

GCSE 2003

June Series



Report on the Examination

Geography *Specification A*

- 3031 – Full Course
- 3036 – Short Course

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

© Assessment and Qualifications Alliance

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee, registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered Charity 1073334.
Registered address Addleshaw Goddard, Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ.
Kathleen Tattersall, Director General

CONTENTS

3031 – Full Course

	<i>Page No.</i>
Paper 1 Foundation Tier	5
Paper 1 Higher Tier	9
Paper 2 Foundation Tier	13
Paper 2 Higher Tier	16
Coursework.....	19

3036 – Short Course

	<i>Page No.</i>
Foundation Tier	26
Higher Tier	30
Coursework.....	33

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades	
---------------------------------------	--

3031

General

In this first year of the new AQA Geography Specification A, centres and candidates are to be congratulated on the generally very good preparation of both the coursework and written components involved in the Specification's pattern of assessment. All of the components have differentiated 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.

There were few rubric errors on Higher Tier papers and those on Foundation Tier tended to be Centre specific. Centres are asked to emphasise to candidates the needs of each component in terms of those sections where there is a choice of questions.

The main change in the assessment for 2003 was in the replacement of Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SpaG) with the Quality of Written Communication (QWC), now assessed as part of the levels responses in the written components and in the data presentation section of the coursework. In general, the award of marks is governed primarily by the geography. The descriptors for QWC are used when an answer is considered marginal and then the QWC is used to determine the final award of the mark. However, undoubtedly both are inter-linked and in general those candidates able to generate complex and compound sentences are those who are then able to access the higher levels in the assessment criteria.

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' or some such like. 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. The difference lies in the assessment. If they are 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 one 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.

3031/1F

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 7, 9 and 10. The time allowed for this examination was sufficient and the vast majority of the candidates completed all the required questions. However, there was a significant minority of candidates who attempted more than three questions in Section B and in some centres virtually every candidate attempted every question in their section. Centres are asked to reinforce the requirements of this paper with candidates to avoid the rubric errors that all too often mitigate against candidates achieving their potential with more detailed and considered answers to questions for which they have been prepared.

Section A

Some excellent answers were seen at this level reflecting sound preparation for the skills section by both centres and candidates. A minority, often the very weakest candidates, made little attempt to answer questions in Section A but in general candidates did try to answer all parts of these compulsory questions.

Question 1

In 1(a)(i) most candidates scored the full two marks, with only a few offering a six figure Grid Reference instead of a four or reversing the figures. In part (ii) most candidates identified the masts, though a few weaker candidates referred to golf courses or did not correctly read the key and wrote radio signals or similar. In part (iii) the majority of candidates offered at least a partial explanation as to why the sites were chosen, usually referring to their height. Those gaining full marks added additional comments in relation to the lack of obstruction for signals and/or added detail by quoting the height as 182 metres above sea level.

In Part (b) a large proportion of the candidates correctly identified the direction of flow, although some incorrectly opted for east to west. In (c) most candidates were within tolerance, although the answers given varied enormously from a few centimetres to 15,000km. Many candidates scored two marks in part (d) by correctly recognising the first and third statements. However a significant minority scored zero and a surprisingly large number of candidates only ticked one box rather than the required two. Part (e) was in general, poorly answered. Many candidates simply described the types of road or referred to the Perth area only. Few candidates made reference to any overall distribution.

Question 2

In question 2 (a)(i) most candidates correctly labelled the road, while in (ii) a significant number, having correctly drawn the North bank of the R. Tay, failed to label it. In other cases candidates spent a long time copying the map detail of sand banks and labels etc with the end result that the demarcation and labelling of the north bank was not clear. Most candidates in part (iii) shaded an appropriate grid square but again a significant number failed to label it. Part (b) was often poorly answered. There was a common tendency to account for lack of settlement in terms of height of land rather than steepness and very few recognised the likely flood risk adjacent to the river.

Question 3

In part (a) most candidates responded giving the correct measurement of car ownership, although a few simply described the colours in the key. Part (b) was also well answered by the majority of candidates. The most common error here again was to describe the mapping technique putting the emphasis on the colours used in the map rather than the importance of the pattern of car ownership.

Section B

Question 4

Parts (a)(i-iv) were accurately answered by most candidates, though more errors were evident in part (iv), where a range of incorrect figures or countries were given. In part (v) some very good answers were written with reference to factors such as population densities, building techniques, earthquake strength etc, though a significant number referred to only one factor. Some candidates incorrectly answered the question in terms of differences in the type of plate boundaries. Part (b)(i) was poorly answered by the majority of candidates,, although maximum marks were achieved by some candidates from some centres, and in part (ii) about half of candidates responded correctly. In part (iii) there were some excellent detailed accounts of the effects of volcanic eruptions often quoting Montserrat, Mt. St Helens and Pinatubo as examples. However there were also some inaccurate accounts such as the death toll for the Mt. St Helens eruption thought by some to be in the thousands. A common failing was the inability to use/refer to a specific example and a few confused their case studies with references to examples such as the Kobe ‘eruption’.

Question 5

In (a)(i) most candidates successfully used the information to score at least one mark with many achieving full marks. Some candidates however suggested things that were not there such as suggesting houses would have to be demolished or misinterpreting the data e.g. proposing that the quarry would be 260m deep. In part (ii) most candidates scored at least one mark with many achieving the full two marks. Candidates who were less successful often made only vague reference to pollution and a common error was to confuse the caravan company with a caravan site for tourists. Part (iii) was generally well answered. One common error was to refer to a possible future use of the quarry as a reservoir! In part (b)(i) the majority of candidates scored two marks although a common error was to tick pothole, and in (ii) while candidates from some centres referred to limestone pavement and/or clints and grykes many candidates could not go beyond the simple identification of cracks in the rock. Part (iii) was poorly answered by the majority of the candidates. Few understood the chemical weathering process and even fewer could give a good account of it. Many explained the formation of the gaps solely in terms of a freeze-thaw process and many misinterpreted the question being content to describe the sequence of formation (without reference to the process) of one or more of the landforms shown.

Question 6

In part (a)(i) many candidates were able to score two marks for a simple sketch and whilst the standard varied greatly poor artists were not penalised. A significant minority drew a cross-section not a sketch. In part (ii) labelling was generally well done with many candidates achieving full marks. Locating the cap rock proved more of a problem on the sketches than on the cross-section. In part (iii) many candidates gave accurate answers though errors included traction instead of hydraulic action, meander instead of plunge pool, and, most commonly, advance instead of retreat. In part (b) some candidates answered the question well and made good reference to the map while others failed to recognise anything but the meander and some went into great detail about the future formation of an oxbow lake rather than description of the present features. In addition some candidates confused cuttings with embankments. In part (c) there were some good accounts, for example, of the Lynmouth Flood (1952) and the Mississippi floods in the 1990’s though many lacked specific detail.

A large number of candidates however failed to make reference to a flood and others quoted an example from an LEDC such as Bangladesh rather than a MEDC country as required. This confined their answers to Level 1 only.

Question 7

In part (a)(i), as in Question 6 many candidates were awarded two marks for a simple sketch with weaker artists able to gain marks. Again a significant minority drew a cross-section not a sketch. In part (ii) the sketches were generally well labelled, the main problem being for the candidate to locate the lip, most frequently drawn in the position of an arete. Part (iii) was completed well by the candidates of some centres but poorly by most. Few candidates achieved full marks with most gaining only one or fewer marks. Any combination of the words given seemed to be possible answers for the candidates. In part (b)(i) many candidates scored at least two marks by describing a variety of uses related to tourism but relatively few identified other uses such as farming and HEP necessary for maximum marks to be achieved. In part (ii) there were many basic but few clear answers where the candidates were able to link ideas together. It was rare to see examples such as the visual pollution caused by replacing natural forest by ski lifts and pylons, or the increase in job opportunities through work provided in the form of ski instructors, guides etc. Too often candidates were referring to vague terms such as ‘more pollution’, ‘more jobs’ and ‘more money’.

Question 8

In part (a)(i) most candidates answered correctly although common errors included ‘bungalows’ or ‘craft shop’. Most candidates answered part (ii) correctly, being able to measure the cliff erosion within the tolerance allowed. Part (iii) saw most candidates score at least two marks. A common error was to state constructive rather than destructive waves. Part (v) was completed well by candidates from the majority of centres, with references to a wide range of engineering techniques such as sea walls, gabions, rip rap etc. In contrast, a number of candidates made only vague references to ‘barriers’ and ‘dams’ or to ‘not building on cliff tops’, or ‘replacing the soft clay with a hard rock’. Part (b)(i) was generally well answered with many candidates scoring at least two marks. Locating the spit proved the most problematic, not helped by the failure of some candidates to show its precise location with the use of an arrow. To a lesser extent this applied to the beach. Part (ii) was completed well by candidates from some centres but many diagrams were disappointing. Arrows were drawn and labelled incorrectly, on others there was no distinction between land and sea, many showed no indication of wind direction and others failed to include the direction of longshore drift. Some candidates simply redrew figure 12!

Question 9

Part (a)(i) was, for the most part, poorly labelled. The warm sector was most frequently identified but very few candidates correctly labelled the two fronts. Part (ii) was also poorly answered with few candidates gaining more than a single mark (usually at the fourth part). In part (iii) approximately half of candidates understood that low pressure was at the centre of a depression. In (b)(i) many candidates scored at least one mark on speed and/or direction but few achieved maximum marks. In part (ii) a case study was not as well known as for the previous questions. There were a small number of accurate accounts of Hurricanes Andrew or Mitch but most answers were very general with little specific detail. Many candidates also thought that they could only use Michelle as their example but were unable to provide any convincing evidence that they had studied it as a case study.

Question 10

In part (a)(i) many candidates scored at least two marks, the most problematic being the third part. In part (ii) there were some very good descriptions which easily achieved maximum marks but in contrast a number of answers contained confused statements with little if any creditworthy material such as long roots, tall trees, grow in bundles to avoid the cold. In (b)(i) most candidates scored both

marks, but the problem for others came with the lower boxes, where the answers were frequently reversed. In part (ii) many candidates answered correctly but a significant number of answers showed a lack of understanding of the process of desertification. In (iii) many candidates used the diagram to explain the process but a significant number did not and were unclear about the process. Part (iv) was poorly answered. There were many basic answers with references to reducing numbers of livestock or crop rotation but few developed responses. A minority of candidates failed to attempt this question whilst some responses contained no creditworthy material or vague statements such as ‘reduce the number of people living here’.

3031/1H

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. Candidates showed good skills in integrating processes into answers where explanations of landform formation were required and photographic interpretation was often completed to a good standard. Unfortunately too often candidates responded to requests for a sketch by providing a cross-section and some 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. Part (a) was generally very well done although some failed to achieve the second mark in part (ii) being content to give high up without any further elaboration. More successful answers included the precise height (with units) or further developed the answer with reference to the lack of obstruction for signals etc. Part (b) was generally accurate for the majority although some managed to reverse the direction by giving east to west. Overall the question posed few problems until section D where a significant minority of candidates misinterpreted and poorly described the pattern of roads. There were only very limited reference to ring roads, by passes or other relevant points and many answers were a catalogue of the start points or destinations of individual roads.

Question 2

The majority of candidates accurately completed part (a), in particular there was an impressive degree of accuracy in the drawing of the north bank of the River Tay. Where errors occurred it tended to be in the labelling where it was frequently omitted or in the case of the road, many incorrectly labelled it 'T' only. In (b) candidates were adept at using the OS map in order to select and use appropriate examples and grid references. Detailed descriptions were often furnished, however the comparisons were rarely explicit or direct, a prerequisite for the Level 3 response. Candidates of lower ability on this paper often demonstrated only limited understanding of the term relief and much confusion remains over directions with some even reverting to top, bottom, right of map etc. A minority of answers often had only weak reference to land height or shape almost lost amongst accounts of settlement, woodland, rivers and forts while an amazingly large number of candidates perceived the north west as mountainous. Another common error was the candidates who strayed beyond the boundary shown on figure 2 in particular to the area to the south. Candidates should also be reminded to always quote values, in this case heights accurately and with the appropriate units. Answers commonly omitted metres from the heights and few recognised the 50 metre land height in the south east area. Section C was generally well answered with most recognising the steepness of slopes in the north west and the flood risk to the south east. Common errors were to try to blame the height of the land in the north west and being unable to provide two acceptable reasons.

Question 3

The vast majority of candidates scored Level 2 marks in this question. The most common error was for the precise relationship not to be stated, and for candidates to only give the links between GNP

and car ownership at one end of the scale. Other candidates couldn't resist launching into an irrelevant explanation of the pattern after some brief comment about the relationship. The impressive answers not only stated the relationship with illustration but also recognised some of the exceptions to the basic relationship shown.

Section B

Question 4

In part (a)(i) the majority of candidates gained the full two marks recognising the need to go beyond the mere stating of the relationship and to add further description and or illustration for the second mark. The lack of this elaboration prevented a significant minority achieving the second mark. In (a)(ii) there was some excellent case study material from candidates and centres. In many cases candidates achieved the maximum mark of 6 by including one example in detail and passing reference to a contrasting example. However, many candidates were unable to go beyond simple quoting of those examples given in Figure 4 and made only generalised comments about why some earthquakes cause more deaths than others. Many had difficulty adequately integrating their explanations with their chosen example(s). In the weakest answers some candidates had read volcanoes in place of earthquakes while others misinterpreted the information in Figure 4 making comments such as Japan had 18 earthquakes in a year. In part (b)(i) a surprising number of candidates labelled Figure 5 incorrectly with some wildly inaccurate guesswork generating such labels as mouth, tube, mantle. In part (b)(ii) candidates made good use of case studies such as Mt St Helens and Montserrat. However, a significant minority of candidates missed the significance of 'effects on the physical environment' and wrote, sometimes at length, about the impact on housing and people and a variety of other human aspects.

Question 5

This was a less popular question but answered well by the majority who attempted it. Part (a)(i) and (ii) scored well although in part (ii) candidates did not always make their answers precise preferring to write in general terms about likely problems of dust, traffic, noise etc without reference to local residents or the caravan company. In particular some candidates failed to comment on the likely impact on the caravan firm or interpreted it as a caravan site and gave responses in terms of tourists being discouraged from visiting. Section (b)(i) usually attracted maximum marks with a sound appreciation of the need to recognise and describe features from both photographs. However, part (b)(ii) generated a fuller range of responses. Some candidates had a full and detailed understanding of the sequences and processes at work but all too often explanations covered the sequence quite well but process information on carbonation was lacking. Candidates frequently confused weathering and erosion in this context and the solution process was misunderstood or ignored. Freeze-thaw processes often over-ruled carbonation as the principal formation process.

Question 6

This question was a popular choice amongst candidates and many answered to good effect. However, in (a)(i) significant numbers of candidates confused the need for a sketch and produced a cross section. Most candidates easily gained two of the four label marks allocated for basic characteristics but fewer were able to generate any additional detailed labels in order to access the formation marks. In some cases candidates wanted to write a separate paragraph not in the spirit of the question. Candidates need to gain experience of annotating photographs and sketches during their GCSE studies. In part (b) there were some excellent answers that demonstrated highly developed skills in map interpretation and very good knowledge and understanding of river and valley features. However, some candidates failed to achieve Level 3 as a consequence of writing two separate accounts and not making the comparisons explicit and/or not referring both to river and valley features, the valley being the usual omission. In part (c) candidates' answers ranged from the

excellent to the disappointing. Examples such as the Mississippi, Chichester and the Severn and York floods generated some excellent answers; those choosing Lynmouth often scored well on the effects on people but struggled to find anything with much clarity to say about the effects on the land. Less effective answers often gave generalised effects that were clearly not linked to the chosen example or any example was absent or inappropriate, for example, England, Bangladesh.

Question 7

This question was not particularly popular but answered well by candidates from centres where this has been taught. In part (a)(i) there were some very well drawn and labelled sketches but as in question 6 some candidates failed to adequately take note of the need for a sketch and generated cross-sections. This often then hindered their response to the need for labels with some unacceptable labels such as bergschlund, glacier and other process information being included. In part (a)(ii) there were some excellent responses regardless of the chosen landform in which both sequence and process were integrated and detailed. Overall the pyramidal peak was the most popular choice although not all candidates were as effective in explaining the formation once the corrie and backwall had been explained. Ribbon lakes were generally well done with explanations both in terms of over-deepening in areas of less resistant rock and through deposition of terminal moraine. Some excellent answers were seen for drumlin formation although some answers were rather vague while others misunderstood the landform seeing it as an erosional feature. In part (b) the full range of possible responses was seen. The more effective responses targeted their comments precisely and clearly at the question making it explicit the impact on both the environment and the people. Less effective were the generalised responses such as litter, pollution, jobs etc. candidates need to be encouraged to move away from the simple sentences in order to add greater clarity to their responses.

Question 8

This was extremely popular and elicited a full range of responses from the candidates. Parts (a)(i) and (ii) scored well with the majority of candidates gaining maximum marks although in (a)(iii) many candidates adequately addressed the ‘how’ part of the question but ignored the ‘why?’ with a consequent impact upon their attainment. Part (a)(iv) was well answered and a very wide range of possible coastal erosion strategies was quoted. Less effective responses wrote in vague terms about barriers or dams and/or failed to adequately elaborate for the second mark in this question. Part (b) proved to be a good discriminator. There were some excellent responses, with accurately drawn and labelled diagrams showing longshore drift and explanations of one or more of the features indicated. However, the question proved problematical for some that could not provide a basic diagram to show longshore drift but merely copied Figure 12 above and added an arrow. In other cases diagrams had incorrect arrows, no labelling of land and sea, swash and backwash etc. Accounts similarly lacked precision and in particular candidates appeared to find difficulty in adequately linking the process to the actual formation of either a beach or a spit.

Question 9

This was probably the least popular of questions for candidates and centres although some really excellent responses were seen reflecting both good teaching of this unit and thorough knowledge and understanding by the candidates. Section (a)(i) caused candidates few problems however (a)(ii) proved a good discriminator with responses varying from the truly excellent to the weak. In most cases candidates ably described the sequence although this even eluded a few that perceived that the depression was moving from east to west and so had it all in reverse. The explanation proved to be more challenging and some totally omitted to include any explanatory comment while others were confined to generalised statements about air rising. Part (b)(ii) was almost always effectively answered but in (b)(ii) some candidates did not sufficiently recognise the importance of the need to concentrate upon the people’s response and instead wrote in detail about the general effects of a tropical storm. Other responses failed to give an example and/or tried to use Hurricane Michelle, about which it was clear they had no other experience other than its use as a resource in the question.

Question 10

This question, while more popular than question 9, was not as popular as some others such as those regarding coasts and rivers. Part (a)(i) caused few problems with most candidates seeing the scattered nature, the links to steeper slopes and/or were able to illustrate with examples from the extract. However, some did not adequately use the key to the map and confused other areas of mixed and/or deciduous woodland. Part (a)(ii) was well understood by most candidates and some very effective answers were seen although fewer were able to target effectively the thin soils and there is still some misconceptions about the roots which were frequently long or deep. In (b)(i) many candidates knew a good definition although in other instances the response was poor with little, if any, understanding that the term is a process. In (ii) some candidates did not make the impact upon people explicit but were content to write about cattle dying or soil being eroded, i.e. little beyond what was already written on Figure 15. They needed to go beyond these statements to ideas about people migrating away, the effects of famine and wood shortages etc. Part (b)(iii) discriminated well. There were some very good responses firmly based upon case studies; the most common being the Sahel, Ethiopia and/or West Africa. However, some candidates launched into a response firmly rooted in the Tropical Rain Forest and the issue of deforestation, desertification was never mentioned. This was not really in the spirit of the question or the detail of the specification for this unit. Credit was given for appropriate responses based in the rain forests to the top of level 2.

3031/2F

General

The candidates easily completed the paper in the allotted time, with the opportunity for the most able to write extended answers. Generally questions were accessible to all abilities allowing weaker candidates to gain marks and the more able to expand and exhibit knowledge.

There was a more even spread of answers across the paper with a slight bias towards question 4 in section B and question 5 in Section C. There were fewer rubric errors than in previous years.

There was an overall poor use of case study materials in questions where candidates were to write about an area/CBD/scheme/example you have studied. Several of the level response questions were poorly answered especially those requiring an explanation.

Skills questions were generally answered competently.

Section A

Question One Population

Most candidates correctly answered part (a)(i). Many candidates assumed that a river valley or industrial area was the name of the area required for part (a)(ii). Few achieved more than level 1 with the majority failing to explain the underlying reasons for high population density. The best simply wrote that an industrial area provided jobs. Most answers referred to population growth/BR/NI. The concept that population density reflects resource availability seemed not to be generally understood. Most correctly answered part (b). Part (c)(i) was generally well answered. Most candidates understood that the BR was connected to the number of babies born. The explanation for countries having a high BR produced many answers that showed clear understanding. However, some candidates failed to gain marks for (c)(ii) because they reused words from the stem question, i.e. birth and rate. Many candidates dwelt on contraception in part (c)(iii). Parts (d)(i) and (ii) were generally correctly answered. The understanding of the concept of an ageing population was variable in (d)(iii). Many answers to (d)(iv) focussed on the idea of a declining BR/DR/population/lack of workers rather than specific problems facing the country.

Question 2 Settlement

Part (a)(i) was generally correctly answered. Most answers for part (a)(ii) were descriptive. Few were able to explain the land use of the CBD. The concept of CBD was poorly understood by many. There were examples of the inclusion of inner city, suburbs and industrial areas in the answers to this part. Most filled in the gaps correctly for (b)(i). However, in (b)(ii) many had no understanding of the concept 'suburbs'. Most focussed on housing characteristics with few describing any layout features. All were able to identify Lincoln Edge in part (c)(i), but the meaning of the term 'site' seemed poorly understood for part (c)(ii). Candidates need reminding that more is required than just vague statements such as 'by roads,' 'by rivers', etc. Most concentrated on route focus and water supply with a few referring to shelter and defensive site. Most answers to (d)(i) were correct. Most were able to describe the problems of shanty towns at length for (d)(ii). However, many focussed on social issues rather than the built environment response required by the question. Few were able to go beyond very general responses in part (d)(iii). Only a minority were able to give examples of specific schemes and even fewer could name an example.

Section B

Question 3 Agriculture

Most candidates correctly answered (a)(i). A surprising number did not recognise the farm equipment shown in the source material. Many wrote about aspects of arable farming which were not evident from the photograph in part (a)(ii). Most knew the term 'mixed farming' for part (a)(iii). Candidates generally used the map well to correctly answer parts (b)(i) and (ii), although some candidates still gave vague answers such as 'good' weather or 'good' soils. Most ticked the correct boxes in (c)(i) but knowledge of EU agricultural policy (c)(ii) still remains poor or muddled. There are several misconceptions about quotas, subsidies and set a side, although many referred to the concept of diversification. The majority answered (d)(i) correctly but the responses to (d)(ii) were variable. There were some good, descriptive answers but others demonstrated a confusion with commercial systems. These then failed to answer part (d)(iii). Some also confused shifting cultivation with crop rotation. Few were able to produce more than basic answers to the problems associated with subsistence farming.

Question 4 Industry

Most candidates answered (a)(i) correctly. However, some candidates are still not referring to source material as indicated and describe the features of primary industry in general for (a)(ii). There were few candidates who got (a)(iii) wrong. Candidates were able to correctly identify one river from the map for (b)(i). The majority correctly identified reasons for the development of industry in Northern Italy by using the source material. However, some candidates need to ensure that the way they used this material made sense in relation to (b)(ii). Part (c) was generally answered correctly. A majority of candidates were able to describe aspects of industrial pollution for (d)(ii). Many were able to link pollution to the environment in general. However, several misconceptions appeared, for example, carbon dioxide causing damage to the ozone layer. The more able candidates linked a precise type of industry to precise types of pollution/precise environmental impact. Part (d)(iv) produced fewer good answers with candidates rarely able to move beyond general comments on the reduction of pollution. Many concentrated on traffic pollution and how we can reduce it rather than the action of governments take in the reduction of industrial pollution. A significant number of candidates incorrectly identified robot production systems in (e)(i) and in (e)(ii) the weaker candidates gave a response from the viewpoint of advantages to the TNC. Many did not understand this term TNC or its role.

Section C

Question 5 Managing Resources

5(a)(i) and (ii) revealed a general lack of understanding about what physical features and facilities in National Parks and Reserves are, frequently, incorrectly, featuring them as answers to both parts. Part (iii) and (iv) were answered well with candidates using the source material to quote examples for (a)(iii). Part (b)(i) was generally well answered. Most candidates achieved Level 1 by mentioning jobs and money. The more able developed points using the multiplier effect. For example: More jobs mean more income earned so that the government can receive more money from taxes to improve education, etc. The disadvantages that tourism brings was well understood by the majority of candidates in (b)(ii). However, candidates do need to qualify such vague statements as 'pollution', etc.

Most candidates understood the concept of renewable energy in (c)(i). However, the concept of location defeated all but the most able for (c)(ii). Many described how the energy was generated with no reference to location. Some failed to name a particular type of renewable energy and wrote in general terms. Few named locations were used. Many continued to write about renewable energy in part (iii) and consequently achieved no marks. Many referred to 'turning lights/computer/TV off

when not required', or used vague generalities such as "don't use as much." The more able developed points in relation to recycling, conservation and resource substitution.

Question 6 Development

Parts (a)(i) — (iv) were generally well answered with the majority correctly using the source material. However, part (a)(v) was not clearly answered. In part (b)(i) the concept of literacy was not understood by a surprising number of candidates. The most common error was to interpret it as 'education.' Few candidates failed to identify Japan as the MEDC (b)(ii). The majority of candidates reached the top of level 1 in part (b)(iii) by using the source material. The more able justified/developed their answers to achieve higher marks. Very few candidates understood the concept of appropriate technology as being that suited to the country in which it was used. Most repeated the terminology from the stem question (c)(i) or referred to the 'right/correct technology for the job.' The majority of candidates were able to give reasons why water may not be clean in LEDCs for part (c)(ii). Many were able to identify drought/hot climate as a reason for shortages in (c)(iii). However, too many wrote about large populations drinking it too quickly, etc. Part (d) produced few well developed answers. Most responses described the various types of aid (well, in many cases), many did not state how it was used. There were few references to actual examples although many could name organisations such as OXFAM.

3031/2H

General

The paper proved to be accessible to candidates of all abilities, allowing even the weakest to attempt all parts of the questions. Centres should be congratulated as most candidates had been well prepared for the examination and had been entered for the correct tier.

As the first paper in the new specification, most centres had been careful to ensure that the correct subject content had been taught and the considerable detail and variety of case studies quoted in answers displayed the fact that teachers appreciate that it is such detail that often gives candidates access to the higher levels of marks. It was also pleasing to see some excellent geographical use made of recent national and international events to illustrate answers. Where candidates lost marks it was frequently because they did not respond accurately to the command words or, as in some questions, had not answered all parts of the question. Candidates also penalised themselves by failing to write in sentences. Quality of written communication is assessed throughout each answer and if points made are not developed it is also more difficult to access the higher levels of marks.

There were no questions which proved more popular but, as candidates from many centres seem to be answering the same three questions, it suggests that centres are concentrating on teaching one topic only from each section.

SECTION A

Question 1 Population

Although most candidates ticked the correct boxes in (a)(i) many misinterpreted (ii) and wrote about population growth rather than population density. Of those who did give the correct response, some failed to name an area or named too large an area e.g. Africa and as a result the vague reasons given were insufficient to score the higher levels of marks.

Some candidates assumed that describing each location in turn was sufficient to describe the pattern of population density (b); however, there were some excellent answers which described the patterns and the exceptions. Some candidates wasted time giving reasons for the patterns.

A common error in completing the boxes in (c)(i) was to write ‘more/little change’ rather than stating whether there was an increase or decrease in the population. In (ii) there were some excellent answers about high and low birth rates which were illustrated by detailed examples, although there was the usual confusion about whether China or Japan has a one child policy!

Candidates usually completed the population pyramid in (d)(i) accurately but some failed to answer both parts of the final question. Topical points were made about pension problems including some competent discussion about raising the age of retirement, charging higher taxes, dependency ratios and generally diverting resources from the young to the old. Poorer responses were usually general statements about lack of sufficient food or jobs.

Question 2 Settlement

The correct boxes were usually completed in (a)(i), but in the second section of part (a) some candidates described rather than explained the land uses. Few candidates gave the incorrect response in the table in (b)(i), but many did not understand the meaning of the term ‘urban sprawl’, (b)(ii). Of those who did, a common response was the loss of the countryside and/or animals’ habitats with very few candidates referring to any problems created in the CBD or inner city as a result of this development. Exemplars were not a requirement of this question; when used however the candidate was more likely to write in detail thus allowing access to the higher marks.

The mark in (c)(i) was for the *reason* a feature would be unlikely to be found in a city in a MEDC rather than for the feature itself. Many candidates did not realise this. However, the problems of shanty towns were well known and there were some excellent answers using exemplars such as Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, Cairo and cities in India. Marks were sometimes lost because candidates failed to address the last part of the question which required describing attempts to solve the problems.

The site of Lincoln was described accurately by many candidates, using the data on the map. Only the better candidates however suggested how the site might have helped it's development.

SECTION B

Question 3

Again the ticks were placed accurately for most candidates in the boxes in (a)(i), two creditworthy features were given for the photograph (although sometimes features not on the figure were mentioned) and the term 'mixed farming' was well known.

The responses in (b) varied from those who had studied East Anglia as an arable farming area and wrote all they knew about it, ignoring the map, or those who gave very vague reasons such as 'the temperature is right' or the 'soil is good' or even the 'North Sea is useful for irrigation'. To gain the marks, candidates needed to use data from the map and put it into the context of being important for arable farming.

The best answers in part (c) were from candidates who realised that sheep farming was the only choice when the physical conditions were unsuitable for other types of farming. Otherwise candidates were struggling to think of the suitable soil/relief/climate conditions for such an activity. Nearness to urban markets could be interpreted for live sheep or for meat and wool, but few candidates mentioned any other factors although the question allowed this.

There were some very detailed answers about the EU policy and its effects on farmers from some centres who had obviously studied this topic well. Others were confused between grants and subsidies and suggested that the EU dictated what a farmer grows and to whom they could sell.

The last section in the agriculture question proved to be an excellent discriminator. Most candidates were able to write about a type of subsistence farming, the most common type chosen being rice growing in India or shifting cultivation in the Amazon rainforest. Problems were described but not always explained and some candidates failed to include any recent changes.

Question 4

Part (a) did not display any problems for the candidates. In (b) use had to be made of the map in order to gain marks but as in the paired question (3), it attracted a number of vague answers such as 'rivers good for transport' without naming any particular river.

Many candidates lost marks in (b)(ii) because they did not read the word 'heavy' for industry and wrote about car exhausts or traffic congestion with related pollution control such as catalytic converters or congestion charging. Some centres had studied this topic well and there were some excellent answers.

In (c) there was a tendency to repeat the points from (b)(i). This question required an explanation, not just a description and there was the opportunity to consider other factors that affect industrial location. Some candidates wrote very detailed answers here whereas others made bullet points which usually did not score highly.

The advantages and disadvantages of transnational corporations were well known by many candidates, but not all included an explanation. The candidates who scored high marks often used exemplars to illustrate their account and often (although it was not essential) included a discussion from both the TNC's and the country's viewpoint.

SECTION C

Question 5

There were plenty of physical features from which candidates might choose on Figure 13 in the first part of this question, but some gave answers such as National Parks and National Reserves. In (a)(ii) it was necessary to describe a holiday, not just state a type.

There were some detailed answers in (b) about the disadvantages of tourism in LEDCs using specific locations e.g. Phuket. No credit was available for advantages which many candidates included in their answer. Some answers were not location specific and, as a result, they tended to be rather general comments about such features as noise, crime, drugs, litter and prostitution which could apply to anywhere and so failed to score the higher levels of marks.

The last part of this question concerned energy and sustainable development. Renewable energy proved to be known well, although some candidates did lose marks in the first two parts because they did not read the question accurately. Sustainable development other than by using renewable energy was less well known. Recycling and cutting down on pollution were frequently mentioned but rarely were the points developed. Very few candidates wrote about resource substitution, conservation, stewardship, ecotourism or using appropriate technology in less developed countries.

Question 6

The introductory short answers in this question were invariably well done although some lost marks by not stating Kenya's main import in full. In (a)(iv) some candidates wrote at length about the imbalance of trade between LEDCs and MEDCs rather than answering the question set. Some lost marks by considering the trade from one country's viewpoint only e.g. what MEDCs can get from Kenya without considering the interdependence.

Part (b) proved easy for most candidates to explain how the data in Figure 15 suggested that Japan is an MEDC as well as suggesting two other measures of development. In (c) there were some detailed answers about the problems of clean water supply in LEDCs but often less detail about the supply in MEDCs. Some candidates did get sidetracked into a discussion about tropical diseases.

Long-term aid i.e. investment in projects which have a long-term effect, was not recognised by many candidates [part (d)]. Many described the effects of different types of aid but failed to focus on what the question actually asked. Examples were required in this question and it was those who used them well, explaining the advantages and disadvantages who gained the high scores.

Coursework

Full Course : 3031/C

General

In this first year of the new Specification, it was pleasing to see how well many centres coped with the new marking criteria. Moderators were impressed with the variety of coursework produced and the breadth of knowledge displayed by many of the candidates. There were a number of outstanding enquiries in evidence. It is appreciated that the logistics behind organising fieldwork visits are becoming more complex: staffing, cover, finance, safety, transport are all difficult and time consuming issues for a Head of Department. This, added to the fact that Geography teachers are at the mercy of the British climate, makes it remarkable that departments produced such an impressive range of quality work.

Teacher-led enquiries were by far the most common format. The range of topics submitted was varied; the most popular theme being urban studies with CBD investigations, shopping hierarchies, tourism and traffic being dominant. This is not surprising as, in most cases, the urban environment provides a range of topics that are very accessible for most candidates and gives easy opportunities for them to re-visit the sites. As expected, a number of centres opted for a purely physical study, with rivers and coastlines by far the most popular.

There were a few examples where 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 and teachers selecting the data presentation techniques to be used with little input from the candidate. As a result, only in the data interpretation and evaluation sections could the candidate's true ability be assessed.

Some centres allowed their candidates to consider a large number of sub-hypotheses which, in some cases, were nothing more than predictions. This type of enquiry tends to become rather repetitive and fails to provide candidates with an opportunity to give an overview or summative statement. As a result, links to achieve Level 3 in the interpretation section are never identified. Furthermore, these tend to develop into extremely long enquiries which some centres assume justifies high marks. Teachers have a clear responsibility to guide their students appropriately in title and task selection.

It is encouraging to report that a large number of centres obviously made use of the Coursework Advisers or attended AQA training sessions and/or Standardisation meetings. The quality of enquiries produced and the detailed annotation that accompanied some of this work suggests that the advice they received and the materials they were given were put to great effect in creating new coursework topics or adapting existing coursework to the new guidelines.

Administration

There is no doubt that this year there were problems regarding administration that were in some cases beyond the control of the centres. The fact that this was the first year of a new Specification; the late allocation of moderators to some centres and the supply of the correct documentation; the completion of new proforma sheets and new sampling procedures for some, all combined to make it a difficult start for some centres and, indeed, some moderators. The whole process was further complicated and prolonged by the very late arrival of scripts from some centres.

On a more positive note, AQA moderators were a little less frustrated than in previous years in that centres knew exactly the specific sample to send. The new sampling procedure worked well and made sure that the number and composition of the sample sent from the centre was correct in the majority of cases.

The detailed attention needed to efficiently negotiate the administrative process cannot be overstated. Whilst some centres were quite superb in all aspects of administration and justifiably deserve credit, others failed to meet even the basic requirements and thus delayed the whole moderation process.

The following points need to be stressed:

Centres with **20 or fewer candidates** should ensure that **all** their candidates work is sent together, and that the **second** and **third** copies of the **Centre Mark Sheets** (or an EDI 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 **second** and **third** 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 which meant a photocopy or note had to be made by the moderator of the sample requested as well as asking the centre to return a copy of the CMS). The moderator will **return the third 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. In one or two cases, centres were using out of date proformas and, as a result, did not provide all the information required. **The Centre Declaration Sheet should also accompany the sample.**

Some coursework is being 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.

The work should be submitted in simple plastic or manila folders and **not in hard back files or ring binders** and so reduce the cost of postage.

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 is, within the work, elements that are indeed creditworthy. If a candidate has submitted no work or has withdrawn then 'X' should be encoded.

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. However a minority of centres provided only limited evidence that internal assessment had 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 unhelpful comments scattered throughout the work that bore no relation to the content or the mark scheme. These centres need to be reminded **that annotation is a requirement of the GCSE Mandatory Code of Practice**. 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.

MARKING CRITERIA

Many centres successfully applied the new criteria. In the majority of cases, the centre's marks were within tolerance, with centres identifying the 'triggers' required to access the different levels and applying the marking criteria in a uniform manner across the whole department. Where centres were outside the tolerance, a common trend was for centres to either overmark at the top end of the mark range or undermark at the bottom. There were, however, a number of centres who had insufficient understanding of what was required and no appreciation of the 'triggers' necessary to move a candidate from one level to another.

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 then went on, through description and explanation to clearly identify the key concepts that were then constantly referred to throughout the work.

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.

In the weaker enquiries, many of the hypotheses were inappropriate, poorly structured or over-ambitious and, as a result, failed to set an effective agenda for an enquiry. Locating the study area involved basic statements and simplified maps that were badly drawn and lacked the normal conventions. Understanding was delivered through background information, scene setting or a series of chapters headed 'theory'. In each case, the theoretical basis of the work was compartmentalised with little cross-referencing or application to the data collected.

In the very weakest work, it was difficult to identify the purpose of the enquiry or the link to the taught Specification, there being no clearly stated question, issue or hypothesis. (Evidence would suggest that there was some misunderstanding by candidates and centres regarding the meaning of the term ‘hypothesis’). In a few extreme cases, it was also impossible to even locate the study area. Some candidates packed their work with irrelevant and unnecessary information, taken from popular core textbooks or even downloaded from the Internet. Throughout the enquiry, no links were made to this material and generally it was never referred to.

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.

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 must be remembered, 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. In one or two instances, candidates failed to find the right balance, spending most of their time and energy describing the location whilst neglecting the concepts underpinning the work.

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.

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 primary data collection methods that were to be used in the investigation. Access to Level 3 marks, however, proved to be a little more difficult even for the higher ability candidates.

Originality in data collection and the justification of this unique element 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. ‘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.

It must be stressed that 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. Equally, it is important to remember that originality and initiative are not the only criteria required for Level 3 Methodology marks. For example, a number of potential Level 3 candidates often relied too heavily on a narrow range of data usually only collected by means of a questionnaire. Some failed to justify their techniques, preferring to spend most of their time discussing the advantages and disadvantages of each technique or the merits of different sampling procedures.

A limited range of techniques, an adequate sample size, failure to explain the rationale behind the hypothesis or, more likely, a detailed description of how the techniques were carried out without any explanation of why those particular techniques were used, would all prohibit progression into the higher level, even if the candidate had produced an individual piece of work.

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.

One successful method used by some centres to make sure that their candidates covered all the criteria in this section, was to produce a methodology table. The table covered the what, when, how and why of the methods used. There was also a section for each candidate to describe their own individual contribution. This approach tends to work well for the lower ability candidates, but, for the higher ability, the table in most cases does not provide enough detailed information for access to Level 3.

It must also be stressed that marks are not awarded in this section for a list of data collection methods per se. 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 weaker 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

Centres are to be congratulated on the quality of work produced in this section and the wide range of techniques and skills exhibited by their candidates. In many cases, the presentation techniques showed flair and imagination, as well as fulfilling the criteria, allowing access to Level 3 marks.

It was common, however, for this section to be overmarked. Some centres confused '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 reflect a continuum which takes account of the accuracy, appropriateness, range and complexity of the types of presentation being used. 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.

It is not possible to provide a definitive list of more complex techniques because with care, accuracy and a little elaboration, the majority of techniques have the potential to access the highest levels. The annotation of photographs, for example, is a presentation skill that is seen at all levels. A low level of labelling might see the candidate only giving the photograph a title; at an intermediate level the candidate might indicate relevant features, and at the highest level, the candidate will interpret those features. The same progression can be identified for most presentation techniques, hence no list.

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 ‘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 type and quality of data collected determines the range of presentation techniques that can be used. Centres and candidates should ensure, at the planning stage, that the data produced is suitable for being represented by higher order skills.

The quality of written communication was generally quite pleasing with the majority of candidates being able to express themselves with reasonable accuracy. The use of Spellcheck in the word-processed enquiries clearly benefited some candidates.

Data Interpretation

This section proved to be a useful discriminator. The majority of 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, demonstrate links between the data sets, and draw 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 and thus 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 weaker 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 overcredited 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 was some 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 appeared to have an 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 proved to be the weakest element. For example, candidates often failed to suggest why their conclusions, however valid, may be a reflection of the particular location and time when the enquiry was undertaken and so cannot be considered applicable in the wider context.

Evaluation presented a problem for some centres with candidates having a tendency to write in congratulatory terms rather than highlighting limitations. Any evaluation statements tended to be vague and generic rather than detailed and specific to the enquiry. 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.

In the most effective enquiries, candidates, rather than just discussing in detail the three components of the criteria separately, identified the fact that poorly/faulty methodology led to inaccurate results and that conclusions based upon such results had, therefore, questionable validity.

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.

Summary

The annual report, by design, records this year’s findings and gives guidance as to how to avoid future pitfalls. It would be an injustice to view the document as purely negative comment. Public recognition should go to all fellow hardworking committed Geography teachers who have tackled the new Specification with professionalism. In the majority of cases, coursework enquiries were worthy of great merit, testament to the youngsters’ hard work and the teachers who guide them.

3036/F

General

Most candidates completed this Foundation level paper but, despite the clear wording on the front of the script, there were a considerable number of rubric errors. The most common rubric infringement was to attempt all of the questions. This usually does not help candidates to gain extra credit as they invariably do not have the time to answer the longer sections in any detail. Occasionally, all candidates from a centre committed this error. Centres must advise candidates against this practice.

Some questions in the optional sections B and C proved more popular than others. Tectonic Activity and Coastal Landscapes and Processes were answered more frequently in Section B and Settlement and Managing Resources in Section C. However, there was no evidence of any particular question proving more difficult than others within these two sections. The photographs, maps and diagrams appeared to be accessible to candidates of all abilities.

The new specification suggests that for the study of many of the topics, use should be made of case studies. This was sadly lacking in many of the answers. Although not all of the questions ask for an exemplar, candidates often write in more detail when one is cited and centres should encourage candidates to make use of them.

SECTION A

Question 1

Most candidates performed well in this question which tested skills. Occasionally candidates gave a six figure reference in (a)(i) and so lost the two marks available and others lost the marks by giving the Northings reference first. In (ii), a few of the weaker candidates identified a golf course instead of the masts and so struggled to find reasons for the location in (iii).

Measuring the length of Mugdrum Island was either extremely accurate or wildly wrong, ranging from a few centimetres to many thousands of kilometres! In the final section, (c), some candidates lost marks by failing to tick two boxes.

Question 2

It was disappointing to find that although many candidates were able to perform the skills of identifying the road, drawing the North bank of the river Tay and shading in a correct grid square of higher land, they lost marks by failing to label these features correctly. The second part of this question was also poorly answered by many, who tried to account for the lack of settlement in terms of the height of the land rather than its gradient and ignored the risk of flooding in the south east or the lack of communications in the north west. Some were confused about the points of the compass so it was difficult to identify the areas to which they were referring.

Question 3

The responses to this question were much better. There were some excellent answers describing the general pattern, noting exceptions to this pattern and making use of figures from the map to illustrate their answer. There were a few candidates who described the colours on the map, but failed to translate the colours into any meaning.

SECTION B

Question 4 Tectonic Activity

Most candidates gave accurate responses in the first three parts of Section (a). In (iv), a number of incorrect ranges were given but there were some excellent answers in (v) referring to such factors as population densities, building techniques, strength of the earthquake etc. A few candidates wrote about differences in the types of plate boundaries which did not answer the question.

It was surprising to see that many candidates could not label the features of the volcano accurately in part (b) or identify the type of plate boundary for a composite volcano. The final section, however, gave an opportunity for candidates to write about the case studies they had learnt well and there were some vivid descriptions of Mount St Helen's, Mt Pinatubo and Montserrat. This detail enabled some candidates to score the higher level of marks. Descriptions of effects which could apply to any volcano restricted the candidate to level 1.

Question 5 River Landscapes and Processes

Many candidates were able to score two marks for a simple sketch and, whilst the standard varied, poor artists were not penalised. A minority drew a cross-section with the subsequent loss of a mark. Most features were accurately labelled although some candidates were unsure about the position of the 'hard (cap) rock'. The paragraph in (iii) did not prove to be a problem although some confused 'hydraulic action' with 'traction'.

The recognition of river features from the OS map rarely went beyond 'meanders'. Of those who noted the embankments/levees, many consulted the key and described the feature as 'cutting/embankment' without apparently giving thought to the sense of their statement. The question demanded a description, so lists of features were not acceptable for the full marks.

An exemplar was a requirement of the final section of this question and the Lynmouth floods and those of the Mississippi were the most commonly quoted. Despite so much recent flooding in the UK, it was very surprising to see how few candidates used these as exemplars. Some candidates lost marks by quoting an LEDC example or omitting to describe a specific example altogether.

Question 6 Glacial Landscapes and Processes

As in the previous question, candidates were able to gain marks for a recognisable sketch but lost a mark if a cross-section was drawn. The label that proved most difficult to locate in this question was the one for the 'lip'. A surprisingly few candidates were able to complete the paragraph about the formation of a corrie accurately.

In part (b) many candidates scored at least two marks by describing a variety of uses of the glaciated upland area related to tourism but relatively few identified other uses such as farming and HEP which was essential for the third mark. The impact of tourism on the environment and the local people was too often referred to in vague terms such as 'more pollution', 'more jobs' or 'more money'. Only the better candidates were able to link ideas such as 'the visual pollution caused by replacing natural forest by ski lifts and pylons' or 'the increase in job opportunities provided in the form of ski instructors or guides' or describe the multiplier effect of jobs leading to more money in the area etc.

Question 7 Coastal Landscapes and Processes

The early sections of this question were usually accurate although common errors in completing the paragraph were to write 'constructive' instead of 'destructive' and to confuse 'hydraulic action' with 'longshore drift'. There was some excellent knowledge, often using case studies, of a wide range of

engineering techniques to prevent further erosion at Kingsdown in (a)(iv). In contrast, some poorer candidates made reference only to ‘putting up barriers’.

Candidates who labelled the coastal features clearly, using an arrow, were more likely to score full marks in (b)(i) than those who just wrote the word ‘beach’ or ‘spit’ but did not indicate a precise location of the feature. The diagrams to explain longshore drift were rather disappointing. Many showed no distinction between the land and the sea, the angle of arrows showing swash and backwash were often wrong and not labelled, and the wind and general direction of longshore drift were often lacking also. Some of the weaker candidates redrew Figure 12.

SECTION C

Question 8 Settlement

Although candidates were able usually to tick the correct box for Zone A, there was some confusion about the features of suburbs. The paragraph rarely proved difficult but not all of the candidates understood the term ‘urban sprawl’ and so there were some interesting but inaccurate reasons suggested and likewise, a small minority thought that a business park was some type of floral gardens or theme park.

In part (c), most candidates were able to give two out of the three correct responses but marks lost in (d) were often because candidates gave a list of problems rather than a brief description. For candidates who understood that the question was about *environmental* problems in (e), there were some excellent responses using topical ideas such as the congestion charging in London. The question required the candidate to deal with more than one problem in order to score full marks.

Question 9 Agriculture

This question was answered by very few candidates. The farm as a system was well known and most candidates gave suitable physical factors as well as completing the paragraph and the box in (b) accurately. Unfortunately, few candidates displayed any knowledge about EU policies, despite the fact that a list was acceptable in this sub-section.

Sustainable farming was another term that many candidates did not understand but most were able to state that commercial farming was about farming for profits although they found it difficult to give two more features. Methods of soil conservation were largely unknown.

It seemed as if many of the candidates who attempted this question did so by accident or as part of answering all the questions. It seemed as if many had not been prepared for it.

Question 10 Managing Resources

This was a very popular question and some candidates were well informed about energy so that full marks were often scored in (a). The tourism section was less well answered although most candidates did not have any difficulty in putting ‘jobs’ in the box in Figure 16 or suggesting one or two ways that tourism affects the environment.

In section (c), the word ‘physical’ was missed by some and in (d) many wrote about a tourist area in a MEDC rather than an LEDC. Sometimes, no area was named or a vague area was given such as ‘Africa’. This elicited weak responses which could have applied to anywhere and so failed to score marks.

The final section about ‘green tourism’ was a problem for many who did not understand the term. Even for those who did, many failed to write much beyond a mention that it was an ‘environmentally

friendly' type. This was an example of where candidates who used a case study in answer to this question usually wrote in more detail and so gained the higher level of marks.

3036/H

General

The paper allowed candidates of all abilities to attempt the required number of questions and the wide range of marks suggested that it discriminated well between candidates. There were few rubric errors with this higher paper but candidates from many centres attempted exactly the same questions in Sections B and C in which there is a choice, suggesting that teachers do not cover the entire syllabus. Nevertheless, most candidates appeared well prepared and were entered into the correct tier.

The improved specification layout with detailed guidance had encouraged the better use of case studies and centres should be congratulated on the variety and detail of such case studies displayed in candidates' answers. Consequently, it was the lack of detailed knowledge in questions requiring an exemplar that often lowered the mark for some candidates. Marks were also lost where candidates did not respond accurately to the command words or did not answer all parts of a question. The quality of written communication is assessed throughout the paper and candidates should ensure that they write in complete sentences in the longer answers, developing any points made.

Sections B and C had choices and some questions proved more popular than others. In Section B, the Tectonic Activity question was by far the most commonly chosen, closely followed by Coastal Landscapes and Processes. The Glacial Landscapes and Processes question was the least popular. Agriculture was the least favourite question in Section C with candidates shared equally between answering the other two questions in this section.

SECTION A

Question 1

The mast and the reasons for its location were correctly answered by the majority of candidates, as was also the length of Mugdrum Island. Kilometres or miles were acceptable in the latter answer but units were essential for the 2 marks.

Question 2

This question was not so well answered. Some labelled the road using the letter 'T' only – this did not score the available mark and there were some very inaccurate drawings of the North bank of the River Tay. Marks were lost also if the drawing was not labelled.

In the second part of this question, a comparison was requested and so it was essential that relative comparisons were drawn in the answer. Full marks were not attainable for two discrete accounts or if no reference was made to the map by the use of grid references and other details such as actual heights.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to recognise the correlation between GNP and car ownership but few mentioned the exceptions to this relationship or quoted actual figures from the maps in order to score the full 4 marks.

SECTION B**Question 4**

The negative correlation was recognised in (a)(i) but, as in the previous question, candidates were reluctant to quote figures from the table to illustrate their answer. Most candidates appeared to enjoy answering the second part of this subsection as there were some extremely detailed accounts using a variety of exemplars, particularly the Kobe earthquake. Good use was also made of Figure 4 with many candidates noting and explaining the low death toll in the very strong Alaskan earthquake of 1964.

Candidates rarely had a problem labelling Figure 5 and again there were some excellent accounts of the effects of specific volcanic eruptions, particularly those of Mount St. Helen's, Mt Pinatubo and the eruption on the island of Montserrat.

Question 5

Some excellent well-labelled sketches were used to answer to this question but some candidates lost marks because they drew a cross section instead. A comparison was required in (b) and resulted in the same problems as in Question 2. It was also essential to compare the valleys as well as the rivers to gain access to the highest levels of marks. Many candidates restricted their answer to the rivers.

For the final part of this question, an exemplar was essential to score marks at level 2, as well as describing the effects of the flood on both the land and the people. Some candidates lost marks in this question because they wrote about a flood in a less developed rather than a more developed country.

Question 6

As in the previous question, some candidates drew a cross section rather than a sketch from the photograph, thus losing marks. The formation of the glacial features was generally rather poorly explained. Some candidates used diagrams to aid their description. This is acceptable providing they are labelled.

The final section of this question required a description and not just direct copying from the resource. It was also essential to consider the impacts on both the environment as well as the local people in order to access the top marks.

Question 7

The first two parts of this question were answered accurately by most candidates but in part (iii) some candidates lost marks because they did not consider both the 'how' and the 'why' of cliff collapse. This was a pity for those who had written in detail about cliff retreat in specific areas such as the Holderness coast or Barton in Dorset but had not considered both aspects of the question. Preventing cliff erosion proved an easy two marks for most candidates with plenty of relevant suggestions made.

In the final part of the question there were some excellent answers explaining longshore drift using labelled diagrams and text. Failure to link the explanation to the formation of the features on Figure 10 prevented some candidates from achieving the top marks for this section.

SECTION C**Question 8 Settlement**

The short questions at the beginning of question 8 about urban zones were answered easily by most candidates although a few concentrated on shanty towns to the exclusion of other zones in part (iii).

The best answers in this section invariably included a description about a specific LEDC city, although an exemplar was not a requirement of the question.

Urban sprawl was a term not understood by some candidates. Others failed to describe both the advantages and disadvantages and many did not consider the problems created in the CBD of businesses moving to the edge of town or of the increase in traffic problems in the central urban zones as more people are attempting to access these areas from the more distant edge of town.

In the final section, many candidates did not restrict their answer to environmental problems. For those candidates who confined their answers to the question, there were some excellent answers, some of which included topical solutions e.g. congestion charging in London to reduce pollution from vehicle exhausts in the confines of the central urban areas.

Question 9 Agriculture

The start of this question included easily answered short questions although candidates must be aware that the command ‘describe’ requires more than a one word answer. There was no shortage of problems discussed in part (b) but a detailed development of more than one problem was necessary to access the top level of marks.

The word ‘describe’ appeared again in part (c) and so a list did not answer the question fully. The final section of this question was an excellent discriminator with only the better candidates clearly focusing on sustainability.

Question 10 Managing Resources

Candidates generally displayed a sound knowledge about renewable energy, but not all realised that more than one possible cause of global warming was required in answering section (a)(iii) for full marks. The question about green tourism was less well answered, requiring an answer to both the protection of the environment and the benefit of the local people. Thus, choosing an exemplar such as ecotourism in Antarctica made it difficult for candidates. Those who had studied ecotourist developments in some of the African countries usually did well in this section.

Part (c) was another ‘describe’ question and the attractions needed to be specific to the UK location. Many candidates wrote about ‘attractive scenery’ without any description e.g. coastal or mountain, which related to the chosen area.

In the final section of the paper, the question was about ‘physical’ attractions of an LEDC area and how these attractions are important for tourism. In this question there was not a space to specify an area, but nonetheless, the attractions needed to relate to a specific location and some description was essential to explain how those physical attractions promoted tourism.

Centre Assessed Component

Short Course : 3036/C

General

In this first year of the new Specification, it was pleasing to see how well many centres coped with the new marking criteria. Moderators were impressed with the variety of coursework produced and the breadth of knowledge displayed by many of the candidates. There were a number of outstanding enquiries in evidence. It is appreciated that the logistics behind organising fieldwork visits are becoming more complex: staffing, cover, finance, safety, transport are all difficult and time consuming issues for a Head of Department. This, added to the fact that Geography teachers are at the mercy of the British climate, makes it remarkable that departments produced such an impressive range of quality work.

In many cases, there was no obvious difference between the coursework submitted for the Short Course and that produced for the Full Course. This was highlighted in centres that had candidates entered for both courses, it was impossible to distinguish between the two sets of enquiries. In the vast majority of cases, the work was identical and, therefore, interchangeable. Generally, no allowance was being made for the reduced word limit or the more detailed and specific marking criteria that was designed to lessen the demands made on candidates in completing Short Course enquiries. Centres were generally asking too much of their Short Course candidates.

It is also worth noting that, where centres did enter candidates for both courses and used identical coursework, the Short Course marking, in most cases, was more accurate than the Full Course. It would seem that teachers carry through the notion of one concept, three methods of data capture and three ‘more complex’ data presentation techniques to the Full Course and thus overmark their scripts. 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 in that course.

Another common problem was that the ability range of Short Course entrants tended to be more limited than that of the Full Course with a number of the candidates being frequently less motivated. Centres expected, nevertheless, to achieve a full mark range and, in some cases, ended up marking candidates and not work, giving marks for effort in exceptional circumstances.

Teacher-led enquiries were by far the most common format. The range of topics submitted was varied, the most popular theme being urban studies with CBD investigations, shopping hierarchies, tourism and traffic being dominant. This is not surprising as, in most cases, the urban environment provides a range of topics that are very accessible for most candidates and gives easy opportunities for them to re-visit the sites. As expected, a number of centres opted for a purely physical study, with rivers and coastlines by far the most popular. Such centres relied upon group-generated fieldwork data and provided no real opportunity for candidates to focus their approach in a more meaningful and useful way. Such teacher-led enquiries, however, should enable candidates to progress further and show their own initiative. This aspect was all too often ignored or forgotten.

There were a few examples where 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 and teachers selecting the data presentation techniques to be used with little input from

the candidate. As a result, only in the data interpretation and evaluation sections could the candidate's true ability be assessed.

Finally, one interesting aspect of the Short Course is the variety of centres involved, not only in terms of the number of candidates entered but also in respect of the type of institutions involved. It is encouraging to report that a large number of these centres obviously made use of the Coursework Advisers or attended AQA training sessions and/or Standardisation meetings. The quality of enquiries produced and the detailed annotation that accompanied some of this work suggests that the advice they received and the materials they were given were put to great effect in creating new coursework topics or adapting existing coursework to the new guidelines.

Administration

There is no doubt that this year there were problems regarding administration that were in some cases beyond the control of the centres. The fact that it was the first year of a new Specification; the late allocation of moderators to some centres and the supply of the correct documentation; the completion of new proforma sheets and new sampling procedures for some, all combined to make it a difficult start for some centres and, indeed, some moderators. The whole process was further complicated and prolonged by the very late arrival of scripts from some centres.

On a more positive note, AQA moderators were a little less frustrated than in previous years in that centres knew exactly the specific sample to send. The new sampling procedure worked well and made sure that the number and composition of the sample sent from the centre was correct in the majority of cases.

The detailed attention needed to efficiently negotiate the administrative process cannot be overstated. Whilst some centres were quite superb in all aspects of administration and justifiably deserve credit, others failed to meet even the basic requirements and thus delayed the whole moderation process. The following points need to be stressed:

Centres with **20 or fewer candidates**, should ensure that **all** candidates work is sent together, and that the **second** and **third** copies of the **Centre Mark Sheets** (or an EDI 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 **second** and **third** 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 which meant a photocopy or note had to be made by the moderator of the sample requested as well as asking the centre to return a copy of the CMS). The moderator will **return the third 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. In one or two cases, centres were using out of date proformas and, as a result, did not provide all the information required. **The Centre Declaration Sheet should also accompany the sample.**

Some coursework is being 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.

The work should be submitted in simple plastic or manila folders and **not in hard back files or ring binders** and so reduce the cost of postage.

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 is, within the work, elements that are indeed creditworthy. If a candidate has submitted no work or has withdrawn then ‘X’ should be encoded.

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. However, a minority of centres provided only limited evidence that internal assessment had 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 unhelpful comments scattered throughout the work that bore no relation to the content or the mark scheme. These centres need to be reminded **that annotation is a requirement of the GCSE Mandatory Code of Practice**. 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.

MARKING CRITERIA

Many centres successfully applied the new criteria. In the majority of cases, the centre’s marks were within tolerance, with centres identifying the ‘triggers’ required to access the different levels and applying the marking criteria in a uniform manner across the whole department. Where centres were outside the tolerance, a common trend was for centres to either overmark at the top end of the mark range or undermark at the bottom. There were, however, a number of centres who had insufficient understanding of what was required and no appreciation of the ‘triggers’ necessary to move a candidate from one level to another.

Applied Understanding

In the majority of cases, enquiries were well organised, based on a single, clear, manageable hypothesis, underpinned by a sound 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 then went on, through description and explanation to clearly identify the key concept that was then constantly referred to throughout the work.

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.

In the weaker enquiries, many of the hypotheses were inappropriate, poorly structured or over-ambitious, in that they involved a range of concepts, and, as a result, failed to set an effective agenda for an enquiry. Locating the study area involved basic statements and simplified maps that were badly drawn and lacked the normal conventions. Understanding was delivered through background information, scene setting or a series of chapters headed 'theory'. In each case, the theoretical basis of the work was compartmentalised with little cross-referencing or application to the data collected.

In the very weakest work, it was difficult to identify the purpose of the enquiry or the link to the taught Specification, there being no clearly stated question, issue or hypothesis. (Evidence would suggest that there was some misunderstanding by candidates and centres regarding the meaning of the term 'hypothesis'). In a few extreme cases, it was also impossible to even locate the study area. Some candidates packed their work with irrelevant and unnecessary information, taken from popular core textbooks or even downloaded from the Internet. Throughout the enquiry, no links were made to this material and generally it was never referred to.

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 concept was not clearly identified and was 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.

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 must be remembered, 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. In one or two instances, candidates failed to find the right balance, spending most of their time and energy describing the location whilst neglecting the concepts underpinning the work.

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.

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 primary data collection methods that were to be used in the investigation. Access to Level 3 marks, however, proved to be a little more difficult even for the higher ability candidates.

The major ‘triggers’ to accessing Level 3 marks in this section are the use of three data collection techniques and evidence of originality and initiative which has been justified. 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. ‘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.

It must be stressed that 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. Equally, it is important to remember that originality and initiative are not the only criteria required for Level 3 Methodology marks. For example, a number of potential Level 3 candidates often relied too heavily on a narrow range of data usually only collected by means of a questionnaire. Some failed to justify their techniques, preferring to spend most of their time discussing the advantages and disadvantages of each technique or the merits of different sampling procedures.

Using less than three techniques, an inadequate sample size, failure to explain the rationale behind the hypothesis or, more likely, a detailed description of how the techniques were carried out without any explanation of why those particular techniques were used, would all prohibit progression into the higher level, even if the candidate had produced an individual piece of work.

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.

One successful method used by some centres to make sure that their candidates covered all the criteria in this section, was to produce a methodology table. The table covered the what, when, how and why of the methods used. There was also a section for each candidate to describe their own individual contribution. This approach tends to work well for the lower ability candidates, but, for the higher ability, the table, in most cases, does not provide enough detailed information for access to Level 3.

It must also be stressed that marks are not awarded in this section for a list of data collection methods per se. 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 weaker 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

Centres are to be congratulated on the quality of work produced in this section and the wide range of techniques and skills exhibited by their candidates. In many cases, the presentation techniques showed flair and imagination, as well as fulfilling the criteria, allowing access to Level 3 marks.

It was common, however, for this section to be overmarked. Even when appropriate techniques were used, a great number of candidates failed to achieve Level 3 as the techniques chosen lacked complexity. These centres were confusing ‘attractive’ with ‘more complex’ so Level 3 was frequently being awarded for what were basic techniques.

To access Level 3 marks, there has to be evidence of data presentation of three ‘more complex’ techniques being used. This would appear to be a significant increase in the demands made on the candidates when compared to the Level 2 criteria. This, however, is not necessarily the case with centres tending to overestimate the degree of complexity required to access this higher level. The goal of ‘more complex’ is achievable because with care, accuracy and a little elaboration, the majority of techniques have the potential to access Level 3. The annotation of photographs, for example, is a presentation skill that is seen at all levels. A low level of labelling might see the candidate only giving the photograph a title; at an intermediate level the candidate might indicate relevant features, and at the highest level, the candidate will interpret those features. The same progression can be identified for most presentation techniques.

It is worth stressing that 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.

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. The type and quality of data collected determines the range of presentation techniques that can be used. Centres and candidates should ensure, at the planning stage, that the data produced is suitable for being represented by higher order skills.

The quality of written communication was generally quite pleasing with the majority of candidates being able to express themselves with reasonable accuracy. The use of Spellcheck in the wordprocessed enquiries benefited some candidates.

Data Interpretation

This section proved to be a useful discriminator. The majority of 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, demonstrate links between the data sets, and draw 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 and thus 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 weaker 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 overcredited 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 was some 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 appeared to have an 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 proved to be the weakest element. For example, candidates often failed to suggest why their conclusions, however valid, may be a reflection of the particular location and time when the enquiry was undertaken and so cannot be considered applicable in the wider context.

Evaluation presented a problem for some centres with candidates having a tendency to write in congratulatory terms rather than highlighting limitations. Any evaluation statements tended to be vague and generic rather than detailed and specific to the enquiry. 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.

In the most effective enquiries, candidates, rather than just discussing in detail the three components of the criteria separately, identified the fact that poorly/faulty methodology led to inaccurate results and that conclusions based upon such results had, therefore, questionable validity.

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.

Summary

The annual report, by design, records this year’s findings and gives guidance as to how to avoid future pitfalls. It would be an injustice to view the document as purely negative comment. Public recognition should go to all fellow hardworking committed Geography teachers who have tackled the new Specification with professionalism. In the majority of cases, coursework enquiries were worthy of great merit, testament to the youngsters’ hard work and the teachers who guide them.

Mark Ranges 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	26.6	11.4
3031/1F Paper 1	70	104	60.1	15.9
3031/2F Paper 2	75	91	51.6	12.8
Foundation tier overall 3031/F	--	260	138.3	33.2

		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 Paper 1 boundary mark	raw	70	50	43	37	31	25
	scaled	104	74	64	55	46	37
3031/2F Paper 2 boundary mark	raw	75	51	45	39	33	27
	scaled	91	62	55	47	40	33
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		260	163	141	120	99	78

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3031/C	30	65	45.7	11.7
3031/1H Paper 1	70	104	67.7	14.2
3031/2H Paper 2	75	91	60.3	12.8
Higher tier overall 3031/H	--	260	173.8	32.7

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D
3031/C boundary mark	raw	30	27	23	19	15	12
	scaled	65	58	50	41	33	26
3031/1H Paper 1 boundary mark	raw	70	58	50	42	35	29
	scaled	104	86	74	62	52	43
3031/2H Paper 2 boundary mark	raw	75	63	54	45	37	31
	scaled	91	76	66	55	45	38
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		260	210	186	157	129	107

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier – (26754 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	23.8	47.5	68.8	83.6	92.8

Higher tier – (39887 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D
Cumulative %	14.4	37.6	69.5	90.4	97.3

Overall (66641 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	8.6	22.5	41.6	63.7	77.3	86.6	92.6	96.3

Short Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3036/C	30	30	11.2	4.7
3036/F	70	90	47.7	12.9
Foundation tier overall 3036/F	--	120	58.9	15.5

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3036/C boundary mark	raw	30	15	12	9	7	5
	scaled	30	15	12	9	6	3
3036/F boundary mark	raw	70	50	44	39	34	29
	scaled	90	64	57	50	44	37
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		120	76	67	59	51	43

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3036/C	30	30	18.6	5.2
3036/H	70	90	54.4	11.7
Higher tier overall 3036/H	--	120	73.0	14.6

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D
3036/C boundary mark	Raw	30	27	23	19	15	12
	scaled	30	27	23	19	15	12
3036/H boundary mark	raw	70	57	51	45	39	28
	scaled	90	73	66	58	50	38
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		120	97	86	75	65	48

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (735 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	12.5	29.3	47.1	64.9	79.6

Higher tier (437 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D
Cumulative %	5.9	21.3	49.9	71.6	92.9

Overall (1172 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	2.2	7.9	18.6	34.6	53.0	65.5	76.7	85.9

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum (scaled) mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade. Although component grade boundaries are provided, these are advisory. Candidates' final grades depend only on their total marks for the subject.

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).

