future GNVQ examinations.

1. The papers will expect students to have a good knowledge and understanding of the syllabus specification. Papers will be testing the application of such knowledge to real or simulated situations.
2. Delivery of courses should include instruction on concepts, terminologies and techniques and should also follow the vocational philosophy of learning by doing and by studying what is happening in the real world.
3. Papers will be constructed to test, wherever possible, the following aspects of each unit:
  - the full content of the What You Need to Learn.
  - the Assessment Evidence Grid.
  - any additional points from the Essential Information for Teachers which relates to the content or assessment evidence grid.
  - the generic grading criteria, which highlight the general qualities that distinguish between grades.

4. The assessment evidence grid provides an example of what might be tested at each grade. The generic grading criteria will be used, with this, to allow all parts of the content to be tested at any grade. Questions will be differentiated according to the skill being tested and the level of understanding, analysis, reasoning etc., required by the question.

### **Pre-prepared Work**

The pre-prepared work (PPW) is intended to support the candidate's learning and provide an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their abilities.

However, there were some common problems associated with this work.

- In a few centres the work of all candidates was similar, indicating too much guidance being given. In these centres, candidates were able to gain high marks on their PPW, yet would be unable to transfer skills and/or knowledge to answering the examination paper.
- The authentication statement is an important document and should be treated with respect. In some centres Teachers either did not sign the authentication statement for all candidates or allowed an authentication statement with a photocopied signature to be submitted.
- Teachers signed authentication statements for a few candidates where a cursory glance by the examiner indicated collusion between those candidates.

### **Common administrative problems**

The examination paper was marked online for this examination series and centres were asked to send paper 01 (the examination paper) to one address for scanning and paper 02 (pre-prepared work) to an examiner at another address. There were two attendance registers, one for each paper.

In many cases, centres ignored these instructions and sent all the work to the same address, usually the paper 01 address. This caused many problems, including:

- delays in the receipt of PPW by the examiner
- no attendance register for PPW, so examiners had no idea whether work was missing or the candidates were absent.

In addition:

- sticky labels were not affixed to the authentication statement.
- PPW scripts were not always sorted in the same order as the attendance register. It is time-consuming for examiners to sort the scripts out before starting to mark the scripts.
- a few centres are still submitting PPW in plastic wallets. This wastes the examiner's time.
- in some centres, printouts were not each clearly identified with the candidate's, name, number and centre number.
- some candidates submitted multiple printouts for a task or printouts of tasks that were not set for this examination.
- some centres did not include signed authentication statements for all candidates.
- PPW is a part of the examination. "Clean" copies should be submitted. Teachers should not permit candidates to submit marked PPW.

One centre sent a batch of papers to the examiner that was not sorted into individual candidate's work. Some pieces of work had no name on and it was impossible to allocate this work to any candidate. This centre did its candidates great disservice.

# Unit 1: Presenting Information

## General

There was evidence of some candidates being entered for Intermediate GNVQ when they should have been doing the Foundation level. Other candidates were entered in years 7, 8 and 9. Such candidates have more opportunity of demonstrating their ability when entered at the appropriate level and maturity.

## Paper 01

### General

Many candidates did not score well on this paper; common problems included:

- being too vague in their responses
- giving one or two word responses
- using technical language inappropriately, or not at all
- giving reasons when the question asked for descriptions
- answering a question from a previous paper instead of the question being asked in this paper.

Some candidates clearly had absolutely no understanding of the meaning of the technical language of the specification for example

- giving content instead of presentation techniques
- giving presentation techniques or writing styles instead of presentation styles
- talking about fonts instead of writing styles
- giving items of information rather than forms of information.

Some candidates did not appear to be familiar with the scenario. In order to reduce the amount of text given in the questions, there is an assumption that candidates, having spent approximately twenty hours working on their pre-prepared work, have an understanding of the scenario.

### Question 1

A significant number of candidates scored high marks on part (a); however some candidates answered poorly and had little idea of what constituted a presentation technique. Many responses were too vague, e.g. links, highlighting, font. Some candidates took the opportunity to list all the techniques they know, without any consideration as to whether they were used in the document.

Many candidates gave reasons why the presentation technique had been used i.e. "to make page stand out", instead of describing the technique used. Also a number of candidates described the method used to get graphics onto the web page, such as "copy & paste". Single word answers were also very common.

Many candidates continue to give content, such as logo and band members' names.

All previous issues with part (b) were still present. The candidates still felt that they should criticise the document rather than offer an improvement and they wanted to add things, rather than improve what was there. Where candidates gained marks,

they were for stating ways to improve the web page but candidates generally failed to clearly identify how/why it was improved.

Candidates generally failed to provide specific information on how the document can be improved using presentation techniques. Where candidates do seem aware of presentation techniques, some managed to achieve a mark for moving an object such as the heading or the logo, but a lot of “moves” were to an unspecified finishing position.

Candidates are often vague, for example they want to “make things bigger” or “use more word art” to make “it” more interesting. Bullet points are suggested without reference to what is being organised.

One misinterpretation was to “add more information”, usually in the form of pictures of the band. The use of colour and animated images also seemed to be the common responses. Some candidates were more interested in the features of web pages than the presentation.

## **Question 2**

Candidates from many centres clearly had not looked at an agenda. Many candidates had no idea of the layout or standard content. Some candidates even thought it was a letter or a memo. Candidates had agenda information in the wrong area and a number of candidates did not give any answer. The average mark for this question seemed to be five; date and time of meeting, numbered bullets and Marketing Director. Very few candidates scored ten marks.

Part (b) was very poorly answered. Candidates confused minutes with an agenda, e.g. what will happen and also memo in some cases. Some gave answers such as “easy to produce because they only take a minute”, “to say how long the meeting is for”. Most candidates scored one mark for this question with the most common answer being “to record what was said at the meeting”. Very few candidates gave a second point and even fewer stated that it was a summary of the discussions.

Part (c)(iii) was not very well answered. Answers such as: “so he knows what is happening” and “in case the fax or email was not received” were very common, also many candidates thought that the letter looking professional was a reason to confirm something in writing. Many repeated the question in the answer. A few higher-level candidates’ answers did reflect the business-to-business relationship.

## **Question 3**

This question displayed the usual problems, both in the candidates’ lack of understanding of the terms of the specification and their inability to answer the actual question being asked. Very many candidates did not fully understand the difference between presentation style, presentation technique and writing style. However, many candidates were particularly weak in their understanding of the meaning behind the command words. Where it asks for describe they tended to explain or give reasons. Ironically, where they were asked in part (b)(ii) to explain they clearly described the writing style.

Part (a)(i) was poorly answered, not many candidates had any real idea about what a presentation style was, many confusing it with techniques. Nevertheless, some candidates did gain marks for the style but not for the description, instead many gave reasons. Typical answers given incorrectly were: font style and colour, short & snappy sentences, confusing presentation style with writing style; word art to make writing stand out; loud, informative and bold. The most common correct answers were columns, table and text boxes. In the case of tables, this was almost always joined by “for the venues”. The problems with part (b)(i) were similar.

Some candidates appear to understand about “writing styles” in part (a)(ii), although frequently they did not expand their description of the writing style, instead explaining why the writing style is used; for example “informal because it is for fans”. It was disappointing to see so many candidates who misinterpreted the term writing style to mean font. Indeed, many candidates who stated formal/informal then went on to indicate that layout or fonts were meant rather than writing styles. Where reasons for writing styles were already given in answer to (a)(ii), some candidates were then unable to give sensible responses to (iii).

Many candidates did not get any marks for part (a)(iii) because they failed to mention a writing style in (ii) or (iii). The most common answer was “it was for fans”.

Good answers to part (b)(ii) were extremely rare, candidates generally described the content rather than giving a reason for the use of the writing style. Common mistakes refer to a description of the font style. Good answers are “that it is for adults (the roadies)” and “it is about rules”.

There were few good answers to part (b)(iii). Generally candidates seem, as usual, to be unaware of the concept of writing style and many suggested changes in the font, with answers such as “word art”, “bold and colourful”. Another common error was “I would put it in to an itinerary”.

#### **Question 4**

Candidates who attempted part (a) generally scored well on it. However, many candidates spotted a mistake and so gained one mark, but did not use the correct symbol; for example the “insert space” symbol was used where a colon or hyphen needs inserting. Other candidates were vague as to exactly which part was the error; for example the word JOB was generally indicated to be “lc”. The most common errors picked up were wembley, JOB, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> Oct and lightingsystem.

“Company image”, “confusing” and “loss of business” were common answers to part (b). Candidates were generally able to gain the first mark but expansions were generally poor. Some candidates gave repeated examples of miscommunication leading to problems. Other candidates focused on the use of the symbols causing problems for businesses. Some candidates tended to be vague in their responses; e.g. “might do things wrong at the wrong time”.

Part (c) was well answered although some candidates gave one word answers “spelling” and “grammar”, which were not enough to answer the question. A significant number failed to acknowledge the word “automatic” in the question and gave the answer proofreading, a correct answer to other questions in previous examination series.

## Question 5

Part (b) appeared to be a poorly understood question. There were many candidates who just did not attempt it. Most candidates only gained one mark for sensible use of times but did not use a suitable form to present the information. Many created paragraphs of writing instead of a table or other suitable form. Many lost marks for incorrect journey times or just repeated all the ferry and coach information. A considerable number of candidates failed to understand that the journey began at West Cowes. Many also chose the 16.30 ferry and completely ignored the walk from the ferry to the coach station. The accuracy of transcription was also very poor.

However, those candidates that had used a table would often achieve at least three marks, mainly losing a mark for the headings as they did not have the form of travel per phase.

## Question 6

There were many good answers to part (a)(iii) although some candidates were a little vague on specifically where the final graphic will be pasted. Most candidates clearly understood the process and could no doubt have done the task in the real world, but many lost marks due to imprecise answers such as “put into the leaflet” and “take a digital photo and get it onto the computer”.

Most candidates described taking a photo, downloading it and pasting it into the document. It was surprising that more didn't copy and paste onto the leaflet from the website. There were many vague answers which just stated “copy and paste”, not saying where they are copying from and where they are pasting it.

In part (iv), there was significant confusion over the word “manipulate” in that some candidates thought that the question was asking how images could be used in inappropriate ways to manipulate the reader and others did not understand the word at all.

There were some good answers which used techniques such as “crop”, “flip” and “rotation”, but these were in the minority. Some candidates interpreted this as importing into a “paint” program to change the colours. The majority of candidates did not give descriptions but instead listed various ways to manipulate.

Candidates' marks were also very variable for part (b). A disturbingly large number of students referred to save on CD, lock the door, hire a security guard etc. They had obviously revised from previous years' papers and were giving answers to these questions, indicating that they had not read the question to hand.

Candidates also seem confused about specific ICT security issues. Many candidates went into perfect answers about virus checkers in part (b), which would have got full marks in 6c(ii). They somehow managed to transpose the questions because many then gave a perfect answer for part (b) “firewalls to prevent hackers” in response to part (c)(ii).

Passwords were mentioned frequently in part (b) but not in relation to files, they were indicative of the usual username and password type answers. Candidates sometimes gained marks for stating the method of keeping data secure, with firewall being the most common answer, but few candidates expanded their answers with descriptions.

Part (c)(i) was generally well answered with most candidates getting a least one mark, which was usually giving an example of the kind of malicious damage that a computer virus might inflict on a system. A few candidates had no idea what a computer virus was; they saw it as an illness (the human form). Many answered a question from the January paper, writing about how the user knows they have a virus.

Most candidates did not score well on part (c)(ii). Using a virus checker was seen infrequently. Common responses were to get, install or buy a virus checker, none of which by itself is enough to avoid viruses. Also many candidates failed to appreciate that it is the attachment that carries the virus. It would seem that candidates do not have specific ICT knowledge, but have generalised type understanding. Firewall appears to be the answer to all ICT-based security problems  
Common, totally impractical, responses included “don’t use the Internet” and “don’t use e-mail”.

## **Paper 02**

It would appear that candidates in many centres are not familiar with a range of business documents. The specification includes a list of documents that candidates are expected to study. They should use knowledge gained about the presentation of such documents when they produce their own documents for submission.

Most candidates within many centres paid little attention to the detail given in the scenario. Facts were used inaccurately, given facts were omitted, little thought was given to the purpose of the documents and there was little attempt to use a corporate identity within the set of documents. Candidates were asked to design a company letterhead and use it to produce an itinerary in task three. Very few candidates applied knowledge learnt when producing the letter in task five; although some letterheads were similar it was rare that letters used the identical letterhead.

Some centres had clearly given the candidates the images to use in the tasks, particularly tasks one and four. Within some centres it appeared the teacher had also selected the information for the candidate and they then simply added it in, with a bit of their own work. This was particularly apparent for tasks one and three. This resulted in many tasks looking very similar.

There appeared to be far too much over direction by many centres, particularly in tasks one and three. Indeed the itinerary from some centres looked almost identical for every candidate.

### **Task 1**

This task was generally well done. Many candidates had a good idea of the layout and content of an information sheet for fans, although there were many newsletters instead of information sheets. Spelling had generally been checked, but this often lead to grammatical oddity.

Candidates lost marks for not using the correct Minds Eye logo as given. Candidates from a few centres used an entirely different band than the one given. Also a number of candidates did not use the correct size, i.e. A4. There was poor use of white space by many candidates, often within complete centres. Other common faults were incorrect spelling or capitalisation of band members' names, particularly Sundeep Kaur and Matt O'Brien. Some candidates inappropriately used cartoon graphics for the band members.

Candidates who scored poorly elsewhere generally managed to do well on this task.

## **Task 2**

This task was surprisingly poorly done. A significant number of candidates lost marks for not using an appropriate size i.e. A5 or A6. Many candidates gave little consideration to the intended audience, i.e. industry/media, instead producing invitations more suited to friends or fans, using unsuitable graphics and language. Some candidates addressed target audience by stating “not for fans”.

Very few candidates appreciated that it was Minds Eye Marketing plc who were doing the inviting and failed to include this on the invitation, those who did tended to use the company name incorrectly. Few candidates included company contact details. Many candidates failed to include details such as the band's name, RSVP or recipient name. A significant number of candidates used the venue name incorrectly, e.g. nitro club, Nitro Club, Nitro Night Club, nitro night club.

## **Task 3**

Again, this task was poorly attempted. Very few candidates achieved more than two or three marks and a considerable number of candidates achieved no marks for this task. Some candidates, often within complete centres, produced itineraries for band members rather than the roadies.

The company name was frequently omitted from the letterhead or used inaccurately. The address was often either wrong or incorrectly capitalised.

Many candidates referred to the Albert Hall rather than the Royal Albert Hall. Accommodation details were often missing. Both venue and hotel names were frequently incorrectly capitalised.

Candidates tended to have the timings correct for the setting up of the equipment, but didn't give the details of travelling from the hotel to the venue on day two. Few candidates mentioned what happens to the equipment at the end of the concert on day two.

Timings were often inconsistently presented, e.g. 20.00pm.

It was also apparent that a number of centres had over directed the candidates with this task. A large number of tasks were very similar indeed from the same centre, sometimes only the hotel names had been changed - with the layout and timings being the same. It was clear that this was not the candidate's own work.

## **Task 4**

Generally answered well, with some very good CD covers. However a significant minority of centres seemed to have a problem identifying the correct shape and size of a CD cover, many had back covers bigger than the front. In a few cases candidates lost marks for not identifying the back & front of the CD.

Many candidates did not acknowledge Sandy Lean. Many candidates from at least one centre used a different band from the one on information sheet. Most candidates listed the tracks and included the band's name, but often again used inconsistent capitalisation.

## **Task 5**

There seemed to be little knowledge/understanding of the structure and layout of a business letter. The date, reference and subject were continually missed out. A large minority of candidates didn't score any marks for this task.

A substantial number of candidates from most centres did not use the same template for the letterhead as that used for Itinerary in task three. Few candidates included the designation (some put Managing Director instead of Marketing Director). Many candidates did not leave enough space for the signature. A large number of candidates used capital 'S' for sincerely.

Only a handful of candidates had the recipient name included. Some candidates referred to Suresh Patel as Mrs/Miss/Ms despite the task indicating that Suresh is male.

## **Standard Ways of Working**

Most candidates gained full marks here. However, some candidates lost marks for not submitting all tasks, a few did not submit tasks in correct order, and others omitted centre number and were not securely fastened.

The spell checking facility had generally been used, often leading to odd content such as band members "looking forward to precipitating in your show". Candidates should be encouraged to proof read their work as well as using the spell checker.

## Unit 5: Information Resources

### General

One-word answer questions were best answered. Candidates found it difficult to give explanations, advantages and disadvantages difficult.

Generally, candidates attempted all of the questions. There was evidence that there was enough time for the candidates to complete the paper. Candidates who achieved the higher scores achieved this by attempting all of the questions and attempting the expansions for several questions. There was evidence that some centres had not covered the unit specifications as students showed lacking in the identification of technical terms and associated meanings.

### Paper 1

#### Question 1

This question was attempted by most of the students.

Students lost marks in part (a) for not expanding the answers to include all of the stated functions of each department, which were available in the scenario in the front of the exam paper. Students often missed marks on (ii) by not stating "ordering".

There were a lot of disappointing answers to part (b)(i) which didn't really demonstrate much understanding of the benefits of the methods they could often quite easily identify. Many candidates gave repetitive reasons like "quick and easy". However the more/ able candidates gained high marks. Overall it was answered well by most candidates.

In part (b)(ii) some candidates got extra marks as either 2 advantages or 1 advantage and an expansion were accepted – most got the extra marks for the 2nd advantage. The methods were usually answered correctly for all 3.

#### Question 2

Generally this question was well answered as most candidates displayed an understanding of the hardware and database fields.

Most students correctly identified an input device in part (a)(i); an output device in (ii) and storage media in part (iii), with many choosing the USB data pen showing knowledge of the more recent storage devices.

Significant numbers of candidates failed to gain marks in part (b)(i) by naming documents such as CVs and application forms rather than following the process through and relating answers to the payroll process, but generally it was well answered.

In part (b)(ii) most candidates gained some marks, although weaker candidates tended to produce field names such as Address1, Address2, and Town etc. thus failing to identify separate pieces of information. This may be due to the question being similar to a previous paper where database field names were needed. The

majority of the candidates did well on this and got three out of the four marks available.

Far too many candidates did not appreciate the need to develop the advantages/disadvantages they were able to identify in part (c). There were many vague responses, which did not warrant marks.

Part (d) was either done very well or very badly. Some just copied the list from above but others thought about what they had to do and completed it well. Those that didn't do that well appeared to have no knowledge about flow diagrams, despite them being on the paper for the last few series.

### **Question 3**

Most candidates attempted all parts of this question.

Most candidates failed to recognise the "Browser" in part (a)(i) and those who did tried to increase their chances by writing several answers. Most candidates correctly identified search engine in (ii), however there were some candidates who got (i) and (ii) confused.

Part (b) was generally answered well with candidates correctly identifying the keywords needed to perform the search.

Most got three out of the four marks for part (c)(i), identifying where the images could come from. In part (ii) some did not scan the image first but went on to copy and paste into a new document. Some just picked copy and paste with no relevance to anything in particular. Most candidates gained at least two marks.

A common problem with part (c)(iii) occurred because candidates did not know what copyright law was, or what the actual legislation implied. Candidates who did score seldom got more than one mark. Even more able candidates did not score more than 2 marks.

### **Question 4**

Many pass candidates lost marks for not expanding the advantages and disadvantages of their answers.

In part (a) a source was generally given for both with a disadvantage of each but no expansion to gain the full marks.

Most candidates were able to identify at least three correct methods of communication in part (b). Many candidates were able to gain marks for expansions such as 'lost in the post' but fewer were able to gain the second mark available. Weaker candidates struggled to identify a third method of communication.

A significant number of candidates were able to identify the need for a checking process in part (c) but answers then tended to be vague with few candidates identifying the need to check with the original source. On the whole this part was answered well.

## Question 5

This question was not answered well - complying with the DPA law got confused with general confidentiality issues, use of passwords was answered well but the spread of viruses was limited to getting a virus checker and the confidential issue was confused with keeping data safe – locking rooms etc.

Part (a) was well answered by many candidates but some were confused with copyright in part (i). Good candidates who had studied the DPA gained three marks quite easily in part (ii). However many candidates had obviously not studied the DPA and they generally gained no marks or one for the general ideas of keeping the data safe/secure.

Part (b) was generally well answered. In part (ii) many candidates correctly identified rules to follow, possibly because of recent virus scares in computer systems and guidelines given to students at centres.

Part (c) was poorly answered; in most cases candidates did not identify the confidentiality aspect of the questions choosing to select physical or other methods of keeping data safe.

## **Paper 02**

Many candidates included a lot of research documentation, sometimes up to 20 extra pages. Candidates should be encouraged to submit only those tasks required.

### **Task 1a**

A significant number of candidates still used the past tense, which lost them a valuable mark. The task is about planning a task.

### **Task 1b**

On the whole this task was completed well; some candidates missed out the image on the fact sheet but most gained full marks.

### **Task 1c**

This task was not completed well in most cases, candidates failed to give specific examples of the benefits of their chosen method and some failed to make a choice losing them available marks.

### **Task 2a**

This task was generally well done by candidates who generally only lost marks for the identification of the two travellers and the total costs.

### **Task 2b**

Generally answered well, but some candidates still failed to show the search condition that they used to complete a search.

### **Task 3**

This was the poorest task as several candidates failed to mention the staff in any way, losing a mark. Many candidates just copied and pasted information about the Dewey Decimal System from the internet, and therefore lost marks as it was not relevant to the task.

### **Task 4**

On the whole the bibliography was answered well. Candidates lost usually one mark for not identifying the CD ROM encyclopaedia used in their task.

### **Task 5**

It was clear that many students could create back-up copies of their files but many could not evidence this in two separate screen shots of the files and their back-ups of all tasks one to three.

## **Standard Ways of Working**

On the whole candidates achieved good marks on this as many more centres ensured that the candidates understood that their documents should be in the correct order and when stated tasks were to be on only one page.

## GRADE BOUNDARIES

### Y201T Presenting Information

Unit no		Distinction	Merit	Pass	N	U
Y201T	Upper	128	96	72	49	26
	Lower	97	73	50	27	
	Cumulative % of candidates	0.1	4.4	35.0	73.3	100.0

### Y205T Information resources

Unit no		Distinction	Merit	Pass	N	U
Y205T	Upper	119	82	66	51	36
	Lower	83	67	52	37	
	Cumulative % of candidates	1.2	18.3	56.5	76.9	100.0

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4LN  
Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481  
Order Code G014505

For more information on Edexcel qualifications please contact our  
Customer Response Centre on 0870 240 9800  
or email: [enquiries@edexcel.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@edexcel.org.uk)  
or visit our website: [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk)

