



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2011

Geography

Assessment Unit A2 1

assessing

Human Interactions and Global Issues

[AG211]

TUESDAY 25 JANUARY, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Descriptions for Marking Criteria

Knowledge and understanding	Skills	Quality of Written Communication	Level
<p>The candidate will show a wide-ranging and accurate knowledge and a clear understanding of the concepts/ideas relevant to the question. All or most of the knowledge and understanding that can be expected is given.</p>	<p>The candidate will display a high level of ability through insightful analysis and interpretation of the resource material with little or no gaps, errors or misapprehensions. All that is significant is extracted from the resource material.</p>	<p>The candidate will express complex subject matter using an appropriate form and style of writing. Material included in the answers will be relevant and clearly organised. It will involve the use of specialist vocabulary and be written legibly and with few, if any, errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.</p>	3
<p>The candidate will display an accurate to good knowledge and understanding of many of the relevant concepts/ ideas. Much of the body of knowledge that can be expected is given.</p>	<p>The candidate will display evidence of the ability to analyse and interpret the resource material but gaps, errors or misapprehensions may be in evidence.</p>	<p>The candidate will express ideas using an appropriate form and style of writing. Material included will be relevant and organised but arguments may stray from the main point. Some specialist terms will be used and there may be occasional errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. Legibility is satisfactory.</p>	2
<p>The candidate will display some accurate knowledge and understanding but alongside errors and significant gaps. The relevance of the information to the question may be tenuous.</p>	<p>The candidate will be able to show only limited ability to analyse and interpret the resource material and gaps, errors or misapprehensions may be clearly evidenced.</p>	<p>The candidate will have a form and style of writing which is not fluent. Only relatively simple ideas can be dealt with competently. Material included may have dubious relevance. There will be noticeable errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. Writing may be illegible in places.</p>	1

Section A

Option A: Impact of Population Change

- 1 (a) $3 \times [2]$ for age, gender and social status. [1] only if they do not make a clear comparison. Note this is migration, people are choosing; if they get into refugees, no reward. We do not need explanations either. Migrants tend to be younger and male, we don't require to know why; the command word is 'how'. Examples are welcome but not necessary. [6]
- (b) Note it says 'use this material'. This means that full marks are available for just that, a candidate does not need to bring in anything extra. If they do and it helps, reward it, but be careful that the high marks are going to people who have spent the time looking at the resources. Resource 1A is more about economic activity and 1B more about social stability, but do not require things to be quite so clear cut, they can put the two resources together and answer successfully.
- If both resources are not used, maximum Level 2.
 - If there is no overt resource use, Level 1.
 - If either economic activity or social stability are missed, maximum Level 2.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Both resources are explicitly used and their material taken to provide a cogent answer that deals with both economic activity and social stability in a reasonably balanced way. Language and terminology are appropriate.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Sub-optimal routes to Level 2 were identified above. Full answers at this level will be adequate in terms of range but may lack depth, command or balance.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Level 1 perhaps because there is something missing and what is left does not merit Level 2. Full answers will fail to display understanding, through being too short or flawed in some other way. [9]

(c) 'Global contrasts' mean that spatial reference has to be made, not in great depth necessarily, but it has to be there. If there is none, Level 2 maximum. Fertility and mortality have to be there, both. If one is missing, Level 2 maximum. They have to describe and explain. They cannot do the latter without the former, but if they just describe, Level 2 maximum. More than one problem, Level 1.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

There is description and explanation; fertility and mortality are both covered in reasonable balance. The answer displays command and is couched in appropriate language and terminology.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

A number of sub-optimal routes to Level 2 were seen above. Full answers may lack balance and or depth, though they will still have a good deal of merit.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Multiple problems or answers that do not otherwise demonstrate a complete grasp of the topic will be here. Command will be weak and, language perhaps lacking in clarity. [15]

30

- 2 (a) Malthus and Boserup, both. If one is missed, Level 1 only as the question demands that they compare the two of them. If they present two stand-alone pieces, Level 2 maximum.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

The candidate has answered the question fully. The two authors are reasonably balanced and there is a definite and successful attempt to compare them regarding population sustainability.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Boserup and Malthus feature but maybe there is some issue over balance or depth. There is some command over the issue of population sustainability.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

One of the pair may be totally or almost completely absent. There is a weakness in the answer, perhaps population sustainability is not sufficiently highlighted. [6]

- (b) (i) [6] for their Demographic Transition Model as follows:

Demographic Transition Model Diagram removed due to copyright issues

Axes labelled correctly: [1]
Population growth curve: [1]
Death Rate curve: [1]
Birth rate curve: [1]
Stages (4 or 5 acceptable) [1] for having them; [1] for correct labels
The other [3] for suggesting 'how' Pakistan might achieve this: economic growth, increasing education and status of women, population control measures etc. [9]

- (ii) Resource 2 **and** their case study are needed. Level 2 maximum if no use of Resource 2; Level 1 maximum if no use of their case study.

Economic **and** moral considerations are required. Level 2 maximum if either is omitted.

Level 1 if there are multiple problems.

Be accommodating regarding 'moral' considerations, if they stray into social that is OK. Be less accommodating as to what you will accept as 'economic'.

This time it is the reasons that lie behind the fertility policies, so material on impact is not really needed except perhaps to point up economic or moral considerations. If the answer focuses on impacts, confine to Level 1.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

The candidate answers fully: Resource 2, case study, economic, moral are all here and the focus is on the reasons behind the policy. The language is appropriate and set within a balanced answer that displays command of the topic.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Some sub-optimal routes to Level 2 were shown above.

Otherwise, answers will still have merit, but may lack balance or depth or proper focus.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Some sub-optimal routes to Level 1 were shown above. Full answers will display a lack of command perhaps through being short or lacking focus or understanding.

[15]

30

Option B: Planning for Sustainable Settlements

- 3 (a) They will be able to see that the greenery of Namba Gardens is very artificial in that it has been constructed above the ground – emphasising the ‘expense and effort’ of the question – and also see that central Osaka has very little green space. The need for it is the material they have covered in Box 2 of the specification. No resource use, maximum Level 2.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

There is sufficient resource use and the candidate uses Osaka to set out the need for open space in terms of social and environmental benefits. Language is appropriate and command is demonstrated.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

An excellent theoretical answer can be here; otherwise Osaka is used to illustrate in a reasonable way why open space and urban parks are valued. Perhaps there is an issue over the depth of the response.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Little or inadequate resource use might be a problem; otherwise the answer is limited in terms of length, depth or the understanding of the value of open space and urban parks in cities. [6]

- (b) They have to use the resource on Corby to help them. If the Corby material from Resource 3B is not used, maximum Level 2; if there is no evidence of their own material, maximum Level 1.
It is opportunities and problems from brownfield development; if either is missed, maximum Level 2.
Multiple problems, Level 1.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Resource 3B is added to their own material to create a meaningful answer which deals with both the opportunities and the problems. There is reasonable balance and the use of appropriate language and terminology.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Some routes to Level 2 were detailed above. Full answers here may lack balance or depth but still cover the material in a reasonable fashion.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Sub-optimal answers scoring from Level 1 were seen above; otherwise answers will lack command through being short of material and/or understanding. [9]

(c) Evaluate the impact of Local Agenda 21, so reasons behind are of themselves only background to the answer. If they are its focus, Level 1.

No case study or an inappropriate case study, Level 1.

This is a straightforward case study recall question, as simple in construction as can be, so look for depth and detail for high reward.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

The case study is just that, a place that is known about, not just a name attached to general principles. Depth, detail and command both of place and processes.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers at this level are competent, but may display a lack of depth of sharp focus on the evaluation, especially.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Sub-optimal routes to Level 1 were seen above. Otherwise answers will be too short or find some other way to convey inadequate understanding. Focus might well be an issue.

[15]

30

4 (a) They can, and perhaps will, distinguish between the three by presenting you with three definitions; that is fine. Redevelopment is where you start again; regeneration is where you find new uses for the old buildings and/or upgrade the area; restoration is where you improve them. Something like that, seek understanding, not textbook definitions. $3 \times [2]$. If they put it all together mark out of [6] (Level 3 ([5]–[6]); Level 2 ([3]–[4]); Level 1 ([1]–[2])). [6]

(b) The overlapping characteristics bring open space and local production into the built up area, so there are benefits from recreation, the green lung idea, environmental bonuses etc. People get exercise and regarding allotments, grow their own food. Nurseries enable people to garden; farmers' markets bring in local food with few food miles attached. There is a lot to say here. No resource use, though how can this be, Level 1.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

The answer is full and takes the ideas from Resource 4 and runs with them. There is a good range of material brought up. Language and terminology are appropriate.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

There is use of Resource 4, but the answer lacks the depth and/or range necessary for higher reward.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

No resource use is evident or, if the answer does use Resource 4 it fails to grasp the demands of the question properly and presents a text that lacks proper understanding of the issue. [9]

(c) This has to present case study material; if it does not or the case study is not appropriate, Level 1 maximum. The question seeks evaluation of the land use and planning policy, if that is not the focus, Level 2 maximum; if that is not covered at all, Level 1.

Again, this is as simple a format for a case study question as it is possible to set, so look for depth and detail for high reward.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

The answer is full, with good case study detail. The focus is on evaluation as required. Language and terminology are appropriate for the task in hand.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

There is case study use, but maybe the focus is not sharp enough for Level 3 or the depth and detail may be wanting a little.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Some ways of getting Level 1 were listed above. Otherwise the answer lacks proper understanding, perhaps because there is insufficient text or because the candidate has gone off on the wrong tack. [15]

Option C: Issues in Ethnic Diversity

- 5 (a) The social and economic outcomes of ethnic diversity from the resource are:
- A supply of cheap labour in the low paid service sector (economic).
 - New services provided such as the Polish shop (social).
 - Racially motivated attacks (social and economic).
 - Pluralism in areas like the Village (social).
 - Discrimination (social and economic).

There is no prescribed number of outcomes they must discuss but there has to be more than one social and economic example. Be prepared to be flexible on the distinction between social and economic outcomes as they can overlap. They also require additional material either in the form of deeper discussion or other examples. Accept any plausible outcomes. A range of sub-optimal answers is possible here:

- If there is no extra material award **Level 1 maximum**.
- If there is no resource use award **Level 1 maximum**.
- If either social or economic outcomes have been omitted award from **Level 2 maximum**.
- If there is only one social and one economic outcome award from **Level 2 maximum**.

Level 3 ([6]–[7])

This is a thorough answer that demonstrates sound understanding of this topic. There is rigorous resource use and the extra material is well integrated into the answer. Use of English is very good.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

The sub optimal situations described above are here. Apart from these, answers at this level are still adequate but lacking some depth and detail. Use of English is quite good.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Apart from the sub optimal situations described above, an answer at this level is seriously flawed by inaccuracies or irrelevant material. There may also be grammatical errors. [7]

- (b) **Social status** is a secondary factor in the definition of ethnicity. It helps define ethnicity where an ethnic group is largely confined to a specific social niche such as the black population in South Africa during the apartheid era. The caste system in India is also a form of social stratification that could be used in this answer. Social division is often accompanied by economic division and some groups are confined to poorer areas in cities. Living in close association with people from similar backgrounds reinforces their shared characteristics and emphasises the differences with the remainder of the population. These clusters of ethnically similar people often leads to the formation of enclaves and ghettos with clearly defined territorial boundaries.

Gender is another secondary factor and is an important issue in some cultures. In Islamic countries women are restricted in many aspects of life. In some situations they are not allowed to vote, attend school and must adhere to strict regulations regarding dress code. In western society, there are government laws to protect women's rights but they can still face prejudice in some occupations.

For full marks look for an understanding of how each of these factors operates to define ethnicity. Better answers will discuss them as secondary factors and through examples show how their role varies from place to place. 2 × 4 marks [8]

- (c) The specification lists migration, colonisation and migration as processes creating ethnic diversity. The choice of case study can be either LEDC or MEDC. Obviously, the detail of their answer will depend on their case study choice. We might see the processes of colonisation and annexation operating mainly in a LEDC. In the case of a LEDC colony migration of a ruling class and military personnel or the forced movement of a labour force would all lead to ethnic diversity. In a MEDC migration of those from former colonial territories looking for a better lifestyle etc. leads to ethnic diversity. In recent times the migration of economic migrants and asylum seekers are contributing to increased ethnic diversity. They need to give a sound description of the ethnic diversity of their chosen country and then evaluate the role these processes played in creating this ethnic diversity.
- If there is no case study and there is only a discussion of processes, then award out of **Level 1 maximum**.
 - If there is only one process used award from **Level 2 maximum**.
 - If there is no evaluation but the processes are discussed, award from **Level 2 maximum**.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

The pattern of ethnic diversity is outlined clearly with facts and figures. There is good understanding shown. The processes are understood and there is depth, detail and adequate evaluation. The answer is well written.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Apart from the situations described above, there is less detail and depth throughout or the processes/evaluation are handled less rigorously than at the previous level. English is still good.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Apart from the situation described above, this answer is lacking in detail and depth on all aspects or there may be incorrect information. Use of English may be flawed. [15]

30

- 6 (a) (i) The primary factors that define the Uighur people as an ethnic group are religion, language and perceived ethnic identity. The Uighur people are Muslim which has a very distinct code of practice for everyday life which is at odds with the communist regime in China. Their Muslim religion unites them in opposition to China and they have sought independence. The Chinese authorities regard the Uighurs as a distinctive group and claim they are associated with Islamic terrorists.

For full marks look for sound understanding of the primary factors and their role in defining this ethnic group and thorough resource use.

- If there is no resource use award from **Level 1 maximum**.
- If there is only one primary factor discussed award from **Level 1 maximum**.
- If there are only two primary factors discussed award from **Level 2 maximum**.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

This is a thorough answer that demonstrates sound understanding of this topic. The three primary factors are identified correctly and discussed thoroughly with reference to the resource. Use of English is very good.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

The sub optimal situation described above is here. Apart from this, answers at this level are still adequate but lacking some depth and detail. Use of English is quite good.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Apart from the sub optimal situation described above, an answer at this level is seriously flawed by inaccuracies or irrelevant material. There may also be grammatical errors. [6]

- (ii) China assumed full control of this province in 1949 through **annexation**(see map) thereby creating a **pluralist** society. Since that date the local Uighur terrorists have fought for independence. There is mention of repression and heavy handed treatment of Uighur separatists and perhaps over emphasized claims of links to international Islamic terrorism. The Chinese Government has also been accused of **discrimination** against the Uighur population which will maintain ethnic diversity by creating a disgruntled section of the population. The Chinese have encouraged mass **migration** of Han Chinese into the area. This has antagonized the Uighurs who see this as a deliberate policy to undermine their majority in the region.

Look for an understanding of the processes that create and maintain ethnic diversity and thorough resource use. There is no prescribed number of policies they must identify but to get to Level 3 a candidate will need to discuss at least two.

- If there is no resource use award from **Level 1 maximum**.
- If there is only one policy but it is discussed well award from **Level 2 maximum**.
- if the candidate omits either policies that create or maintain ethnic diversity **Level 2 maximum**.
- if there is no extra material, **Level 1 maximum**.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

This is a thorough answer that demonstrates sound understanding of this topic. At least two policies that create and maintain ethnic diversity are identified and discussed thoroughly with reference to the resource. Use of English is very good.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

The sub optimal situations described above are here. Apart from this, answers at this level are still adequate but lacking some depth and detail. Use of English is quite good.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Apart from the sub optimal situation described above, an answer at this level is seriously flawed by inaccuracies or relevant material. There may also be grammatical errors. [9]

- (b) This is a national case study of ethnic conflict. The case study can be either MEDC or LEDC but it must be at the national scale. They have to explain the underlying causes of the conflict and discuss the outcomes and responses to the conflict. Do not reserve equal marks for each of the three parts of the question but if one part is omitted completely **maximum Level 2**. As there is only one case study on the specification there should be no confusion but if someone uses a case study at the wrong scale then award from **Level 1**.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

There is a correct choice of case study. There is good understanding shown with depth and detail in all aspects. The answer is well written.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

The case study is still correctly chosen but there is less detail and depth throughout or one aspect is only dealt with in a superficial manner. English is still good.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

This answer is lacking in detail and depth on all aspects or there may be incorrect information. Use of English may be flawed. [15]

Section A

30

60

Section B

Global Issues

- 7 (a) Primary gaseous pollutants are those which are directly emitted into the atmosphere, usually due to the activities of people. The specification names carbon dioxide, methane, sulphur dioxide and CFCs as primary gaseous pollutants. There are no significant, direct emissions of secondary gaseous pollutants into the atmosphere; rather, they are formed by chemical reactions between combinations of other pollutants. The specification names ozone and PANs as secondary pollutants. If an appropriate explanation without examples is presented, a maximum of [2] marks may be awarded. Detailed, valid comments accompanied with relevant examples (at least one primary and at least one secondary) may be awarded a maximum of [4]. [4]
- (b) A clear description of an appropriate data processing/analysing technique should be given, along with comment on the suitability of the technique employed.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

An appropriate data analysis/processing technique is described with a high level of detail. Strong, valid comment on the suitability of the technique for the chosen purpose is given. Terminology is good.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

An appropriate data analysis/processing technique is described with some detail. Some comment on the suitability of the technique for the chosen purpose is given, although depth and detail may be restricted. Terminology may be restricted.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

An inappropriate data analysis/processing technique may be described, or the comments presented may not relate to air pollution. Alternatively, an appropriate technique may be described in a cursory manner. Comment on the suitability of the technique may be absent, invalid, or cursory. [6]

(c) The candidate is asked to discuss the extent to which they agree with the given statement. Thus, reference to the statement is an integral expectation of the response. Although scientists generally agree that global warming/climate change is occurring, this is not universally the case. Nor is there total agreement on solutions to the issue. Possibilities include: use of clean, renewable energy sources; curbing demand; alteration of farming practices; international co-operation such as Technology Co-operation and carbon trading. LEDCs and MEDCs differ in their priorities for the future and in the role they are prepared to play in addressing the issue. The IPCC, Kyoto Protocol etc may be mentioned.

Level 3 ([14]–[20])

The candidate makes strong and appropriate reference to the statement. Each element of the statement is addressed: political controversy regarding solutions; economic controversy regarding solutions; the extent to which the candidate agrees with the statement. A high level of detail is given.

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

The candidate makes some appropriate reference to the statement. There is some, albeit restricted, clarification as to the extent to which the candidate agrees with the statement. At least two elements of the statement are addressed: political controversy regarding solutions; economic controversy regarding solutions; the extent to which the candidate agrees with the statement. Details may be restricted.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate may make limited appropriate reference to the statement. Either each of the elements of the statement: political controversy regarding solutions; economic controversy regarding solutions; the extent to which the candidate agrees with the statement, may be addressed in a cursory manner only, or a number of elements neglected or mishandled. Details may be very restricted.

[20]

30

- 8 (a) Nuclear weapons testing has, in the past, released contamination which has induced physical effects upon servicemen and their offspring (e.g. 11000 civilians and servicemen worked on or near the Marshall Islands in November 1952 when testing occurred and, subsequently, many developed cancers, suffered emotional problems or impaired fertility, and birth abnormalities increased in number). Nuclear waste is a problem because of the long contamination period, problems finding suitable storage sites and the possibilities of pollution during transit. Contact with waste may also lead to the problems identified as for weapons testing. If only a simple statement/description is presented a maximum of [2] marks may be awarded. Detailed, valid comments may be awarded a maximum of [4]. If the candidate has presented comment on both applications, the better set of comments should be rewarded. [4]
- (b) A clear description of an appropriate data processing/analysing technique should be given, along with comment on the suitability of the technique employed.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

An appropriate data processing/analysing technique is described with a high level of detail. Strong, valid comment on the suitability of the technique for the chosen purpose is given. Terminology is good.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

An appropriate data processing/analysing technique is described with some detail. Some comment on the suitability of the technique for the chosen purpose is given, although depth and detail may be restricted. Terminology may be restricted.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

An inappropriate data processing/analysing technique may be described, or the comments presented may not relate to nuclear energy. Alternatively, an appropriate technique may be described in a cursory manner. Comment on the suitability of the technique may be absent, invalid, or cursory. [6]

- (c) Risks associated with the development of nuclear energy include, for example: human fallability; political differences and associated difficulties including nuclear weapons; nuclear accidents and associated fallout, illness; occupational exposure; effects on air, water and ecology. Benefits include, for example: high energy output which may permit closing the energy gap; low emissions, thus addressing the concerns about global warming/climate change; relatively small amounts of waste. The candidate is asked to discuss the extent to which they agree with the given statement. Thus, reference to the statement is an integral expectation of the response. Reference to places, both within the British Isles and elsewhere, should be made if either is omitted **maximum Level 2**.

Level 3 ([14]–[20])

Each element of the question is strongly addressed: clarification in relation to the statement; risks; benefits; strong, valid references to places, both within the British Isles and elsewhere. Comments are well-developed and with good use of terminology. A high level of detail is given.

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

At least four elements of the question (clarification of position in relation to the statement; risks; benefits; references to place) have been addressed, albeit in an unbalanced fashion. Comments may be under-developed and terminology/details may be restricted.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

More than one element (clarification of position in relation to the statement; risks; benefits; references to places either the British Isles or elsewhere) may have been omitted. Comments may be cursory only, perhaps lacking validity or detail validity. Use of terminology may be poor.

[20]

30

- 9 (a) People object to GM crops for many reasons. A major concern is the possibility of unknown side effects from some of the genetic modifications and the use of artificial fertilisers. There are also environmental concerns associated with the potential risks from cross contamination from GM crops to non-GM crops and the damaging effects of pesticides on biodiversity. There is no specified list of objections so we have to be flexible here and accept anything plausible. They have to give a brief outline of one reason for objecting to the use of GM crops. For 4 marks we do not require a lot of detail. An answer that is nothing more than generalisations should not be awarded more than 2 marks. [4]
- (b) One sampling technique relating to agricultural change should be described and its effectiveness evaluated. Any sampling technique is acceptable.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

The chosen technique is described fully and it is related to the aims of the investigation. The effectiveness of the technique is evaluated. If none was used then the candidate must explain why sampling was deemed unnecessary. Appropriate terminology is used

Level 2 [3]–[4])

At this level the answer still has merit but it lacks the required depth and detail. Alternatively, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the technique or the explanation of why no sampling was required is limited. There may be inadequacies in terminology.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

The chosen technique is not described accurately and/or the evaluation is missing or is not properly related to the aims of the investigation. Alternatively there is no justification for the lack of sampling. There is limited use of terminology. [6]

- (c) This is their case study of a region undergoing agricultural change. There are two things to do here but do not reserve equal marks for each as the detail they will have on each will depend on their case study. Description only **maximum Level 1**; description and consequences only **maximum Level 2**. Similarly do not expect a given number/type of change to be discussed. The specification is quite flexible in this respect and we must accommodate this. Remember this is case study material and we should be guided by the normal requirements of a good case study answer i.e. knowledge of place and detail. The management of the potential environmental consequences of change must be closely related to the changes discussed in the previous section. Do not over reward an answer that gives examples of management not tied to the chosen case study. As above there is no given number of management policies required.

Level 3 ([14]–[20])

At this level the candidate has provided a balanced answer. The nature of the agricultural change/s is described in detail. The candidate has facts and figures from a case study and these are used to good effect. The potential environmental consequences are outlined and the management policies are clearly understood and are tied to the case study. The answer is well written using appropriate terminology and showing very good written communication skills.

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

This is still a competent answer addressing all aspects of the question but the level of depth and detail is less than above. There may be fewer facts and figures relating to the case study. Nevertheless, there is still adequate understanding shown and the main difference between a Level 2 and a Level 3 answer is the depth and detail used. Quality of language is good.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

At this level the answer is seriously flawed either in accuracy, depth and/or detail. The candidate is not in control of the topic. The answer is short showing only partial understanding or knowledge. Written English may be flawed.

[20]

30

10 (a) This model describes how a tourist resort changes over time. All tourist resorts develop around some form of attraction such as coastal, mountains or scenery. The product cycle model views tourism as an exploitive industry, such as mining of a finite resource, whereby the attractions of the tourist resort are exploited to the full. This situation may result in over development and the region begins to lose its pulling power for tourists and may go into decline. The tourist then seeks new attractions elsewhere. This model can be used to show evolution of a single tourist resort in time or it can locate different resorts on the model at one specific time period. For 4 marks do not expect a lot of detail. There is no requirement for examples but some may use them. The Butler Model is a refinement of the Product Cycle model and is also acceptable here. The essential difference between the two is that the Butler Model incorporates the possibility of rejuvenation through management policies. [4]

(b) One sampling technique relating to tourism change should be described and its effectiveness evaluated. Any sampling technique is acceptable.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

The chosen technique is described fully and it is related to the aims of the investigation. The effectiveness of the technique is evaluated. If none was used then the candidate must explain why sampling was deemed unnecessary. Appropriate terminology is used.

Level 2 [3]–[4])

At this level the answer still has merit but it lacks the required depth and detail. Alternatively, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the technique or the explanation of why no sampling was required is limited. There may be inadequacies in terminology.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

The chosen technique is not described accurately and/or the evaluation is missing or is not properly related to the aims of the investigation. Alternatively there is no justification for the lack of sampling. There is limited use of terminology. [6]

(c) This is their regional/national scale case study of tourism change. There are two things to do here but do not reserve equal marks for each as the detail they will have on each will depend on their case study. Description only **maximum Level 1**; description and consequences only **maximum Level 2**. Similarly do not expect a given number/type of change to be discussed. The specification is quite flexible in this respect and we must accommodate this. Remember this is case study material and we should be guided by the normal requirements of a good case study answer i.e. knowledge of place and detail. The management of the potential consequences of change must be closely related to the changes discussed in the previous section. Do not over reward an answer that gives examples of management not tied the chosen case study. As above there is no given number of management policies required.

Level 3 ([14]–[20])

At this level the candidate has provided a balanced answer. The nature of the change in tourism is described in detail. The candidate has facts and figures from a case study and these are used to good effect. The potential consequences are outlined and the management policies are clearly understood and are tied to the case study. The answer is well written using appropriate terminology and showing very good written communication skills

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

This is still a competent answer addressing all aspects of the question but the level of depth and detail is less than above. There may be fewer facts and figures relating to the case study. Nevertheless, there is still adequate understanding shown and the main difference between a level 2 and a level 3 answer is the depth and detail used. Quality of language is good.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

At this level the answer is seriously flawed either in accuracy, depth and/or detail. The candidate is not in control of the topic. The answer is short showing only partial understanding or knowledge. Written English may be flawed.

[20]	30
Section B	30
Total	90