



General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography 3032/3037

Specification B

Examiners' Report

2005 examination - June series

- 3032 GCSE
- 3037 GCSE (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

Full Course 3032

3032/C	Coursework.....	5
3032/1F	Paper 1 Foundation tier written paper	13
3032/1H	Paper 1 Higher tier written paper	16
3032/2F	Paper 2 Foundation tier written paper	19
3032/2H	Paper 2 Higher tier written paper	21

Short Course 3037

3037/C	Coursework.....	23
3037/2F	Foundation tier written paper	31
3037/H	Higher tier written paper.....	33

Mark ranges and Award of Grades	35
---------------------------------------	----

This page has been left intentionally blank

Geography B Full Course

Centre-Assessed Coursework (3032/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 led 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 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 **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 weaker candidates, for describing the full range of data collection techniques that they intended to use in their teacher-directed investigation. In reality, these candidates used few, if any, of the techniques described and this should have been reflected in the marking. 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 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 weaker 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.

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!

Paper 1 – Foundation Tier (3032/1F)

General Comments

The paper proved accessible to nearly every candidate and they had many opportunities to demonstrate geographical knowledge, understanding and skills and so it discriminated well. Very high marks were reduced by failure of many candidates to score well on question 6(c). There is still a basic concern about this paper that the candidates have not developed a good factual knowledge of place. This is particularly important in a specification which has been chosen by centres presumably because of this particular emphasis. It is important for centres to ensure that candidates have covered all the topics which require study at a local scale. These can be tested in the examination with questions requiring sketch maps and details of location along with detailed factual information. The following are the detailed local scale studies required by this specification:

- use of a ground water supply;
- use of an upland reservoir;
- a case study of a hill sheep farm in the Lake District;
- a case study of an East Anglian arable farm;
- a case study of a honeypot tourist site in the Lake District;
- a case study of a gas fired power station;
- a case study of a coal fired power station;
- a case study of a nuclear power station;
- a case study of a hydro-electric power station;
- a case study of a wind farm;
- a case study of a chemical industry on a river estuary;
- a case study of the growth, characteristics and morphology of one large urban area in the UK.

The weakness in this area is shown by the failure of many candidates to name examples in 1(b), use an alternative honeypot to Bowness in 3(c) or name an HEP station in 6(b)(i).

In general the less able candidates scored well where questions provided stimulus material that examined basic interpretation and understanding e.g. 4(a). The quality of responses to map work questions have shown an improvement over recent years.

Question 1

Most candidates had a go at this question but it was possible that much of it was guess work. The failure to locate with lines as indicated by the given example made many of the locations imprecise. With two marks for each of the items it was obviously necessary for them to know a name and a location. What was of concern was even if they knew a name for the chemical industry, such as the Middle Mersey, this could be located anywhere from south-east England to northern Scotland. Weakness in this question and the other one demanding case study knowledge, was very often centre-specific. The 'R' in an upland area was the most frequently achieved mark or Kielder Water wherever it was located in the British Isles.

Question 2

This question was not read carefully enough. Only a description was needed and a lot of explanation was offered. Candidates on this paper do not appear to understand the meaning of the term 'distribution' when applied to farming. They used the key well but tried to use their own knowledge rather than using only the stimulus material. There was therefore much reference to relief and climate. Remarkably few candidates scored full marks on part 2(b).

Question 3

Tourism is obviously a popular topic that the less able candidates can understand. Most had an idea about what a honeypot is. There were lots of references to ‘bees swarming around’, with reference to tourists. Two marks were available for the answer to the question and candidates tended to score the mark for the idea of there being lots of tourists but not the other mark for the idea that honeypots tend to be a centre of many tourist attractions. Candidates also missed the idea of concentration of attractions in part (b) where too often only one feature was named (an hotel, a boat house), missing the idea of concentration. In part (c) it was nearly always Bowness that was chosen. There was evidence, however, of centres using examples from outside the Lake District, presumably from their home area. It is important that centres recognise that the specification clearly states that the honeypot should be in the Lake District. It was pleasing to see there was increasing evidence of candidates using linked statements in this question and so gaining Level 2 credit. There were still candidates who did confine their answers to the environmental impact of tourists, often writing about the general disadvantages of tourists to an area. This proved to be a good discriminator.

Question 4

Part (a) was very well answered showing an ability to interpret information from a table of figures. In part (b) many candidates however disregarded the data provided in Figures 4 and 5 when choosing their plans, and as a result their answers degenerated into simple generalisations rather than detailed factual comment. There was a need for the answers to be developed and to give more explanation on how the lives of the people would be improved. Many did not realise that the engineering works had already closed so that noise and air pollution was not an issue. Similarly they failed to refer specifically to improvements to the existing terraced housing, instead resorting to generalisations such as ‘better facilities, will look better’.

Question 5

The understanding of a ‘watershed’ was very poor. Many simply left the answer blank. The most original answer was that it was the fact that after 9 pm they show more adult programmes on TV. The mining and farming sections in part (b)(i) were well answered. Tourism was less well done, most candidates felt that the water was contaminated due to sewage getting in the water as a result of the tourists bathing! Recycling waste was the most popular answer to part (b)(ii).

Question 6

Most candidates recognised that they only had to give two ticks in part (a). Wind power was well understood and there were many excellent, well expressed advantages and disadvantages in parts (a)(ii) and (iii). There were some candidates that had not noticed that the focus had moved to nuclear power in part (iv) so there were many vague answers about ‘chemicals leaking into the sea’ and about it being dangerous. Here again there was a lack of qualification to many of the answers. There were many blank pages to part (b). There was a distinct lack of case study knowledge although there was a tendency for this to be centre specific. Many confused HEP, wind and nuclear. Many had a lack of understanding of what HEP was. Many thought it related to the sea or to waves, so many coastal towns were cited. Kielder and Dinorwic were usually the only correct answers seen. When part (b)(ii) was attempted the answers were largely concerned with why the location was chosen rather than a description of the location. In part (c) the word natural was frequently omitted before gas. There were lots of Level 1 and low-Level 2 answers to (c)(ii). Some candidates explained why we should conserve energy rather than how we would generate it. There was frequently much unrealistic emphasis on the energy of the country being totally generated by renewable means, and fossil fuels and nuclear being totally banned.

Question 7

Part (a)(i) was generally well answered. While there was some evidence of carelessness in drawing in the M4 most candidates scored well on this question, even those who tried to draw the complicated junctions.

In (b)(ii) many candidates inverted the focus of the question to the advantages of shopping in the retail parks rather than concentrating on the effect on the city centre shops. Despite the popularity of the question in (d)(i) and (ii) in recent years, surprisingly few candidates could give the meaning of a footloose industry and give an example. There were plenty of answers about industries running around the country and there was some confusion with transnationals. There was still a lack of appreciation of the general locational factors in the M4 corridor but this question proved a good discriminator. There were too many list type answers. 'Good access' was the most frequently given answer, often repeated several times in an answer. This was a question where there was a need for more linked statements and some locational facts with reference to Bristol University and Heathrow airport.

Paper 1 – Higher Tier (3032/1H)

General Comments

The paper discriminated well across a wide range of marks. It demanded knowledge and skills from across the specification. There were few outstanding marks because of difficulties with particular questions. There were only a few candidates who appeared to have been wrongly entered for this level but there are still too many candidates who were under prepared and failed to demonstrate specific knowledge and understanding. Candidates tended to achieve the bulk of their marks with general comments, and there is still a lack of precise and accurate knowledge. This is particularly noticeable in those questions demanding detailed 'place' knowledge. This has been mentioned every year in this report but it is still a big concern, especially in an examination with a specific 'place' emphasis. It would perhaps be useful for centres to be reminded of those areas of the specification which demand study of an exemplar at a local scale. Any of these can be the subject of a question in their own right and may be linked with a demand for the drawing of a sketch map, or precise factual information about their location and main characteristics. The case studies are as follows:

- use of a ground water supply;
- use of an upland reservoir;
- a case study of a hill sheep farm in the Lake District;
- a case study of an East Anglian arable farm;
- a case study of a honeypot tourist site in the Lake District;
- a case study of a gas fired power station;
- a case study of a coal fired power station;
- a case study of a nuclear power station;
- a case study of a hydro-electric power station;
- a case study of a wind farm;
- a case study of a chemical industry on a river estuary;
- a case study of the growth, characteristics and morphology of one large urban area in the UK.

The generic requirements for the award of a Level 3 asks for detailed information. This can be provided by the use of a case study, even if one is not specifically asked for in the question. A small minority of candidates showed evidence of running out of time but these were invariably candidates who had failed to be precise and had written very wordy answers, including a tendency to rewrite the question out before starting to answer it, or including irrelevant material. It is important that candidates develop an ability to apply their knowledge and understanding of geographical principles accurately within the spirit of the question asked.

Question 1

Approximately half were able to give a temperature value within the correct range. The isotherm was chosen as it was thought that the candidates, having made a detailed study of the climate of East Anglia and the way it influences farming, would have no difficulty in knowing this value. Part (b) was not well answered, with the exception of the Merseyside Chemical industry. What was of concern was the number of candidates who could name the features, like Kielder or Eggborough, but had no knowledge of their location within the British Isles. Kielder, for example, was located in places as far apart as northern Scotland and southern England.

Question 2

Part (a) was well answered, although some candidates did not confine their answers to what was visible on Figure 2, using their knowledge to give details of relief and markets in addition to climate. There are still too many candidates using non-geographical vocabulary – referring to the top, bottom, right or left of the map. The arrows as well as the quadrant descriptions gave candidates plenty of scope. Arable and hill-sheep farming were the two main types chosen. The more widespread distribution of dairying and

mixed farming proved a disincentive. In part (b) the less able candidates failed to recognise the significance of the command word, which required a description, and so their account tended to become a list. If the candidate could name a particular hill sheep farm then they were more likely to avoid this trap and so reach Level 2. A significant number could name a farm but then went on to deal with the Lake District in general, limiting them to Level 1, because of the requirement for a local scale.

Question 3

This was well answered with most candidates able to recognise that naming one activity was not sufficient evidence for Bowness to be considered a honeypot. There was a need for the idea of a concentration of activities to be emphasised. Most candidates concentrated on Bowness in answering part (b) but it was not clear whether this was because they had studied this example or because of the inclusion of the map in the paper. Other examples chosen were Tarn Hows and Helvellyn. These tended to give better answers as there was less of a tendency to write in general terms or use direct lifts. There was still too much reference to pollution without any qualification and lists without any elaboration. Footpath erosion was frequently left to speak for itself without any indication of why it occurred, other than people walking. Candidates were preoccupied with litter and this was reflected in the choice of litterbins as a damage reduction strategy in part (ii). This did not gain credit.

Question 4

There were some unrealistic suggestions in part (a). Flats were often used again, in addition to the exemplar given. Other examples were the knocking down of viable features, reopening the engineering works or the provision of public toilets with showers. There were relatively few badly located or unlocated points. It was pleasing to see that most candidates made use of the census data in coming up with their suggested improvements. Part (b) proved a good discriminator with the better candidates elaborating upon a basic point.

Question 5

Eutrophication was the buzzword in part (a) but only the best candidates had a full understanding of this process. To many, pesticides and herbicides cause it, while only a minority correctly explained the lack of oxygen. Many candidates merely lifted information from Figure 6. Part (b) was not well answered. Many gave vague answers or suggested the direct opposite of 5(a). Less able candidates did not recognise the link between management and water quality, dwelling exclusively on management. The better answers covered ideas such as improving sewage works, lining landfill sites, planning controls and effective monitoring and follow up.

Question 6

Part (a)(i) was done well. There were some less able candidates who felt the presence of the nuclear power station was significant. They were confused by the nuclear power station and thought that the wind farm produced power for it. A few wrote about Anglesey and ignored the evidence on the photograph. Most candidates scored at least one mark in (a)(ii), with many getting two, with points about radioactivity, time, danger and link to cancers. The answers to part (b) were very weak, with many candidates getting no marks. Many simply left the whole page blank. Eggborough was the most popular choice of those who could name an example. Merseyside schools made use of Fiddlers Ferry. The maps were of very poor standard most gaining their credit for generic location features rather than precise case study details. A significant number drew a map of Great Britain with the alleged power station shown. An ability to draw simple sketch maps in examinations is clearly a neglected skill. This is despite the poor response to a similar type of question last year on Paper 2, and the reference to this fact in the 2004 Report on Examination. Where candidates scored it was in part (iii), provided they had indicated some knowledge of an actual case study, because here they could relate the advantages of the location in a more general manner without having the need to refer to a specific river or coalfield. Even so, the less able candidates could not even relate the location of a thermal power station to the proximity of coal to reduce

transport costs or the presence of water for cooling purposes. Some thought that the steam was obtained from the river. Part (c) was largely a justification of the use of renewable resources. Candidates need to ensure that there is some reality injected into this topic. HEP is unlikely to supply more than 1-2% of our energy needs and most of this capacity has already been utilised. The idea of an energy mix, which was a requirement for consideration for the award of a Level 3, was not often present in the answers seen.

Question 7

It was surprising how many candidates could not use the key to recognise the meaning of the number 6 in part (a)(i). Part (ii) was largely answered correctly. Most scored full marks on part (a)(iii), but there was still a significant number who either through carelessness or lack of graphical dexterity failed to achieve the maximum. Part (b)(i) was generally done well although a number failed to link the presence of a population to a customer base or a labour force. Part (b)(ii) surprisingly caused more difficulty than would have been expected, many candidates writing about the advantages of the out-of-town shopping centre rather than the effect of Cribbs Causeway on shops in the city centre. Very few correct answers were seen to part (c), despite this being one of the geographical terms that is listed in the specification. Many related suburbanisation to the movement of people rather than an expansion of the urban area. There were many vague Level 1 answers to part (d) - not helped by many candidates choosing the wrong area. There was too little precise map evidence. In part (e) candidates had good knowledge of the locational factors important in the M4 corridor but failed to answer the question. Many saw it merely a repeat of the question set in 2004. Hardly any grid references were given and their answers showed little evidence of the use of the OS map extract and so could not be considered for Level 3. Cambridge is regularly considered to be part of the M4 corridor. There was a problem of failing to read the question and to address this part of the specification at the local scale.

Paper 2 – Foundation Tier (3032/2F)

General Comments

This year the paper provided candidates with more support material than in previous years. Many candidates seemed to rely heavily/solely on the support material and, consequently, failed to show their own knowledge on a number of questions e.g. question 3(e). On question 3(e) the majority of candidates simply lifted the information given to them about the Mezzogiorno rather than using it constructively to develop their answers, by adding their own knowledge. Hence most gained between 1-3 marks. Questions from previous years which did not provide such support material have been better answered by candidates.

With reference to questions 2(c), 3(a) and 5(c) there was widespread misunderstanding on the part of those who attempted the questions and, as many made no attempt at these questions, it would seem that some centres do not teach these parts of the specification.

Many candidates failed to show knowledge of the sequence of processes leading to the formation of a delta.

Too many candidates still insist on writing vague words like 'good' and 'bad' in relation to soils and their influence on farming.

Location with regard to the European conurbations proved weak but there was much better knowledge about the islands of Japan than in previous years, showing that centres/candidates are now coming to terms with this part of the specification.

There seemed to be fewer entries on the foundation tier this year of candidates capable of attempting the higher paper. As a result very few candidates scored high marks. However, there were few really poor candidates who scored less than 30 marks and few blank pages overall.

Question 1

All candidates were able to access marks on this question, although few candidates knew the name of the Spanish Costa.

Question 2

In part (a), the regional knowledge of the European conurbations was very poor. Hardly any candidates scored full marks. The question on Milan/Turin/Genoa was answered better than the other questions whilst the Rotterdam question was probably the least well answered. In (b)(i) many candidates did not give the figure in millions. In (c) the term 'infrastructure' was not understood by many candidates. Rotterdam was the most popular choice of port (and was allowed in the mark scheme) but many answers related to movement of vessels/goods on the Rhine, hinterland of the port, etc and gained no credit. Surprisingly many students answered question 2(b)(ii) better than the Higher candidates answered their question!

Question 3

Many candidates scored poorly in part (a)(i) with some poor map drawing. There were very weak answers in (a)(ii), which mostly consisted of vague generalisations e.g. they have farming/cities/jobs. In (c)(i) nearly all candidates gained full marks on the pie chart. In (e) the majority of candidates made no reference to their own knowledge (see previous comments above).

Question 4

There were high scores on part (a), although part (iv) did cause problems for many candidates and very few were able to give the right sequence in the formation of a delta. Answers to (b)(ii) were disappointing and seemed to rely on the old 'heavy' industry type of answer with regard to importing/exporting and port locations. Hardly any candidates appreciated that the electronics industry is a 'footloose' industry and, therefore, could be located anywhere. There was hardly any reference to proximity to universities or to the fact that end products are light and can be flown out by plane (rather than shipped using the ports). In (c)(ii) there were some accurate answers given but a significant number presented irrelevant information about transport.

Question 5

This question was the highest scoring one on the paper and hardly any candidate scored less than 12 marks out of 30 giving the less able candidates a respectable mark. In (a)(ii) many candidates just quoted the names of the three cities named on the map and, therefore, scored no marks. Several candidates gave the 'Fens in Scotland' as an answer! Parts (a)(iii) and (b)(iv) invariably scored full marks or nearly full marks. In part (b)(v) almost all candidates did not state the urban area and simply named a country. Even here the push factor was often incorrect! Very few students attempted part (c).

Paper 2 – Higher Tier (3032/2H)

General Comments

This year there were some excellent candidates who showed very good knowledge of the topics and scored highly. Less able candidates did not score as highly on certain questions, particularly question 2, which proved a very discriminatory question. Only the more able candidates scored highly on this question. However, less able candidates did find a number of sections that they could score well on, especially question 1 and question 4.

This year the paper provided candidates with slightly more support material than in previous years. A significant number of candidates seemed to rely heavily/solely on the support material on some questions and, consequently, were unable to achieve anything higher than Level 1 e.g. question 3(d) and 5(b)(iv). Candidates should be made aware by their teachers that where it states 'and with your own knowledge' they **must** use some of their own knowledge in order to access the higher levels and should not restrict themselves to the data provided. For example, on question 3(d) many candidates simply lifted the information given to them about the Mezzogiorno rather than using it constructively to develop their answers, by adding their own knowledge. Hence most gained between 1-3 marks. On question 5(b)(iv) most candidates simply used the stimulus material (electricity/bricks/water taps) and little additional information was provided.

The sketch maps on the European conurbations in question 2, proved challenging but there were some excellent maps produced by many candidates, showing a good understanding of locations, especially with regard to the Milan/Turin/Genoa Triangle. There was also very accurate knowledge shown about the islands of Japan on both questions 1 and 4. This was better than in previous years and shows that centres/candidates are now coming to terms with this part of the specification.

Question 5(c) also proved to be a good discriminator. There were some excellent answers provided by students who had clearly studied a development project and could accurately describe the project and name the location. But there was an equal number of candidates who gave vague answers, some of which simply tried to repeat the information in the pie charts on 5(b)(iv). A significant number of candidates gave the 'Cassa' as their development project and clearly believed Italy to be an LEDC! A small number of students made no attempt to answer this question. It would seem that some centres either do not teach this part of the specification or do not make the subject clear to candidates.

There was general confusion in the minds of some candidates as to the sequence of processes leading to the formation of a delta, although the majority of candidates achieved Level 2. Very few candidates, however, gave the full sequence of processes in the formation of the delta.

Too many candidates still insist on writing vague words like 'good' and 'bad' in relation to soils and their influence on farming.

Question 1

This was generally well done with most candidates able to achieve at least 12/15 marks. The Costa Dorada was not well known and, surprisingly, many candidates did not know the annual range of temperature in Amazonia.

Question 2

In part (a) there were some very good maps, especially on the Milan/Turin/Genoa Triangle. The maps on the Ruhr and Paris were much weaker. Quality seemed to depend on the centre. In (b)(i) many candidates failed to make use of the data provided and wrote about it being cheaper, more comfortable,

not affected by weather, carrying more cargo – none of which gained credit. Despite the definition provided, many candidates did not understand the term ‘infrastructure’ in part (c). Rotterdam and Dover were the most popular choices of port (any European port was allowed in the mark scheme) but many answers related to movement of vessels/goods, toilet facilities, hinterland of the port, cross channel ferries etc and gained no credit.

Question 3

There were some good answers on (a) but there were problems with (a)(ii) and most candidates did not access Level 2 on this question. CAP was the most popular choice on (b) but CAP was often confused with the ‘Cassa’ and many candidates simply tried to write about farming improvements like machinery, fertilisers etc. Many candidates scored full marks on (c)(iv) but simply lifted information from the paragraph in order to answer (c)(v). However, some candidates still insist on writing vague words like ‘good’ and ‘bad’ in relation to soils and climate and their influence on farming. There were some excellent answers on the Mezzogiorno, in part (d) showing good knowledge of the area and the changes that had been made, despite some candidates relying solely on lifted information (see above comments).

Question 4

Most candidates gained full marks on (a)(i) and (a)(ii) and had clearly interpreted the satellite image. The explanations of the delta formation in (iii) were better than in previous years, although the diagrams did not normally gain any extra marks and simply repeated the text. Part (a)(iv) was disappointing with many failing to go beyond ‘lots of water’, ‘fertile soils’, ‘good climate’. Part (b)(i) showed good knowledge of the names of the islands of Japan but (b)(ii) was poorly answered and most candidates seemed to rely on the standard explanations of ‘heavy industry’, based on coastal locations for importing/exporting, large areas of flat land and port locations. Very few candidates appreciated that the electronics industry is a ‘footloose’ industry and, therefore, could be located anywhere. Those that did understand the nature of the industry and made reference to ‘proximity to universities’, ‘location in pleasant surroundings’, (Kyushu) or ‘end products being light and flown out by plane’ (rather than shipped using the ports) normally accessed Level 2 and some scored maximum marks. In part (c) the majority of candidates did appreciate that the question was about industrial pollution and not transport, although they often did not write in detail about the solutions. The Minimata Bay incident seemed to be well known and was frequently quoted by candidates.

Question 5

In (a)(i) candidates invariably showed accurate location knowledge with regard to the UK and the areas liable to flooding, although a minority did just name the cities given on the map which gained no credit. Few candidates managed to access Level 2 on question (iii) and confined their answers to vague comments like ‘flooding will occur’. Where examples were given it was usually UK examples that were quoted rather than the Ganges/Bangladesh. In (b)(i) a number of candidates tried to explain the pattern rather than describe it. Part (b)(ii) was probably the least well answered question on the paper. Push and pull factors were again confused and a significant number of candidates tried to make out a case for ‘pull factors to Brazil’ (eg. tourism) or the push factors from Bangladesh. Some wrote about pull factors into Rio and then the push factors from the favelas! Clearly many candidates had no idea about an urban area in one of the countries. Very few candidates accessed Level 2 as even those who understood the terms often gave long lists of factors without any explanations or simply gave opposites. In (b)(iv) nearly every candidate simply lifted data from the pie charts. Part (c) produced a full range of answers from the excellent detail about dykes in Vietnam or self-help schemes in Rio, to vague answers about nowhere in particular, some of which was lifted from the pie charts or mentioned charities like Action Aid, Cafod, Oxfam but without any real detail.

Geography B Short Course

Centre-Assessed Coursework (3037/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 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 weaker candidates, for describing the full range of data collection techniques that they intended to use in their teacher-directed investigation. In reality, these candidates used few, if any, of the techniques described and this should have been reflected in the marking. 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 bypass 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 weaker 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 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, 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!

Foundation Tier (3037/F)

General Comments

The entry, although over 100, only had 3 centres over 10 candidates and two of these had less than 20 candidates. Furthermore, the pattern of entry suggested that only the very weakest candidates were entered for this examination. It is therefore very difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions. The same weaknesses were present in this cohort as had been recognised in previous years. These candidates find it very difficult to reproduce any place knowledge to any extent. There was also considerable evidence of candidates not really understanding what a question was asking for. The idea of a geographical distribution seemed totally beyond most of these candidates and also many did not appear to read the questions carefully enough. This was particularly evident where a question was based on a piece of stimulus material. In many cases candidates totally ignored the map or diagram on which the question was based.

Question 1

Most candidates could identify the Lake District National Park. Virtually no candidate could name or locate a coal fired power station despite the fact that the specification lists these as one of the local case studies that has to be studied in detail. Many ignored the map altogether and just wrote a possible answer on the page opposite.

Question 2

Question 2(a) proved completely beyond the majority of the candidates. They made general statements about the different farming systems. These were largely concerned about what arable or pastoral farming was and there was no attempt to use the map to state where these farming systems were practised in the UK. The nearest attempt was a quantitative statement about how much of the country practised a particular form of farming. It was disappointing how few scored both marks on part 2(b). Most recognised the part played by the CAP in subsidising hill-sheep farmers, but the majority thought that the sheep grazed on the inbye.

Question 3

Map reading was poorly done. Very few candidates could use the OS map extract key to recognise that the number 6 referred to the height of the land. A few picked out the motorways, which appeared to have limited the expansion north and westwards of Bristol. There were some good answers to part (iii) but too many instances of carelessness in transferring the route of the M4 onto the sketch map. This was despite the fact that the other motorways had been drawn in to provide a number of reference points. The presence of the motorway was often the only reason given for the location of Cribbs Causeway and this was often left without any development as to why it was important for an out-of-town retail park. Few candidates could define a footloose industry and once again the presence of the motorway was frequently the only correct answer seen in the answers to (c)(ii).

Question 4

Quite a number of these candidates had an idea of what was meant by the core in part (a) and the corresponding reference to the periphery in 5(a). Rotterdam-Europoort was the choice of the largest centre, while the other centres chose Paris as their European conurbation. It was pleasing that there was an improvement in the knowledge of the reasons for growth of the conurbation compared with previous years, although this could be the result of a different form of the question testing this topic. Part (c) on the other hand largely produced vague, generalised statements whatever problem was chosen, with little reference made to specific information relevant to the chosen conurbation.

Question 5

Few candidates appreciated why water shortages were increasing in Mediterranean Spain. The usual answers were that tourists washed and drank water. As usual those candidates who read Figure 5, merely reproduced the information without any development or elaboration, but many ignored the information given and wrote vaguely about drunken tourists etc.

Question 6

The only candidates who scored on part 6(a) were those who managed to use Setouchi and Hanshin from Figure 9. It was very disappointing that they could not even name Tokyo the capital of the country. Many candidates tried to use the names of the 4 main Japanese islands as names of the cities. Centres should recognise that the Short Course only has to concentrate on Honshu. Many candidates were inaccurate in plotting the line graph. The geographical distribution of the Japanese car industry proved difficult and there was little evidence of the specific case study information about the factors influencing this industry, which was required in part (d).

Question 7

Candidates were unable to relate the change in the weather during the year in the Ganges Delta to the different farming activities. They seemed most concerned that the farmers would get wet during the heavy monsoon rains.

Question 8

This was the best-answered question on the paper but there is still the fixation with the hole in the ozone layer. More careful reading of the questions would have helped because whilst candidates saw it was on global warming, they failed to recognise that it was restricted to the destruction of the rain forest in part (c) and gave information on the burning of fossil fuels. In the same way part (d) was not always answered in terms of the change in the way energy could be produced.

Question 9

Sustainable development proved difficult for these candidates and there was not a good appreciation of the differences between short and long term aid.

Higher Tier (3037/H)

General Comments

With only 40 candidates any report will not be very helpful to centres because with so few centres involved they may or may not be representative. The general feeling is that candidates find the place emphasis of this specification difficult in that their answers are still failing to make good use of up-to-date case study information, even on the local studies specifically required in the specification.

Question 1

A worrying aspect of this question, apart from a failure to know the name of a coal fired power station, is the lack of knowledge about locations in Great Britain – even where a power station was named as say being in Teesside, it could be located on the map as far away as Kent! Most candidates could name the Lake District, however.

Question 2

It was centre specific whether the candidates could name a hill sheep farm – even though it is specifically referred to in the specification. Where this was not done candidates could not get out of Level 1. Diversification seems to be associated only with tourist activities; there was little reference made to agricultural changes.

Question 3

Most candidates could recognise the meaning of the number 6, but they had more difficulty in naming the features shown on the map which appear to have restricted the growth of Bristol, apart from the motorways. There was some carelessness in drawing the motorways on Figure 3, even though there were enough reference points given on Figure 2. Knowledge of the M4 corridor was sound but candidates saw part (c) as giving their standard explanation of the reasons for the hi-tech industries importance in this area without making use of the O.S. extract. This question was testing cartographic skills of map interpretation and this was a requirement if Level 3 was to be achieved. All parts of a question must be answered.

Question 4

This was answered quite well with some factual information about the chosen conurbations shown. The nature of the specification is that the question on this topic is always likely to be open-ended.

Question 5

As ever, little specific knowledge of the impact of tourism on Mediterranean Spain was seen. If the candidates restricted themselves to the impact on the environment, which was rare, the effects could have been true of any tourist resort. Level 3 therefore was rarely achieved.

Question 6

It was of concern that few candidates could name any settlements on Honshu, even the capital of the country, Tokyo. The more canny candidates made use of Figures 8 and 9 to get 2 towns correct. The description and explanation of the distribution of the Japanese car industry rarely achieved Level 3 as the candidates took this to be a question dealing with Japanese industry in general and had little specific knowledge of this particular type of industry.

Question 7

The more able candidates could relate the farming activities to the different seasons of the monsoon climate, but these were few and far between. There were far too many vague, general statements referring to wet and dry, suggesting little real knowledge of the changes in the weather during the year.

Question 8

Candidates still find describing and extracting information from a stimulus like Figure 11 difficult. They either ignored the map altogether and wrote a general account of deforestation or copied information off the map without giving any development or elaboration. Parts (b) and (c) were generally well answered.

Question 9

This did not prove too difficult and it was pleasing to see an increased appreciation of what is meant by sustainable development. Candidates tended to rely on a description of the differences between long and short term aid without really concentrating on the relative advantages of these two forms of aid.

Mark Range and Award of Grades

Full Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3032C	30	75	33.8	14.3
3032/1F	75	90	37.1	11.4
3032/2F	120	135	53.1	17.4
Foundation tier overall 3032F	--	300	124.0	36.5

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3032/C boundary mark	raw	30	15	12	9	6	3
	scaled	75	38	30	23	15	8
3032/1F boundary mark	raw	75	38	34	30	26	22
	scaled	90	46	41	36	31	26
3032/2F boundary mark	raw	120	63	54	46	38	30
	scaled	135	71	61	52	43	34
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		300	149	129	109	89	69

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3032C	30	75	55.6	13.2
3032/1H	75	90	47.2	11.5
3032/2H	120	135	76.9	19.7
Higher tier overall 3032H	--	300	179.7	38.3

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
3032/C boundary mark	raw	30	27	23	19	15	12	-
	scaled	75	68	58	48	38	30	-
3032/1H boundary mark	raw	75	46	42	38	34	27	-
	scaled	90	55	50	46	41	32	-
3032/2H boundary mark	raw	120	82	74	66	59	49	-
	scaled	135	92	83	74	66	55	-
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		300	219	188	166	145	118	104

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (4167 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	25.7	45.5	63.7	78.2	89.2

Higher tier (4205 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	16.7	42.8	63.9	82.9	94.6	97.5

Overall (8372 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	8.4	21.5	32.1	54.4	70.2	80.7	87.9	93.4

Short Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3037/C	30	30	14.6	4.8
3037/F	70	90	30.9	10.7
Foundation tier overall 3037/F	--	120	45.5	13.5

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3037/C boundary mark	raw	30	15	12	9	7	5
	scaled	30	15	12	9	7	5
3037/F boundary mark	raw	70	39	35	31	28	25
	scaled	90	50	45	40	36	32
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		120	58	53	48	43	38

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3037/C	30	30	16.6	4.4
3037/H	70	90	43.2	9.6
Higher tier overall 3037/H	--	120	59.7	11.4

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
3037/C boundary mark	raw	30	30	25	20	15	12	-
	scaled	30	30	25	20	15	12	-
3037/H boundary mark	raw	70	43	40	37	34	27	-
	scaled	90	55	51	48	44	35	-
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		120	81	72	65	58	47	41

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (107 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	16.8	24.3	44.9	58.9	71.0

Higher tier (36 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	2.8	13.9	36.1	52.8	88.9	94.4

Overall (143 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	0.7	3.5	9.1	25.9	40.6	57.3	67.8	76.9

Definitions

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

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

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