



General Certificate of Education

Geography 6031

Specification A

Unit 5 GGA5

Mark Scheme

2007 examination - January 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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) Country of Java not creditworthy though credit can still be given for pattern identification.

All emanating from one central location - Java (1 mark).

Predominantly to coastal locations (1 mark) and bays (1 mark).

There is a wide dispersal (1 mark) to relatively small-scale locations (1 mark), with exception of Southern Sumatra (anomaly) where there appears to be a large area receiving migrants (1 mark).

Mainly to the larger islands (1 mark).

Concept of distance decay (1 mark).

Transmigration tends to be to the southern parts of the islands. (1 mark)

(4 marks)

- (b) Any appropriate example is applicable.

To exploit resources in the natural environment (1 mark) especially through logging, mining and agricultural initiatives such as oil palm plantations in Indonesia (1-3 marks with appropriate exemplification). This requires additional labour.

To relieve areas from the effects of overpopulation/population pressure (1 mark) where quality of life is poor and poverty levels high, with services, building quality and education being very limited (1-3 marks depending on detail).

To serve wider political ends such as unifying and amalgamating disparate islands in the face of separatist opposition, such as that in West Timor or Amazonia for example (1-3 marks depending on detail).

(4 marks)

- (c) Evaluation largely depends on the choice of transmigration scheme. In the case of Indonesia, the scheme was discontinued in 1999 with many shortcomings, though voluntary migration is still encouraged. Any appropriate reference is appropriate.

The successes of the scheme are that serious overpopulation on Java and specifically in Jakarta, has been somewhat alleviated. There are now an estimated 20,000,000 transmigrants or direct descendents in Indonesia. There are also thriving transmigration settlements such as that in Metro, where infrastructure, irrigation and strong markets support a thriving transmigrants community.

The problem was that when the tropical rainforest land was farmed at any level of intensity, the lack of vegetation cover left the soil infertile after only a few growing cycles. Litter nourishment decreased, soil erosion increased, leaching increased and desertification occurred. Many transmigrants were, therefore, displaced from their new land within a few years, due to crop failure and food shortage. Habitat loss for native flora and fauna also rapidly escalated. It is also relevant and pertinent to consider scale, organisation and state intervention.

It is estimated that about 3 million returning transmigrants were left homeless, unable to return to their former homes because their land had been redeveloped or allocated to others.

Clearly, any evaluation of this scheme would have to consider these limitations.

Level 1 (1-3 marks)

The response will be largely descriptive of a scheme with little analysis of the impacts. The response may also be generic and not clearly linked to a named scheme. It is likely to offer a limited and unbalanced evaluation. It may not come to a clear view about the success of the scheme or use only very basic evaluative language. Max L1 for no obvious named example (generic).

Level 2 (4-6 marks)

This response will be more aware of the impacts of the named scheme with more balance in terms of the evaluation. The candidate must show clear understanding of a named scheme. Likely to come to a more coherent view about the success of the scheme.

Level 3 (7 marks)

This will be a detailed analysis of a named scheme. It will be fully aware of the impacts, offering balance in terms of evaluation. It must come to a clear and well-constructed view and be linked to preceding content.

Be aware that candidates may refer to more than one case study. In that case, there may be a trade off between breadth and depth.

(7 marks)

Question 2

- (a) Surrounding the major conurbations and cities/urban areas of England (1 mark).

More green belt (by area) around the larger conurbations and cities/urban areas (1 mark).

Uneven distribution (1 mark).

Some urban areas appear to have no green belt (1 mark).

Marginally more greenbelt to the north and west of England than to the south and east (Severn-Wash as divider) (1 mark). Appropriate example max 1.

(4 marks)

- (b) To regenerate declining inner urban areas, by forcing development back into the city (1-3 marks), with appropriate development.

To encourage people, housing development, industry and business back into cities, reversing the decline of inner cities and central areas (1-2 marks depending on detail).

To protect and conserve natural habitats acting as environmental buffer on the urban fringe (1 mark).

To limit the processes of suburbanisation and urban sprawl (1 mark).

To limit the spread and arguably uncontrolled growth of conurbations (1 mark).

Candidates may refer legitimately to examples outside of the UK.

To allow urbanites the opportunity to enjoy a leisure and recreational opportunity.

Max 3 without 2 reasons.

(4 marks)

- (c) The specification allows for valid evaluation of wedges, buffers and hearts and not just green belts. Any one of these strategies is valid if considered in the context of containing growth. Clearly the response **must** be rooted in the MEDW.

Any evaluation should consider shortcomings as well as successes. There are numerous examples of the success of greenbelt initiatives, which when combined with other government initiatives (such as Derelict Land Grants and Enterprise Zones) have certainly made previously less attractive locations the preferred destination. Expect to see quite localised exemplars predominantly found in the north-west and north-east of Britain and also linked to the Assisted Areas scheme. Candidates can also legitimately refer to the Isle of Dogs and other well known case studies as evidence of the success of containing growth. Schemes such as Stamp Duty relief have also made inner urban locations relatively more attractive to home buyers.

Candidates could also argue against the success of these policies. The massive planned expansion of home building in the south-east is a response to the demand for housing in the core region of the UK or the development of the M25 through some areas of greenbelt. This has, and will continue to inevitably involve some construction in protected areas and arguably marks a failure in attempts to contain growth, as well as a failure in attempts to redistribute wealth creation around the country. Some candidates may argue that there is an inconsistency in application of planning controls around the various conurbations.

Level 1 (1-3 marks)

Generic, central and inner area improvements (Max L1). This will be a very simplistic approach without a detailed understanding of the impacts of the policy. The candidate may also lack in detailed knowledge of a chosen case study. Largely descriptive and may evaluate but with only very simple statements.

Level 2 (4-6 marks)

There will be a clearer understanding of the impacts of the chosen policy. The chosen case study will be detailed and analysis will be a feature. There will be evaluation though perhaps crude and perhaps explicit.

Level 3 (7 marks)

There will be a full understanding of the impacts of policies to contain growth. Case study support will be thorough, with detailed analysis. Evaluation will be coherent, balanced and clearly linked to preceding content. One detailed example can access full marks.

(7 marks)

Question 3

- (a) Footpath erosion caused by the excessive visitor numbers (1-3 marks depending on detail of description) especially where the physical carrying capacity has been exceeded (1 mark). Congestion on surrounding roads (1 mark). Air, visual and noise pollution (1 mark). Intentional or unintentional damage to important heritage site (1 mark) caused by walking on the wall undercutting it when walking on wet ground in large numbers (1-2 marks). Impact upon local farmers such as disturbance of livestock, etc. (1-3 marks). Litter creditworthy (1 mark). Negative economic impacts on local population (1-3 marks depending on development). (4 marks)

- (b) Candidates have to clearly explain how the chosen management solution will improve the situation at the site. This list is not exhaustive.

Close the trail at certain times of the year to allow maintenance or recovery of surrounding vegetation (1-2 marks). Move or re-route the path to protect especially sensitive areas (1 mark). Improve the education for the visitors via clear sign posting to limit the damage and problems caused inadvertently (1-2 marks). Employ more trail guides to act as educators and also wardens (1 mark). Promotion and provision of public transport systems to replace private car ownership, perhaps with park and ride schemes emanating well away from the destination (1-2 marks depending on detail). Hard management of footpaths (1 mark). Widen footpath to increase capacity (1 mark). (4 marks)

- (c) It is important for candidates to clearly identify the different groups involved in conflict at honeypot sites. Long drift into description of the nature of the conflict/s is not really the question, though scene setting is appropriate and acceptable.

Some obvious potential conflict groups include:

- tourists and farmers
- tourists and local people
- developer and conservationists
- entrepreneurs and local people
- tourists 'v' tourists
- Second homes issue likely to feature as justifiable conflicts.

The question requires that candidates come to a view on how well the site is managed in relation to the named group and the detailed conflict of interest. Compromise is a key feature of managing any conflict and this theme should be a feature of Level 2 and 3 responses. Similarly, sustainability is another crucial aspect of conflict management. If sustainable solutions are in place at the site, the 'rug of discontentment' can be removed from the conflict.

Candidates can legitimately argue that managers of the chosen site/s may not be not succeeding in managing conflict, or may be successful. The evaluation though should be linked to preceding content.

There are numerous honeypot sites. Physical locations are likely to dominate but human, cultural and heritage sites are equally creditworthy. For L1 and L2 a broad view on what constitutes a honeypot is accepted.

Level 1 (1-3 marks)

A simplistic description of problems at honeypot sites without clear reference to the named groups involved, or the intricate nature of the conflict. A lack of awareness of the complex management issues or the need for compromise. There will be very basic evaluative statements or none at all.

Level 2 (4-6 marks)

Clearly aware of the nature of the conflict between two or more named groups identified and the conflict clearly outlined (or with one group). There will be evidence of the management issues and an awareness of compromise and sustainability. Clear evaluative comment linked to preceding content.

Level 3 (7 marks)

A detailed analysis of the management issues in resolving conflict at a named honeypot site. A full awareness of the need for compromise and sustainability in managing the site. Evaluative comment will be linked clearly to preceding content.

Maximum Level 1 for content which does not name groups involved. *(7 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 21-27 and 28-30.

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.

28 – 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.

21 – 27

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 question's 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 – 20

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

To what extent do you agree that Malthusian views are relevant today?

As world population totals continue to grow, it is estimated that by 2050, there could be approximately 10 billion people. Malthus suggested that a variety of 'checks' would occur to ensure that provision of resources matched population totals. These checks could occur in the human or physical environment.

When Malthus wrote his theory over 200 year ago, he would arguably have been surprised to see world population totals of over six billion today. In that sense, his theory surely has shortcomings. Having said that, there are estimated to be more than 800 million suffering from some form of malnutrition. This perhaps gives some credence to Malthus.

In answering the question candidates can legitimately point to two clear limitations of his theory. He did not consider gains in land productivity. One fact is that grain production has doubled per hectare between 1950 and 1990. He also did not account for the MEDW preference of eating higher up the food chain, i.e. feeding animals for food for humans, which is much less productive, due to the energy loss at each trophic level (synoptic links to 10.3). Candidates writing along these lines are already considering neo-Malthusian theory and Boserup who argued that necessity is the mother of invention.

There is ample evidence of Malthusian theory being apparently proven correct today and candidates can reasonably be expected to discuss food shortage in Sub-Saharan Africa as well as human epidemics such as AIDS, as evidence of application. Some responses may also comment on a variety of physical checks such as the incidence of geological events in areas of high population density (synoptic links to 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3).

World water shortage is yet more evidence of Malthus being proven correct. Countries such as India are heading for real difficulties since the consumption of water is already exceeding supply as evidenced by groundwater exploitation. Even in the MEDW, fresh water shortage is set to become a real issue and challenge facing governments, and candidates may well usefully link this to global warming (synoptic link to 10.2).

Furthermore:

- Fish stock are depleting with North Sea cod as a useful exemplar.
- Desertification is decimating potential agricultural land in places like Indonesia and Amazonia.
- Global warming could interfere with food supplied in unpredictable ways.
- The green revolution had many failings and is no longer providing increases in food production.

Expect candidates to juxtapose these negative views with more positive views on population change such as those held by Simon or Boserup. Necessity being the mother of invention, these arguments should challenge the theme of the question and assert that population growth brings new challenges, which can be met by human innovation, invention and imagination.

Candidates should argue along the following lines:

- That food shortage mainly persists where there are other problems such as war or corrupt government.
- The food distribution is the problem, not supply.
- That new developments in agriculture should bring further increases in food production such as genetically modified foods.

Candidates should really acknowledge that world population growth cannot continue indefinitely. Candidates would do well to recognise that in the MEDW, population is largely stable and there is considerable food surplus. The problems really lie in the LEDW where growth rates vary dramatically and food shortage is a problem for most countries (synoptic links to 11.1).

Be aware of candidates who simply describe Malthus with a basic application to Easter Island followed by Boserup applied to Common Agricultural Policy. This constitutes a narrow response and certainly not better than mediocre in terms of the criteria bands.

Any conclusion is valid, provided it is clearly linked to preceding content.

Question 5

The successful regeneration of central and inner urban areas is the greatest challenge facing cities around the world. How far do you agree with this view?

This question is intentionally provocative and designed to stimulate a broad debate leading to a variety of responses from candidates.

Quite clearly, the successful regeneration of central and inner urban areas is a great challenge, but is by no means the greatest challenge. Expect candidates to contrast the LEDW and MEDW. In doing this, responses should show challenges vary according to location. Indeed, many candidates could argue that in contrast with MEDW cities, the LEDW city has the least of its problems in central and inner urban areas.

Candidates could reasonably dissect the two areas. Over the last thirty years, the challenge facing the inner city has been brought about by the process of de-industrialisation and out-migration, as well as the infrastructural and social problems as a direct result of unemployment and subsequent revenue falls. The central area challenges have been to some extent tied to the inner city, but also there are intrinsic problems such as the issue of accessibility and location.

The greatest challenges facing cities in the MEDW really revolve around transport, migration and the continuing effort to even out the disparities, which exist in healthcare, employment, education and housing across and within different regions. In addition, the ongoing challenge of attracting families and business back into the inner urban zone is now becoming a process, and certainly one which is gathering pace, and becoming increasingly successful as a government policy. This success though is also attributable to changes in the housing market, which have increased the relative attractiveness of inner urban locations. One example of this is the increase in house prices as a result of demand outstripping supply, brought about by increased divorce rates and the demand by many more single people to own property (potential links to 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3). These are certainly issues and challenges which affect the inner urban area but are by no means restricted to that zone. In addition, social problems related to racial disharmony and a failure of integration by some minority groups are likely to intensify. Candidates may also relate this to global political challenges. The point really is that cities as a whole are facing issues and challenges rather than zones within the city.

Urban environmental quality is another issue, which transgresses boundaries and zones within the city (potential synoptic links to 10.2). It is certainly the case that there is a clearly negative correlation between population/industrial density and environmental quality. Responses could therefore, legitimately relate environmental quality into a framework of broader regeneration. Here there is a clear contrast between the MEDW and the LEDW. In the LEDW, one of the biggest obstacles to regeneration is the poor quality of the air, water and land. Though there are similarities, the obstacles to regeneration are clearly greater in the LEDW.

In the LEDW, the structure of the city is simply very different. In many cities, inner urban zones never lost skilled, affluent and mobile people. Here the only real challenge is for the wealthiest protecting their assets in well-guarded apartments or detached properties. The challenge in the central area is similar with high competition for land and intense traffic congestion, along with associated poor air quality.

Candidates who refer to shanties being an inner urban problem are likely to have misunderstood the location of shanties. These are often built along transport routes out of town or on marginal land unsuitable for 'normal' development. Shanties are certainly not characteristically found in inner urban locations. Responses which use shanties to support statement in the essay title are simply not being relevant.

Response can and really should express the view that central and inner urban area regeneration is the main issues facing the MEDW. Controlling birth rates, tackling housing problems and the continued in-migration, as well as tackling the major health concerns are certainly more central to government approaches in the LEDW.

There are many valid and useful case studies on which candidates could draw. Expect to see evidence of successful regeneration in case studies such as Cardiff Bay and the Isle of Dogs. In addition, Manchester and Newcastle regeneration will feature. For the LEDW, candidates are likely to use case studies from Africa (City of the Dead, Kibera), South America (especially Brazil and the Favela) and Asia (Bustees of Kolkota (Calcutta)).

Question 6

To what extent do you agree that tourism is an extremely useful means of encouraging sustainable economic development?

It really depends how candidates approach this question, but in contemporary terms, the focus is arguably slightly more targeted at the Less Economically Developed World since it is here that tourism is still in its infancy in many places. Equally though there are obvious examples in the MEDW where tourism has brought with it more than expected or hoped for, especially in terms of development.

Candidates may reasonably consider an MEDW resort such as Benidorm in Spain for example. Benidorm arguably reached its carrying capacity in the 1980s when mass tourism really began to impinge on the natural environment and limited resources. It was clear by the 1990s that fashions were changing and Benidorm's attractiveness was diminishing. So, although Benidorm certainly benefited economically from tourism in the 1980s, the gains have not come without costs. Benidorm has until recently, suffered from a creaking infrastructure, dilapidated accommodation and failing image or perception by potential Western European visitors. With a whole economy based around tourism in the Costa Blanca, the potential damage of falling visitor numbers and therefore revenues is clear. In direct answer to the question, tourism has in recent history proved to be an extremely useful means of economic development based on the primary resources of sun, sea, sand and Spanish culture. The problems for Benidorm began in the 1980s, but may not be fully realised until later into this decade. With an over-reliance on tourism, an increasingly globally competitive market and a fickle consumer, the reality facing Benidorm is arguably one of stagnation and decline. In this sense candidates might reasonably argue that tourism has not encouraged sustainable development despite the obvious economic benefits.

Candidates could legitimately consider British resorts such as Blackpool, which really do challenge some of the assertions of the question. Through diversification and reinvention, Blackpool has arguably succeeded in rejuvenating or at least stabilising. Whether tourism has encouraged sustainable development, or not, is clearly debatable. Candidates could quite legitimately argue either way.

National Parks and other areas of outstanding natural beauty have exploited tourism with many indirect economic costs. The whole second homes issue is of relevance if candidates choose to develop that concern. Responses could legitimately argue that tourism has destroyed what were previously sustainable communities.

Governments often see the revenue potential of tourism and without any major preconditions for economic growth, the opening up of primary resources is perceived as a mechanism by which growth can be stimulated. There are many examples across the MEDW and LEDW where this has happened. Taking Kenya, a likely case study, the attractions of safari in the Masai Mara or Amboseli National Park, and beautiful beaches on the coast near Mombassa have been promoted and triggered considerable development as a direct result of tourism (potential synoptic links to 11.3). Considerable development has taken place also, which has directly benefited the local people. Infrastructural improvements have occurred and peripheral development has helped to develop the infrastructure for the wider Kenyan community.

However, this must be juxtaposed with the economic and environmental realities such as:

- leakage due to top jobs being held by 'shipped in' foreigners; hotel companies and airlines being foreign owned; all inclusive packages, discouraging tourists from re-distributing their income.
- the nature of the employment - low pay, low skill and casual
- increased in-migration as the perception of the population is that opportunities to cash-in on tourism exist. This can lead to other socio-economic problems (potential synoptic links to 11.1 and 14.2)
- strain on limited natural resources
- policing and security costs
- resettlement issues related to indigenous communities.

This is by no means exhaustive but does highlight some of the more significant counterbalancing realities associated with developing tourism in a region. This could be used as evidence of unsustainable aspects of tourism.

Butler's model is sure to feature in many responses. Weaker responses will describe the stages of Butler as learned theory. This is inappropriate and adds little to the response. However, if Butler is used, say in relation to Benidorm and stagnation, or Blackpool and rejuvenation, then it is clearly relevant, and adds depth to the response.

Candidates can bring the Ecotourism phenomenon into the response as evidence of sustainable development as a direct result of tourism. Responses which drift into long description of a variety of eco-tourism projects are relevant in the context of the question, though evaluative comment is likely to indicate a stronger response. Candidates who refer to cost benefit analysis without an attempt to engage clearly with the theme - "mediocre". For sustainable development, a view which does not necessarily develop the environmental aspect is also "mediocre".