GCE Geography A 6466
Mark Scheme (Standardisation)
Summer 2008

GCE

GCE Geography A (6466/01)

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.

- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.

- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.

- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.

- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.

- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.

- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.

- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Question Number	Indicative content

1(a)

Site factor	Detroit	Toulouse
Altitude	Relatively low-lying (map)	Relatively low-lying (map)
Relief/Gradient	Flat (photos & map)	Flat (photos & map)
Water	On a river/straits/lakeside	**on outside of meander bend – both sides of river**
Soil	-	**Floodplain so fertile**

Situation	Detroit	Toulouse
Position	Great lakes trading routes (1(a)) – **might add distances e.g. to Cleveland**	Half way Atlantic to Med (1(a)) – **might add to distances**
Routes	Important trading routes (1(a))	**Crossing point river – has islands (photo)**
Latitude	42° +	43° +
Resources	Close to great lakes resources	-
Borders	**Canada over straight (photo)**	**Spain 60 miles to south**

- Higher-level points are shown in bold.
- Site is local, physical factors.
- Situation is position and location sometimes relative to other places.
- Toulouse and Detroit have similar sites.
- Positions obviously different in most respects although not latitude.

(12)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-4	Limited list of points. Site and situation not obviously understood. No meaningful comparison.
Level 2	5-8	Site and situation sometimes confused or unspecified. Decent list of descriptive points. Comparison largely implicit.
Level 3	9-12	Site and situation distinguished. Some higher level points made in decent list of points. Proper comparison.

Question Number	Indicative content

1(b)

Growth	
Description	**Explanation**
Detroit rises and falls whereas Toulouse rises and rises **after decline in early 1900s.**	Different industrial histories
Detroit rapid growth starts in 1900s	Centre of emerging motor industry then (1910s) **'Fordism' and production lines** sucking in labour from home and abroad.
Toulouse limited change until 1950's	Backwater in centralised France.
Toulouse grows rapidly from 1950s.	Tourism then aeronautics and spin-offs **because of govt. policies and climate. Universities also important.**
Detroit declines rapidly from 1950/60s	Auto-industry relocates and **multiplier effects.**

Structure	
Description	**Explanation**
Similar pyramids from 85+ down to mid 50s.	*Both advanced MEDCs with high life expectancy.*
Many more 25-45 in Toulouse than Detroit.	Reflecting economic history of recent growth **and presumably in-migration** to Toulouse and out migration from Detroit. **In-migration idea reinforced by growth of number of children in Toulouse in 1990-1999 period.**
20-24 very small in Detroit – large in Toulouse.	**Student population.**

- Higher-level points are shown in bold.
- *Italics for similarities – differences asked for.*

(12)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-4	Limited list of points. Structure not understood. Lack of balance. Explanation weak.
Level 2	5-8	Decent list of descriptive points. Uneven coverage of cities. Uneven coverage of structure and growth. Comparison largely implicit. Differences implicit. Explanation better than description. Some data.
Level 3	9-12	Explicitly addresses both. Good balanced description and explanation. Has a number of higher level points. Differences explicitly addressed. Good use of data.

Question Number		Indicative content
1(c)		• Examine asks for a description and an explanation. • Thus why are the patterns different both within the cities and between them. **Detroit** 1. Detroit has a very poor city centre area with generally rich suburbs. 2. Much dereliction in the centre. 3. High rise city centre. 4. Grid street pattern. 5. Some urban regeneration. 6. Almost every area in the inner city is poor. 7. Most of the suburbs are rich with one or two poorer pockets. 8. Largely Black population in inner city. 9. High crime rate. **Toulouse** 1. Inner city much more varied than Detroit – some very wealty areas. 2. income rises at edge of 'Greater' Toulouse but then declines toward margin of metropolitan area. 3. Pockets of real poverty close to city centre – Le Mirail. 4. Highest incomes in south-east suburbs. 5. Low rise city centre. 6. Signs affluence on the fringes. 7. Pre-industrial street pattern. 8. Low crime rate. **Forces in Detroit** 1. Economic decline. 2. inner city dominated by car industry. 3. Therefore white flight after decline escaping urban decay and high taxes. 4. Therefore abandoned 'unemployed' black city population. **Forces in Toulouse** 1. Pockets of poverty correspond with migrant areas. 2. Inner city never a centre of industry but associated with universities and pleasant urban landscape. 3. Link between universities and research and thus affluence. N.B: Do not expect complete coverage even for top band. (12)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-4	Limited range of descriptive points. Explanation highly generalised. Contrasts very thin.
Level 2	5-8	Patchy coverage of the two cities. Description partial and links to forces often assertive. Range of explanation limited and contrast implied.
Level 3	9-12	Addresses built environment and income in both cities. Good range of descriptive points and convincing links to the social demographic and economic forces. Contrasts explicit. Explanation sound.

Question Number		Indicative content
1(d)		- Or 'Could history repeat itself'? - Summative question and might offer opportunities for applied knowledge and understanding (**aku shown in bold**) which should be rewarded if appropriate. - Critical examination thus should put forward evidence to support both 'for' and 'against'. - No 'correct conclusion'.

For the proposition	Against the proposition
- Both heavily reliant on one industry – **Airbus A380 a very risky project.** - Toulouse has problem of unemployed migrant population (35% unemployed young men at present). - Both have experienced urban riots and Toulouse might experience 'white flight' if these happen again. **Europe faces increasing competition from MICs and RICs (rise of China) which might threaten the manufacturing base of Toulouse.** **Economic decline would almost inevitably lead to demographic and social decline.**	- But Toulouse has a variety of industry 'biotechnology aerospace'. - Toulouse has no public debt and **could thus spend money on new projects if necessary.** - Toulouse has a highly educated student population **thus could attract new industries.** - Toulouse is in the sunbelt – **Pyrenees and Mediterranean close.** - Toulouse has spent money on its infrastructure **thus would be likely to attract new industries.** - Toulouse remains a pretty city and a centre for arts and sport and **thus would still attract visitors even if industries declined.**

(12)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-5	Limited relevant points. Asserts rather than argues. Limited use of evidence. Lack of logic argument. Dem/ soc/ eco not properly explored.
Level 2	6-10	Lacks balance in argument. Some supportive data. Argument not always logical. Dem/ soc/ eco uneven.
Level 3	11-14	For and against well covered. Good supportive data. Good range of 'aku' included. Comes to a view after logical argument. Dem/ soc/ eco all explored.

Question Number	Indicative content
2	• Most are predictable in principle (hurricanes, floods, volcanic eruptions, tsunami) some less so (tornadoes, flash floods, earthquakes). • In reality prediction is frequently expensive and sometimes unreiable (tracking of hurricane paths). • Predictability only one factor determining loss of life. • Size of event, cost of evacuation, cost of providing shelter, willingness of population to respond are all important controls. • So almost always is a bit strong although contrasting MEDC/LEDC data suggests there is a strong case to be made here. • Hazardous events could include man-made hazards. (25)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-4	Topic not understood. No focus on proposition. Evidence irrelevant.
Level 2	5-9	Range of hazards very narrow or highly generalised. Proposition not really addressed. Very limited relevant evidence and data.
Level 3	10-14	At least two hazards examined. Statements rather than arguments provided about proposition. Data and evidence provided but not always appropriately.
Level 4	15-19	Good range of hazards. Focus on proposition variable. Some qualifications made. Good supportive data and evidence, relevant.
Level 5	20-25	Excellent range of hazards. Focus on proposition always very clear. Good range of complex qualifying points. Excellent evidence and data offered to support argument.

Question Number	Indicative content
3	• Relates to grasp of IPAT formula or similar. • Links to established include increasing wealth – increasing consumption – environment or might pursue the contrary idea that wealthier countries use cleaner technologies. • Physical environment might include lithosphere, atmosphere, biosphere and hydrosphere. • 'Assess the view' requires evidence to be offered both for and against the central proposition and a conclusion to be drawn. (25)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-4	Topic not understood. Focus hazy and evidence both thin and frequently irrelevant.
Level 2	5-9	Limited view of proposition. Offers descriptive statements. Supportive evidence thin and unbalanced. Hazy grasp of global 'issues'.
Level 3	10-14	Sound account that covers some of the main points simply. Explanation is partial and tends to be clichéd statements. Conclusions not necessarily supported. Supportive evidence a little sparing.
Level 4	15-19	Good account usually focussed on proposition. Uneven focus on population/wealth. Some good linkage to global issues. Some good supportive evidence.
Level 5	20-25	Full and balanced account. Excellent understanding of proposition. Convincing linkages established with global issues and processes clearly explained. Excellent range of supportive evidence.

Question Number	Indicative content

4	• Much depends on what version of 'sustainability' one accepts thus problems might embrace issues of definition.
	• Common problems might otherwise include:
	  1. lack of international or national consensus
	  2. short term costs of pursuit
	  3. sacrifices in current consumption
	  4. public awarness
	  5. unevenness of 'sacrifice'
	  6. practical difficulties of applying principles
	• Focus is on problems of management.
	
	(25)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-4	Topic not understood. Focus hazy and evidence both thin and frequently irrelevant.
Level 2	5-9	Limited view of proposition. Offers descriptive statements. Supportive evidence thin and unbalanced. Hazy grasp of global issues.
Level 3	10-14	Sound account that covers some of the main points simply. Explanation is partial and tends to be clichéd statements. Conclusions not necessarily supported. Supportive evidence a little sparing.
Level 4	15-19	Good account usually focussed on question. Range of problems with some good linkages to global and local issues of sustainability. Some good supportive evidence.
Level 5	20-25	Full and balanced account. Excellent understanding of problems. Convincing linkages to issues and processes of sustainability at a range of scales. Excellent range of supportive evidence.

Question Number	Indicative content
5	- Issues include the motives for trying to control population movement. - Issues also include the levels of persuasion and coercion needed to carry out policies. - Expect range of examples including UK immigration policies, Turks to Germany, Mexicans to USA, Indonesian transmigration and 'new towns'/greenbelt in the UK. - Tend to become essays about migration 'issues' in general. (25)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
Level 1	1-4	Topic not understood. Focus hazy and evidence both thin and frequently irrelevant.
Level 2	5-9	Limited view of proposition. Offers descriptive statements. Supportive evidence thin and unbalanced. Hazy grasp of migration.
Level 3	10-14	Focus on government' attempted. Sound account that covers some of the main points simply. Explanation is partial and tends to be clichéd statements. Conclusions not necessarily supported. Supportive evidence a little sparing.
Level 4	15-19	Good account clearly focussed on question. Range of problems addressed with some good linkages to issues, probably application problems. Some good supportive evidence.
Level 5	20-25	Full and balanced account. Excellent understanding of issues. Convincing linkages to issues including both motivation and application. Excellent range of supportive evidence.