



General Certificate of Education

Geography 6031

Specification A

Unit 7 GGA7

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.

GGA7

General Guidance for A Level Geography Assistant Examiners

Quality of Written Communication

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 style of writing which matches the requirements of the question and acknowledges the potential complexity of the subject matter;
- demonstrate relevance and coherence with appropriate use of specialist vocabulary;
- demonstrate legibility of text, and qualities of spelling, grammar and punctuation which do not detract from the clarity of meaning.

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 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 Co-ordination 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 '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 Advice

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) Figure P2 traces changes in Tower Hamlets from 18th Century and notes period of decline both during and after World War Two. It then presents a more optimistic current view relating to regeneration of the core and the thriving Banglatown area resulting from the multiethnic mix. Figure P3 provides an overall, more pessimistic current view, flagging high levels of deprivation and continued existence of many areas with high deprivation indices – despite investment regeneration projects. Stimulus, therefore, would seem to come from trying to ascertain whether regeneration has been successful in inducing re-urbanisation and the extent to which this is partial/in pockets or more widespread?

Level 1 Describes the information present in either Figure P2 or P3. No reference to fieldwork. *(1 mark)*

Level 2 Initial description is linked to aim or objective. There may be reference to both Figure P2 and P3 or only one if well done. At top end, link will be clear. Implicit reference to own fieldwork. *(2-3 marks)*

Level 3 Clear purposeful use of both figures. (although perhaps not equally). The link with the aim objectives will be valid – recognising different characteristics of the component of re-urbanisation. Explicit reference to own fieldwork. *(4 marks)*

- (b) Figure P1a – clearly an inner city / central location (1)/next to City (1) so in an appropriate position – definition indicates that this is where re-urbanisation is occurring (1).
 Figure P4 proximity of Liverpool Street Station suggests fringe of CBD location: (1) as do arterial routeways (1) A11, A1209 and railway (1) *(2 marks)*

Question 2

(a) ✓ d Distribution – appear to be linear (1); following E/N/E direction from start (1); uneven / distance apart vary (1) – some areas have a lot of coverage (e.g. sites 1, 2, 3) (1) and other relatively little e.g. west of Vallance Road (1).

✓ s – Sampling strategy – uneven cover would suggest a random sampling method (1). This may have been determined via drawing a grid over the study area (1); numbering equidistant grid lines (1) and then using random number tables to determine study sites (1). Alternatively, coverage across whole of transect may imply also some stratified method (1) where only certain coordinates were available at times (1).

Minimum 2; maximum 3 on any one component.

Allow any valid feasible sampling strategy (not systematic).

Allow up to 3 for reference to own fieldwork.

(5 marks)

(b)

Advantages	Disadvantages
General - Wealth of information (1) Tower Hamlets – Easily obtainable – quick / immediate access (1).	Too much information - much time to search for what is needed.(1) Not always most relevant (1) Unreliable with reason (1)
Reliable with reason (1) Council tax – If address of property known – specific, quick data (1) Indicative of value (1).	No specific address – no map to help identify whole street (1) ... how useful is this, given variation? (1) No entries for some areas – yet property there (1) Out of date (linked to data source) (1)
Census – Generally similar criteria (1) Summaries offer pre selection (1) Similarity means comparable so manageable.	Difficult to break down area so that internal variation noted (1) Difficult to access specific variables. (1)

Do not allow single reversals. Maximum 4, minimum 2 for either component.

Allow up to 4 for reference to own fieldwork – experience of trying to access such specific information from websites. 1 per basic point; 1 + 1 per developed point.

(6 marks)

- (c) Decision does not matter – what is important is justification. Points likely to relate to:

QDI – overview in a single figure (1) no need to total - quicker option (1)
Scale of 1 to 10 offers significant variation more than environment
However, there are 5 different criteria (1)
And more is a best fit (1) to what extent do study sites fit descriptor (1)

Environment – components make it clear to see what contributing factors are (1) and whether they vary (1).
Can determine overall assessment by adding numbers together (1) so gives same result as QDI.
Smaller scale allows less subjectivity (1) or arguably shows less of a range and therefore variation less clear (1).

Reasons must relate to chosen option, but can include perceived advantages of selected method or disadvantages of that rejected.
Allow up to 3 for reference to own fieldwork. (5 marks)

Question 3

- (a)(i) 6 x 1 for any valid label relating to characteristics ✓ c or evidence for re-urbanisation ✓ r.
Labels referring to age (not Victorian) - Georgian, design, building materials, size related to housing.
Labels regarding quality; possible improvements; comments relating to these reflect re-urbanisation component.
Allow to let / for sale; car → affluence; parking provision for residents. Do not allow litter / vegetation.
Labels must be attached to specific feature and statements must be precise/qualified.
Maximum 4, minimum 2 on either component. (6 marks)

- (ii) t – Type of buildings – great variation in type of buildings from 6 storey flats of different design to terraces, clear variation also in age of housing – some just built whilst some appear Georgian and Victorian. Some housing reflective of providing low cost housing in 60s/70s – such as Massingham Street (15) and therefore, of inner city redevelopment rather than re-urbanisation.

However, there is also evidence which is supportive of re-urbanisation – e.g. new housing at site 8 (Granary Road) suggests people are looking to live in these areas as desirable residence Site 7 (Hemming Street) whilst some of the terraced housing at site 16, 17 and 18 would also suggest re-urbanisation.

q – Quality – many of those in last paragraph above are of the best quality in the area and high quality is expected in areas of re-urbanisation. Indeed, there does appear to be evidence of gentrification at sites 13 and 16, 17 and 10 for example, where it appears that there have been significant improvements to the houses. Elsewhere, there is evidence of poorer quality – e.g. site 9 and it is apparent that there is significant variation on a small scale – such as in photographs 2 and 4.

Clearly evidence on both criteria is partial; two seemed to be linked and certain sites offer evidence of the process (e.g. 3 and 16) while others do not (e.g. site 9) and there is immense variation in a small area. *(8 marks)*

- Level 1** Describes features from the photographs. Quality and / or type of buildings are considered. *(1-4 marks)*
- Level 2** Begins to relate characteristics of either type of building or quality of buildings, to the process of re-urbanisation (objective 1) – low Level 2, some specific evidence is offered in support. Begins to evaluate – may be implicit. Clear links or both aspects needed for top of band. *(5-7 marks)*
- Level 3** Clearly relates type and quality of buildings to re-urbanisation process. Specific evidence is given via reference to study sites and features visible on photographs. Explicit evaluation which reflects content of answer. *(8 marks)*

(b)(i) 2 x (1+1) for adding height of bar and shading according to key. (4 marks)

(ii) Candidates may describe aspects of pattern as part of their answer. Pattern of housing cost – fluctuates markedly along some sections of the transect – e.g. study sites 1, 2 and 3 and to a lesser extent – study sites 16, 17 and 18. There is no clear pattern with lowest values being found at both ends of the transect – (Study sites 3 – 18) however, highest values, according to modal council tax band are at sites 1 and 2 – nearer the City of London.

Quality – fluctuates in all sections – e.g. relatively good on Brick Lane (3) and especially eastern area (sites 16 – 18) but poorer at sites 2 and 14/15. Even where it appears relatively uniform between Vallance Road and Cambridge Heath Road, site 9 is of far worse quality than the other four study sites.

Links – there are no clear links here – good quality housing – best area has category E for modal council tax, whilst site 2 has much poorer quality score and category F council tax band. Conversely, good quality housing – as at study site 18 has a rating of only B whilst the highest rating of G is at study site 1 which is 'average' for quality. Clearly, varied housing quality has the same modal tax band – C – thus 17 (very good quality); 10 (average) 15 (poor) and 9 and 14 (the worst) all have this category.

Reasons for strength of link – should identify its very limited nature. Reasons may equate housing quality with housing type and there does appear to be some evidence here.

Response likely to focus on council tax bands and inadequacies of this method for determining accurate housing cost/value. Initially, council tax bands identified in 1991 property values and clearly an area experiencing re-urbanisation will experience many changes over 16 years; some housing clearly newer than this (sites 7 and 8). Also, method itself is flawed – information stated is mode for street ... significance of property at actual study site? Was this even included given the sampling method?

Level 1 Describes the pattern of housing costs and/or quality.
Description of each criteria is separate.
Evidence may be given in support. (1-4 marks)

Level 2 Begins to investigate the link between the two criteria.
Evidence provided in support which may be one sided (all against link).
Some explanation present – but account likely to be imbalanced so either links or explanation dominant. (5-7 marks)

Level 3 Clearly and purposefully investigates the links between the two criteria.
Evidence provided in support – some for as well as against.
Explanation seeks to explain (limited) strength of link). (8 marks)

- (c)(i) 4 x 1 for correct completion of each component in appropriate sequence.
Reversed order / does not start at base - max. 2. (4 marks)
- (ii) Bars vary in height - some relatively high - e.g. sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 nearer City but also further out - such as 13-15. This indicates a relatively poor quality environment and not really that that might be expected of an area experiencing re-urbanisation. However, some - a minority are lower - such as 18 and 16, are especially low on sense of space and overall appearance. However, scores for traffic and landscaping remain relatively high. There is further variation in the components e.g. traffic flow is relatively low at sites 7, 8, 9 and 12, indicating uneven performance of study sites on different criteria. This contributes to a very limited fulfilment of environment expected following re-urbanisation.
- Level 1** Describes quality of environment - may focus on overall quality - will consider components at top end. Evidence generalised. (1-4 marks)
- Level 2** Begins to target response to question and relates quality of environment to re-urbanisation. May be one-sided - and imbalance likely. Evaluation tentative, implicit or unbalanced. (5-7 marks)
- Level 3** Clearly considers how the overall environmental quality links to expectations. Similarly, different sections are considered. Evaluation is clear and explicit, and reflective of content of response. (8 marks)
- (iii) There will be a positive relationship between building and environmental quality/
As building quality falls, so too will the quality of the environment.
Targeted clear hypothesis (2)
If open-ended - e.g. there is a relationship between or hypothesis not stated clearly (but valid) (1) (2 marks)
- (iv) 1 mark for completing d and d^2 for site 2.
1 mark for identifying correct number within equation.
1 mark for bracketed deduction.
1 mark for identifying r_s value. (3 marks)
- (v) The calculated value of r_s of 0.71 clearly exceeds the critical values of 0.399 / 0.564 (1) at both 99% / 95% levels of significance (1). Further comment about 99 times in a 100, etc (1). Therefore, the expected hypothesis can be accepted / null hypothesis rejected (1). Further comments relating to verification of map evidence permissible (1).
If wrongly calculated, but value appropriately used, credit can be given. (3 marks)

- (d) Expect there to be evidence of population returning; features of revitalisation - so relatively low unemployment, achievements in education; adequate wealth; appropriate housing and indeed going beyond this to show evidence of middle class and substantial improvements to property if gentrification element of re-urbanisation present.

The whole of Tower Hamlets indicates about 3 in 10 householders are overcrowded - not a sign of quality / gentrification but perhaps a sign of people wishing to live in the area. This is seen to an ever-greater extent in the two areas nearest the city of Spitalfields and Banglatown. Bethnal Green South with almost 4/10 households classed as overcrowded.

The number of elderly in these wards is below that for Tower Hamlets borough - indicative of rentalisation / re-urbanisation and in contrast to the higher proportion in Mile End and Globe Town. Proportions of owner occupation is relatively low throughout - between approximately 24-28% higher might be expected.

However, the nature of re-urbanisation needs considering. The background information talks about the life and vitality (characteristics of re-urbanisation) resulting from Bangladeshi community. They clearly form an important group in Spitalfields and Banglatown and Bethnal Green South.

Levels of car ownership are generally low - all wards are above borough average, especially Spitalfields and Bethnal Green South (6% more not having a car). Higher levels of car ownership might be expected.

Similarly, unemployment in these wards is at times double the borough average in Spitalfields and Bethnal Green South not really reflective of revitalisation and less so of more of middle classes. However, there are about a third of people working who are classed as professional, employers and managers - potentially more reflective of re-urbanisation.

Candidates will need to select from table different criteria that seek to offer evidence for and against re-urbanisation. The same data can be manipulated in different ways to convey contrasting viewpoints and provided they are feasible, are perfectly acceptable.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------|
| Level 1 | Describes some of the characteristics of the residents. Will provide some evidence - may be detailed description. | <i>(1-4 marks)</i> |
| Level 2 | Begins to target answer to task. Some points made in respect of either evidence for or against the re-urbanisation process. Evidence used in support. | <i>(5-7 marks)</i> |
| Level 3 | Clear, purposeful response. Evidence provided for and against the re-urbanisation process. A variety of appropriate social, economic indicators selected. | <i>(8-9 marks)</i> |

Question 4

- Level 1** Simple statements made with reference to objectives or overall aim. May focus more on some aspects than others, e.g. characteristics of component rather than reasoning and be imbalanced. May jump about and be poorly structured. No reference to own fieldwork experiences. Lacks awareness of limitations or may refer to limitations only and neglect to summarise findings. *1-4 marks*
- Level 2** Some developments of statements. Refers to all objectives (perhaps in varying detail) and in appropriate order or clear reference to aim/title. May make intermittent reference to evidence or refer in generalised way. Will show some awareness of reliability of findings and limitations and will show their own experience of conducting an enquiry by drawing on own experience. If good on either summary or limitations but no reference to other element, max. 5. No explicit reference to own fieldwork – max. 7. *5-8 marks*
- Level 3** As Level 2, but will refer precisely and specifically to data collected as evidence. Will be clearly aware of limitations. Will realise extent to which aims/objectives have been realised. Will be critically evaluative of enquiry. May suggest meaningful extensions of study. Will clearly be applying own experiences of fieldwork and enquiry. *9-10 marks*

Question 5

Use of questionnaire -

- 2 Questions - ✓q 1 mark for topic identified in question (via wording) / (Yes / No answer) basic question
and
 1 mark for appropriate wording which is clear, offers options and is clearly taskable! (max 4)
- Justification - ✓j 1 mark per valid point noted as to the purpose of the question; if well developed / clear reasoning - 2 per question. (max 4)
- Practical problems - ✓p may refer to language (1); given predominance of Bangladeshi via census data (a); how many will be able to understand questions (1); refusal rates likely to be high (1); with reason (1) (max 4)
- Other way - ✓a e.g. map location (1) of different categories of services (e.g. health, education, leisure, shops). Up to 2 marks for categories/ideas of categorisation and how this might help e.g. can see distribution (1) any areas relatively deprived of services (1) well provided for and implications for re-urbanisation (1). (Goad plan permissible) (max 6)
- One risk - ✓r any valid risk working in an urban environment (1). If well elaborated up to 2. (max 2)
- Minimise - ✓m Minimise risk - any valid strategy (1). If well elaborated up to 2. (max 2)
- Minimum 1 mark for each component; maximum shown in brackets with regard to relevant sections. (13 marks)