



## General Certificate of Education

# Geography 6031 *Specification A*

*GGA5*

## Mark Scheme

### *2005 examination - June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

## GGA5

### General Guidance for A Level Geography Assistant Examiners

#### Quality of Written Language

As required by QCA, the marking scheme for this unit includes an overall assessment of quality of written communication. There are no discrete marks for the assessment of written communications but where questions are “Levels” marked, written communication will be assessed as one of the criteria within each level.

- Level 1:** Language is basic, descriptions and explanations are over simplified and lack clarity.
- Level 2:** Generally accurate use of language; descriptions and explanations can be easily followed, but are not clearly expressed throughout.
- Level 3:** Accurate and appropriate use of language; descriptions and explanations are expressed with clarity throughout.

#### Levels marking – General Criteria

The following general criteria relate to knowledge, understanding and their critical application and the quality of written communication as outlined in the AQA Geography A subject specification. They are designed to assist examiners in determining into which band the quality of response should be placed, and should be used when assessing the level of response an answer has achieved. It is anticipated that candidates’ performances under the various dimensions will be broadly inter-related and the general guidelines for each level are as follows:

- Level 1:** An answer at this level is likely to:
- display a basic understanding of the topic;
  - make one of two points without support of appropriate exemplification or application of principle;
  - demonstrate a simplistic style of writing, perhaps lacking close relation to the term of the question and unlikely to communicate complexity of subject matter;
  - lack organisation, relevance and specialist vocabulary;
  - demonstrate deficiencies in legibility, spelling, grammar and punctuation, which detract from the clarity of meaning.
- Level 2:** An answer at this level is likely to:
- display a clear understanding of the topic;
  - make one or two points with support of appropriate exemplification and/or application of principle;
  - demonstrate a clear style of writing which clearly addresses the terms of the question
  - demonstrate a degree of organisation and use of specialist terms.
  - demonstrate sufficient legibility of and quality of spelling, grammar and punctuation to communicate meaning clearly.

**Level 3:** An answer at this level is likely to:

- display a detailed understanding of the topic;
- make several points with support of appropriate exemplification and/or application of principle;
- demonstrate a sophisticated style of writing incorporating measured and qualified explanation and comment as required by the question and reflecting awareness of the complexity of subject matter and/or incompleteness/tentativeness of explanation;
- demonstrate a clear sense of purpose so that the responses are seen to closely relate to the requirements of the question with confident use of specialist vocabulary;
- demonstrate legibility of text, and qualities of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which contribute to complete clarity of meaning.

**NB** A perfect answer is not usually required for full marks. Clearly it will be possible for an individual candidate to demonstrate variable performance between the levels. In such cases, the principle of best-fit should be applied. Experience suggests that the use of exemplars within this mark scheme and the discussion, which takes place during the Standardisation Meeting, normally provides sufficient guidance on the use of levels in marking.

### **Annotation of Scripts**

- Where an answer is marked using a levels of response scheme the examiner should annotate the script with a 'L1' 'L2' or 'L3' at the point where that level is thought to have been reached. The consequent mark should appear in the right-hand column. Where an answer fails to achieve Level 1, zero marks should be given.
- Where answers do not require levels of response marking, each script should be annotated to show that one tick equals one mark. It is helpful if the tick can be positioned in the part of the answer which is thought to be credit-worthy.

### **General**

It is important to recognise that many of the answers shown within this marking scheme are only exemplars. Where possible, the range of accepted responses is indicated, but because many questions are open-ended in their nature, alternative answers may be equally credit-worthy. The degree of acceptability is clarified through the Standardisation Meeting and subsequently by telephone with the Team Leader as necessary.

### Question 1

- a) Response should show an ability to analyse tabular data distinguishing between variations within the nitrogen fertiliser data between “fantastic” growth, medium and low growth rate, even decline in the Netherlands (1-3) and variation within phosphate fertiliser from modest growth to substantial decline (1-3). Credit also contrast in volume of size and trend between nitrogen and phosphate (1-2). Comments which elaborate or qualify trends are creditable. 1 mark available for accurate manipulation of data.

Thus there are several ways of accessing 4 marks and examiners should be sure to recognise sophisticated as well as more basic points.

**(4 marks)**

- b) Response should show knowledge and understanding of the factors which have encouraged intensive farming of a capital intensive nature in general and use of fertiliser in particular - technological developments, high levels of demand, government support for farming - subsidy, e.g. CAP intervention pricing; agricultural improvement grants, reorganisation grants encouraging larger farms and so on. (1-4 depending on detail and development). There is a trade off here between breadth and depth; however, outline means more than just list. A list of 3-4 accurate factors should attract 1 mark. Candidates may well distinguish between nitrogen and phosphate but responses which do not distinguish between types of fertilizer are perfectly creditable.

**(4 marks)**

- c) Response should show detailed knowledge and understanding of the less desirable outcomes of intensive farming in western Europe/United Kingdom - or indeed in any other comparable area. Detailed accounts of fertiliser impact including nitrates or phosphates only are fully creditable. These include pollution of local and regional environments - detail can be expected and rewarded on various aspects including groundwater/water course pollution, also atmospheric pollution e.g. nitrous emissions, bovine flatulence and their greenhouse impacts, linked with the intensification of chemical and energy inputs. Also credit wider intensification outcomes such as aesthetic landscape impacts. Socio/economic impacts in terms of demand for labour, impact on local communities and so on. Overarching or even sideways comment about unsustainability is certainly relevant and creditable. (Comment which queries the idea of the trends being a source of concern is perfectly creditable as long as it contributes to a balanced outline of reasons which acknowledge the concerns.)

Relevant exemplification at a variety of scales is possible and that which contributes to illustration of points should be credited.

Level 1 Generic Descriptor (1-3). Simple knowledge and understanding of impacts of intensification - perhaps a little detail on one aspect.

Level 2 Generic Descriptor (4-5). More refined knowledge and understanding with some detail on impacts of intensification - perhaps some detail on more than one aspect.

Level 3 Generic Descriptor (6-7). Clear knowledge and understanding of a variety of reasons possibly with some sense of summary emerging.

**(7 marks)**

**Total for this Question: 15 marks**

---

---

**Question 2**

- a) Response should show knowledge and understanding of changes in inner cities within the last 40 years or so and this therefore encompasses economic, social, environmental deterioration as well as their partial recovery whether by market led or government led initiatives. Hence a considerable variety of responses is creditable. For example economic decline with attendant impacts on employment, abandonment, decline and dereliction of land/premises and related environmental impacts, abandonment of housing, failure in some public housing initiatives, etc. Equally regeneration and renewal might be outlined depending on photo selected. This might be reported favourably or not, again depending on selected example or candidate's own predilection - for example physical, social, economic renewal, employment opportunities, income etc or problematic relationships with local labour markets and local community needs, gentrification in housing markets and so on (1-3 depending on detail and development). Statements about what photographs show without "aspects of recent change". Maximum 1 mark. Thus there are several ways of accessing 4 marks and examiners should be sure to recognise different routeways and sophisticated as well as more basic points. Responses rooted in national settings other than UK are perfectly creditable.

**(4 marks)**

- b) Response should show knowledge and understanding of one or more initiatives. These might include original urban policy initiatives connected with the Inner Urban Areas Act, economic and housing initiatives or strategies associated with the 1980s with (purportedly ) more market led initiatives, Urban Development Corporations (UDCs), Enterprise Zones even Garden Cities, specific schemes such as Mersey, Salford, Cardiff Bay, Heartlands, London Docklands or others might form a focus. More recently more locally based initiatives with "joined up" nature involving local communities, integrated approaches e.g. *Excellence in Cities* etc is creditable. The question does not ask for a critical approach to the policy(ies) but if comment is made in the 8 lines available this should not be discounted as creditable - as long as it is associated with a genuine outline of policy(ies). (1-4 per policy depending on detail - detail might include appropriate exemplification). Identification of at least one specific policy (1). Clearly some trade off between depth and breadth but outline means more than just mention so a simple list, however accurate, is not creditable. Responses rooted in national settings other than UK are perfectly creditable.

**(4 marks)**

- c) Response should show knowledge and understanding of recent and contemporary inner urban redevelopment and much of the material alluded to in parts a) and b) will be relevant along with the images presented in Figure 2 which may well prompt negative or positive comment depending on the values taken this means that economic, social, environmental, political aspects of redevelopment may creditably be scrutinised by candidates. The wording of the question "a good thing" needs to be recognised and we can expect and reward candidates who make a measured response which "considers the attitudes and values of decision makes as well as exploring their own in relation to these developments" (Spec A page 34). The response will clearly need to be securely rooted in a particular context and show an awareness of generic issues but is likely to focus on their relationship between developments and community needs, the success of some schemes compared with what went before as in the case of Docklands - the only requirement is that it is securely founded and measured and reasonable in expression. Relevant exemplification which contributes to illustration of points made should be credited.

Level 1 Generic Descriptor (1-3). Simple knowledge of schemes with perhaps an implied or stated view. Alternatively detailed account of schemes with no view. Detailed account without clear reference to appropriate named inner city area, e.g. generic or lacking in a focus.

Level 2 Generic Descriptor (4-5). More refined knowledge with more explicit and measured statement about good thing or not. Some reference to appropriate named area.

Level 3 Generic Descriptor (6-7). Detailed knowledge of developments and issues with clear sense of coming to a view about good thing or not, clearly rooted in appropriate named area.

**(7 marks)**

**Total for this question: 15 marks**

### Question 3

- a) Response should show ability to read and summarise the pattern of land uses shown on the map identifying pattern rather than mentioning the location of particular types of land use - thus summary statement about generalities shown are creditable. Central CBD/historic nucleus (1) focus on headland/castle/ and pre 19<sup>th</sup> century nucleus or harbour (1), symmetry N/S either side of headland (1); linearity approximately parallel with beaches (1), peripheral residential areas (1). Measured statements about concentric zones and/or wedges/sections (1-2). Each point 1 mark may extend to 2 if clearly developed. **(4 marks)**
- b) Response should show knowledge and understanding of the role of primary resources in the development of a tourist area - in this case the impact of topography on the arrangement of land use in typical seaside resorts. The role of the beach in the linear alignment of land uses particularly the promenade/seafront type activities and hotels in relation to the beaches (1-3 depending on detail). Similarly the gardens. The (apparently) fundamental influence of topography in determining the early pattern of development around the headland and the castle (1-2) castle defensive/vantage point on headland. More sophisticated responses might go into the role of the railway and station in extending the hotels and seafront zones by generating 19 and early 20<sup>th</sup> century tourism (1). Generalised statements about the concentric growth outwards are creditable (1) also responses which explains sectors or wedges of tourist related activities explicitly should certainly be credited as they relate to the linearity referred to above (1). Accept mix of generic and seaside urban factors. Can be quite relaxed about precise link between explanation in (b) and patterns described in (a). **(4 marks)**
- c) Response should show knowledge and understanding of experience of a specified MEDW resort. Changes in income, mobility, tastes and predilections are legitimate along with increased accessibility of more distant locations/settings. Various models of tourist behaviour and indeed tourist resort development (for example Butler) are perfectly creditable as long as clearly related to the named resort. The impacts may well have been those of decline in tourism and real local economic, employment, social and environmental problems, repositioning in markets, regeneration schemes - in this context judicious use of the Butler model may well be very effective and creditable. However it is perfectly possible that expansionary effects of changing patterns may be envisaged for some MEDW resorts. E.g. possibly parts of Spain, Greece, Portugal, perhaps Florida resorts in relation to European tourists. The effects should be expressed in terms of change in character/role for better or for worse and/or the effectiveness or not of attempts to relocate resorts in the tourist market - in other words several types of result should be recognised and credited. Flexible view on scale of resorts so Rivera, Costa del Sol, Ibiza, etc., are acceptable. Relevant exemplification which contributes to illustration of points made should be credited.

Level 1 Generic Descriptor (1-3). Simple outline of some relevant changes in tourism patterns and suggestions of result. More detailed outline of relevant changes without reference to a named resort.

Level 2 Generic Descriptor (4-5). Fuller account of relevant changes, and clear reference to results perhaps with appropriate reference to models such as Butler; firm reference to a named resort.

Level 3 Generic Descriptor (6-7). Detailed account of relevant changes and clearly rooted in named resort. Perhaps confident reference to models such as Butler. Some sense of overview of changes and impacts.

**(7 marks)**

**Total for this Question: 15 marks**

### **Mark Scheme for Synoptic Essays**

#### **Preamble**

Examiners should bear in mind that these questions are synoptic in nature and offer candidates the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and understanding:

1. across a range of geographical subject matter;
2. of connections between the different aspects of geography in the specification;
3. of the importance, where relevant, of human perspectives on themes and issues.

Candidates are advised of this both in the Assessment Unit Rubric and in the Note to Candidate, which precedes the essay questions in Section B. Synoptic elements might therefore feature in answers matching all the criteria bands but can be expected to feature more prominently in higher mark bands. It will be seen that explicit synoptic content is a necessary feature of the two band ranges 19-24 and 25-30.

Additionally, essay writing is an important vehicle for the demonstration of communication skills – at level 3 these refer to writing in a manner appropriate to purpose and complex subject matter; organising relevant information clearly and coherently using specialist vocabulary as appropriate and ensuring clarity of meaning through legible text, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar. (Key Skills – Communication Level 3 C3.3 [QCA]; Para. 13 AS/A Level Geography Specification Outlines [QCA].

Synoptic content and communication aspects should be kept in mind when assessing the unit and are incorporated into the criteria bands set out below which refer to knowledge, understanding and skills. Indicate synoptic content using the letter's' in the margin as appropriate.

## **CRITERIA BANDS**

Examiners will use the criteria below to evaluate the work, placing the candidate's performance in the appropriate band and attributing the mark from the left-hand column appropriate to the question concerned. They should seek the best fit from the band descriptor – work adjudged to be in a particular band might not contain all the features attributed to that band.

### **25 – 30**

A very good answer. Consistently relevant to the theme and to the demands of the question. Evaluates explicitly where required. Displays a very confident range of knowledge and understanding by using the appropriate terminology, critically referring to concepts and theory where necessary and establishing relationships between different physical and/or human factors and processes. Synoptic elements are a prominent feature and are fully integrated into the answer and used to purposeful effect in respect of the question's requirements. Demonstrates, where relevant, either implicitly or explicitly awareness of human perspectives upon geographical themes and issues. Argues coherently and in an organised, logical and balanced fashion. Support is consistent, accurate and detailed. A well developed essay style. Detailed and sophisticated communication skills with fluent and cogent writing style.

### **19 – 24**

A good answer which remains relevant to the theme and demands of the question. Evaluation may now only be implicit. Displays a confident range of knowledge and understanding, but with a few omissions at the lower end, e.g. some terminology missing or some pertinent relationships left unexplored. Synoptic elements should be a feature of the answer and seen to be meeting the questions requirements. Some possibly rather uncritical reference to theory; some reference to awareness of human perspectives and decisions taking on geographical issues and problems. Argues well, but organisation may be suspect in places. Support is invariably there, but may not always be detailed. A competent essay style. Effective communication skills with accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.

### **13 – 18**

A satisfactory answer ranging down to the mediocre, which always attempts, but not always succeeds to be relevant. Lacking in evaluation. Displays a reasonable grasp of knowledge, but understanding is suspect in places. Relevant theory and concepts might be mentioned but with basic uncritical application. The interconnections and relationships between different physical and/or human processes are briefly mentioned but understanding of their significance is limited. There is some synoptic content which is relevant to the question. Argument and analysis are partial and become less significant in relation to mere description. Increasingly unbalanced as an answer, and the logic and organisation are clearly deficient. Support is not detailed here, occasionally inaccurate and barely consistent. The bare bones of an essay format. Appropriate communication skills so that meaning is almost invariably clear with adequate language skills. Possibly some spelling/punctuation/grammar errors.

### **7 – 12**

A very mediocre answer which is only occasionally relevant to both the theme and the demands of the question. Decidedly deficient in knowledge and understanding with only simplistic notion of relevant theory and concepts. Little if any relevance to inter-relationships between physical and/or human processes and factors or subject matter from other elements in the specification. Increasing irrelevance in a predominantly descriptive context. Clearly lacks an ability to organise material and may drift into another answer. Support is scanty and usually suspect. A weak, barely perceptible, essay format. Basic communication skills – many spelling errors and/or oddities of grammar and punctuation.



**1 – 6**

A very weak answer which shows little attempt to follow the theme and the demands of the question. A very low level of knowledge and understanding, with even the simplest of concepts avoided. Very inaccurate and may completely miss the point. No idea of how to organise material with haphazard format, evidence of guesswork and little or no support. No attempt at an essay format. Little or no language and communication skills. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

**Question 4**

**Current trends of continuing economic development and population growth mean a better quality of life for all. Based on your studies of geography how far do you consider this a likely scenario for the future?**

This question is intended to enable candidates to engage in broad human and physical geographical themes represented elsewhere in the specification (and quite possibly and creditably from outside the specification as well) from a *population pressure and resource management* specialisation. It should enable the introduction and elaboration of such human and physical geographical themes and allow for the human environment relationship to be explored. The response can be exemplified and illustrated at a variety of scales and contexts and the assigned task enables a discussion of values and policy aspects to be incorporated.

See generic scheme for criteria band – examiners are reminded that some synoptic content is expected for credit of 13 and over. However it is difficult to imagine an answer of reasonable quality without some synoptic content.

Appropriate content might include:

Review of definitions of quality of life. Review of population and economic development trends in recent years with a secure view about their future over the next 10-20 years or so. This might form an important and substantial element of a response and might be rooted in a variety of settings. An outline of continuing economic growth with prospective decline in population growth at the global level might then be developed by distinguishing between different parts of the world - possibly MEDC/LEDC division might be useful but equally broad distinctions between different parts of the world, different environments.

Responses which focus on the distribution of costs and benefits of economic development and population growth within societies, countries, urban areas and so on are very creditable with clear synoptic potential. Such content might cover urban problems and urban deprivation contrasting some inner city areas, peripheral estates with more suburban, gentrified or urban fringe areas for example. Similarly references to areas of economic expansion and decline e.g. *rustbelts* compared with *sunbelts* in the MEDW. In the LEDW similar references might be made e.g. contrasts between spontaneous settlements/shanty towns and higher status housing, between lower and upper circuit economic activities, between areas of rapid economic development and abandoned backwater/peripheral areas. Careful use might be made of economic development models based on core periphery relations.

Likely impacts of continuing economic/population growth on the environment are legitimate - aspects of global natural environmental change, the greenhouse effect and its harmful impacts as well as more localised/regionalised effects perhaps connected with industrial pollution, agricultural intensification e.g. urban air quality, river catchments; waste generation, environmental impacts of resource development, possibly of resource depletion, exhaustion or simple deterioration (e.g. soil).

Notions of overpopulation and the prospects for it can be usefully explored, either in a global context and/or in local regional settings. Such an approach may justify measured statements about improbability of continuing growth and development on sustainability grounds. Equally a more optimistic view based on ingenuity and behavioural and technical change is also perfectly creditable as long as measured and reasonable. An outline of both these and other perspectives would contribute to the discussion, which the question calls for. Clearly there is potential for reference to Malthus and neo Malthusian perspectives as well as the “Boserupian” perspective and these will be perfectly legitimate where used to purposeful analytical effect, e.g. to provide an analytical framework which supports a relevant review.

Synopticity will be evidenced in the range of factors covered in considering the validity of the proposition, in the breadth of the exemplars and settings covered and their depth and detail. There are many geographical aspects, which can contribute to a real discussion of this topic - some from within and some from without the specification.

Whilst the question is about the future and not the past it will be important to recognise that candidates will perfectly creditably recount current events, processes and patterns including those of the (more recent) past in order to consider what the future might hold.

Thus a very wide range of responses is possible and examiners should recognise this. To access the top band there should be fairly even treatment of both economic development and population growth but some imbalance between the two can be tolerated for 24 and below. For reference to only one, the maximum is 18.

We can probably expect responses which differentiate between continuing “good” quality of life in the MEDW and “less good” in the LEDW but we must be careful to credit alternative or dissenting views such as those which point to rising living standards for many in southern and eastern Asia for example. There should be a clear sense of balance and measure in the response and it should conclude with a measured summary and/or assessment of prospects for the future which clearly relates to the preceding discussion.

The question clearly requires a discussion approach and discussion should be a feature of the response. Responses which are essentially descriptive but imply a response should be held to 15; those which are essentially descriptive but come to a summarising conclusion can get 18. The response should come to a summary view in respect of the proposition question. Any reasonable conclusion can be credited but it should be measured and reasonable and relate to preceding content.

### **Question 5**

**To what extent do you agree that the quality of urban life is most powerfully affected by where in the world the urban area is located?**

This question is intended to enable candidates to engage in broad human and physical geographical themes represented elsewhere in the specification (and quite possibly and creditably from outside the specification as well) from a *managing cities – challenges and issues* specialisation. It should enable the introduction and elaboration of such human and physical geographical themes and allow for the human environment relationship to be explored. The response can be exemplified and illustrated at a variety of scales and contexts and the assigned task enables a discussion of values and policy aspects to be incorporated.

See generic scheme for criteria band – examiners are reminded that some synoptic content is expected for credit of 13 and over. However it is difficult to imagine an answer of reasonable quality without some synoptic content.

Appropriate content might include the following with a clear urban focus.

A review of the notion of quality of life with reference to how it can be and is measured e.g. GDP per capita, HDI, PQLI and similar composite measures - this should not be extended but form a firm basis for discussion which follows.

A review of environmental/economic/social problems commonly experienced in cities the world over with a distinction made between different parts - quite possibly based on MEDC/LEDC division. The impact of development may probably and justifiably be seen to be most important - therefore a comparative and contrasting review of aspects of urban life, housing, employment, transport, services, environment will be creditable.

In LEDCs responses might justifiably emphasise informal housing/dual economies with lower circuits and related low incomes, unemployment, under-employment, insecure lower circuit/informal employment and associated poverty, unequal income distributions etc. The relative affluence of MEDC cities might permit reasonable contrasts to be made but legitimate reference might also be made to urban problems in MEDCs - inner area problems of employment /unemployment, deprivation, dereliction, housing and related social problems. Similar issues in certain low income peripheral estates and so on.

Aspects of the physical environment may also be set out as distinctive and also transport and traffic problems might well be raised including congestion and pollution and the balance between public and private transport.

Also potentially relevant are differences in the capacity of different countries/societies to deal with urban problems - to alleviate or remedy them.

A potential discussion element is the distinction and demonstration that quality of life experienced by individuals has much to do with their income status, education skill level in urban societies, no matter where they are, and that there is a broad comparison to be made in quality of life between different segments of society.

A tolerant view should be taken on the definition of city or urban - urban living generally in towns and cities of varying size will be acceptable.

A fuller response and more synopticity will be indicated by reviews of the many problems which are to some extent essential elements for a sense of balance and the formation of a reasonable conclusion.

Thus a very wide range of responses is possible and should be recognised. A full and secure review of different dimensions affecting quality of life suitably supported in sufficient depth and detail should access the top mark band if there is a clear discussion approach.

Synopticity will be evidenced in the breadth of the exemplars, in the range of aspects and settings covered and in their depth and detail; looking for good understanding of several dimensions of quality of life probably with physical, social and economic aspects considered.

The question clearly requires a discussion approach and discussion should be a feature of the response. Responses which are essentially descriptive but imply a response should be held to 15; those which are essentially descriptive but come to a summarising conclusion can get 18. The response should come to a summary view in respect of the proposition question. Any reasonable conclusion can be credited but it should be measured and reasonable and relate to preceding content.

## Question 6

**Tourism has more economic and environmental impacts than any other major economic sector. Discuss this in relation to one or more areas you have studied.**

This question is intended to enable candidates to engage in broad human and physical geographical themes represented elsewhere in the specification (and quite possibly and creditably from outside the specification as well) from a *recreation and tourism* specialisation. It should enable the introduction and elaboration of such human and physical geographical themes and allow for the human environment relationship to be explored. The response can be exemplified and illustrated at a variety of scales and contexts and the assigned task enables a discussion of values and policy aspects to be incorporated.

See generic scheme for criteria band – examiners are reminded that some synoptic content is expected for credit of 13 and over. However, it is difficult to imagine an answer of reasonable quality without some synoptic content.

Generally, we can expect and credit a review of the nature of tourism and its economic and environmental impact in societies and regions in which it develops. There should also be reference to other industries' impacts – this is necessary to come to a balanced view but examiners should be tolerant of an emphasis on tourism.

Appropriate content might include:

Positive impact in economic and social development terms – tourism as a leading sector transmitting growth impulses, employment and income generation, possibly leading to environmental enhancement and conservation e.g. use of tourism to generate revenue which can be used for sustaining the character and nature of the environment/eco-systems and communities/societies and their heritage. Exemplification/illustration from both LEDW and MEDW potentially useful and creditable and responses may well differentiate economic and environmental impacts depending on location and setting, e.g. M/LEDW or developed compared with wilderness settings.

Negative impact might be in environmental terms as well as socio-economic cultural terms. Tourism as a diversion from more potentially productive/sustainable economic activities, opportunity costs. Potential overuse, overexploitation, environmental damage and degradation, cultural/social impact on the communities which host tourist activity, cultural dilution and decline, social disruption, economic effects, leakage of income from LEDC economies - all reducing benefits for local communities – not always beneficial on communities. Comment on management of tourism, e.g. eco-tourism to reduce environmental impacts is creditable.

Review of other industries in contemporary world, for example manufacturing, agriculture possibly quite critically in terms of their potential for sustainability bearing in mind energy use and environmental impacts when compared with tourism. There is potentially full credit in essays in which other industries take up as much if not more attention than tourism as the question invites a comparative response and tourism will need to be placed in a wider context.

Example and illustration might come from anywhere with the application of the statement to a variety of contexts or more selectively to just a few as long as the purpose is seen to be discussing it, qualifying it in some way and over-generalisation is avoided. Perhaps distinctions between MEDW/LEDW offer the most obvious potential and such comparisons and contrasts are very likely to be synoptic.

Tolerate some emphasis on tourism to the exclusion of other sectors - responses which confine themselves to tourism only should be held to a maximum of 24. For access to the top band credit 25-30 should be reserved for those in which other industries are given substantial attention so enabling a real discussion. Purely hypothetical responses with no clear relationship to one or more areas should be held to a maximum of 12.

The question clearly requires a discussion approach and discussion should be a feature of the response. Responses which are essentially descriptive but imply a response should be held to 15; those which are essentially descriptive but come to a summarising conclusion can get 18. The response should come to a summary view in respect of the proposition question. Any reasonable conclusion can be credited but it should be measured and reasonable and relate to preceding content.