Version 1

ASSESSMENT and QUALIFICATIONS ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography 3031 (Full Course)
Geography 3036 (Short Course)

Specification A

Report on the Examination

2006 examination - June series

- 3031 Full Course
- 3036 Short Course
-

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX. *Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.*

Contents

Specification A 3031 (Full Course)

Page No.

3031/1F 5
3031/1H 8
3031/2F 12
3031/2H 17

Specification A 3036 (Short Course)

3036/F 21
3036/H 25

Coursework

3031/C 28
3036/C 35

This page has been left intentionally blank

3031/1F

The Foundation Tier paper in 2006 was a straightforward and well-balanced paper that allowed candidates to show their geographical skills, knowledge and understanding. The range of marks scored suggested that the paper discriminated and differentiated well. The paper was clearly accessible to all candidates and overall relatively few parts of any question attempted remained unanswered. Other parts of the paper included some challenging questions, especially in Section A, whilst the level marked questions gave plenty of opportunity for the more able students to demonstrate their greater depth of knowledge and understanding. All questions were represented although the most popular combination in Section B was questions 4, 6 and 8 and fewer responses were seen in response to questions 7, 9 and 10. The time allowed for this examination was sufficient and the vast majority of the candidates completed all the required questions. Rubric infringements seemed to have reduced this year although there is still a minority of candidates who attempt more than three questions in Section B. Overall, students, understanding of the formation of landforms appeared good. In contrast description of features, even when this was supported by visuals, was much weaker. Candidates should be encouraged to amplify those responses where more marks are available and to refer to appropriate examples wherever possible.

1 (f) Generally, well answered. Many candidates were able to list or briefly describe various land uses and to avoid focusing on irrelevancies such as relief or landforms. However, there were few developed points and there was a general failure to locate specific land uses either individually or with reference to other land uses in the grid square.

2 (a) Most candidates labelled the A road correctly and were able to locate and label a tourist attraction. Drawing the course of the river was less well done and many of those candidates who attempted this part of the question failed to label the river.

(b) Candidates found this question challenging. Many candidates referred to site factors with little, if any, reference to the shape of the settlement. Furthermore, whilst some candidates did recognise the avoidance of flooding as a valid reason, too many candidates referred to high land inhibiting building/expansion of the town rather than referring more specifically to steep land.

3 (c) Most candidates were able to describe the general shape of the cross section in simple terms. However, few candidates included a detailed tracking of the relief with accurate height figures to support their answer.

4 (a)(v) Generally, well answered. Many candidates recognised the close location of Sumatra to the epicentre with the best answers linking response, or lack of it, to the poorly developed infrastructure of this part of the world.

(b)(i) Generally well answered with most candidates scoring at least one mark and many achieving full marks. Few candidates gained an amplification mark for fertile soils but there were many well developed points related to the impact of tourism on employment and the generation of income for local people.

(b)(ii) Well answered. Most candidates recognised the threat of an eruption although a few concentrated solely on the disadvantages of tourism in terms of litter, noise etc.

5 (a)(i) Variable responses. Whilst a number of candidates located both features accurately, others appeared to be completely in the dark as to what these features were. Some candidates labelled pillars as stalactites, whilst others drew their arrows somewhere in the caverns and often between stalactites and stalagmites.

(b)(iii) Many candidates were able to list or briefly describe various physical features and avoid focusing on land use. However, there were few developed points and there was a general failure to locate/name specific features within the grid square.

(b)(iv) Many candidates were able to list or briefly describe various land uses. However, there was a general failure to locate specific land uses either individually or with reference to other land uses in the grid square.

6 (a)(i) Most candidates correctly located one or two river features accurately with 'meander' predominantly correct. The location of the floodplain however proved more problematic.

(a)(ii) Poorly answered. Too many candidates referred to formation rather than described the feature.

(b)(i) At a basic level many candidates recognised possible impacts on the immediate surroundings but there were few developed answers linking, for example, the flooding of tourist attractions to the impact on employment and revenue in the town.

(b)(ii) Generally, well answered. Most candidates were able to refer to one or two methods of flood protection, although few gained amplification marks for describing how these methods worked.

7 (a)(i) Generally, well answered with a high proportion of candidates identifying correctly one of the two features and many both.

(a)(ii) Generally, well answered with most candidates scoring at least one mark. References to its circular shape proved to be the most popular response but many candidates also referred to a steep backwall, its armchair-shape, and its lip.

(b)(i) Many candidates identified a correct group of people and gave valid reasons. However, a significant number of candidates misread the question and focused on those 'in favour' of the speed limit.

(b)(ii) Most candidates responded correctly. A few misread the question (see above).

(b)(iii) Most candidates identified reasons why people in general were in favour of the speed ban but not all identified the specific group of people and even fewer developed their answers to consider in more detail the benefits to the specified group of people.

8 (b)(i) Most candidates identified at least one reason why coastal defences were required though few further developed their answer.

(b)(ii) Most candidates described at least one feature with the best focusing their response on the features shown on the photograph rather than, as often was the case, writing a general description of sea defences which might have applied to any coast.

(c) Generally, well answered. Most candidates were able to refer to one or two methods of coastal although few gained amplification marks for describing how these methods worked.

9 (b)(i) Generally, well answered. Most candidates referred to the direction of movement either in terms of country or by means of compass points with a large number referring to both.

(b)(ii) Well answered with many candidates scoring full marks and the most popular responses being 'heavy rain' and 'strong winds'.

(b)(iii) Most candidates were able to list or briefly describe an effect(s) of tropical storms but the majority lacked detail/amplification and only a minority referred to specific examples, such as Katrina.

10(b)(i) Well answered with most candidates responding correctly.

(b)(ii) Most candidates were able to refer to at least one reason for deforestation, mainly the demand for timber. However, some candidates explained the effects of deforestation rather than the reasons for it.

(b)(iii) Generally, well answered although references to local people were not always clear. Many wrote about the generic impact of deforestation.

3031/1H

General

Centres and candidates are to be congratulated on the generally very good preparation for both the coursework and written components involved in the Specification's pattern of assessment. All components of the examination discriminated across the ability range and the vast majority of candidates have been able to demonstrate an accurate picture of their geographical skills, knowledge and understanding. The examination was well structured and allowed candidates ready access to the questions.

There were few rubric infringements on the higher tier and an apparent reduction on the foundation tier. Congratulations to centres who have responded to advice in previous reports to discourage candidates from attempting all of the questions where choice exists. Some concerns were expressed by examiners on the Higher Tier that some candidates may have been better served by entry into the Foundation Tier.

The detail on the geography will follow in the reports for individual components but here it would appear appropriate to comment on the importance of candidates being adequately prepared with respect to examination technique. A significant number of candidates fail to achieve higher marks on the written components as a result of careless regard to instructions, command words and mark allocations. For example, candidates should practice labelling diagrams preferably ruling a line to indicate the precise locations of features. On this years papers some candidates failed to see the questions asking for diagrams to be labelled and so failed to gain up to four additional marks. A question including a plural is often disregarded and candidates give a one item response while others do not pay sufficient attention to the mark allocations in questions. In most cases questions with 4 or more marks tend to be level marked. Some centres encourage the good practice of candidates underlining the key words in questions so that such pitfalls may be avoided. In addition, literacy and legibility of handwriting would appear to be problematical for a number of candidates particularly on the Foundation Tier. Weak expression of geographical ideas, limited use of geographical vocabulary and the illegibility of handwriting all mitigate against candidates being able to access more than the most basic of marks in the mark scheme.

The AQA Specification A is almost unique in that it does not prescribe specific case studies for centres to deliver, leaving the choice to the professional judgement of teachers in centres in relation to their own location and individual specialisms and resources. The impact of this is that questions targeting case studies tend to ask 'for one or more examples' or 'for an area you have studied'. Candidates should be made aware that they should use examples and case studies in these questions but that opportunities often exist elsewhere for them to use them even though they may not be asked for directly. If they were requested then usually the Level 3 award would not be possible without some detailed reference to a case study. This would not be necessary if the question did not specifically request an example although it is often a good way of adding the clarity and detail to move through the levels. In addition candidates who do not give any examples or case studies in questions that require them are not automatically given zero. They can usually access the marks in Level 1 and sometimes in Level 2 depending upon the other question demands. Candidates should always be encouraged to answer a question even if they feel unable to answer all of its requirements.

Examiners reported that this was a straightforward and well-balanced paper that allowed candidates to show their geographical skills, knowledge and understanding. The range of marks scored suggested that the paper discriminated and differentiated well. All questions were represented although the most popular combination in Section B was questions 4, 6 and 8 and fewer responses were seen in response to questions 9 and 10. There were comparatively few rubric infringements and there were no time problems evident. Candidates showed good skills in integrating processes into answers where explanations of landform formation were required. In questions requiring the labelling of a sketch some candidates failed to complete the question. Candidates need to ensure they read all questions carefully. Candidates continue to misinterpret the wording of questions, including the command words, inevitably leading to lower scores for questions. Centres should be congratulated as most candidates had been well prepared for the examination and had been entered for the correct tier.

Section A

Question 1

This question was generally well done by the majority of candidates and was a sound introduction to the paper as a whole although some examiners commented that map work was less well done by some centres. Candidates need practice to ensure they use the detail given e.g. on the OS map extract to enhance their answers. Centres are also reminded to pay due attention to the skills list in the Specification when preparing candidates for the examination.

Parts 1(a) and (b) presented few difficulties for candidates. Part 1(c) proved to be an effective discriminator. Some candidates failed to correctly interpret the need for 'pattern', being content to describe the shape of Reading or the internal urban morphology of the settlement, a throw back to previous questions in earlier years. Even those who did recognise features of the pattern often failed to access Level 3 marks as they failed to adequately support their answers with detailed examples and/or grid references from the OS map extract. Part 1(d) required candidates to make a direct comparison to access Level 2 marks. The simple use of a comparative word is not sufficient for Level 2. Level 1 answers merely listed the land uses inserting whereas or however in between. A minority of candidates misinterpreted the needs of the question presenting an answer based upon relief rather than land use or identified the incorrect grid square.

Question 2

The majority of candidates accurately completed part (a) effectively delimiting the area, shading it and labelling the built up area. A minority failed to achieve the shape largely due to scribbling the area or by shading in two or three grid squares rather than providing a firm outline. In (b) candidates appeared less familiar with the skill of annotation and answers frequently consisted of brief labels largely reliant upon interpreting individual symbols shown on the extract such as the canoe launch. This question proved demanding and was a good differentiator but it was also apparent that some centres may not have adequately prepared candidates for this type of question.

Question 3

The vast majority of candidates scored the maximum in parts (a) and (b) although a significant number gave air survey height in part (b). Part (c) was also generally well answered although some candidates failed to give any detail of heights (with the units of measurement) and locations and the idea of following a sequential pattern in their answers for example by starting at Dadnor Court and moving to Brampton Abbotts eluded some. There were some very vague answers in which terms such as 'bumpy' were quite common and some candidates are convinced that 100 metres in height represents mountains.

Section B

Question 4

This question remains very popular amongst centres and students. In part (a)(i) the majority of candidates gained full marks for identifying two features of the earthquake from Figure 4. They then went on in (a)(ii) to write at length as to why the loss of life was so great. The question with the command word 'suggest' allowed candidates to draw on their knowledge of examples of earthquakes and the impact in LEDCs other than that in Sumatra in December 2004. Answers to part (b) were generally good although weaker answers tended to merely list likely advantages such as tourism with little reference to the map provided or their own knowledge. Part (c) differentiated well and responses varied from those where process and sequence were well known to those where it was clear that the processes at work had not been well learned or understood. There were common errors over plate movements and some confusion over the formation of volcanoes and fold mountains. Other candidates tried to include several different types of volcanoes resulting in less detailed answers. Some candidates wrongly believe that the buckling of plates forms volcanoes. Effective answers used the correct terminology and clear reference to appropriate plate margins and examples. Some candidates also made effective use of diagrams to help with the explanation, a skill to be commended.

Question 5

This was a less popular question but answered well by the majority who attempted it. Part (a)(i) scored well although a disappointing number of candidates appeared not to answer the question. In part (a)(ii) some very good answers were seen with effective description of the sequence and good explanation of carbonation. However, many lacked sufficient detail on the sequence and/or process to access Level 3 or the answer concentrated upon the role of freeze-thaw as opposed to chemical weathering. Weaker answers attempted to describe the formation of river potholes entirely inappropriate for the demands of the question. Part (b)(i) was generally well done although inevitably some candidates did not understand the emphasis on physical features that the question demanded and were side tracked into human features and / or land uses while others quoted the height correctly but failed to include the unit of measurement. In part (b)(ii) there were some good responses with explanations for the features especially in connection with the reservoir and quarries. Some candidates however used their own knowledge rather than the given resource. Candidates need reminding to follow the instructions carefully and to recognise when to use their own knowledge and when a response to stimulus material is required.

Question 6

This question was a popular choice amongst candidates and many answered to good effect although some examiners commented that in general the candidates' answer to this question were weaker than to other questions. Some candidates ignored question (a)(i) totally while others failed to recognise the need to give at least one river and valley feature. Some candidates labelled features such as ox-bow lakes that were clearly not visible on the resource. In (a)(ii) the most common choice was meanders and answers were variable, the best providing detailed explanation of their formation often with well labelled diagrams. Less effective answers failed to adequately explain the processes and integrate them into the account or they selected features such as tributaries or sources which really limited their access to the full range of marks. In part (b)(i) effective answers used the resource well recognising for example the differences that occurred under both normal and extreme flood conditions but it is disappointing to note that so many candidates failed to use the resource at all or to recognise that the flooding was unlikely to lead to the castle being destroyed or to people being drowned. In (b)(ii) many good answers were seen. The most common errors were when candidates failed to adequately explain how the method would work, often a result of them attempting to include a variety of different methods.

Question 7

This question was not particularly popular but answered well by candidates from centres where this has been taught. Question (a)(i) was done very well by the majority of candidates although a significant number omitted to complete it while others demonstrated only limited understanding of glacial features. There were some outstanding answers for the formation of ribbon lakes that showed good understanding of the sequence and processes of differential erosion and deposition of terminal moraines. Inevitably, weaker answers achieved little more than a repeat of some of the features shown on the diagram or surprisingly tried to explain its formation as a result of water erosion. The majority of candidates were able to answer parts (b)(i) and (ii) very well demonstrating the ability to write coherently and link ideas together. Weaker answers tended to be vague ideas on noise and pollution not well linked to the groups of people likely to be affected.

Question 8

This was extremely popular and elicited a full range of responses from the candidates. Part (a)(i) scored well with the majority of candidates gaining maximum marks although a significant number appeared not to have seen the question at all. Explanations for the formation of the wave cut platform were frequently detailed and precise on both the sequence and process. Some candidates used the cave-arch-stack route which was perhaps not as effective, as they often failed to link their explanations to the formation of the wave cut platform. Only in a minority of cases did candidates see the feature as a product of deposition. Some candidates made effective use of diagrams in their answers. In part (b) many candidates could name the defences shown on the photograph but too many then explained how they worked rather than describing one of the defences shown. Part (c) was very well answered by the majority of candidates often with the use of appropriate examples. Groynes and sea walls were the most popular choices.

Question 9

Sadly, this question remains relatively unpopular although some excellent responses were seen reflecting both good teaching of this unit and thorough knowledge and understanding by the candidates. Section (a)(i) was completed successfully by many candidates although those who tried to label the actual fronts often misinterpreted their locations. The most effective answers were those that concentrated on what could be seen such as the differing thicknesses / patterns of cloud cover. Part (a)(ii) was an effective discriminator and some truly excellent answers were seen; some tended to be descriptive rather than giving explanation while others were only partial; for example concentrating on the cold front, or were confused and inaccurate. In part (b)(i) knowledge of the formation of hurricanes was generally good and in (b)(ii) candidates had very good knowledge of tropical storms and were often able to provide very accurate and up to date case study information that proved an easy route to Level 2 and maximum marks in this question.

Question 10

This question, while more popular than Question 9, is not as popular as some others such as coasts and rivers. Part (a)(i) caused few problems, although as in question 1 the need for direct comparison eluded some candidates. In addition weaker answers showed great confusion over the names of regions/continents and very vague statements about locations. Part (a)(ii) is a well established question and the majority of candidates were able to link the adaptation to the environmental characteristic although few could provide the detail necessary for Level 3 in this question. The majority of candidates gave an acceptable definition for deforestation in (b)(i) but part (b)(ii) proved more demanding. Candidates frequently failed to make the impact on the local people clear debarring them from the achievement of Level 2.

3031/2F

General

The paper showed the usual range of responses. There were candidates whose literacy skills let them down, but there are still many examples of candidates who seemed ill prepared for this examination. This was particularly true in those questions, which relied heavily on the recall of factual knowledge. Carelessness as ever, lost candidates marks, and this was particularly true in the one-word answers. Candidates should read through their answers and make sure that they have not made silly mistakes. If the question asked for a year, as in Questions 1 and 2 (b)(ii) then a decade or a range of years cannot be the correct answer**.** It was felt that the paper was accessible to the targeted candidates and was an appropriate test of their geographical knowledge, understanding and skills. The importance of candidates having the correct equipment in the examination room needs to be emphasised once again - particularly a sharp pencil capable of drawing a graph with sufficient accuracy to gain credit. Section B still remains the weakest section and the agriculture question again proved problematical to many candidates. This year there appeared to be more centres choosing the population question in preference to the one on settlement in section A. In Section C Question 6 also seems to have increased its popularity at the expense of Question 5 this year. As this was the 4th year that this specification has been examined, experience has been gained in making the paper accessible to the majority of the targeted range of ability. There was some evidence that a minority had been entered for the wrong tier. Case study material is still sparingly used. Very few candidates showed a clear knowledge of place or specific examples and this absence of geographical understanding and knowledge often confined answers to Level 1. Many candidates are still using the bullet points approach, failing to make links between the points made. Centres should emphasis the importance of linked statements, which at least in most cases will get them into the bottom of Level 2. Candidates need to look more closely at the mark allocation and try to develop their answers in full sentences.

Section A

The marks awarded to Questions 1 and 2 were broadly similar.

Question 1 Population

Birth rate was not really known. The majority of candidates scored one mark for recognising that it partly referred to the number of babies born, but relatively few gained the second mark explaining the meaning of the word 'rate'. The calculation in (a)(ii) was largely correct provided the candidate had some grasp of the idea of 'natural increase in population'. It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates could interpret the graph in Figure (a)(iii) and so choose the correct words in the four sentences. Reference has already been made to question (b)(i) and (ii). Answers to (b)(iii) generally gained some credit with each of the three options being attempted roughly equally. Those who chose 'careers for women' generally performed better than 'family planning' and improved health care', because they were able to develop their answer, whereas in the other two options this was not the case. There was a strong emphasis on contraception for both of these two, with the answers worthy of credit. Many gave an answer to improved health care, which justified a growth in population. This was a classic case of not reading the question. Pull factors were better understood than the push factors in answering (c)(i) and there were too many examples of candidates making up their own examples instead of using those on Figure 3. In (c)(ii) a misreading of the question meant that some candidates often referred to the advantages to the immigrants rather than to the receiving country, some also dealing with the disadvantages of immigration. The answers to this question were frequently typified by a lack of development, with many candidates only managing Level 1 responses with 'more people to work' being the dominant theme. On the positive side, there were many candidates who were able to appreciate that the topical subject of immigrant workers in the UK could provide them with answers based around 'jobs locals are reluctant to do' theme. In part (d) many

failed to grasp the ideas of 'physical factors', giving many human factors, or they were unable to develop their ideas beyond basic statements such 'too hilly', 'too hot' etc. Volcanoes and earthquakes proved a problem, perhaps they were confused when they remembered the question on paper 1 which asked them to justify why many people live in areas of high tectonic activity. They could not gain credit at even at Level 1 for these tectonic activities if they failed to elaborate them in terms of danger to life or property.

Question 2 Settlement

Urbanisation is a difficult term for Foundation Tier candidates, many confusing it with urban growth or even migration. There was a need to emphasise the change in percentage or proportion of the population living in urban areas. The majority of candidates were able to recognise that Country B became more urbanised between 1950 and 2000 in part (a)(ii). As its equivalent in Question 1, part (a)(ii) was well answered. The graphical skills were generally good in part (b)(i) but far too many candidates gave a decade as their answer to part (b)(ii) despite the question asking for a year. Part (c)(i) worked as well as the equivalent question on Hong Kong. In this case it was the physical factors that caused the greatest difficulty if any. Some candidates described the causes of the rapid growth of cities in LEDCs in (c)(ii), rather than the effects. Most answers managed to reach the top of Level 1, but this question was a prime example of candidates failing to go higher because of the lack of development or linked statements. A wide range of ideas was considered. Some answers were wholly concerned with shantytown development while others considered food, health and development. This was a common question with the higher tier and was aimed at the Grade C candidates and so the question was left open-ended. There were a number of vague answers to (c)(ii) with little reference to 'how'. Candidates did not appear to understand the word 'how' in this context. Very few candidates saw the possible link between (c)(ii) and (c)(iii). Improvement to shanty towns regularly gained one mark and there were some attempts at linked statements on 'brownfield sites'. Transport policy answers were centred on what the policies would do to traffic and not how they would cope with rapid urban growth. There were some interesting answers to part (d). The majority were able to name Burgess. Some very good ones gave the background to the model before describing it. Most recognised some sort of zoning, although some labels and descriptions were very inventive. Most could describe the CBD. It was pleasing to see that candidates did use local examples often it appeared as a result of fieldwork. These worked well and frequently produced the best answers. A number of candidates described both Burgess and another model – frequently Hoyt. This often led to confusion. Centres should recognise that the specification only requires the study of one urban land use model.

Section B

These two questions appeared to be roughly equal in popularity but Question 3 undoubtedly scored lower than Question 4. Both questions tended to be weaker than their equivalents in Section A and C.

Question 3 Agriculture

This question remains a problem area, which candidates either find difficult or less appealing and so are more reluctant to learn the work in sufficient depth. The precise nature of the questions meant that the candidates had to rely on specific information and could not rely on generalisations to gain credit, even at the lowest level. The basic definition of 'market gardening' in (a)(i) showed a distinct lack of knowledge. Many thought in terms of a garden centre or selling produce at a market. Candidates scored quite well in (a)(ii) but they were unable to carry this information over into (a)(iii). This was by far the most poorly answered question on the whole paper. There were vague ideas about distance from markets and the possibility of the 'crops going off'. The specification is quite clear in that the distribution of dairying, arable, hill sheep, mixed farming, and **market gardening** in the UK should be studied and explanations given in terms of physical and human factors. The answers to (a)(ii) were too generalised and failed to make reference to market gardening. Descriptions of soils and climate were confined to muddled or bland statements about fertile soil and high rainfall, as well as the usual good/right/suitable soil and/or climate. Description of photographs remains a problem area and many candidates in (b)(i) failed to mention the simple facts about what was actually happening in the picture, i.e. the women were planting or picking a crop in a flooded field. Many were concerned that the women were rescuing the crop after the flood! There was the usual mix of human and physical factors given in the answer to (c)(ii). Changing agriculture in LEDCs often was restricted to the increased use of machines. There were however, some good answers to the Green Revolution and these candidates were able to carry on this idea to part (c)(ii). Irrigation and conservation, the other ideas listed in the specification, were rarely seen in these answers. Unemployment seems to be the most commonly perceived effect of changes to agriculture in the LEDCs. The less able candidates gave advantages rather than disadvantages. The meaning of the letters CAP, was generally known even if the candidates did not get all three words correct. The answers to (d)(ii) varied widely, from the very vague and limited in scope to the detailed and wide ranging, with the abler candidates showing understanding of the impact of these polices on farming. Most had some idea of at least one policy. Quotas, subsidies and set aside were answered best. Common misconceptions were that the woodland grant scheme was aimed at farmers cutting down trees or encouraging them to do so in order to provide more land on which to grow crops, and that the arable area payments were a tax or rent paid by the farmer. Candidates were unable to accurately put tariffs in the context of the EU.

Question 4 Industry

Overall this question scored better than Question 3. Manufacturing industry was better known than the equivalent question on market gardening. The majority of candidates defined secondary industry accurately and good marks were common in the input, processes and output question. Where a candidate managed to give a relevant example, they often managed to score 4 marks in part (b)(ii). They had no difficulty with question (c)(ii). There were however some candidate who did not carry over their correct definition of secondary industry from the start of the question and chose the coal mining industry as their example in part (b). The photo interpretation in part (c) was done better than its equivalent in Question 3. Some candidates appeared not to really understand the idea of 'layout'. Here and in part (c)(ii) there were too many vague references to good roads/good access/big space/easy for visitors to get to / easily noticed etc. Many thought it was a Theme Park leading to many references to tourists! Many candidates answered part (d) wholly in the negative, concentrating on where an industry cannot locate rather than where it can, or writing about what an industry needs (often saying that if it cannot get what it needs then it will close down). One wonders why it set up there in the first place? There was little reference to the effect of this on location. There were

widespread misconceptions about the role of energy in this regard. Level 2 was more frequently reached in this question, in contrast to the equivalent part of Question 3. Government policy was the factor that tended to develop the clearer answers. In (e)(ii) a significant number of candidates gained some credit, but a number made general statements about industrial pollution without identifying the source. The less able candidates wrote about global warming and acid rain without linking it to the impact on land or sea.

Section C

There appeared to be a greater parity in the number of candidates answering questions 5 and 6 than in previous years, with question 6 gaining in popularity. Question 5 did not score as highly as in previous years particularly the parts on tourism.

Question 5 Managing Resources

The definition of resources was answered well in part (a)(i). Generally good use was made of the graph of unequal resources, in that most candidates were able to understand it and draw out relevant evidence. Some added explanation and comments, which were not asked for. On the other hand this question also elicited some surprisingly poor answers, despite the wide range of general and specific answers allowed for in the mark scheme. Recycling was also easily defined, but candidates did not always recognise the point of the cartoon in Figure 14. They merely referred to pollution, without realising the significance of the transport of the recycled material in adding to air pollution. Candidates should always remember that pollution only gains credit if it is qualified. There is still a widespread inability to explain global warming. The fixation with the hole in the ozone layer is still present in GCSE answers. The stimulus material may or may not have helped the candidates, because often they did not go beyond the information on Figure 15, or they were unable to get the sequence of events in the correct order. Part (c)(i) did not cause any difficulty provided the candidates realised the information had to be taken from Figure 16. 'Green Tourism' is widely misunderstood, many candidates thinking of it in terms of green landscapes. There were insufficient candidates including references to local people and sustainability. In all definition type questions it should be stressed to candidates that no credit is given where there the word or a derivative is merely repeated. This was a problem in this question and even more in the equivalent part of Question 6 on appropriate technology. Most candidates scored one mark for each of the chosen rules in (d)(iii) but many failed to get the second mark. The most common response was that it was environmentally friendly for all three rules. Part (iv) is a question that has been asked fairly regularly in recent years and so the candidates generally did well. There was some evidence of the use of case studies in these answers with references to Kenya and the Caribbean. Litter and noise are far too frequently seen as a disadvantage of the development of tourism in LEDCs.

Question 6 Development

Candidates generally were able to respond to the graph in Figure 17 accurately and also could define GNP in parts (a)(i) and (ii). Even if the candidates were not able to name the type of aid in (b)(i), this was an example of a question where candidates had used the source material well and many were aware of the advantages and disadvantages of aid in parts (ii) and (iii). Centres should be aware that because of the nature of the cartoon, candidates were given credit if they made reference to LEDCs paying back aid because of the presence of the term 'loan interest' in the bottom left picture. Normally this would not be credited on a question on aid, as paying back money is seen by the examiners as a disadvantage of loans as opposed to aid. Part (c)(i) produced confused answers with most candidates merely repeating the question or giving examples. The idea of 'appropriateness' in this context was not well known. Most candidates concentrated on the global rather than the local effects of advantages 1 and 3 in (c)(ii). Number 2 on the advantages of the upesi being sold by women produced the best answers rather than the one on the reduction of the number of trees cut down which was expected to be the most straightforward one. In part (d)(i) the majority of candidates were able to identify at least one problem around the quantity and quality of water in LEDCs, and a number gained full credit. Part (d)(ii) also saw many candidates gaining some credit, although many wrote in general terms about clean water etc. without referring to the method of improvement used. Those that did invariably referred to dams, wells and pumps. There was some case study evidence with reference to the Aswan Dam in Egypt. Part (e) suffered from there being too much evidence on the pie charts which did lead to some candidates concentrating merely on descriptions rather than the disadvantages of international trade, but generally this question scored more highly than equivalent questions in previous years.

3031/2H

The standard on the paper seems to be more variable this year. There was perhaps a greater demand on factual knowledge, for example on the knowledge of the CAP policies in the Agriculture Question and the requirement for the use of case studies or examples in many of the questions. This meant that the candidates who were under-prepared and undertook a perfunctory revision did not do well. Examination technique still remains an issue. It is important that candidates remember that to be considered for Level 3, they have to obey the command word and answer all parts of the question. It is important for them to highlight all key words and take particular notice if there are any plurals in the question. If this is the case, then Level 3 would only be achievable if more than factor or advantage, for example, has been covered. There does seem to have been a change in the choice of questions answered. Traditionally the options in Sections A and B have been fairly evenly split, but there seems to have been a greater number answering population than settlement this year. The biggest change however, has come in Section C. For a number of years, Question 5 has been vastly more popular than Question 6. This year there seems to have a major shift towards Question 6. The standard of English is still an area of concern, particularly sentence construction – although it generally did not interfere with the geographical evidence coming through. Centres should recognise that the amount of space given in the answer booklet (2 lines per mark) should be sufficient for the majority of candidates to write enough to gain full marks. Conciseness was often characteristic of the best answers.

Section A

The population question was considerably more popular than the question on settlement, but both seemed to be of the same level of difficulty.

Question 1 – Population

A surprisingly large number of candidates could not explain 'natural increase' in population. Some candidates over emphasised the word 'natural' saying it was an increase in population without interference from humans! Most candidates answered (a)(ii) well, showing good ability to interpret graphs. The most common reason for low scoring responses was when candidates attempted to explain the differences, showing a failure to read the command word. Very few identified the top line on the graph as being the total population, usually seeing it as the total population of LEDCs only. In (a)(iii) many candidates related the possible fall in the population of LEDCs to increasing death rate due to poor hygiene, starvation, war and natural disasters. Those who recognised the significance of the Demographic Transition model for this question produced better answers. They discussed the factors leading to a declining birth rate. China's one child policy is obviously well known and there were some good case studies based on Kerala. The weakest candidates argued that a decline in the death rate would lead to a fall in the population! Only the very weakest candidates did not score well on question (b), and then it was often because they tried to use their own examples, ignoring the reasons given in Figure 2. Pull factors seem to be better understood than push factors. Level 3 answers were quite rare to question (b)(ii). There was a lack of sufficient detail or the candidate failed to consider both advantages and disadvantages. Advantages were generally limited to 'taking low paid jobs that no-one else wanted, plus some vague comments about 'increasing the work force' and 'helping the economy'. There was some use of case studies, including Turks moving into the former West Germany, Mexicans entering California and increasingly Palestinians moving to Lebanon. The term 'physical' was often ignored in part (c) and there were many vague generalisations. Candidates seem to be more familiar with this type of question dealing with low population densities and so they struggled with the opposite concept. In fact some tried to write in negative terms to get themselves on more familiar grounds.

Question 2 – Settlement

There is great confusion between 'urban growth' and 'urbanisation'. Many candidates answered this in terms of increasing population, rather than an increase in the size of the built up area. In definition type questions it should be stressed to candidates that no credit can be given where the word or a derivative is merely repeated. 'Urban growth is growth of an urban area' therefore gained no credit. Candidates generally could cope with the description of the graphs in Figure 3. A lot of figures could be produced from these and some answers were almost overwhelmed with them. A significant minority of candidates referred to LEDCs without giving the continent(s) named on the graph line(s) and so could not get above Level 1. Question (b)(i) scored in a similar manner to the equivalent question on population. Where there was any difficulty, it tended to be with the physical rather than the human factors. There were not as many good answers to (b)(ii) as would have been expected, as this question has been asked many times in the past. The majority concentrated on shanty towns but let themselves down by not developing the points they made. In part (iii) self-help schemes had clearly been studied as case studies for a number of cities. Answers were generally good, although a number did write about China's one child policy but failed to link it to the growth of cities. Other good case studies included the building of Barra da Tajica as an extension to Rio de Janeiro. The majority of candidates used the Burgess model as their example of a MEDC model. There was less knowledge and understanding of the LEDC model. Many candidates considered the Hoyt MEDC model was the one applicable to city in LEDCs. There were also a significant number who were able to describe the urban models but were unable to compare them. Command words are important in these questions and reference to the teacher's guide will show that the instruction to compare requires a consideration of both the similarities and the differences. This question proved to be a good discriminating one.

Section B

This generally was the weakest section for most candidates. Question 4 appeared to be more popular than the question on agriculture, and scored more highly. This is a section which does not appear to appeal to candidates and the requirement for case studies and an emphasis on factual recall means that they cannot rely to the same extent on generalisation to gain any credit.

Question 3 Agriculture

Far too many candidates could not give a precise meaning to the term 'market gardening' in part (a)(i). Many thought of it in terms of garden centres or selling the produce from a garden. Either with or without the help of Figure 5, most candidates could state that urban areas, motorway links and winter temperatures had some effect on the distribution of market gardening in the UK, but had no idea as to why these factors were significant. The nearness to the coast for export was a common response and there was some discussion of a north-south divide in the distribution of this type of farming. Intensive farming is generally well understood whether it is considered from an input or an output point of view. Those candidates who read part (b)(i) carefully and confined their attention to what was seen on the photograph tended to do well. There were however, too many who recognised it as rice farming and then described the features that they had learnt rather than what they could see. There was a range of responses to (b)(ii), with many candidates making use of their knowledge of the Green Revolution to good advantage. There were some however, who mentioned HYVs or other changes without any references to their impacts on farming in LEDCs. Question 3(c) produced a huge range of responses. Candidates who knew the policies were able to score well, but a lot of misunderstanding was evident in many answers. The candidates recognised the terms, but showed confusion as to which one was which, for example, quoting subsidies but describing guaranteed prices. Quotas and set aside produced the best answers. What was much weaker was the impact these policies had on farming in the EU. The newer polices, namely arable area payments and woodland grant schemes, were not known at all. Many thought that woodland grant schemes were aimed at reducing the amount of woodland so as to increase the area under arable crops.

Question 4 Industry

Virtually all candidates knew the definition of 'secondary industry', in contrast to the equivalent definition in the farming question. In part (a)(ii) the answer was only required to go to Level 2, but many candidates used good case study evidence of the decline of the steel industry in South Wales. There were still those who answered the question very generally, but the worst answers were from those who chose a primary industry, such as coal mining in order to answer this question. The general feeling was that the decline in the UK's manufacturing industry was entirely to do with the fact that it was cheaper to make the product overseas. There was some reference to the exhaustion of local raw materials but very little consideration of obsolete machinery or inadequate training in the new skills necessary for the modernisation of a steel plant. Photo interpretation was sound in (b)(i) but the reference to the Science Park's location invariably led to comments about the University. A significant number of candidates think that all science parks, including this one at Cambridge, are along the M4. The definition of 'footloose' was generally well known. Less able candidates in answering part (c) tended to try to discuss all the factors shown on Figure 10. This led to a very superficial approach. Transport and raw materials got the same comments, such as the need to transport raw material at low cost etc. There was also some general location theory given without any detail. The better candidates realised it was better to restrict themselves to one or two and deal with them in greater depth. The best answers just dealt with government policies making reference to Enterprise Zones and the assistance available in setting up new industries in areas of Decline. It was a pity that detail of case studies was not evident here. The South Wales steel industry would have proved very useful in this respect. Few candidates answered part (d) well. All too often, they thought about global warming which was not acceptable and many did not appreciate that there was an internal choice in this question and they had to choose the effect of pollution on either land or sea. Oil spillages seem to kill animals in the sea rather than fish according to these candidates. Concern for wildlife is very important apparently. Many answers concentrated on air pollution and acid rain was not acceptable unless it was shown to actually affect land or sea. Rivers and lakes were considered in the mark scheme to be part of land pollution.

Section C

There was greater parity between the two questions this year in terms of numbers answering a particular question and the marks achieved. There was an improvement in the quality and quantity of Question 6.

Question 5 Managing Resources

The cartoons proved more difficult for the candidates than was expected. In particular many failed to appreciate the significance of the air pollution created while transporting recycled material in Figure 11(a). In part (b), far too many candidates relied on the stimulus material entirely and merely gave lifts from the diagram and so restricted themselves to Level 1. Frequently the only additional information given was related to the burning of fossil fuels. The sequencing of the events was sometimes at fault and the ozone layer appears even more frequently in global warming answers. It is difficult to see why candidates continue to have difficulty with this topic considering how many times they cover it in geography as well as in a number of other subjects including science. Are candidates being confused by different subjects teaching different information. There was also a tendency to describe the effects rather than the causes of global warming. Candidates need to be aware of the impact of other greenhouse gases apart from carbon dioxide. The increasing industrialisation of LEDCs, as well as the ever-increasing demands of the MEDCs was rarely dealt with. 'Green Tourism' was defined appropriately, but part (c)(iii) was poorly answered. The general response to all of the rules was that 'it would not harm the environment'. Rule 1, in particular was poorly understood. There was little awareness that planning could foresee potential threats, which could be avoided or minimised while the project could advance.

Many candidates saw these developments solely in terms of' 'putting off the tourists'. One concern was that the taking of fresh water out of the sea would lead to a drop in sea level! Part (c)(iv) was a disappointment this year. In the past this question has produced answers with details of such location as Kenya or the Caribbean. The majority of answers this year were of the 'anywhere' type which lacked the detail and elaboration required for Level 3.

Question 6 Development

The cartoon gave plenty of scope for a range of responses. There were those candidates who did not see the point being made. This was a question where the allocation of marks suggested that a number of points needed to be made. Questions allocated less than four marks are normally point marked. Many candidates responded well and could make creditworthy points. There was perhaps an overemphasis on the fact that aid had to be paid back, or the donor got a profit out of it, not realising that only $7 out of $10 came back. Centres should be aware that because of the nature of the cartoon, candidates were given credit if they made reference to LEDCs paying back aid because of the presence of the term 'loan interest' in the bottom left picture. Normally this would not be credited on a question on aid, as paying back money is seen by the examiners as a disadvantage of loans as opposed to aid. Part (b)(i) produced confused answers with most candidates merely repeating the question or giving examples. The idea of 'appropriateness' in this context was not well known. There was a wide range of marks for part (b)(ii), with the best candidates thinking carefully about the benefits and linking them well to development issues. The less able candidates as ever were concerned about the effect on wildlife. Advantage 2 was generally the weakest if it was chosen. In part (c) there were many basic references to installing pipes and digging wells, however reference was made to examples of projects that improved water supply in LEDCs. Candidates did have a tendency to look at how water supply improved lives, rather than how the supply of water was actually improved. This again emphasises the importance of candidates reading a question carefully. Most candidates could give at least one difference between the export trade of Malawi and Japan. Part (d)(ii) produced better answers than have been seen often in equivalent questions in previous papers. There is still some confusion between trade and aid, but generally the advantages and disadvantages of international trade were well understood. Perhaps the presence of the pie diagrams acted as an appropriate form of scaffolding on which candidates could base their answers.

3036/F

General

The paper appeared to be accessible to candidates with the less able achieving most of their marks on the short answer questions whereas the more able were able to demonstrate their knowledge in the answers requiring extended prose. Rubric infringements still occurred, usually the less able candidates attempting the short sections of all the questions.

In Section B, the Physical geography section, candidates needed to answer only two questions. The topics chosen most frequently were Tectonic Activity, Coasts and Rivers in that order. Very few candidates chose to answer the Glaciation question. In the Human section of the paper, Section C, candidates were required to answer only one question. The Settlement and Managing Resources questions were equally popular with fewer candidates choosing to answer the Agriculture question.

Section A

Question 1

The short answer questions assessing the skill of map reading was a good introduction to the paper with most candidates giving accurate answers. Some lost one of the marks available in (b) because they failed to give the units of measurement and a common error in (c) was to give the opposite direction. Candidates could be encouraged to annotate their question paper, in this instance to highlight the words 'to' and 'from', which might help to avoid such confusion.

Question 2

In the first part of this question, most candidates labelled the A road correctly and were able to locate and label a tourist attraction. However, candidates found that completing the course of the river was quite difficult and not all remembered to give it a label.

Part (b) was poorly answered. Most candidates referred to site factors with little, if any, reference to shape. Furthermore, whilst some candidates did recognise the avoidance of flooding as a reason, too many candidates referred to high land inhibiting building/expansion of the town rather than steep land.

Question 3

The features X and Y were usually correctly given and most candidates were able to describe the general shape of the cross-section in simple terms. However, few candidates included a detailed tracking of the relief or accurate height figures to support their answer.

Section B

Question 4

The questions requiring short answers did not prove difficult for candidates and most completed the sentences in part (iv) accurately although some stated that the plates were moving 'inwards'. In part (v), candidates recognised the close location of Sumatra to the epicentre and the best answers linked the response, or lack of it, to the poorly developed infrastructure of this part of the world.

Part (b)(i) was generally well answered with most candidates scoring at least one mark and many achieving full marks. Few candidates gained an amplification mark for fertile soils but there were many well developed points related to the impact of tourism on employment and the generation of income for local people. In the second part of (b), most candidates recognised the threat of an eruption although a few concentrated solely on the disadvantages of tourism in terms of litter, noise etc.

Question 5

Most candidates correctly located either one or two river features accurately with 'meander' predominantly correct. The location of the floodplain, however, proved more problematic. Many candidates struggled to describe a levee in (a)(ii). Some described its formation rather than the feature itself.

In (b)(i) many candidates recognised possible impacts on the immediate surroundings at a basic level, but there were few developed answers linking, for example, the flooding of tourist attractions to the impact on employment and revenue in the town. However most candidates were able to refer to one or two methods of flood protection in the final part of this question, although only a few gained amplification marks for describing how these methods worked.

Question 6

A high proportion of candidates correctly identified one of the two glacial features on Figure 8. Many were able to identify both. Candidates also responded well to describing a corrie. References to its circular shape proved to be the most popular response but many candidates also referred to a steep back wall, its armchair-shape and its lip. The completion of the sentences to explain the formation of a ribbon lake proved more testing.

In the second part of this question candidates were able to identify a correct group of people and give valid reasons for that group being against the speed limit on Lake Windermere. However, a significant number of candidates misread the question and focused on those 'in favour' of the speed limit. The same problem arose for some in part (ii). Many different reasons as to why people were in favour of the speed limit were suggested in (iii), but not all identified a specific group of people and even fewer developed their answers to consider the benefits of such legislation.

Question 7

The features X and Y on Figure 10 were invariably identified correctly but many candidates found the completion of the sentences to explain the formation of a wave-cut platform more difficult. Pairs of words which were especially confused were 'destructive/constructive' and 'advances/retreats'.

In the first part of section (b), most candidates identified at least one reason why coastal defences were required on the stretch of coastline pictured in Figure 11, although few developed their answers. In the second part of this question, candidates usually described at least one type of coastal defence, but not all were those shown on the photograph. Many responses were a description of sea defences which applied to coasts in general.

The last part of question 7 was generally well answered. One or two methods of coastal protection were usually given although there was less reference to how these methods worked.

Section C

Question 8

This was a popular choice of question for candidates. The first parts of this question, each of which commanded a single mark, did not prove a problem to most candidates. They understood the meaning of the letters CBD, were able to tick the correct box in (ii) and give the correct words in (iii) and (iv).

Part (b) of this question was concerned with changes in inner cities. The addition of trees, the zebra crossing and the removal of overhead wires were the changes most frequently stated – very few candidates noticed the addition of bathrooms to the houses. Simplistic ideas were usually given for these changes such as, 'trees improve the environment', without any development of the points which would have given access to the higher level of marks. Many candidates struggled to suggest other ways in which inner city areas have been improved (b)(iii), often they described other changes seen in Figure 13. The final part of section (b) was a common question with the higher paper and those who lost marks often did so for the same reason, i.e. they did not explain the disadvantages to the group asked about in the question i.e. the original residents. Others made basic comments such as the original residents liked their old house or they would not like any changes.

The rural-urban fringe, the topic of part (c), was not known by a substantial number of candidates. Some wrote about the green belt and the problems of development restrictions in such an area. Very few candidates were able to describe in any detail the disadvantages of the development of the rural-urban fringe. Candidates who did gain high marks often used a case study and so were able to write about the specific problems encountered in that location.

Question 9

This was the least popular choice of question in Section C. Many candidates were able to use the resource, Figure 14, to pick out the correct words and to choose the correct farming system in the short answer questions in part (a).

The removal of trees and hedges and the increase in the size of fields were the most common responses to the question about changes between Figures 15(a) and (b). The reasons for changes were usually related to 'growing more crops'. Only the more able candidates were able to develop their answers to gain two marks for each change (ii). Some struggled to think of other changes, which were not shown in the figure in part (iii) although those who had mentioned using more fertilisers were often able to describe environmental problems such as loss of insects and discuss eutrophication in some detail in part (iv).

The final part of this question required the candidate to describe the parts of a farming system in an LEDC. Common errors were to omit the name of the farming system or to choose a type found in a MEDC. There were a few excellent answers seen where candidates used a diagram showing the inputs, processes and outputs clearly described.

Question 10

This was another popular question. As in the other questions in Section C, candidates scored well in the first section. A description of the advantages of one type of renewable energy was required in part (b) and there were some excellent answers describing wind and hydro electric power. The use of a case study, although not a requirement of the question, gave some candidates the opportunity to write in detail to gain high marks.

In part (c), candidates noticed the increase in buildings, traffic and the wider road as the most common changes, but the explanation for these changes was often weak with many just stating that it had become a tourist area. The most frequent responses about tourism bringing improvements to an area concerned jobs and increased income, although a few mentioned that the locals could use the tourist facilities. The question asked candidates to describe, so a list was not a suitable response with which to score at the available marks. The question asking for an explanation of how a tourist industry can bring disadvantages to an area required linked or developed statements for access to Level 2 marks. Many wrote about traffic, litter, pollution (with often no type or cause mentioned), drunkenness, fighting and crime. Very few wrote about the fact that many hotels in LEDCs are owned by companies in MEDCs with the resulting problems of profits going out of the country and the locals being offered only the low paid jobs.

3036/H

General

The paper was accessible for the target candidates and most seemed to be entered for the correct tier. Candidates were given the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge, understanding and the use of geographical skills. It was pleasing to see an increase in the use of case study material; such detail often gives access to the highest levels of marks. The questions requiring answers in extended prose allowed for differentiation. However, candidates should be warned that such questions will rarely score high marks if candidates answer in bullet points.

It would appear that many centres teach the minimum number of topics necessary in order to sit the examination as candidates from the same centre often answer exactly the same questions. This has reduced the number of rubric errors.

All questions were attempted, but the most popular in section B were questions 4 and 7 and in section C, questions 8 and 10.

Section A

Question 1

The first part of this question was an easy introduction to the paper with most candidates correctly answering parts (a) and (b). In (c), a description of the 'pattern' of settlements in the area of Figure 2 was required, but many candidates restricted their answer to a description of Ross-on-Wye, often with an attempt to locate the different urban zones apparent within the settlement using the OS map. Such candidates restricted their marks to Level 1. Only candidates who mentioned the villages and scattered farms and made some attempt at describing their pattern were able to move up the levels of marks.

Question 2

The majority of candidates were able to shade and label the built-up area of Ross-on-Wye, but some lost marks because they forgot to label the town or because the outline of the shaded area was not clear. Detailed labels to explain the location of the settlement were not understood. Many labelled features found in or near the town such as the hospital, canoe launch, the Information centre or the Danger Area with very few noticing that the town is built to avoid much of the flood plain or the steepest land to the south east, and the use of the River Wye for a water supply and/or a transport route.

Question 3

Candidates usually recognised the feature at X but many had difficulty in describing the relief shown on the cross-section. For full marks, it was necessary to describe the section in sequence, working from one side or the other, giving specific heights using contour or spot heights from the map, and describing the steepness of slope. General comments such as 'the land is flat near the river and slopes up either side' do not access the higher marks.

Section B

This was a very popular question and the resource in part (a) of the 2004 earthquake in the Indian Ocean was used well to give most candidates both of the marks available for part (i). It was necessary to go beyond the resource to gain high marks in part (ii) and most candidates used and developed the information that Sumatra is part of an LEDC, to suggest why the loss of life in that event was so great.

The rest of the question concerned volcanoes; the map of the area around Vesuvius provided ample information to suggest the advantages of living in such a location. Answers attempting to explain how one type of volcano was formed ranged from excellent, covering details such as convection currents, plate boundary types, sequence of events, magma type and resulting volcano shape etc. to simple answers such as 'lava erupts and builds up to form a volcano'.

Question 5

This was quite a popular question. In part (a)(i) some candidates lost a mark because they did not include river and valley features. The best answers explaining the formation of a physical feature of the river or its valley, (i), were given by those candidates who gave a detailed explanation of the processes and the correct sequence of those processes which lead to the formation of such a feature.

The map, Figure 7, clearly differentiated between the areas likely to be flooded during a normal event as opposed to an extreme event. It was candidates who displayed an awareness of this difference and possibly the impact on humans who scored the higher marks in this section, (b)(i). Most candidates in (b)(ii) were able to state a way in which as area could be protected from flooding in future, although not all explained the stated method to gain the second mark.

Question 6

This question was the least popular in section B. It did not prove difficult for most candidates to mark and label four features on the section through an upland glaciated landscape although some lost marks because of the lack of an arrow or lack of precision in locating the feature. In the second part of (a), there were a variety of responses which seemed dependent on the knowledge of glacial processes and the sequence involved in the formation of a ribbon lake.

The human aspect of glacial scenery was tested in section (b) and candidates had little difficulty in explaining at length why some people are for and some against the speed limit on Lake Windermere.

Question 7

This was a very popular question. In part (a)(i), the same problem arose as in the equivalent parts of the previous questions i.e. the lack of arrows or preciseness in locating the chosen features. In (a)(ii) the expectation of the examiners was for detail in describing the coastal processes and their sequence in the formation of a wave-cut platform in order to award the highest levels of marks.

Parts (b) and (c) of this question considered coastal defences. Not all candidates recognised that the metal cages contained rocks in Figure 11 or were able to give the name of this type of coastal protection. Hardly any candidates noticed the protection given to the sand dunes. Some candidates went on to explain how the method worked which was part of the next question, but not this. In fact, the explanation required in part (c) elicited excellent answers about protection methods such as sea walls, rip rap and groynes.

Section C

Question 8

The candidates had no difficulty in answering the short questions in part (a). In (b)(i) candidates had to look for changes between Figures 12 (a) and (b) and describe how these changes might improve the environment *and* the lives of the local people. Many candidates did not consider both aspects, so were not eligible for the highest levels of marks. Some wrote in very vague terms e.g. 'planting trees improved the environment' without stating in what way the trees will improve the environment. In the second part of (b) those who lost marks often did so because they did not explain the disadvantages to the particular group asked about i.e. the original residents, or gave only one disadvantage.

The final part of this question concerned the rural-urban fringe. There were some excellent answers dealing with the issues of developing such an area, with many candidates using case studies which gave detail to their arguments. However, some candidates did not know the term; there was confusion with green belts and shanty towns.

Question 9

This question was the least popular in Section C. In (a) candidates needed to explain each of the two words i.e. 'extensive' and 'commercial' to gain both of the available marks. Examples of such a farming type were not credited.

EU policy was asked about in part (b) and a number of candidates appeared to be confused over the details and names of such policies.

The changes between the two Figures 13(a) and 13(b) were noted by most candidates, but marks were lost by some because they failed to explain how these changes increase the agricultural output. The impact of more intensive farming on the environment was well answered by those who could write about eutrophication, but it should be noted that candidates needed to write about more than one environmental problem for the higher marks.

The requirements of the last part of the Agriculture question were that the candidate chose a type of farming in an LEDC and described or drew a systems diagram. Some poorer answers failed to specify a type of farming and some careless candidates chose a type from a MEDC. The inputs, processes and outputs needed to be described, so if a diagram was used it needed to have some annotation. Some excellent answers on rice farming in India were seen.

Question 10

This was equally as popular as question 8 in the human section of this paper and candidates had no problem in describing both causes and effects of global warming in part (a). Part (b) required candidates to note the changes (note that the question asks for more than one change) between Figures 14(a) and (b) and describe how these changes might improve both the economy and the lives of the local people. Not all candidates covered both of these aspects and some mentioned how the growth of tourism in the area would bring money into the local economy without developing the point further. It was obvious that those candidates who had studied such changes in a real location were able to give more detail in their answers, which often accessed the top marks. The same point was true of the answers seen in the final question on the paper – the disadvantages of tourism developing in an area.

Full & Short Course

Centre-Assessed Coursework - 3031/C

General

The range of geographical skills and the breadth of knowledge displayed by many of the candidates continue to impress. The vast majority of work was appropriate: it related to the taught Specification and allowed clear differentiation between the candidates. Some excellent geography and an increasingly high standard of ICT made the process of moderation, in most cases, an interesting and enjoyable experience.

Teacher-led enquiries continue to be the norm with individual enquiries becoming an endangered species. The range of topics did show some variety; the most popular choice was the urban study, and within this CBD investigations dominant. The trend towards purely physical studies continues, with rivers and coastlines by far the most popular.

In a few cases teacher direction was not only apparent in the planning stage but also in the writing up process. In extreme cases, the work was so directed that the enquiries became almost identical, each candidate using the same section from the textbook as the basis for their introduction, identical methodology written in the form of a series of instructions and the use of a limited range of similar data presentation techniques. As a result, only in the data interpretation and evaluation sections could the candidates' true ability be assessed.

Many centres continue to successfully apply the criteria. In the majority of cases the centre's marks are within tolerance. They successfully identify the 'triggers' required to access the different levels and apply the marking criteria in a uniform manner across the whole department. But three years into this current cycle, with the Board continuing to put a lot of time and resources into coursework support, there remains a fairly small but persistent number of centres whose marking is identified as outside the tolerance. Where this happens, a common trend is to either over-mark at the top end of the mark range or under-mark at the bottom. In the majority of cases the discrepancies in the marking are very small but in a number of cases there was insufficient understanding of what was required, and no appreciation of the 'triggers' necessary to move a candidate from one level to another. As a result, mark differences were significant.

Administration

Administration, as ever, was done meticulously by a few, adequately by most and haphazardly by a significant minority. The following areas remain from one year to the next troublesome for centres and as a result prove time consuming and problematic for moderators.

Centres with 20 or fewer candidates should ensure that all their candidates work together with the PINK AND YELLOW copies of the Centre Mark Sheets or an EDI print out (if an EDI print out is being used then centres must make sure that the Centre name and number is included on the print out) should arrive with the moderator by the deadline indicated, allowing time for postal delivery. If a centre has more than 20 candidates, they should ensure that the PINK AND YELLOW copies of the Centre Mark Sheets (or two copies of the EDI print outs) should arrive with the moderator by the deadline indicated, allowing time for postal delivery. (Some centres only sent one copy of the CMS or EDI which meant a photocopy had to be made by the moderator). The moderator will return the YELLOW copy of the CMS (or one of the EDI print outs) indicating which candidates' work needs to be forwarded as the sample. The work must be dispatched within five working days of notification from the moderator. If any centre anticipates that they are not going to meet the coursework submission deadline, then they will need to inform the Board and apply for an extension.

The Candidate Record Form should be attached to the relevant pieces of work. They should be filled in correctly, making sure that the candidate numbers are placed in the relevant boxes and that both the teacher and the candidate have signed the document (for the first time this year failure of the candidate to sign the CRF form will result in zero marks being awarded for the coursework). As well as totalling up the marks awarded on the reverse side of the CRF, the total mark is also required to be placed in the box provided on the front of the CRF. This allows moderators to place the work from a centre in rank order without having to open every plastic wallet in order to access the total mark. The majority of centres continue to ignore these boxes or simply choose to place a tick in the relevant box. In one or two cases, centres continue to use out of date CRF forms and, as a result, do not provide all the information required, for example summative statements and teacher signatures. The incorrect addition of marks on the CRF forms and the inaccurate transfer of the total mark to the Centre Mark Sheet remain a common problem. A significant number of centres continue to fail to supply the Centre Declaration Sheet with the sample.

A significant amount of coursework continues to be sent with each page inside a plastic sleeve and this causes problems especially if the work is not secured properly. It would be appreciated if individual sheets could be removed from any plastic envelope; this would save time. Also, if the pages were numbered this would facilitate cross referencing particularly when it came to the summative comments on the CRF.

The work should be securely packaged using the Board's sacks. If the work could be placed in the sacks in rank order, resisting the temptation to cram far too many enquiries into one sack so that it breaks in the post, it would be appreciated. Equally, there is no need to send the work registered post as this requires the moderator to sign for the package, and inevitably this leads to delays, particularly if the moderator has to visit the local sorting office.

A number of candidates were given zero marks for their enquiry. If the candidate has submitted some work but it has been found to be worthless then 0 (zero marks) should be encoded in the 'Total Mark' box on the CMS. If the candidate has produced some evidence relating to the enquiry, no matter how basic, it would be extremely unlikely to be completely worthless. Centres need to examine the work of their lowest ability candidates carefully before giving zero, as experience has shown that, in a number of these cases, there are elements that have been found to be creditworthy. If a candidate failed to submit work or has withdrawn then 'X' should be encoded. Leaving a blank box next to a candidate's name on the CMS is **not** an option.

The quality and quantity of teacher comments/annotation varied enormously. It was often excellent on the CRFs but less impressive in the body of the work as teachers did not always relate comments to levels. There was ample evidence that comments were obviously provided by experienced specialist Geography teachers being detailed, informative and showing evidence of a clear understanding of the application of the marking criteria. A minority of centres continue to provide only limited evidence that internal assessment has taken place. Examples of poor practice included: just marks on the CRF; a number of ticks in the body of the work or a few comments scattered throughout the work that bare no relation to the content or the mark scheme. Centres will hopefully realise that far from being an unnecessary chore, annotation helps their candidates by focusing their marking and making it more likely that moderation will confirm the centre's marks.

It is the responsibility of the centre to make sure that the sample of work and accompanying paperwork is correct. It is vital that time and resources are allocated to this part of the moderation process. In a few centres this has not been given priority and moderators are spending more time dealing with the problems associated with administration than they are on assessing the quality of the Geography. It is also important that the internal standardisation process carried out by the centre is rigorous. If there are problems with the marking, it is sometimes the result of one teachers' marking not being in line with the rest of the department. In these cases the ramifications are felt across the whole centre.

Marking Administration

It is important to remember that each assessment objective consists of three levels, each level statement containing a number of different criteria. The application of the marking criteria is not based on a 'best-fit' model and for a candidate to achieve a particular level of performance he/she has to provide evidence of all the differing elements that make up that level statement. The quality and consistency of evidence provided determines the mark given within that particular level. A number of centres are assuming that if a candidate fulfils the criteria for a particular level, then automatically they should be awarded the top mark in that level. This is not the case. This approach is particularly common when it comes to higher ability candidates and Level 3 statements. There is evidence to suggest maximum marks being awarded in the section even though this is not supported by the written evidence. If this strategy is used across all the sections of the marking criteria then inevitably it will lead to the centre marks being outside the tolerance recommended by the Board.

Applied Understanding

In the majority of cases, enquiries were well organised, based on a single, clear, manageable hypothesis, underpinned by sound geographical concepts that related to the taught Specification, and were approached in an investigative mode. In the initial part of the investigation the candidate, through the use of a series of maps and written description, located the study area in detail. Candidates through description and explanation clearly demonstrated understanding of the key concepts and then went on to apply this understanding to the results of their enquiry.

The notion of 'application' was misunderstood by some and, as a result, this section was inaccurately assessed. Candidates were being awarded Level 3 applied understanding marks, sometimes as early as the first paragraph for very generalised and descriptive work. The key concepts were not clearly identified and were certainly not being applied. In extreme cases, this policy was adopted across the group and all candidates from the centre were given high applied understanding marks for explanations of theory that were almost identical, having been plagiarised from the textbook. Applied understanding is relevant in all sections, but is particularly important when it comes to data interpretation where the theory needs to be used to explain the patterns of data collected. It follows, therefore, that this section can only be accurately assessed when the whole of the enquiry is taken into account.

In an effort to ensure a wide range of geographical terminology is used in the enquiry, a number of centres suggest that candidates include, within their introductions, a glossary of terms. This is a useful idea but it must be remembered that it is not the comprehensive nature of this glossary or the detail of the definitions that determines the mark in this section. It is the application of these terms that provides evidence of the candidate's level of understanding and, therefore, ultimately the mark in this section.

It was pleasing to see an increase in the use of annotated maps in the majority of enquiries. Maps of varying scales both hand drawn and ICT produced were used effectively by candidates to accurately locate study areas. It is worth bearing in mind, however, that the critical factor in determining the mark level in this section is how well candidates have applied their understanding throughout the investigation and not the quality or detail of the location statements. Evidence suggests that some candidates failed to find the right balance, spending most of their time and energy describing the location whilst neglecting the concepts underpinning the work.

Methodology

This section was generally tackled well by candidates with the majority reaching the top of Level 2 without much difficulty. These candidates were able to identify a question or issue, state how the investigation was to be carried out, and provide a detailed description of a range of valid primary data collection methods that were to be used in the investigation. Access to Level 3 marks, however, continues to prove to be a little more difficult even for the higher ability candidates.

Originality in data collection and the justification of data collection methods used are the major 'triggers' to accessing Level 3 marks in this section. The amount of teacher involvement in the organisation and direction of the enquiry is the critical issue. Heavily teacher-directed work and group activities prohibit Level 3 methodology marks, as the candidate is not being given the opportunity to show originality and initiative. In some cases, Level 3 marks were awarded to candidates whose definition of originality was questionable: little more than a minute difference in data collection technique. For example, the use of a different photograph by a candidate or the difference of one question compared to the group questionnaire. 'Originality' in this context must reflect initiative on the part of the candidate to produce a significant element of uniqueness in their enquiry. Centres need to find ways of giving fieldwork extensions so able candidates can demonstrate a clearly defined element of uniqueness in their data collection.

From the moderator's point of view, the element of originality is by far the most difficult area to assess in this section – a situation not helped by the failure, in some cases, to clearly identify this in the designated section on the CRF or within the body of the work.

This is the only section of the marking criteria where originality and initiative is credited. A number of centres assume evidence of originality in other sections (notably data presentation) is sufficient to justify the awarding of Level 3 in this section.

It must be stressed that marks are awarded for valid data collection methods. In other words, methods described by the candidate should be actually used in the investigation to collect primary or secondary data, unless there is a very good reason why that particular method did not prove possible. If that is the case, mention of it could be made in the evaluation sections. Centres were awarding marks, particularly to less able candidates, for describing the full range of data collection techniques that they intended to use in their teacher-directed investigation. In reality, these candidates used few, if any, of the techniques described and this should have been reflected in the marking.

Data Presentation

In many cases candidates fulfilled the criteria using presentation techniques which demonstrated flair and imagination, thus allowing access to Level 3 marks.

It was common, however, for this section to be over marked. Some centres confusing 'attractive' with 'more complex' so Level 3 was frequently being awarded for a limited range of what were basic techniques. Even when a wide range of appropriate techniques were used, a great number of candidates failed to achieve Level 3 as the techniques chosen lacked complexity.

The marking levels in this section take account of the key 'triggers' of accuracy, appropriateness, range and complexity. In the best enquiries, candidates used a variety of appropriate, high order techniques accurately, such as, choropleths, scattergraphs, proportional flow lines, located pie charts and so on. In the weaker studies, candidates used only one type of low order technique, for example, bar graphs or pictograms, repeatedly to represent the data. Graphs, if used, were not very accurately drawn, either with no labelling of the 'x' and 'y' axes, or an inappropriate vertical scale. Any maps

used were usually photocopies; if simple maps were hand drawn, they usually lacked the normal conventions.

To access Level 2 and Level 3 marks in this section, all candidates must provide evidence of at least two different types of ICT outcome in their enquiry. Candidates with no ICT had their marks in this section limited to Level 1 provided all other Level 1 criteria had been met. This compulsory element of ICT did not seem to present many problems to centres. Most candidates satisfied the basic ICT requirement and so had the opportunity to progress beyond Level 1. A significant number of candidates submitted entirely ICT generated enquiries. A number of these particular enquiries were outstanding, in terms of data presentation, but the majority were disappointing containing, as they did, a large number of fairly basic Excel produced bar and pie graphs. To access Level 3 marks, there has to be evidence of 'more complex' techniques being used. It is not essential that the element of complexity indicated with the Level 3 statement is delivered by means of ICT, but, if it is not, then it has to be shown by other means.

The quality of written communication remains pleasing with the majority of candidates being able to express themselves with reasonable accuracy. The use of spellchecker in the word processed enquiries clearly benefited some candidates.

Data Interpretation

This section continues to be a useful discriminator with progression through the levels being determined by the key 'triggers' of explanation, analysis and linkage. In the best enquiries candidates described, as well as analysed, their results. In other words, they 'ordered' the data by calculating percentages, proportions and highlighting patterns or anomalies. They then went on to provide explanations, demonstrated links between the data sets, and drew valid conclusions that related to the original hypothesis.

In some instances, candidates divided their analysis into sections, each section based on an individual data collection technique with no attempt to produce an overview or summative statement. As a result, a number of candidates reached the top of Level 2 easily but simply repeated that level over and over again, failing to identify links either between the data sets or links back to the original hypothesis. Thus they failed to progress to the next level.

In a few cases, candidates were overwhelmed by the vast amount of data they had collected. They were unable, or failed, to recognise or identify any common theme or overview and resorted to ordering the data into different sections that they saw as unrelated or unconnected. The less able candidates simply answered questions or confirmed predictions without any reference to their actual results.

The main weakness among candidates was that they gave a description without reference to the results that they had collected. The description, therefore, lacked an element of analysis. In addition, centres over credited descriptive essays at too high a level on the mark scheme and, as a result, inflated marks were awarded for basic description of data. This was particularly true of physical studies which were quite often heavily descriptive especially where the main form of data collection is 'look, see'. Large amounts of description could often be discarded if more careful analysis of the actual data had taken place.

Teacher comments and annotation within the body of the work would suggest that there is still confusion with regard to the crediting of conclusions. The awarding of marks for conclusions reached by the candidate, after examination and analysis of the data, should be considered in this section rather than in the evaluation.

Evaluation

The majority of centres appear to have an increasing understanding of the need to cover all three components. Of the centres that appreciated the demands of this section, limitations of methods were usually covered comprehensively, allowing easy access to the top of Level 2, with more general comment being made about the effect of these limitations on the accuracy of the results. A number of candidates focused their evaluation on the accuracy of the results and then went on to identify problems in the methods that could have caused such discrepancies. Similarly, these candidates achieved Level 2 marks quite easily. It is the evaluation of the conclusions, however, that continues to prove to be the weakest element.

In the most effective enquiries, candidate's evaluation statements were detailed and specific to the enquiry rather than being vague and generic. Furthermore instead of discussing the three components of the criteria separately they proceeded to link the three components identifying the fact that poorly/faulty methodology led to inaccurate results and that conclusions based upon such results had, therefore, questionable validity.

Evaluation presented a problem for some centres with candidates having a tendency to write in congratulatory terms rather than highlighting limitations. In the weaker enquiries, the emphasis was placed solely upon what could have been done to improve the enquiry process. This approach frequently resulted in a 'wish list', without any attempt being made to state how these improvements would influence the methods, the results or the conclusions.

The important point to remember about this section is that it is not about making judgements regarding the quality of the Geography but is an opportunity to provide a critical appraisal of the effectiveness of the enquiry process and suggest how improvements could be made.

Summary

In previous years the Principal Moderator's report provided as much information as possible about the year's findings and offered guidance as to how to avoid future pitfalls. However, this information overload would appear to have had little impact - the percentage of centres marking outside the Board's tolerance remains problematic. In response there has been a concerted attempt to make the report focused and concise. The hope is that by concentrating on the core elements for improvement, centres will be better equipped to examine their practices and bring about positive change where needed.

Centre-Assessed Coursework - 3036/C

General

The profile of the typical Short Course candidate, and the function the Short course performs within the school curriculum, continues to change. There is an increasing variety of small institutions involved, a significant number of which cannot be classed as mainstream schools. Centres are no longer entering candidates in large numbers and entry is no longer limited to Key Stage 4. This is having a major impact on the quality of work produced, as a number of candidates would appear to be less motivated or have yet to fully develop their geographical skills. Centres expect, nevertheless, to achieve a full mark range and, in some cases, end up marking candidates and not the work, giving marks for effort in exceptional circumstances. As a result a large number of centres' marks continue to be outside the tolerance.

There remains no obvious difference between the coursework submitted for the Short Course and that produced for the Full Course. No allowance is made generally for the reduced word limit or the more detailed and specific marking criteria that are designed to lessen the demands made on candidates in completing Short Course enquiries. Centres generally were asking too much of their Short Course candidates working on the erroneous premise that more work equals more marks.

It is important to remember that the Short Course coursework and the Full Course coursework have discrete sets of marking criteria. Centres assume that they are interchangeable and that the number of data collection techniques, for example, identified for Level 3 Methodology in the Short Course automatically fulfils the definition of a 'comprehensive range' in the Full Course and, therefore qualifies the candidate for the equivalent level / marks in the Full Course.

Mirroring the Full Course teacher-led enquiries continue to be the norm with individual enquiries becoming an endangered species. The range of topics did show some variety; the most popular choice was the urban study, and within this CBD investigations dominant. The trend towards purely physical studies continues with rivers and coastlines by far the most popular.

Administration

Administration, as ever, was done meticulously by a few, adequately by most and haphazardly by a significant minority. The following areas remain from one year to the next troublesome for centres and as a result prove time consuming and problematic for moderators.

The majority of Short Course centres have 20 or fewer candidates and therefore they should ensure that all their candidates work together with the PINK AND YELLOW copies of the Centre Mark Sheets or an EDI print out (if an EDI print out is being used then centres must make sure that the Centre name and number is included on the print out) should arrive with the moderator by the deadline indicated, allowing time for postal delivery. If a centre has more than 20 candidates, they should ensure that the PINK AND YELLOW copies of the Centre Mark Sheets (or two copies of the EDI print outs) should arrive with the moderator by the deadline indicated allowing time for postal delivery. (Some centres only sent one copy of the CMS or EDI which meant a photocopy had to be made by the moderator). The moderator will return the YELLOW copy of the CMS (or one of the EDI print outs) indicating which candidates' work needs to be forwarded as the sample. The work must be dispatched within five working days of notification from the moderator. If any centre anticipates that they are not going to meet the coursework submission deadline, then they will need to inform the Board and apply for an extension.

The Candidate Record Form should be attached to the relevant pieces of work. They should be filled in correctly, making sure that the candidate numbers are placed in the relevant boxes and that both the

teacher and the candidate have signed the document (for the first time this year failure of the candidate to sign the CRF form will result in zero marks being awarded for the coursework). As well as totalling up the marks awarded on the reverse side of the CRF, the total mark is also required to be placed in the box provided on the front of the CRF. This allows moderators to place the work from a centre in rank order without having to open every plastic wallet in order to access the total mark. The majority of centres continue to ignore these boxes or simply choose to place a tick in the relevant box. In one or two cases, centres continue to use out of date CRF forms and, as a result, do not provide all the information required, for example summative statements and teacher signatures. The incorrect addition of marks on the CRF forms and the inaccurate transfer of the total mark to the Centre Mark Sheet remain a common problem. A significant number of centres continue to fail to supply the Centre Declaration Sheet with the sample.

A significant amount of coursework continues to be sent with each page inside a plastic sleeve and this causes problems especially if the work is not secured properly. It would be appreciated if individual sheets could be removed from any plastic envelope; this would save time. Also, if the pages were numbered this would facilitate cross referencing particularly when it came to the summative comments on the CRF.

The work should be securely packaged using the Board's sacks. If the work could be placed in the sacks in rank order, resisting the temptation to cram far too many enquiries into one sack so that it breaks in the post it would be appreciated. Equally, there is no need to send the work registered post as this requires the moderator to sign for the package, and inevitably this leads to delays, particularly if the moderator has to visit the local sorting office.

A number of candidates were given zero marks for their enquiry. If the candidate has submitted some work but it has been found to be worthless, then 0 (zero marks) should be encoded in the 'Total Mark' box on the CMS. If the candidate has produced some evidence relating to the enquiry, no matter how basic, it would be extremely unlikely to be completely worthless. Centres need to examine the work of their lowest ability candidates carefully before giving zero, as experience has shown that, in a number of these cases, there are elements that have been found to be creditworthy. If a candidate failed to submit work or has withdrawn then 'X' should be encoded. Leaving a blank box next to a candidate's name on the CMS is **not** an option.

The quality and quantity of teacher comments/annotation varied enormously. It was often excellent on the CRFs but less impressive in the body of the work as teachers did not always relate comments to levels. There was ample evidence that comments were obviously provided by experienced specialist Geography teachers being detailed, informative and showing evidence of a clear understanding of the application of the marking criteria. A minority of centres continue to provide only limited evidence that internal assessment has taken place. Examples of poor practice included: just marks on the CRF; a number of ticks in the body of the work or a few comments scattered throughout the work that bare no relation to the content or the mark scheme. Centres will hopefully realise that far from being an unnecessary chore, annotation helps their candidates by focusing their marking and making it more likely that moderation will confirm the centre's marks.

It is the responsibility of the centre to make sure that the sample of work and accompanying paperwork is correct. It is vital that time and resources are allocated to this part of the moderation process. In a few centres this has not been given priority and moderators are spending more time dealing with the problems associated with administration than they are on assessing the quality of the Geography. It is also important that the internal standardisation process carried out by the centre is rigorous. If there are problems with the marking, it is sometimes the result of one teacher's marking not being in line with the rest of the department. In these cases the ramifications are felt across the whole centre.

Marking Criteria

It is important to remember that each assessment objective consists of three levels, each level statement containing a number of different criteria. The application of the marking criteria is not based on a 'best-fit' model and for a candidate to achieve a particular level of performance he/she has to provide evidence of all the differing elements that make up that level statement. The quality and consistency of evidence provided determines the mark given within that particular level. A number of centres are assuming that if a candidate fulfils the criteria for a particular level, then automatically they should be awarded the top mark in that level. This is not the case. This approach is particularly common when it comes to higher ability candidates and Level 3 statements. There is evidence to suggest maximum marks being awarded in the section even though this is not supported by the written evidence. If this strategy is used across all the sections of the marking criteria then inevitably it will lead to the centre marks being outside the tolerance recommended by the Board.

Applied Understanding

In the majority of cases, enquiries were well organised, based on a single, clear, manageable hypothesis, underpinned by one key geographical concept that related to the taught Specification, and were approached in an investigative mode. In the initial part of the investigation the candidate, through the use of a series of maps and written description, located the study area in detail. Candidates through description and explanation clearly demonstrated understanding of the key concept and then went on to apply this understanding to the results of their enquiry.

The notion of 'application' was misunderstood by some and, as a result, this section was inaccurately assessed. Candidates were being awarded Level 3 applied understanding marks, sometimes as early as the first paragraph for very generalised and descriptive work. The key concepts were not clearly identified and were certainly not being applied. In extreme cases, this policy was adopted across the group and all candidates from the centre were given high applied understanding marks for explanations of theory that were almost identical, having been plagiarised from the textbook. Applied understanding is relevant in all sections, but is particularly important when it comes to data interpretation where the theory needs to be used to explain the patterns of data collected. It follows, therefore, that this section can only be accurately assessed when the whole of the enquiry is taken into account.

In an effort to ensure a wide range of geographical terminology is used in the enquiry, a number of centres suggest that candidates include, within their introductions, a glossary of terms. This is a useful idea but it must be remembered that it is not the comprehensive nature of this glossary or the detail of the definitions that determines the mark in this section. It is the application of these terms that provides evidence of the candidate's level of understanding and, therefore, ultimately the mark in this section.
It was pleasing to see an increase in the use of annotated maps in the majority of enquiries. Maps of varying scales both hand drawn and ICT produced were used effectively by candidates to accurately locate study areas. It is worth bearing in mind, however, that the critical factor in determining the mark level in this section is how well candidates have applied their understanding throughout the investigation and not the quality or detail of the location statements. Evidence suggests that some candidates failed to find the right balance, spending most of their time and energy describing the location whilst neglecting the concepts underpinning the work.

Methodology

This section was generally tackled well by candidates with the majority reaching the top of Level 2 without much difficulty. These candidates were able to identify a question or issue, state how the investigation was to be carried out, and provide a detailed description of two primary data collection methods that were to be used in the investigation. Access to Level 3 marks, however, continues to prove to be a little more difficult even for the higher ability candidates.

The major 'trigger' to accessing Level 3 is the use of three data collection techniques, described and justified with at least one of the techniques demonstrating originality on behalf of the candidate. The amount of teacher involvement in the organisation and direction of the enquiry is the critical issue. Heavily teacher-directed work and group activities prohibit Level 3 methodology marks, as the candidate is not being given the opportunity to show originality and initiative. In some cases, Level 3 marks were awarded to candidates whose definition of originality was questionable: little more than a minute difference in data collection technique. For example, the use of a different photograph by a candidate or the difference of one question compared to the group questionnaire. 'Originality' in this context must reflect initiative on the part of the candidate to produce a significant element of uniqueness in their enquiry. Centres need to find ways of giving fieldwork extensions so able candidates can demonstrate a clearly defined element of uniqueness in their data collection.

From the moderator's point of view, the element of originality is by far the most difficult area to assess in this section – a situation not helped by the failure, in some cases, to clearly identify this in the designated section on the CRF or within the body of the work.

This is the only section of the marking criteria where originality and initiative is credited. A number of centres assume evidence of originality in other sections (notably data presentation) is sufficient to justify the awarding of Level 3 in this section.

It must be stressed that marks are awarded for valid data collection methods. In other words, methods described by the candidate should be actually used in the investigation to collect primary or secondary data, unless there is a very good reason why that particular method did not prove possible. If that is the case, mention of it could be made in the evaluation sections. Centres were awarding marks, particularly to less able candidates, for describing the full range of data collection techniques that they intended to use in their teacher-directed investigation. In reality, these candidates used few, if any, of the techniques described and this should have been reflected in the marking.

Data Presentation

In many cases candidates fulfilled the criteria using presentation techniques which demonstrated flair and imagination, thus allowing access to Level 3 marks.

It was common, however, for this section to be over-marked. Some centres confusing 'attractive' with 'more complex' so Level 3 was frequently being awarded for a limited range of what were basic techniques. Even when three appropriate techniques were used, a great number of candidates failed to achieve Level 3 as the techniques chosen lacked complexity.

The marking levels in this section take account of the key 'triggers' of accuracy, appropriateness, range and complexity. In the best enquiries, candidates used a variety of appropriate, high order techniques accurately, such as, choropleths, scattergraphs, proportional flow lines, located pie charts and so on. In the weaker studies, candidates used only one type of low order technique, for example, bar graphs or pictograms, repeatedly to represent the data. Graphs, if used, were not very accurately drawn, either with no labelling of the 'x' and 'y' axes, or an inappropriate vertical scale. Any maps used were usually photocopies; if simple maps were hand drawn, they usually lacked the normal conventions.

To be able to access Level 2 and Level 3 marks in this section, all candidates have to provide evidence of at least two different types of ICT outcome in their enquiry. Candidates with no ICT had their marks in this section limited to Level 1 provided all other Level 1 criteria had been met. This compulsory element of ICT did not seem to present many problems to centres. Most candidates satisfied the basic ICT requirement and so had the opportunity to progress beyond Level 1. A significant number of candidates submitted entirely ICT generated enquiries. A number of these

particular enquiries were outstanding, in terms of data presentation, but the majority were disappointing containing, as they did, a large number of fairly basic Excel produced bar and pie graphs. To access Level 3 marks, there has to be evidence of three 'more complex' techniques being used. It is not essential that the element of complexity indicated with the Level 3 statement is delivered by means of ICT, but, if it is not, then it has to be shown by other means.

The quality of written communication remains pleasing with the majority of candidates being able to express themselves with reasonable accuracy. The use of spellchecker in the word processed enquiries clearly benefited some candidates.

Data Interpretation

This section continues to be a useful discriminator with progression through the levels being determined by the key 'triggers' of explanation, analysis and linkage. In the best enquiries candidates described, as well as analysed, their results. In other words, they 'ordered' the data by calculating percentages, proportions and highlighting patterns or anomalies. They then went on to provide explanations, demonstrated links between the data sets, and drew valid conclusions that related to the original hypothesis.

In some instances, candidates divided their analysis into sections, each section based on an individual data collection technique with no attempt to produce an overview or summative statement. As a result, a number of candidates reached the top of Level 2 easily but simply repeated that level over and over again, failing to identify links either between the data sets or links back to the original hypothesis. Thus they failed to progress to the next level.

In a few cases, candidates were overwhelmed by the vast amount of data they had collected. They were unable, or failed, to recognise or identify any common theme or overview and resorted to ordering the data into different sections that they saw as unrelated or unconnected. The less able candidates simply answered questions or confirmed predictions without any reference to their actual results.

The main weakness among candidates was that they gave a description without reference to the results that they had collected. The description, therefore, lacked an element of analysis. In addition, centres over credited descriptive essays at too high a level on the mark scheme and, as a result, inflated marks were awarded for basic description of data. This was particularly true of physical studies which were quite often heavily descriptive especially where the main form of data collection is 'look, see'. Large amounts of description could often be discarded if more careful analysis of the actual data had taken place.

Teacher comments and annotation within the body of the work would suggest that there is still confusion with regard to the crediting of conclusions. The awarding of marks for conclusions reached by the candidate, after examination and analysis of the data, should be considered in this section rather than in the evaluation.

Evaluation

The majority of centres appear to have an increasing understanding of the need to cover all three components. Of the centres that appreciated the demands of this section, limitations of methods were usually covered comprehensively, allowing easy access to the top of Level 2, with more general comment being made about the effect of these limitations on the accuracy of the results. A number of candidates focused their evaluation on the accuracy of the results and then went on to identify problems in the methods that could have caused such discrepancies. Similarly, these candidates achieved Level 2 marks quite easily. It is the evaluation of the conclusions, however, that continues to prove to be the weakest element.

In the most effective enquiries, candidate's evaluation statements were detailed and specific to the enquiry rather than being vague and generic. Furthermore, instead of discussing the three components of the criteria separately they proceeded to link the three components identifying the fact that poorly/faulty methodology led to inaccurate results and that conclusions based upon such results had, therefore, questionable validity.

Evaluation presented a problem for some centres with candidates having a tendency to write in congratulatory terms rather than highlighting limitations. In the weaker enquiries, the emphasis was placed solely upon what could have been done to improve the enquiry process. This approach frequently resulted in a 'wish list', without any attempt being made to state how these improvements would influence the methods, the results or the conclusions.

The important point to remember about this section is that it is not about making judgements regarding the quality of the Geography but is an opportunity to provide a critical appraisal of the effectiveness of the enquiry process and suggest how improvements could be made.

Summary

In previous years the Principal Moderator's report provided as much information as possible about the year's findings and offered guidance as to how to avoid future pitfalls. However, this information overload would appear to have had little impact - the percentage of centres marking outside the Board's tolerance remains problematic. In response there has been a concerted attempt to make the report focused and concise. The hope is that by concentrating on the core elements for improvement, centres will be better equipped to examine their practices and bring about positive change where needed.

Mark Range and Award of Grades

Full Course

Foundation Tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3031/C	30	65	28.5	11.0
3031/1F Paper 1	70	104	60.0	14.4
3031/2F Paper 2	75	91	39.7	12.9
Foundation Tier overall 3031/F	--	260	128.2	31.5

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3031/C Boundary Mark	raw	30	15	12	9	6	3
	scaled	65	33	26	20	13	7
3031/1F Boundary Mark	raw	70	47	41	35	30	25
	scaled	104	70	61	52	45	37
3031/2F Boundary Mark	raw	75	41	35	30	25	20
	scaled	91	50	42	36	30	24
Foundation Tier Scaled Boundary Mark		260	147	127	107	88	69

Higher Tier

Unit / Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3031/C	30	65	46.6	11.1
3031/1H	70	104	60.0	14.2
3031/2H	75	91	49.9	14.0
Higher Tier overall 3031/H	--	260	156.6	33.5

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
3031/1C boundary mark	raw	30	27	23	19	15	12	-
	scaled	65	59	50	41	33	26	-
3031/1H boundary mark	raw	70	51	44	37	31	24	-
	scaled	104	76	65	55	46	36	-
3031/2H boundary mark	raw	75	53	45	37	29	23	-
	scaled	91	64	55	45	35	28	-
Higher Tier scaled boundary mark		260	191	166	140	114	90	78

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation Tier (23516 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	29.8	53.4	73.3	86.2	93.9

Higher Tier (40592 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	17.0	40.5	68.3	89.3	97.6	98.9

Overall (64108 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	10.8	25.6	43.2	67.5	81.3	89.6	94.3	97.1

Short Course

Foundation Tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3036/C	30	30	10.8	4.8
3036/F	70	90	41.4	12.9
Foundation Tier overall	--	120	52.2	15.2

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3036/C Boundary Mark	raw	30	15	12	9	7	5
	scaled	30	15	12	9	7	5
3036/F Boundary Mark	raw	70	44	39	34	30	26
	scaled	90	57	50	44	39	33
Foundation Tier scaled boundary mark		120	69	61	53	46	39

Higher Tier

Unit / Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3036/C	30	30	18.1	5.6
3036/H	70	90	46.6	12.6
Higher Tier overall	--	120	64.7	16.2

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
3036/C boundary mark	raw	30	30	25	20	15	12	-
	scaled	30	30	25	20	15	12	-
3036/H boundary mark	raw	70	46	42	38	34	27	-
	scaled	90	59	54	49	44	35	-
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		120	92	77	68	59	47	41

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation Tier (488 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	14.3	29.5	45.9	60.9	75.0

Higher Tier (223 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	5.8	23.8	42.6	65.5	86.5	92.8

Overall (711 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	1.8	7.5	13.4	30.4	47.4	60.6	70.9	80.6

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

Mean Mark: is the sum of all candidates' marks divided by the number of candidates. In order to compare mean marks for different components, the mean mark (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Standard Deviation: a measure of the spread of candidates' marks. In most components, approximately two-thirds of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean, and approximately 95% of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean. In order to compare the standard deviations for different components, the standard deviation (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Uniform Mark: a score on a standard scale which indicates a candidate's performance. The lowest uniform mark for grade A is always 80% of the maximum uniform mark for the unit, similarly grade B is 70%, grade C is 60%, grade D is 50% and grade E is 40%. A candidate's total scaled mark for each unit is converted to a uniform mark and the uniform marks for the units which count towards the AS or A-level qualification are added in order to determine the candidate's overall grade.