



General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography 3031

Geography 3036 (Short Course)

Specification A

Examiners' Report

2005 examination – June series

- 3031 (Full Course)
- 3036 (Short Course)

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

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.

Contents

Specification A 3031 (Full Course)

	Page No.
General	5
3031/1F	6
3031/1H	10
3031/2F	13
3031/2H	17

Specification A 3036 (Short Course)

	Page No.
3036/F	22
3036/H	25

Coursework

3031/C	28
3036/C	36

This page has been left intentionally blank

Foundation Tier

Paper 1 - 3031/1F

General

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

There were few rubric infringements on the higher tier and an apparent reduction on the foundation tier. Congratulations to centres who have responded to advice in previous reports to discourage candidates from attempting all of the questions where choice exists.

The detail on the geography will follow in the reports for individual components but here it would appear appropriate to comment on the Quality of Written Communication (QWC), 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 interlinked 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. Overall, however, literacy and the legibility of handwriting would appear to be problematical for a number of candidates particularly on the Foundation Tier. Weak expression of geographical ideas, limited use of geographical vocabulary and the illegibility of handwriting all mitigate against candidates being able to access more than the most basic of marks in the mark scheme.

The AQA Specification A does not prescribe specific case studies for centres to deliver leaving the choice to the professional judgement of teachers' in centres in relation to their own location and individual specialisms and resources. The impact of this is that questions targeting case studies tend to ask 'for one or more examples' or 'for an area you have studied'. Candidates should be 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. Candidates who do not give any examples or case studies in questions that require them are not automatically given zero. They can usually access the marks in Level 1 and sometimes in Level 2 depending upon the other questions demands. Candidates should always be encouraged to answer a question even if they feel unable to answer all of its requirements.

The Foundation Tier paper in 2005 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 to questions 7, 9 and 10. The time allowed for this examination was sufficient and the vast majority of the candidates completing all the required questions. Rubric infringements seemed to have reduced this year although there is still a minority of candidates who attempt more than three questions in Section B.

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 less able candidates made little attempt to answer questions in Section A but in general candidates did try to answer all these compulsory questions.

Question 1

In 1(a) most candidates scored the mark, with only a few offering a six figure Grid Reference instead of a four or reversing the figures. In part (b) most candidates identified the golf course although a significant number wrote club house the symbol for which was not at the reference given. In part (c) the range of possible answers provided was incredible – into 6 figures and some also failed to adhere to the request to give their answer 'to the nearest whole kilometre'. Part (d) proved problematical for some, the most common error being 100 metres. Candidates did not appear as confident with these map interpretation skills as they have been in the past. Part (e) was generally well done although the most common errors were in the last sentence where candidates selected 'sloping' and 'villages' in preference for the correct answers 'flat' and 'lakes'. The description of land uses in part (f) was effectively done by many who went beyond the basic list and either gave locations within the square e.g. by using compass directions or by linking different land uses. However, it was disappointing that so many reversed the northings and eastings and so attempted to describe the land uses of an incorrect square.

Question 2

In question 2(a) most candidates correctly identified X, Y and Z although there were a number of incorrect responses where it was clear that the areas on the aerial photograph had not been recognised on the OS map extract. Part (b) proved demanding for some who could only comment that it belonged to a farmer rather than recognising the presence of the River Thames and its flood plain and hence the likelihood of a flooding risk. The majority of candidates gained at least one mark in part (c) for recognising the green fields/leaves on the trees etc although the second mark was often lost due to comments about the weather or the sky being clear etc which could just as easily apply in any season.

Question 3

In part (a) most candidates responded correctly completing the shading of the two areas on the choropleth map although a significant minority failed to read the key adequately and did not select the correct type of shading for the areas given. A few candidates failed to gain any marks as a result of poor execution of the skill. They often failed to shade in at least 50% of the area or superimposed different types of shading without making it clear which was intended. Hedging their bets gains no marks!

Part (b) was well done by many but inaccurate use of English caused problems for others. They saw the distribution as discrete numbers rather than percentages, inaccurately describing the map, as for example, there being more people living in Park and Redlands. The most effective answers recognised the decline in percentage moving away from the east and centre, grouped together similar areas and quoted actual percentages in their answers.

Section B**Question 4**

This question remains very popular amongst centres and students. Part (a)(i) was accurately answered by most candidates though many continued to describe the distribution in (a)(ii) even copying the statements from part (i) rather than explaining the distribution in terms of plate boundaries as requested. In part (b)(i) a significant majority gained (maximum marks). The most common error was not to put a mark or an arrow for their labels, although, provided the focus label was written fully inside the smallest shock wave, the mark was awarded. In other cases, the labels were reversed and a small minority were totally inaccurate with the labels variously positioned amongst cows or the urban area. In (b)(ii) some failed to recognise the significance of the urban area on Figure 5 and were convinced that greatest loss of life would occur at the epicentre. Others variously placed the letter D within the Earth's crust or near the cows. Part (b)(iii) was generally well done and those candidates who had indicated the epicentre for part (ii) were able to access one mark here for reference to it being the area where shock waves were strongest. Part (c) was well done by many with very effective use made of case studies such as Montserrat, Kobe and Merapi. Less successful case study choices were Mount St Helens where accompanying information was often inaccurate and Afghanistan. Fewer candidates (than expected, bearing in mind its recent occurrence) gave very effective answers using the Indian Ocean Tsunami as an example. The greatest source of error in this question was from candidates who confined their answers to causes and effects rather than responses or who were unable to recall an example they had studied.

Question 5

This was a less popular question but answered well by the majority who attempted it. Part (a) scored well although the most common errors were with statements one and three. In part (b) a large number of candidates did not know the accurate location of the scarp and dip slope but they were nevertheless able to utilise Figure 6 to give some basic reasons for the location of the village. Better answers developed the reasons giving clear statements and achieving Level 2. In part (c)(i) few were adept at describing the features from the photograph although they seemed happier in (c)(ii) where the basic disadvantages of quarrying were well known; surprisingly few effectively developed these basic points to gain additional marks.

Question 6

This question was a popular choice amongst candidates and many answered to good effect. There were few difficulties with (a)(i) and (a)(ii) although predictably some were confused and reversed the labelling. In (a)(iii) most achieved the mark for the correct cross-sectional shape although again some were convinced of the reverse situation in the third shape provided. In (a)(iv) many candidates achieved 2 marks by correctly linking the processes to the feature. Weaker responses could not go beyond erosion and deposition provided for them on Figure 8 and in some cases they muddled the features to which the process applied. In part (b) candidates mostly gained the full three marks. Errors tended to be confined to 'rising the height of levees' which many thought was an example of soft engineering. In (c)(i) many correctly used the key to place the grazing land but the array of alternatives provided was unbelievable with some even trying to name a place off the OS map extract. In (c)(ii) most gained a mark for a comment about avoiding flooding but few could develop their answers sufficiently for the award of the 3 marks.

Question 7

This question was not particularly popular but answered well by candidates from centres where this has been taught. In part (a) most candidates scored the full 3 marks for recognising the erosional and depositional landforms. In (b)(i) most recognised the terminal moraine correctly. In (b)(ii) answers were predictably varied in the knowledge and understanding of the processes and sequence involved. Some candidates were also confused as to the appropriateness of the different processes to the formation of their chosen moraine. In (b)(iii) few really effective answers were given to describe boulder clay although many were able to gain a mark by reference to its involvement in glacial processes of erosion, transport or deposition. Most candidates achieved maximum marks in part (c)(i) although the array of names for the activity was bewildering. In (c)(ii) many candidates gained both marks but the quality of answers rarely went beyond 'jobs' and 'money'. In (c)(iii) candidates often gave more than one disadvantage rather than developing an idea for one disadvantage, which the question demanded. Also, many candidates still talk in only vague terms about pollution or damaging/destroying the land.

Question 8

This was extremely popular and elicited a full range of responses from the candidates. Part (a) scored well with the majority of candidates gaining maximum marks. There were some excellent sketches and this skill seems to have improved in recent years. In (b)(ii) most could recognise and label the arch and stack although some were reluctant to use an arrow or other means to show precisely the area they were referring to. Weaker sketches tended not to go beyond the foreground arch, which led to inaccurate labelling of the stack as one of the supporting pillars for the arch. In (b)(iii) the best responses correctly recognised the sequence that may occur i.e. arch-stack-stump and integrated the various processes that would be at work. In (c)(i) the majority could name the type of defence although the second mark eluded some as they were sidetracked into explaining how it would work, the remit of part (ii). In (b)(ii) most could achieve a mark for the idea of the wall absorbing the wave energy but effective answers gaining the full 2 marks were rare.

Question 9

Sadly, this question remains relatively unpopular although some good responses were seen. Unfortunately, there were also some very weak answers often written by candidates committing rubric errors. Section (a)(i) caused candidates few problems although many lacked rigour in interpreting Figure 14. For example, 13C was frequently quoted in (a)(i) when a more accurate answer would be 12-13C. In (a)(ii) candidates often gave the highest temperature rather than the location as requested and in (a)(iii) the range was rarely worked out as 4 or 5C. Question (a)(iv) proved a good discriminator with responses varying from the good to the weak. Effective answers commented on distance from the equator, the surfaces being heated and the distance rays needed to travel through the atmosphere. Weaker answers tended to only mention distance from the equator. In part (b)(ii) answers were effective where candidates had a secure example to use but many vague references were made to Africa and Asia. Part (b)(ii) was generally well understood and generated some quality answers. In some cases however, answers were vague and did not go much beyond more money and equipment in MEDCs.

Question 10

This question, while more popular than question 9, is not as popular as some others such as coasts and rivers. Part (a)(i) was generally correctly completed by candidates although an amazing number thought coniferous forest grows in areas where the climate is hot and wet. Part (a)(ii) caused few problems, the knowledge was well known and mostly accurately transmitted. Part (a)(iii) was more demanding and the full range of answers was seen. Some were excellent with candidates showing good knowledge of podsols while in others the 'ground frozen all year' was a common response having been lifted from Figure 16 and incorrectly applied to all of the soil in coniferous forest areas. The satellite photograph resource proved a useful prompt in this question and in (b)(i) large numbers of candidates gained full marks although others did not make the connection between the areas deforested and urbanised and the rivers/roads or were sidetracked into explaining deforestation. Part (b)(ii) proved an effective discriminator. In (b)(iii) few candidates gained maximum marks. Rarely could they go beyond saying 'plant more trees'.

Higher Tier

Paper 1 - 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 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. In questions requiring a sketch a minority of candidates responded 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 question. Centres should be congratulated as most candidates had been well prepared for the examination and had 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 candidates were inaccurate and a surprising number failed to locate the correct grid square. Part (b) was generally accurate for the majority although answers did range from 2.75km to over 500kms and some did not recognise the significance of 'to the nearest whole kilometre'. Part (c) proved to be an effective discriminator. Maximum marks were gained with an effective comparison of relief and land use. Many candidates achieved three marks for a direct comparison of relief while only a few were able to adequately compare land use. Weaker answers merely listed the land uses inserting whereas or however in between; at Higher Tier candidates are expected to produce more effective comments on relief than just 'flat' or 'hilly' and to use heights or other qualifying statements.

Question 2

The majority of candidates accurately completed part (a) and were adept in using the aerial photograph alongside the OS map extract. In (b) candidates were less familiar with the concept of shape of settlement and answers frequently strayed away from the focus of the question into urban morphology, road pattern or land use. Alternatively map interpretation skills need further development; several candidates for example, noted that the northern expansion was restricted by the 'mountainous' terrain. This question proved demanding but it was also apparent that some centres may not have adequately prepared candidates for this type of question. The requirements for 'shape' is clearly stated in the skills list in the specification and does not indeed appear as part of the settlement unit.

Question 3

The vast majority of candidates scored the maximum in parts (a) and (b) effectively completing the choropleth map. The most common errors were to include blank shading for the lowest values in the key or to create a key in which the shading did not demonstrate an increase in density. Part (c) was also generally well answered although some candidates confused their compass directions and weak expression meant that others did not see the map as one of density of percentages but that more people lived in Park and Redlands etc.

Section B

Question 4

This question remains very popular amongst centres and students. In part (a) the majority of candidates gained full marks describing and explaining the distribution of earthquakes however a significant number often only did one or the other with sufficient clarity for low Level 2 and 3 marks. Part (b)(i) and (b)(ii) were generally well done although inevitably some reversed the focus and epicentre in (b)(i) and (b)(ii); some failed to recognise the significance of the urban area on Figure 5 and were convinced that greatest loss of life would occur at the epicentre. Part (c) was well done by many with very effective use made of case studies such as Montserrat, Kobe and Merapi with explicit references made to both long and short term responses. Less successful case study choices were Mount St Helens where accompanying information was often inaccurate and Afghanistan. Fewer candidates (than expected, bearing in mind its recent occurrence) gave very effective answers using the Indian Ocean Tsunami as an example. The greatest source of error in this question was from candidates who confined their answers to causes and effects rather than responses.

Question 5

This was a less popular question but answered well by the majority who attempted it. Part (a) scored well although a large number of candidates struggled to achieve the full three marks. In part (b) a surprising number of candidates did not know the accurate location of the scarp and dip slope but they were nevertheless able to utilise Figure 6 to give some basic reasons for the location of the village. Better answers developed the reasons giving clear statements and achieving Level 2. In part (c) the basic economic and environmental impacts of quarrying were well known but few effectively developed these basic points and provided adequate detail for the award of Level 3 marks.

Question 6

This question was a popular choice amongst candidates and many answered to good effect. There were few difficulties with (a)(i) and in (a)(ii) most achieved the mark for the correct cross-sectional shape. The requirement to label proved more demanding and variable with many content to merely copy across the deposition and erosion labels from Figure 8 and not indicate features such as river cliff/slip off slope/deeper water/faster current etc. In (a)(iii) most candidates had good knowledge of the processes at work but were less successful in linking these to the features being produced. In part (b) candidates were not always clear about 'soft management strategies' although most did attempt the definition in (b)(i). In part (b)(ii) most candidates achieved at least Level 2 with the effective description of the flood plain zoning shown on Figure 9; candidates achieving Level 3 showed good understanding of sustainability and its application in this context.

Question 7

This question was not particularly popular but answered well by candidates from centres where this has been taught. In part (a)(i) few really good descriptions of boulder clay were given although many were able to gain a mark by reference to its involvement in the glacial processes of erosion, transport or deposition. Answers to part (b) were predictably varied in the knowledge and understanding of the processes and sequence involved. Some candidates were also confused as to the appropriateness of the different processes to the formation of their chosen moraine. Most candidates achieved maximum marks in part (c)(i) although the array of names for the activity was bewildering. In (c)(ii) many candidates confined their answers to the actual activity shown on Figure 11 although the most effective answers recognised that they could go beyond Figure 11 and gave some excellent case study

information from examples studied in the classroom. Overall, this part of the question was well done although less effective answers continue to be very general talking about pollution or damaging/destroying the land. In addition some did not recognise the significance of the 'conversation groups' and wandered into second homes etc.

Question 8

This was extremely popular and elicited a full range of responses from the candidates. Part (a)(i) scored well with the majority of candidates gaining maximum marks. There were some excellent sketches and this skill seems to have improved in recent years. In (a)(ii) the best responses correctly recognised the various sequences that may occur such as cave-arch-stack-stump or cliff retreat leading to the formation of wave cut platforms and integrated the various processes that would be at work. More commonly, candidates confined themselves to stack formation without seeing the wider picture as depicted by Figure 11 or adequately explaining the operation of the processes. In (b)(i) the majority could name the type of defence although the second mark eluded some as they were sidetracked into explaining how it would work, the remit of part (ii). In (b)(ii) most could achieve a mark for the idea of the wall absorbing the wave energy but effective answers gaining the full 3 marks were rare.

Question 9

Sadly, this question remains relatively unpopular 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 explained the pattern in terms of latitude in July but were less good at distance from the sea and maritime effect for the January pattern. In part (b)(i) answers were effective where candidates had a secure example to use but many vague references were made to Africa and Asia. Part (b)(ii) was generally well understood and generated some quality answers. In some cases however, answers were vague and did not go much beyond more money and equipment in MEDCs.

Question 10

This question, while more popular than question 9, is not as popular as some others such as coasts and rivers. Part (a)(i) caused few problems, the knowledge was well known and mostly accurately transmitted. Part (a)(ii) was more demanding and the full range of answers was seen. Some were excellent with candidates showing detailed knowledge of depths, horizons, colours and leaching while in others the ground frozen all year was a common response having been lifted from Figure 16 and incorrectly applied to all of the soil in coniferous forest areas. The satellite photograph resource proved a useful prompt in this question and in (b)(i) large numbers of candidates gained full marks although others did not make the connection between the areas deforested and urbanised and the rivers/roads or were sidetracked into explaining deforestation. Part (b)(ii) proved an effective discriminator and few candidates achieved Level 3 marks. Few candidates were able to go much beyond comments about replanting or deforestation for paper and a need for recycling. There appeared to be much confusion about the different uses of hardwoods and softwoods and the use of case study information would have added the necessary level of detail to the solution. In addition, 'giving your views' was ignored by many candidates in their answers.

Foundation Tier

Paper 2 - 3031/2F

General

The paper proved accessible to the pupils entered for this tier. It allowed the less able candidates to gain marks but at the same time allowed the more able to expand and show their knowledge. There were relatively few very high marks, which suggests that some candidates entered for the Higher Tier would have been better suited to the Foundation Tier. There were papers with rubric offences but these tended to be from the less able candidates or were centre specific. This last point might suggest that the centre may be encouraging the candidates to try all questions. Centres should realise that this is counter productive. In general, the skills questions were well done and were an improvement on previous years. On the other hand the questions requiring knowledge, particularly case study exemplification, were poorly done. Questions requiring completion of boxes were well answered suggesting that literary weaknesses often work against candidates showing their geographical knowledge and understanding to the best of their ability. Centres are reminded that the quality of written communication (QWC) is assessed on each levels marked response. While the geographical content of the answer determines the level the answer is awarded, the standard of the written English is used to fine-tune the mark within the level. Poor literary skills can therefore have a detrimental effect on the candidate's final mark. There were a number of parts of questions where two marks were available but where candidates only rarely achieved more than one mark. Centres should encourage candidates to take notice of mark allocations. Candidates should recognise that the way to achieve a Level 2 response is to give linked or developed statements. They seem very reluctant to qualify their comments or to follow up the points made with 'why', which would have given them many more marks. Centres should realise that if the examiner wants to say 'so what' after reading a candidate's answer they have not gone beyond a Level 1 basic response. Examination technique is still not good and candidates are not doing themselves justice as a result.

Section A

There was no significant difference in the marks gained in the two questions and they were both equally popular.

Question 1

Very few candidates could define population density accurately; most saw it as the number or amount of people without any reference to a unit area. Part (a)(ii) was generally answered correctly. The demographic transition questions proved good discriminators although few candidates knew the development of the model to stage 5. Many merely continued stage 4, ignored the key, or drew the lines one up and the other down! Parts (c)(i-iii) were generally answered well, although there was the misconception that the narrow top of the pyramid was the result of a low or falling death rate rather than the opposite. Part (c)(iv) was not done well. Many candidates answered this question in terms of population growth rather than structure. This question was seen as an opportunity for them to bring in their knowledge of China's one child policy – an area of the specification they know very well, even if it was irrelevant to this question.

Question 2

The definition of ‘site’ proved difficult and candidates showed they had not appreciated the difference between the site and the situation of a settlement. The map was used poorly by many candidates, with many misunderstanding the terms wet and dry points. Most candidates recognised why defence is less important as a siting factor, although some considered that flooding was no longer a problem at the chosen site. In part (a) most candidates could appreciate the advantage of settlement B’s accessibility but few recognised the significance of its coastal location and therefore its potential as a port, fishing port or tourist resort. The definition of ‘Urban zone’ was beyond most candidates. They did not appreciate that the work that they had done on urban morphology was based on the different land uses found within a settlement. They coped well in the cloze exercise in part (b)(ii). The graphical skills required in (c)(i) and (ii) did not present any difficulty and it was pleasing to see that most candidates could recognise the generally positive correlation shown by the graph. Some candidates even went as far as to comment on the exceptions to the general pattern. The final part caused as much difficulty as the equivalent part of question 1. Candidates were unable to discuss specific policies to control urban sprawl. Very few responses were above a basic Level 1. Even when a ‘Green Belt’ was quoted, they did not extend their answer to provide the required linked statements. Most were writing about urban sprawl in terms of population or traffic rather than sprawl

Section B

Candidates continue to find this section more testing than the other two, with the question chosen frequently gaining the lowest mark of the three attempted. This was despite the conscious attempt to make it a more accessible mark.

Question 3

Although subsistence farming is generally, well understood, intensive farming is a concept that many candidates find difficult. Those who had some idea about intensive mostly suggested that the small area was the significant clue. Most candidates got to the top of Level 1 or bottom of Level 2 in part (b) although their understanding of the actual data (in terms of units of measurement and even the title of the two graphs) was often questionable. Many misinterpreted the meaning of the bar graph and thought it was the percentage of cropland rather than the percentage of High Yielding Varieties of wheat. Where manipulation of the figures was attempted, which would have allowed credit at Level 2, it was sometimes spoiled by weak arithmetic. The completion of the table in (c)(i) did not cause any difficulty. Part (c)(ii) was not always read as carefully as it should have been, as the answers often did not indicate the advantage of the modern farming method *to the farmer*. Candidates achieved Level 1 without difficulty in part (c)(iii) by often merely giving the opposite to the methods in Figure 10. There was a lack of clarity or links and the answer often was just a list of ideas or non-realistic suggestions. There were few actual schemes discussed. There were however, some exceptions where candidates provided a fluent and detailed account of organic farming and free-range methods.

Question 4

Candidates were more familiar with the concept of ‘secondary industry’ compared to the equivalent section in question 3, however since this question has been very common over the last few years, generally, the results were disappointing. Candidates could generally achieve something in answering parts (b)(i) and (ii) but there were perhaps fewer who manipulated the figures or recognised trends than in the equivalent part on the agriculture question. More candidates therefore remained in Level 1. NICs are a section of the specification that does not appear to be known well. Most candidates read part (iii) as if it referred to LEDCs in general rather than the newly industrialising countries. Cheap labour was the almost unanimous

response. This was also given as the answer to part (c)(ii). Globalisation was usually seen as meaning the same as 'world'. The need for examples meant that many candidates remained in Level 1 in part (c)(iv). It is therefore important that centres remind candidates to read all command instructions very carefully. Several tried to use the Samsung example unconvincingly, while most gave a general account of low wages, pollution and safety issues. There were however some excellent accounts of the Bhopal tragedy. Where names of firms or locations were given they were often as an add on rather than an integral part of the answer. There were some candidates who interpreted the question as asking for the disadvantages of development to LEDCs, rather than industry.

Section C

There did not seem to be much variation in the popularity of the two questions and neither appeared to be more difficult than the other.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to respond appropriately to Figure 14 although some gave very vague generalisations such as pollution, overcrowding and culture without any qualification. This year's candidates have the usual preoccupation with litter. A significant minority of candidates appear to regard nightclubs and shops as the only tourist facilities likely to attract tourist to a city, despite the fact neither could be seen in the photograph. This probably reflects the age and interests of the candidates. There were some case studies used in part (a)(iv), although the attractions were usually very vague and generalised. Some scripts gave a general description of the advantages of visiting Britain as a whole and some ventured into an account of the problems involved. There were too many lists of attractions. The command word 'explain' and the mark allocation should have indicated to candidates that linked or development statements were required. Examination technique is important in questions of this type. Candidates found it difficult to obtain two marks in part (b)(i). They never stated 'useful to people' and concentrated on 'can't be re-used'. In (b)(iii) the word 'increasing' was frequently ignored. The finite nature of the resources and the fact that they were running out was the usual answer. Candidates may have panicked and thought that they had to confine their answer to the resources in Antarctica. This threw them off the demands of the question, and so they did not realise that it was asking them about the increasing demand for resources. In part (c)(ii) there was evidence of candidates failing to read the question and obey the command words so the answers were of a general nature and did not address 'how the aim can be achieved'. The candidates who chose A seem to have more success than the other three. Option D lead to some misinterpretation.

Question 6

Candidates recognised the work done by the charity on Figure 16 as long-term aid, but many of the reasons given were restricted to the benefits of the cow. The second mark proved more difficult as it was restricted to an understanding of how the money gained from the cow could be used for other activities or how it led to the development of transferable skills. In (a)(iii) there were many simple statements concentrating on what the LEDCs have not got with little attempt at explanation. It unfortunately revealed much about the stereotypical view of LEDCs which still prevails. The evidence of (a)(iv) shows there is still frequent confusion between aid and loans. The need to repay aid was far too often seen as a major disadvantage. The difficulty with definitions was seen again in (b)(i) with few candidates recognising that the two marks allocated to this question meant there was a need to consider both environment and hazard. Many got one mark here but it was not always for the same part. The true/false questions were generally answered well. The one that was most often incorrect was the last one. Did candidates answer this without studying the map and assumed that all tropical storms are only found in the Tropics? Few candidates made the link between the environmental hazard and development in part (b)(iii). Most made simple statements

concerned with destruction and death. Candidates at this level often confuse trade and aid and so gave similar answers in (c)(i) to the one on aid in part (a)(iv); the concept of international trade is not an easy one. Option B was the most poorly done in (c)(ii) with A and C scoring most highly. Again, difficulties with written English meant candidates often could not do themselves justice in this final section. The outcomes were slightly better than the equivalent part of question 5 perhaps because the stimulus materials provided stronger clues.

Higher Tier

Paper 2 - 3031/2H

General

The paper proved to be a good discriminator, although there was concern expressed this year that a significant number of candidates may have been entered for the wrong tier. There were some very good answers and some candidates felt themselves confined by the number of lines. On the other hand there was plenty of evidence of candidates wasting time and space by rewriting the question. Centres should remind candidates that the quality of the written communication (QWC) is considered when the level marked questions are assessed. While the standard of the geographical content of an answer remains uppermost, examiners are required to find tune the mark awarded within the level by considering the English. A common mistake, apart from spelling is the use of words like 'to, too and two' 'affect, effect' 'there, their' 'are, is'. Sometimes, sentence construction was non-existent. The use of command words is still an issue, with candidates frequently not distinguishing between describe and explain. Similarly, candidates need to read questions relating to some kind of stimulus very carefully in order to ascertain whether the answer needs to be derived entirely from the stimulus or whether they have the opportunity to use their own knowledge. For a candidate to be considered for the award of a Level 3 it is important that all parts of the questions have been answered in detail. Are they required to describe and explain? Is there a need for more than one advantage or disadvantage if the question is worded in the plural? Is there a specific need for the use of a case study? The generic description of a Level 3 answer is given as 'knowledge of accurate information appropriately contextualised and/or at the correct scale and detailed understanding, supported by relevant evidence and exemplars'. Centres should realise that the use of a detailed case study exemplar would fit these requirements admirably. Candidates can therefore make use of their case studies even if one is not specifically asked for in a question.

It is disappointing that despite the emphasis on Citizenship in schools, there is still a simplistic stereotypical view of LEDCs. Many candidates view LEDCs as places where inhabitants have no skills, who are poor and who are foolish because they choose to live where life is not possible. This is particularly true of Africa, still far too frequently seen as a country, which is uniformly arid.

As in previous years, most centres concentrate on just three of the six topics.

Section A

The two questions were answered in reasonably equal numbers and equally well with neither seeming easier.

Question 1

In general, the grasp of definitions was poor. In (a)(i) many included 'amount of people' without making reference to a unit area. The mark allocation should have given the candidates a clue that there were two distinct parts to the answer. In part (a)(ii) remarkably few candidates gained full marks by making the link between figures 1(a) and 1(b) explicit and left the reasons to speak for themselves. At worst the answers were little more than descriptions of the maps. The question about the sparsely populated area of the Peak District was not answered with any clarity. Part (b) produced a very wide range of answers. For

those who understood the Demographic Transition Model it was a very straightforward question, but if they got the birth and death rates the wrong way around it led to all kinds of confusion. In part (b)(iv) there was a need for the birth rate and the death rate to be related to the changes in national increase and this was not always done. Knowledge of stage 5 appeared to be centre-specific. There were many answers to part (v) which appeared to be guesswork. Many showed the rates to plummet rather than remaining roughly level. The main point was that the death rate had to be above the birth rate for at least 50% of the time. Parts (c)(i) and (ii) were answered well. Part (iii) was often misunderstood. Candidates failed to appreciate that the question was concerned with population structure as opposed to population growth. In addition they ignored the reference to MEDCs as they were determined to bring in their knowledge of China's one-child policy, even those candidates who transferred it to Japan! On the other hand, some excellent answers were seen to this question, using France and Italy as case studies.

Question 2

Very few candidates knew a good definition of the site of a settlement, there being much confusion with situation. A large number of candidates stated it was the 'location' of the settlement or similarly vague words. It was important that there was reference to the actual land on which the settlement was built. Most candidates were able to identify the bridging point, but many were unable to pinpoint the gap town. This is a part of the specification that has not been tested regularly and this seemed to show in many candidates' work. Part (a)(iii) was not particularly well developed beyond the idea of the meeting point of routes. It was hoped that there would be some ideas along the lines of a 'market place', an exchange of goods, or the whole process of trading/shopping etc. Some candidates misread the shading and thought that the sea was an iron ore field. Difficulties with definition were seen again in part (b); very few candidates recognised that urban zones are defined in terms of their land-use. Many merely gave examples from their studies of the Burgess model. Tredworth was far too frequently given as the answer to part (ii). There is concern that candidates are not given the opportunity to study maps other than OS extracts and so may have been unfamiliar with a street map – despite one appearing in the 2004 paper. Often it was suggested that the area was part of the CBD of Gloucester. Most candidates showed the positive correlation of the scatter in Figure 6 by means of a line at 45° from the origin but few were able to show the true line of best fit. This went roughly through the average point with an equal number of settlements on either side. A number were using a curved line, which is now acceptable on Science and Mathematics papers, and of course there was the usual number of candidates who took the opportunity to join up all the dots. Most candidates knew about 'Green Belts' in part (d), although they frequently wrote that no building could take place here. Brownfield sites featured in most answers but with little development and some mentioned high-rise building without explaining where, or for what use or how they could contribute to the reduction of urban sprawl. Generally, candidates could write something in this answer, which got them into Level 2, but very few Level 3 answers were seen. Here was a missed opportunity to make use of case study exemplification.

Section B

The questions appeared to be well balanced within this section.

Question 3

In part (a) most candidates could recognise subsistence but there was considerable confusion between intensive and extensive agriculture. Many considered the outputs of the system rather than the high inputs in relation to size of the landholding. The agricultural changes in Figure 8 were generally well described with reference to the diagram, with the better candidates manipulating the figures and making links between the different types of data.

There are still too many candidates who made no reference to the diagram and saw this as a question testing their knowledge of the Green Revolution. Sustainability continues to be a concept which candidates at this level find difficult, and so (b)(ii) was not well answered. Part (iii) was not well done. Appropriate technology was not understood and it led many candidates to either assume that it meant 'machinery' and give limited answers about combine harvesters etc, or to describe examples of appropriate technology completely unrelated to agriculture. Of those who accurately answered the question, irrigation was by far the most common improvement described, with soil conservation second. Good knowledge of soil erosion and eutrophication was seen in parts (c)(i) and (ii), although some candidates did not refer back to the methods shown in Figure 9. Many candidates did not understand or have detailed knowledge of an extensive farming system. There were many who wrote about intensive rice cultivation in the Ganges Delta, horticulture in the Netherlands, or dairy farming in the West Country. Candidates should realise that there is no credit for statements that indicate that the conditions are 'just right', 'suitable' or 'perfect'. Even after reference to this fact has been made frequently in past Chief Examiner's reports there are still phrases like 'it is hot, warm, wet, cold, dry etc, which gain no credit because they are purely subjective. The best answers were those associated with hill sheep farming often in a named area of the UK. Even among these, while the best linked the physical characteristics of the area and gave climatic data and soil types, they had difficulty in linking this information with the system. Human factors were less well covered, but there were good answers which explained the recent problems faced by farmers in upland areas. Shifting agriculture was the second most popular choice, but was not done as well.

Question 4

The industrial system was generally recognised and the link made between secondary and tertiary industry in part (a). Part (b) was answered in much the same way as the corresponding question on agriculture although there was perhaps less evidence of candidates recognising the links between the different data sources. Candidates generally scored well in part (b)(ii) although most of the answers given could be related to general industrialisation in LEDCs rather than the specific factors influencing the growth of industry in NICs. The changes were largely related to the cheapness of the labour in these areas but there was little evidence of knowledge of the government investment in industry, the laws outlawing strikes and the fact that the workforce is highly educated. Cheap labour was the usual response to (c)(ii). Candidates easily identified why factories were located in LEDCs but the reasons for the offices in MEDCs were less clearly expressed – close to markets where they sell more was the most commonly given answer. Cheap labour was used again in (d)(i) and there were some references to exhaustion of resources in MEDCs. There was little reference to out-dated equipment. There was a tendency for candidates to focus on extractive industries in part (d)(ii). There were too many vague answers about people losing jobs and the improvement of the environment but the opportunity was missed here to make use of case study exemplification. The detail could come from the use of a region which has undergone the decline of traditional manufacturing industries, such as South Wales, or by reference to a specific industry such as iron and steel manufacture. Some candidates saw how a loss of income could impact on the ability to sell one's home. Few candidates went on to consider the impact of political change, such as the granting of special development status or equivalent, although the need to pay out on benefits and/or retrain was often given. The political implications were usually considered in terms of the social impact of industrial decline. This was a question in which the better candidates, if they were to achieve Level 3 had to ensure that they answered all parts of the question.

Section C

Both questions were equally popular and they were similar in level of difficulty.

Question 5

There was better use of the photograph than in previous years, most candidates recognising the significance of historical or religious buildings in the development of a tourist industry in a city environment. Few appreciated the attraction of eating 'al fresco' but there were some references to what appears to be street entertainment in the background. In part (a)(ii) there were too many references to litter and unqualified pollution. Part (a)(iii) once again revealed how poorly candidates develop a real sense of place. Few were able to give detailed factual information about the attractions of a particular UK tourist area. This was equally true of centres from well-known tourist areas. The example was normally nothing more than a name such as the Lake District. From then on the details were so generalised they could have applied to anywhere mountains invariably mean winter sports so the Lake District has well-developed ski facilities – and any coastal location has nice beaches and nice weather! In part (b), despite the word 'claim' being clear in Figure 14, a surprising number of candidates believe that the countries such as the UK own part of Antarctica. There was a missed opportunity for candidates to go beyond merely lifting information in (b)(i) and so they failed to reach Level 2. There was repetition in parts (b)(i) and (ii) because of the failure of candidates to distinguish between the different command words in the two sections. The main reason for the increasing demand for resources was considered to be the finite nature of most of the resources found in Antarctica. Even pack ice was considered to be a resource – for use in refrigerators or even in gin and tonic! Less consideration was given to the increasing demand due to industrialisation, population increase and the greater affluence of many of the world's peoples. Despite the continuing fixation with holes in the ozone layer, it was pleasing to see that most candidates were able to give a clear and accurate explanation of the link between fossil fuels and global warming. Despite not being able to give an accurate definition of sustainable development most candidates could relate it to damage to the environment. This allowed them to put some good ideas forward in part (c)(iii) with suggestions on renewable energy, eco-tourism, recycling etc, but often they did not relate back to sustainability and therefore did not access the Level 2 marks.

Question 6

While most candidates recognised the long-term element of the aid described in Figure 15, most confined it to the various direct benefits of owning a cow and failed to recognise the possible spin-offs that could occur. The disadvantages of aid are well known. However, there is still this misconception that aid can lead to debt even if many candidates find the word impossible to spell. Part (a)(iii) proved straightforward and large numbers of candidates used the Boxing Day Tsunami to their advantage in answering this question. The impact of famine in Ethiopia was another useful source of information. Candidates do not always make the best use of stimulus material. Part (b)(i) was a case in point. Many answers consisted merely of direct lifts from Figure 16. Candidates need to recognise that geography is frequently the consideration of patterns. An overview of the global distribution of tropical storms was required for Level 2. There was a need for more careful reading of (b)(ii). Candidates tended to concentrate on the effects of whatever hazard they chose, without stating how they affected the future development of the country. Many gave general effects such as 'buildings collapsed' and 'people killed' that could have been the result of any hazard. Those who made use of their knowledge of the Asian Tsunami scored well on this question. Fair Trade was generally well understood, although not all candidates could move beyond the impact on individual farmers to the benefits for the LEDCs in general. Some candidates did not interpret this question as being about "Fair Trade", but considered at a fairly general level the debate that is going on about African countries not being able to trade with MEDCs on an equal footing. Perhaps "Fair Trade" should have been printed with a capital letter for both words. How well this question was answered seemed to be very centre specific, suggesting that not all centres have given as much time to this part of the topic as other more familiar areas.

(Short Course) Foundation Tier

3036/F

General

Candidates appeared to have found the paper accessible with the less able ones achieving marks in the shorter questions whilst the more able had opportunities to write extended answers. Rubric infringements still occurred, particularly from less able candidates who attempted the shorter sections of all of the questions.

In sections of the paper where candidates had a choice, some questions proved more popular than others. In the Physical section of the paper, the questions on Tectonic Activity and Coastal Landscapes were the ones chosen most frequently with River Landscapes closely following. Very few candidates answered the question on Glacial Landscapes. The Settlement question was the most popular in the Human section on the paper with the Managing Resources question coming a close second. Few candidates attempted the Agriculture question.

There seemed to be an improved use of case study material, particularly of topical issues, and the use of such details means candidates are usually able to gain access to the higher level of marks.

Section A

Question 1

Candidates did well completing the paragraph about a journey along the M4, but less than half the candidates gave the correct grid reference for Reading railway station and the highest point in square 7378. Level 1 marks were easily obtained by most candidates describing the land uses in the two squares in (d), but few gave detail such as names and location of the land use features within the squares, which would allow access to Level 2 marks.

Question 2

Matching a feature on a photograph with that on the map proved difficult for some candidates; few had all three correct. Some errors were a result of not reading the key accurately e.g. giving the wrong type of woodland, whereas the word 'woodland' on its own would have gained credit. The rest of the question proved to be no problem with evidence that the photograph was taken in summer answered particularly well.

Question 3

Describing distributions always proves difficult for candidates sitting the Foundation Tier and many gave very basic answers such as quoting percentages of people who had been born outside the UK for individual wards.

Section B

Question 4

Most candidates ticked the correct boxes in (a)(i) but found it difficult to explain the distribution of earthquakes in Figure 4.

In section (b) many candidates muddled the focus and the epicentre but were able to position the letter D accurately at the built up area and explain why their chosen location would be most likely to have the greatest loss of life.

There were some excellent answers about the response of people to an earthquake or volcanic eruption in (c) with good use made of text book case studies such as Kobe and Mount St Helens as well as many candidates describing the response after the recent December 26th 2004 earthquake and resulting tsunamis in SE Asia. Some candidates unfortunately misread the question and wrote about the effects of, rather than the response to, earthquakes.

Question 5

Candidates knew the meaning of the term 'meander' and most were able to label a slip-off slope and a river cliff on the map as well as ticking the correct box for the cross-section. Explaining how these features are formed proved more of a challenge and many wrote little more than 'by erosion and deposition'.

The correct boxes were usually ticked in section (b) but many candidates gave 'crops and grazing' rather than just 'grazing' as the land use found closest to the river. Creditworthy responses related to the possibilities of flooding were common in answer to the last section of the question.

Question 6

Not so many candidates correctly ticked the boxes in the first part of the question or were able to name the type of moraine in (b)(i). Some basic responses were made in explaining the formation of a type of moraine although sometimes candidates did not specify which type they were writing about. Very few candidates knew the meaning of the term 'boulder clay'.

Section C was better answered although some candidates did not restrict their response in (iii) to glaciated areas and so lost marks.

Question 7

Most candidates ticked the correct boxes in the first part of this question and also did well on sketching and labelling the coastal features found on the photograph. Explaining 'how' the arch might change in the future was easy for the majority who attempted this question, but the 'why' was more difficult, with very few candidates able to name types of coastal processes.

Methods of coastal protection and how they help protect areas were well known and many candidates did well in section (c).

Section C

Question 8

As in other questions, ticking boxes was usually completed accurately. In part (b) it was necessary for candidates to explain how their chosen plan could improve the lives of the local people and not everyone did that, some suggesting that more people could be encouraged into the area, ignoring the fact that the census details specified that 10% of the area is overcrowded. However, there were some excellent answers where candidates had made good use of the information on Figure 12.

The term 'rural-urban fringe' was well known but some candidates confused rural and urban land use in part (ii) and wrote about farming in part (iii). However, there were plenty of candidates who had sound knowledge about this issue and went on to do well in the rest of the question with some using local knowledge to answer part (v).

Question 9

Many candidates scored some credit in (i), but few were able to give the correct response in all three boxes. An explanation of relief was given in the question in part(ii) but still many candidates do not understand how it affects farming with only the more able writing beyond 'flat land is better for arable farming' or 'hilly land is better for sheep'. The effect of relief on weather was very rarely seen on scripts.

Better answers were seen in section C, particularly where the choice had been the visitor centre and bed and breakfast. Few candidates chose to write about the creation of ponds and marshlands, but many candidates understood quotas and set aside.

The causes and effects of soil erosion had been taught well at some centres and these candidates were able to give detailed descriptions of methods of soil conservation. Other candidates had little idea of this topic.

Question 10

Most candidates were able to access the three marks in section (a). In (b), candidates needed to explain how their choice of suggestions could reduce the problem of global warming. Some described the choice but did not answer the question so, for instance, they wrote about how public transport and rising fuel tax would reduce congestion, but did not make any reference to how this would reduce global warming.

The photograph resulted in plenty of creditworthy responses as to why tourists may be attracted to the area and candidates were well versed in reasons why LEDCs are keen to develop tourism. Problems resulting from the growth of tourism were, however, stated rather than explained, with answers such as noise, crime and unqualified pollution. 'Green tourism' was understood by very few candidates, but those that did know about it often used case studies such as the visits to Antarctica or the Galapagos Islands to answer the question well.

(Short Course) Higher Tier

3036/H

General

The paper appeared to be a fair test for the target candidates although there were a number of candidates who seem to have been entered for the wrong tier. There was no evidence of candidates being short of time to complete the answers and many used the examination to demonstrate their knowledge, particularly of case studies, their geographical skills and their understanding of the course.

Candidates from the same centre often answer exactly the same choice of questions suggesting that the minimum number of topics in each section is taught. As a result, there were very few rubric errors, although many candidates still lose marks by inaccurate reading of the questions.

The quality of written communication seems to have improved this year in so far as there were less candidates writing in bullet form or giving lists as answers. It was pleasing to see the increased use of local, national and international events in answers, suggesting that teachers are encouraging candidates in the application of their knowledge.

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates gave accurate 6 figure grid references but many measured the distance along the motorway inaccurately or gave an exact distance rather than that to the nearest kilometre. Part (c) required a comparison of the relief and land uses of two grid squares. Although many candidates mentioned that e.g. one was higher or steeper, there was little use made of exact heights taken from the map or exact locations of features within a square.

Question 2

Naming the land uses at the three locations on the aerial photograph did not prove difficult for most candidates, but many missed the word 'shape' in part (b), writing instead about the urban morphology in Reading. For those who did notice that the built-up area of Reading has avoided certain areas, very few explained the reasons why that is so.

Question 3

Candidates seem much better prepared for 'describing patterns' now and so this question frequently scored full marks.

Section B

Question 4 Tectonic Activity

This was a popular question, and usually well answered. Candidates had sound knowledge of the distribution of earthquakes (a), and were able to give the names of many plate boundaries such as the mid-Atlantic Ridge and the Pacific Ring of Fire. Most were able to locate the focus and epicentre accurately on the diagram and explain the location for the greatest loss of life in (b).

In section (c), the question asked for the short and long term responses to a tectonic case study and much use was made of textbook exemplars such as Kobe and Mt St Helen's as well as the December 26th disaster in SE Asia. Sadly, some candidates wrote about the effects rather than the responses.

Question 5

The study of rivers remains popular in centres and there were some excellent responses about meanders in section (a). Some candidates lost marks by not drawing an accurate cross section or limiting their labels to erosion' and 'deposition' – words which did not gain credit as they appeared on Figure 1. Better candidates named features found at meanders and were able to relate these features to the processes which create them.

'Issues about river basin management' is a topic clearly stated in the specification, as well as hard v. soft strategies and sustainability. In the guidance section of the specification table, flood plain zoning is given as an example of a soft strategy. However, a large number of candidates appeared to have a very scanty knowledge of this section of the specification. Some gained a few marks by a description of Figure 7, but very few related it to flooding or sustainability.

Question 6

Whilst a study of rivers remains popular, very few centres appear to study glaciation. Of those candidates who attempted this question, many struggled with a description of boulder clay and although the names and locations of different types of moraine were known, few candidates were awarded Level 3 marks because there was a lack of detail on the processes of formation.

Section (c) was usually well answered. Candidates are especially well versed on the impacts of tourism.

Question 7

This was another very popular question, which was usually quite well answered. Some candidates lost marks in the first section by drawing a generic diagram of arches and stacks rather than a sketch of Figure 10. However, most knew the sequence of events leading to changes in such a coastline although the processes involved were often named but not described.

Methods of coastal protection were well known and many candidates were able to score full marks in section (b).

Section C

Question 8

This was the most popular question in section C. Candidates who did well in section (a) made realistic suggestions of improvements and the reasons for them, having considered the data available to them in the table, Figure 12 and the map, Figure 13.

The photograph helped candidates state the meaning of the term 'rural-urban' fringe, but some confused rural with urban land uses. Creating green belts was the most popular response to controlling urban sprawl, but some candidates wrongly stated that no development is allowed on such areas. High marks were awarded to those candidates who used case studies to explain why some people are in favour and some against development on

the rural-urban fringe, but for the majority the answers were very weak stating little beyond loss of farmland or more pollution.

Question 9

This was the least popular question in section C. Candidates understood the differences between types of farming but many struggled to explain the effect of relief on farming. Although a case study was not requested, candidates who used one were much more likely to answer this question well.

Generally, candidates made good use of the map of a farm, Figure 16, and there were some excellent answers by those who knew EU policies. However, some were unable to access Level 3 marks because they failed to consider both protecting the environment and increasing farmers' income.

Soil erosion and conservation were known to most candidates but many named rather than described conservation methods in (c)(iii).

Question 10

This question was quite popular and often scored the highest marks in section C. Global warming is a topic that candidates know well although some did not consider the size of Africa in comparison with carbon dioxide production in (a)(i). There were some excellent answers explaining how global warming may be reduced.

The photograph was not always used in answer to (b)(i) and some candidates made vague comments about nice weather or an old boat or temple with nothing about the attractions of the area for tourists specifically from MEDCs. In (ii) many wrote about noise, crowds and pollution but without any explanation. However, in part (iii), there was some excellent use made of case studies to describe green tourism.

Foundation and Higher Tiers

Centre-Assessed Coursework - 3031/C

General

This academic year has seen the Board put a lot of time and resources into coursework support, and so it is disappointing to record that an increased number of centres were outside the mark tolerance. The advice centres received from the previous years' feedback forms, information provided at standardisation meetings, and the ongoing guidance from coursework advisers had in large part gone unheeded. In many cases the margins for error were narrow and almost wholly in respect of those enquiries seeking the higher marks. There was some evidence that familiarity with the coursework marking criteria and a history of marks being accepted in recent years leading to a degree of complacency when it came to marking the work this year.

Moderators, however, continued to be impressed with the variety of coursework and the breadth of knowledge displayed by many of the candidates. The vast majority of work was appropriate, in that, it related to the taught Specification and allowed differentiation between candidates. Some excellent geography and a high standard of ICT made the process of moderation, in most cases, a pleasurable experience.

Teacher-led enquiries continued to be by far the most common format. Indeed, the individual enquiry has become an endangered species. 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 easier opportunities to re-visit the sites. A trend towards purely physical studies continued 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 having used the same section from the textbook as the basis for their introduction and teachers having selected 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 that, 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 fully developed or identified, with centres 'cherry picking' isolated phrases to justify the awarding of Level 3. Furthermore, this approach tends to develop into extremely long enquiries which some centres assumed justified high marks. If teachers are to maximise the potential of their candidates they have a clear responsibility to guide their students appropriately in title and task selection, as well as encouraging wherever possible quality not quantity.

Administration

This year was no different to any other year in that the quality of administration varied greatly. 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 process. The sampling procedure continued to work well and made sure that the number and composition of the sample sent from the centre was correct in the majority of cases. Centre Mark Sheets were posted to the moderator much closer to the deadline than last year with the time taken for centres to respond to requests by moderators for work or information varying enormously.

The following points need to be stressed:

- Centres, with **20 or fewer candidates**, should ensure that **all** their candidates **work** together with the **PINK** and **YELLOW** copies of the **Centre Mark Sheets** (or an EDI print out) should arrive with the moderator **by the deadline** indicated, allowing time for postal delivery. If a centre has **more than 20 candidates**, they should ensure that, the **PINK** and **YELLOW** copies of the **Centre Mark Sheets** (or two copies of the EDI print outs) should arrive with the moderator **by the deadline** indicated allowing time for postal delivery. (Some centres only sent the pink copy of the CMS, which meant a photocopy, had to be made by the moderator). The moderator will **return the YELLOW copy of the CMS** (or one of the EDI print outs) indicating which **candidates' work needs to be forwarded as the sample**. **The work** must be dispatched within **five working days** of notification from the moderator. If any centre anticipates that they are not going to meet the coursework submission deadline, then they will need to inform the Board and apply for an extension.
- The Candidate Record Form should be attached to the relevant pieces of work. They should be filled in correctly, making sure that the candidate numbers are placed in the relevant boxes and that both the teacher and the candidate have signed the document. Sometimes is not always possible from the teacher's signature at the bottom of the CRF to clearly identify the name of the teacher involved in the marking of a particular piece of work. To save any confusion it would help if the teacher also printed their name next to their signature. For the first time this year the total mark was supposed to be placed in a box on the front of the CRFs. This would allow moderators to place the work from a centre in rank order without having to open every plastic wallet in order to access the total mark on the reverse side of the form. The majority of centres ignored these boxes or chose to simply place a tick in the relevant box. In a number of cases centres are using out of date CRF forms and, as a result, did not provide all the information required, such as summative statements and teacher signatures. The incorrect addition of marks on the CRF forms and the inaccurate transfer of the total mark to the Centre Mark Sheet continue to be common problems for the moderator. A number of centres continue to fail to supply **the Centre Declaration Sheet with 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.
- An increasing number of centres are submitting their work in appropriate folders. However, there are still some centres that use **hard back files or ring binders** and so increase the cost of postage. Also, if centres could ensure that if candidates are submitting large maps within their enquiry that they are not folded in such an intricate manner they prove impossible to open. It would also save moderators time if the candidate's name and total mark were placed on the outside of the folder.
- 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, the work of lower ability candidates is under-marked and that 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. 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

Centres whose marking was within tolerance identified the 'triggers' required to access the different levels and applied the marking criteria in a uniform manner across the whole department. Where centres were outside the tolerance, a common trend was for them to either over-mark at the top end of the mark range and/or under-mark at the bottom. However, there continued to be a number of centres who had insufficient understanding of what is required

and no appreciation of the 'triggers' necessary to move a candidate from one level to another. As a result, they failed to maximise the potential of some obviously bright students.

Applied Understanding

In most 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 detailed description and explanation to 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 suggested that candidates include, within their introductions, a glossary of terms. This is a useful idea but it must be remembered that the terms chosen must be appropriate to the enquiry. However, 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. There was little or no conceptual base, understanding was delivered through background information or scene setting and as a result, it was very difficult to identify where the geography could be credited.

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 misunderstanding by some 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. Some centres were giving too much credit for locational detail, equating detailed location with Level 3. 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 the 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 the techniques used are the major 'triggers' to accessing Level 3 marks in this section. The amount of teacher involvement in the organisation and direction of the enquiry is the critical issue. Heavily teacher-directed work and group activities would now appear to be the norm but centres must realise that this approach prohibits 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 assumed 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 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 covers the what, when, how and why of the methods used. In some instances, there is -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 can only be classed as valid, and therefore creditworthy, if they are actually used in the investigation to collect a significant amount of primary or secondary data. Centres continued to award marks, particularly to less able candidates, for describing the full range of data collection techniques that they intended to use in their teacher-directed investigation. In reality, these candidates used few, if any, of the techniques described and this should have been reflected in the marking. If no data is forthcoming from a particular technique, for example, a candidate writing to a company for information and receiving no reply, there may be a justification in exploring the circumstances for a failed response in the evaluation section but there is no value or credit to be gained in the methodology section. Even some higher ability candidates produce a disappointing amount of data from what appears to be a comprehensive and robust methodology section

Data Presentation

There was a great deal of variation between centres with regard to the quality and range of data presentation techniques used. There was also a great deal of inconsistency within centres when it came to applying the criteria in this section. Access to Level 3 in this section is achieved through the key 'triggers' of range and complexity.

In many cases, centres impressed with the quality of work produced in this section and the wide range of techniques and skills exhibited by their candidates. It was common, however, for this section to be overmarked. Some centres confusing 'attractive' with 'more complex' so Level 3 was frequently being awarded for a limited range of what were basic techniques. Even when a range of different techniques was 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 balance between the number of techniques used and level of complexity displayed by those techniques. 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 present many problems to centres. Most candidates satisfied the basic ICT requirement on the front cover of the enquiry 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 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 within the Level 3 statement is delivered by means of ICT, but, if it is not, then it has to be shown by other means.

The quality and quantity of data collected determines the range of presentation techniques that can be used. There was clear evidence that candidates of all abilities used forms of data that were inappropriate for the techniques used. The most common misused techniques included the humble line graph and the more sophisticated Spearman's rank correlation. Centres and candidates should ensure, at the planning stage, that the data collected is appropriate for the data presentation techniques being considered by the candidate.

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. Explanations were then provided that took full advantage of the opportunity to apply the theory underpinning the enquiry to the results. Candidates then went on to demonstrate links and draw valid conclusions that related to the original hypothesis.

It is worth stressing that the Level 3 statement requires the candidate to demonstrate within the context of their analysis links between the sets of data collected. Some teachers awarded Level 3 on the basis that the candidate simply linked the data to the hypothesis. Such statements do not fulfil the criteria in that they by-pass the analysis process and lead to the formulation of conclusions that are not related to direct evidence.

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.

The amount and type of data collected obviously impacts upon the quality of the data interpretation section. For example, 'in-depth' interviews with farmers, supermarket managers and letters requesting information from various companies, although valid techniques, were very rarely used effectively by candidates. No attempt was made to edit, interpret or analyse the information, the vast majority simply repeated the interview verbatim or inserted the information in an appendix.

The techniques used to present the data can also have repercussions in terms of data interpretation. For example, candidates of all abilities commonly used Spearman's Rank Correlation. Not all candidates, however, were capable of interpreting or even understanding the significance of the results produced by such an advanced mathematical calculation.

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

The main weakness among candidates was that they failed to use their data, they did not quote figures, percentages or ratios instead they used generalities such as 'more than', 'bigger', 'smaller', many etc. As a result, the description, therefore, lacks an element of analysis. In addition, centres over-credited descriptive essays at too high a level on the mark scheme and, as a result, inflated marks were awarded for basic description of data. This was particularly true of physical studies, which were quite often heavily descriptive especially where the main form of data collection was 'look, see'. Large amounts of description could often have been 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

Even though this section is often quite brief, the majority of centres would appear to have come to terms with evaluation and basically got it right, at least in terms of methods and results. It was still, however, the evaluation of the conclusions that continued to be the least developed of the three elements. Many centres over-marked this section, awarding Level 3 marks without candidates reflecting on their conclusions in any way.

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 general rather than detailed and specific. 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 referred in detail specifically to problems relating to their data collection methods and how these problems impacted upon the accuracy of their results. Candidates then went on to explain how these inaccuracies brought into question the validity of their conclusions.

There are two important points to remember about evaluation in this context. Firstly, it carries the same marks as the other sections of the marking criteria. Secondly, it is not about making judgements regarding the quality of the Geography but is an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the enquiry process. Centres need to spend more time getting the message across to students that a more critical and reflective approach is required.

Foundation and Higher Tiers

(Short Course) Centre-Assessed Coursework – 3036/C

General

As in previous years, in the majority of 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 generally asked too much of their Short Course candidates, working on the principle that more work, equalled more marks. In reality, more work usually meant more at the same level.

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 appear that teachers carried through the notion of one concept, three methods of data capture and three 'more complex' data presentation techniques to the Full Course and thus over-mark their Full Course 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 the Full Course.

As with the Full Course, teacher-led enquiries were by far the most common format. Indeed, the individual enquiry has become an endangered species. 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 having used the same section from the textbook as the basis for their introduction and teachers having selected 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, the profile of the typical Short Course centre and the function the Short course performs within the school curriculum continued to change. There was an increased variety of small institutions involved, a significant number of which cannot be classed as mainstream schools. Centres no longer entered candidates in large numbers and the entry was no longer limited to Key Stage 4. This had an impact on the quality of work produced, as a number of these candidates would appear to be frequently less motivated or have yet to fully develop their geographical skills. Centres expected, nevertheless, to achieve a full mark range and, in some cases, end up marking candidates and not work, giving marks for effort in exceptional

circumstances. As a result, an increased number of centres this year were well outside the mark tolerance. This was disappointing considering this academic year how much the time and effort the Board has put into coursework support. The advice centres received from the previous years' feedback forms, information provided at standardisation meetings, and the ongoing guidance from coursework advisers had in large part gone unheeded.

Administration

This was no different to any other year in that the quality of administration varied greatly. 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 process. The sampling procedure continued to work well and made sure that the number and composition of the sample sent from the centre was correct in the majority of cases. Centre Mark Sheets were being posted to the moderator much closer to the deadline than last year but the time taken for centres to respond to requests by moderators for work or information did vary enormously.

The following points need to be stressed:

- The majority of Short Course centres have **20 or fewer candidates** and therefore they should ensure that **all** their candidates **work** together with the **PINK** and **YELLOW** copies of the **Centre Mark Sheets** (or an EDI print out) should arrive with the moderator **by the deadline** indicated, allowing time for postal delivery. If a centre has **more than 20 candidates**, they should ensure that, the **PINK** and **YELLOW** copies of the **Centre Mark Sheets** (or two copies of the EDI printouts) should arrive with the moderator **by the deadline** indicated allowing time for postal delivery. (Some centres only sent the pink copy of the CMS, which meant a photocopy, had to be made by the moderator). The moderator will **return the YELLOW copy of the CMS** (or one of the EDI printouts) 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. Sometimes it is not always possible from the teacher's signature at the bottom of the CRF to clearly identify the name of the teacher involved in the marking of a particular piece of work. To save any confusion it would help if the teacher also printed their name next to their signature. For the first time this year the total mark was supposed to be placed in a box on the front of the CRFs. This would allow moderators to place the work from a centre in rank order without having to open every plastic wallet in order to access the total mark on the reverse side of the form. The majority of centres ignored these boxes or chose to simply place a tick in the relevant box. In a number of cases, centres are using out of date CRF forms and, as a result, did not provide all the information required, such as summative statements and teacher signatures. The incorrect addition of marks on the CRF forms and the inaccurate transfer of the total mark to the Centre Mark Sheet continue to be common problems for the moderator. A number of centres continue to fail to supply **the Centre Declaration Sheet with 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.
- An increasing number of centres are submitting their work in appropriate folders. However, there are still some centres that use **hardback files or ring binders** and so increase the cost of postage. In addition, if centres could ensure that if candidates are submitting large maps within their enquiry that they are not folded in such an intricate manner they prove impossible to open. It would also save moderators time if the candidate's name and total mark were placed on the outside of the folder.
- 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, the work of lower ability candidates is under-marked and that 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

Centres whose marking was within tolerance identified the 'triggers' required to access the different levels and applied the marking criteria in a uniform manner across the whole department. Where centres were outside the tolerance, a common trend was for them to either over-mark at the top end of the mark range and/or under-mark at the bottom. However there continues to be a number of centres who have insufficient understanding of what is required and no appreciation of the 'triggers' necessary to move a candidate from one level to another. As a result, they fail to maximise the potential of some obviously bright students.

Applied Understanding

In most 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 detailed description and explanation to identify the one 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 the terms chosen must be appropriate to the enquiry. However, 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. There was little or no conceptual base, understanding was delivered through background information or scene setting making it difficult to identify where the geography could be credited.

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. Some centres were giving too much credit for location detail, equating detailed location with Level 3. 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 concept 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 two 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 described and justified with at least one of the techniques demonstrating originality on behalf of the candidate. The amount of teacher involvement in the organisation and direction of the enquiry is the critical issue. Heavily teacher-directed work and group activities prohibit Level 3 methodology marks, as the candidate is not being given the opportunity to show originality and initiative. In some cases, Level 3 marks were awarded to candidates whose definition of originality was questionable; little more than a minute difference in data collection technique. '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, 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 have prohibited 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. In some cases, 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 can only be classed as valid, and therefore creditworthy, if they are actually used in the investigation to collect a significant amount of primary or secondary data. Centres continued to award marks, particularly to less able candidates, for describing the full range of data collection techniques that they intended to use in their teacher-directed investigation. In reality, these candidates used few, if any, of the techniques described and this should have been reflected in the marking. If no data is forthcoming from a particular technique, for example, a candidate writing to a company for information and receiving no reply, there maybe a justification in exploring the circumstances for a failed response in the evaluation section but there is no value or credit to be gained in the methodology section. Even some higher ability candidates produce a disappointing amount of data from their three data collection techniques.

Data Presentation

There was a great deal of variation between centres with regard to the quality of data presentation techniques. There was also a great deal of inconsistency within centres when it came to applying the criteria in this section.

Nevertheless in many cases centres impressed with the quality of work produced and the wide range of techniques and skills exhibited by their candidates. It was common, however, for this section to be over-marked. Even when three 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.

To access Level 2 and Level 3 marks in this section, all candidates have to provide evidence of one 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 present many problems to centres. Most candidates satisfied the basic ICT requirement on the front cover of the enquiry 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 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 within 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. There was clear evidence that candidates of all abilities used forms of data that are inappropriate for the technique being used. The most common misused techniques included the humble line graph and the more sophisticated Spearman's rank correlation. Centres and candidates should ensure, at the planning stage, that the data collected is appropriate for the data presentation techniques being considered by the candidate.

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 Spellchecker in the word-processed 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. Explanations were then provided that took full advantage of the opportunity to apply the theory under-pinning the enquiry to the results. Candidates then went on to demonstrate links and draw valid conclusions that related to the original hypothesis.

It is worth stressing that the Level 3 statement requires the candidate to demonstrate within the context of their analysis links between the sets of data collected. Some teachers awarded Level 3 on the basis that the candidate simply linked the data to the hypothesis. Such statements do not fulfil the criteria in that they tend to lead directly to the formulation of a conclusion and in doing so by pass the analysis process.

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.

The amount and type of data collected obviously impacts upon the quality of the data interpretation section. For example, 'in-depth' interviews with farmers, supermarket managers and letters requesting information from various companies, although valid techniques, they were very rarely used effectively by candidates. No attempt was made to edit, interpret or analyse the information, the vast majority simply repeated the interview verbatim or inserted the information in an appendix.

The techniques used to present the data can also have repercussions in terms of data interpretation. For example, candidates of all abilities commonly used Spearman's Rank Correlation. Not all candidates, however, were capable of interpreting or even understanding the significance of the results produced by such an advanced mathematical calculation.

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

The main weakness among candidates was that they failed to use their data, they did not quote figures, percentages, or ratios instead, they used generalities such as 'more than', 'bigger', 'smaller', 'many', etc. As a result, the description, therefore, lacked an element of analysis. In addition, centres over-credited descriptive essays at too high a level on the mark scheme

and, as a result, inflated marks were awarded for basic description of data. This was particularly true of physical studies that were quite often heavily descriptive especially where the main form of data collection was 'look, see'. Large amounts of description could often have been 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

Even though this section is often quite brief, the majority of centre would appear to have come to terms with evaluation, and basically got it right, at least in terms of methods and results. It was still, however, the evaluation of the conclusions that continued to be the least developed of the three elements. Many centres over-marked this section awarding Level 3 marks without candidates reflecting on their conclusions in any way.

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 general rather than detailed and specific. 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.

There are two important points to remember about this section. Firstly, it carries the same marks as the other criteria. Secondly, it is not about making judgements regarding the quality of the geography, but is an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the enquiry process. Centres need to spend more time getting the message across to students that a more critical and reflective approach is required.

Summary

It is appreciated that factors such as staff cover, cost, health and safety etc., make the organisation of fieldwork visits a difficult and time-consuming task. This added to the fact that Geography teachers are at the mercy of the British climate makes it even more remarkable that, year after year, departments around the country produce such an impressive range of quality work. Well done!

Mark Range and Award of Grades

Full Course

Foundation Tier

Unit/Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3031/C	30	65	27.6	11.2
3031/1F Paper 1	70	104	54.2	14.1
3031/2F Paper 2	75	91	46.3	13.1
Foundation tier overall 3031/1F	--	260	128.1	31.2

Grade		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	44	38	32	27	22
	scaled	104	65	56	48	40	33
3031/2F Paper 2 Boundary Mark	raw	75	47	41	36	31	26
	scaled	91	57	50	44	38	32
Foundation tier scaled Boundary mark		260	149	129	110	91	72

Higher Tier

Unit/Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3031/C	30	65	46.3	11.4
3031/1H Paper 1	70	104	60.5	14.2
3031/2H Paper 2	75	91	51.3	13.7
Higher tier overall 3031/1F	--	260	158.2	33.4

Grade		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
3031/C Boundary Mark	raw	30	27	23	19	15	12	
	scaled	65	59	50	41	33	26	
3031/1H Paper 1 Boundary Mark	raw	70	51	44	37	31	24	
	scaled	104	76	65	55	46	36	
3031/2H Paper 2 Boundary Mark	raw	75	54	46	38	30	23	
	scaled	91	66	56	46	36	28	
Higher tier scaled Boundary mark		260	193	167	141	115	90	77

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (23946 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G	E
Cumulative %	26.7	49.7	69.7	84.2	92.7	99.1

Higher tier (40059 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D
Cumulative %	16.7	40.9	68.9	89.7	97.8

Overall (64005 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	10.4	25.6	43.1	66.1	79.8	88.1	93.5	96.7

Short Course

Foundation Tier

Unit/Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3036/C	30	30	11.7	4.7
3036/F	70	90	42.0	12.4
Foundation tier overall 3036/F	--	120	53.7	14.9

Grade		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3036/C Boundary Mark	raw	30	15	12	9	7	5
	scaled	30	15	12	9	7	5
3036/F Boundary Mark	raw	70	45	40	36	32	28
	scaled	90	58	51	46	41	36
Foundation tier scaled Boundary mark		120	70	62	55	48	41

Higher Tier

Unit/Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3036/C	30	30	18.2	5.0
3036/H	70	90	45.9	12.6
Higher tier overall 3036/F	--	120	64.1	15.6

Grade		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
3036/C Boundary Mark	raw	30	30	25	20	15	12	
	scaled	30	30	25	20	15	12	
3036/H Boundary Mark	raw	70	47	43	39	35	30	
	scaled	90	60	55	50	45	39	
Higher tier scaled Boundary mark		120	89	78	69	60	51	46

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (509 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	14.5	28.7	43.4	61.3	74.3

Higher tier (363 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	5.0	20.1	37.7	61.7	80.7	87.9

Overall (872 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	2.1	8.4	15.7	34.2	50.3	61.9	72.4	79.9

Definitions

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

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

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