ASSESSMENT and QUALIFICATIONS ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography 3032/3037

Specification B

Report on the Examination

2006 examination - June series

- 3032 Geography
- 3037 Geography (Short Course)

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

Contents

Full Course 3032

Full Course 3032

This page has been left intentionally blank

GCSE Geography B – Full Course

Centre-Assessed Coursework (3032/C)

General

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

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

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

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

Administration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Marking Criteria

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

Applied Understanding

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

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

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

Methodology

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

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

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

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

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

Data Presentation

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

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

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

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

techniques being used. It is not essential that the element of complexity indicated with the Level 3 statement is delivered by means of ICT, but, if it is not, then it has to be shown by other means.

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

Data Interpretation

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation

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

In the most effective enquiries, candidate's evaluation statements were detailed and specific to the enquiry rather than being vague and generic. Furthermore instead of discussing the three components of the criteria separately they proceeded to link the three components identifying the fact that poorly/faulty

methodology led to inaccurate results and that conclusions based upon such results had, therefore, questionable validity.

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

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

Summary

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

Paper 1 – Foundation Tier (3032/1F)

There was the usual spread of abilities entered for this tier but generally it appeared the majority of the candidates had been entered for the correct level. The feeling was that there was not a question equivalent to the poorly attempted one last year on electricity generation, with the possible exception of 7(c). This specification has quite a high emphasis on knowledge and factual recall, and this area still remains a problem. Candidates at this level still do not know often the most basic information about their case studies. The question on an upland reservoir was a case in point. The demand for factual recall does mean that candidates who under-prepare and undertake only a perfunctory revision will not do well. Centres should not try to predict what question will come up in an exam by looking at the previous year's paper. Centres should emphasis the importance of linked statements, which at least in most cases will get them into the bottom of Level 2. It was felt that the paper was accessible to the targeted candidates and was an appropriate test of their geographical knowledge understanding and skills.

Question 1

The specification content is unique among those offered by AQA in providing a list of key words and phrases that have to be learnt. Candidates generally scored well on 1(a), with only counter-urbanisation causing any difficulty. This was not so true of the definition type questions in 6(a)(v) and 7(a)(i). It was disappointing that a large number of candidates were not able to correctly shade in the position of the in-bye. Those who were in the correct general area often forgot to include the top small field. A few candidates shaded between lines two and three, which was acceptable.

Question 2

There was a range of responses to this question, which was common with the higher tier and therefore was particularly targeted at the Grade C candidates. Candidates who had some knowledge of urban morphology were generally able to complete the table giving details of the generalised model. The mark scheme for this was very generous but at the same time one incorrect fact in any of the descriptions of a particular urban zone invalidated the mark for that zone. Surprisingly the most common errors were seen in the description of the CBD, where factories and large amounts of housing were mentioned as being a feature of the central part of a town. In (b), the very weakest repeated the model in words. There were many candidates who failed to obey the instructions to include names of streets or districts in their answer. The most common failing however was a failure to make some attempt to compare their chosen urban area with the model in Figure 2. Generally however this question was reassuring well done. If the candidates were able to successfully name an urban area, not including Italy, Mediterranean Spain, Japan or the Lake District, they often scored three marks with street names etc. included. The most common example chosen was Blackburn. Centres are recommended to choose a local example with which the candidates would be familiar. Their coursework may be useful here. Sometimes a slightly smaller urban area works better than a large conurbation. The description given in the specification of a 'large urban area' can be interpreted very flexibly.

Question 3

(a)(i) was generally well done. The main marks lost were if the candidate did not 'draw and label'. Most candidates used the photographic evidence to recognise the flat land or the river as being important in the siting of this chemical complex. (a)(iii) on the other hand was not very well answered. Many candidates failed to realise that the focus of this question was the chemical industry. Few candidates were able to identify the characteristics of 'heavy industry'. References to iron and steel, car manufacture, etc. were common and inappropriate to this question. The candidates misread the question and explained why the location was a good location for heavy industry rather than why the chemical industry could be classified as heavy industry. In other words they did not emphasise the significance of the bulky nature of both the

industry's raw materials and finished products. The use of acronym HBLV (High Bulk Low Value) would be useful here.

Question 4

This question proved successful and it was very pleasing to note that the candidates had taken note of suggestions given in previous Reports on the Examination, in that they used the statistics, and many made attempts to process the figures. In other words they are getting better at using data. They nearly all recognised the change in the path was that it had become wider and deeper, giving measurements to support their answers. The arithmetic manipulation of the figures to work out how much wider and deeper the path had become was an encouraging feature of this year's cohort. In contrast (a)(ii) was not so good. Most of the answers given were human based but those who gave physical reasons were generally spot on. Many gave bland answers but failed to appreciate that there had to be LOTS of people DOING something to emphasise the wording of the question which referred to the growth of tourism. Many candidates in (b) chose to ignore the word 'one' in bold and listed all the problems they could think of, including extensive answers on footpath erosion! The main downfall was in not linking their problem to the growth of tourism. This saw many candidates stuck at the top of Level 1. On the positive side we are seeing far fewer unqualified pollution answers, so this message is being taken on board.

Question 5

Most candidates plotted the point accurately in (a)(i) and realised that the line had to be extended to the plotted point. Some candidates failed to be rewarded because their pencils were blunt resulting in the plotted points losing accuracy. There were some good answers to (b). The candidates had obviously taken this taken this topic to heart. On the whole they wrote about sensible suggestions often backed up with real case study information. This is how Geography GCSE answers should be! Even the unconventional solutions were generally feasible. There were far more evidence of linked statements, here allowing more candidates to reach Level 2.

Question 6

In (a)(ii), most candidates correctly identified why it was an arable farm, quoting evidence from Figure 7, even if they believed it was a pastoral farm as indicated in part (a)(i). Most candidates answered (a)(iv) well, although some missed the word 'lots' when quoting evidence about fertiliser, pesticide or machinery. The word 'quota' in the context of farming was not well known. The mark scheme did not allow the idea of selling. Those candidates who had some idea recognised that a quota had something to do with an amount and growing or producing. The most original answer was that 'half of a half is a quota'! (a)(vi) was very well answered. Many candidates produced answers that would have shined on a higher tier paper. Many scored the maximum in (a)(vii) for recognising that the flat land made the use of machinery easier. There were some who wrote negatively such as "because if it was steep land machinery would not be able to be used." There were also some who felt that as it was near the sea it was good as the sea provided water for irrigation! v(iii) was far too vague on the climate of East Anglia. Very few candidates can recall factual information about the climate. References to 'just the right amount of rain', 'it is always sunny' were common. References to seasons were few and linked statements with the link between the climate and farming were few and far between. Some think East Anglia is the second Sahara Desert as it is so hot and dry, but equally others saw it as the Amazon as it was so hot and wet. (b) was also very poorly done. There were some good points on organic farming but little idea on the demands of food processing firms. Many candidates failed to recognise that there was an internal choice within this question and either tried to deal with both the effects of supermarkets and food processing firms or treated them as it they were the same thing.

Question 7

There was very little idea of an area of land being the key to a drainage basin in the answers to (a)(i). One candidate even thought it was where the contents of your toilet went! Many candidates missed out part (ii) – perhaps the diagram was too detailed for them. The watershed was the least well-done part. The tributary and confluence were also muddled up. There is a need for another reminder here of the need for a sharp pencil and that the arrow must point precisely to a point and not leave any room for discussion by the examiner. The lack of an arrow meant that it was not clear where the candidate felt the feature to be located. Too many candidates simply wrote 'tributary' almost at random across the map. b(ii) was quite well done. Mistakes were made when candidates just listed further attractions. Most had some idea that the accessibility to the area was good. Candidates need to be reminded that if the question requires reference to the map there must be evidence, by the use of grid references, names etc, that they have done this. The lack of evidence of the use of the map was also evident in b(iii). The greatest weakness however was the result of misreading the question. Candidates described the use made of river basins without recognising that the question required them to show how the river basins are actually managed in order to develop the different uses. There was a concentration on the tourist use of water, without showing how the building of a dam would be necessary to create a reservoir, which could be used for recreational activities. The disappointing nature of 7(c) has already been referred to. Many left this question blank, but not as many as the question on electricity generation last year. Many candidates correctly named a reservoir but had little or no case study knowledge of the physical advantages of the site. A significant number used the reservoirs named on the O.S. map extract provided, failing to realise that the question asked them to name an upland not a lowland reservoir. Candidates frequently seem unable to distinguish between reservoir and HEP station locations. Keilder was the most commonly named location but here the candidates largely chose to ignore the question and wrote anything they could think about reservoirs and by-passed any reference to physical advantages of its location.

Paper 1 – Higher Tier (3032/1H)

Generally the candidates who were entered for this tier were appropriately entered, but there still remains a significant minority who would have benefited from choosing the Foundation Tier. However even these could tackle at least the vast majority of the paper. There still remains the problem of lack of examination technique by even the most able candidates. This specification has quite a high emphasis on knowledge and factual recall, and this area still remains a problem although it was pleasing to see greater knowledge of case studies this year. However the demand for factual recall does mean that candidates who were under-prepared and undertook only a perfunctory revision could not do well. Centres should not try to predict what question will come up in an exam by looking at the previous year's paper. Centres should emphasis the importance of linked statements, which at least in most cases will get them into the bottom of Level 2. Fleshing out these linked statements with some detail is what is required for Level 3. This is particularly important in the longer questions 6 and 7, which make greater demands on the candidates. There was little evidence of inadequate time to complete the paper. There was some evidence that candidates missed adding information to diagrams, e.g. 1(b) and 7(a), but it is not clear whether they merely missed seeing these questions or were unable to answer them.

Question 1

The only multiple-choice answer which caused any difficulty was on (a)(ii), where suburbanisation was often given rather than counter-urbanisation. b(i) has already been referred to, but of those who attempted this question only a minority shaded the in-bye accurately and completely. Many candidates confused the in-bye with area 2 on the diagram, the enclosed rough grazing. There was still too great a tendency to vagueness in (b)(ii), with frequent references to 'poor soils' and 'poor climate'. Many candidates misread the question and gave details of how hill sheep farmers in the Lake District have diversified rather than explaining why they needed to diversify into non-agricultural activities. Those who read the question correctly often saw the answer merely in terms of the farmers not earning enough money rather than considering the low profit margins. There were also candidates who ignored Figure 1 altogether despite the wording of the question.

Question 2

This question produced a very wide range of responses. There were some very detailed case study examples with plenty of detail, but at the other end this question was a prime example of lack of specific knowledge. Urban morphology and the Burgess model was generally known, but too many fell down by including erroneous information – one factual error in a particular land use zone on Figure 2, invalidated the mark for that zone. The most common error was the inclusion of factories in the CBD. There was a tendency to rework the information in (b), which gave the candidates at least 2 marks. About 50% did not name any streets or districts in their answer despite the precise instructions in the question. The main failing however, even among detailed answers, was a failure to attempt a comparison with the generalised model given in Figure 2. There were some good answers on Liverpool, Manchester and Newcastle. The most common example chosen was Blackburn. Centres are recommended to choose a local example with which the candidates would be familiar. Their coursework may be useful here. Sometimes a slightly smaller urban area works better than a large conurbation. The description given in the specification of a 'large urban area' can be interpreted very flexibly.

Question 3

Most scored well on (a), although those who did not 'draw and label were not credited in (a)(i). (b) offered a classic example of lack of precision. Many candidates offered no locational points at all. Some named 'Merseyside' or the 'Mersey Basin', presumably using the photograph, but then confused the mid-Mersey industry with the petro-chemical industry at Stanlow, e.g. raw materials were coal, salt and large quantities of imported oil. Those candidates who had the necessary factual knowledge often did not gain

full credit because they misread the question and wrote an account of the reasons for the chemical industry being located in the mid-Mersey or Teesside rather than explaining why the chemical industry in these areas is an example of a heavy industry. In other words they did not emphasise the significance of the bulky nature of both the industry's raw materials and finished products. The use of acronym HBLV (High Bulk Low Value) was useful here.

Question 4

There were a number of very good answers to (a). Candidates gave good accounts of the processes leading to deepening and widening of the path, such as deepening by the trampling of vegetation, the lack of roots to bind the soil and soil compression and compaction. Physical processes were considered, including run-off eroding soil etc. There were some candidates who saw the stones and bare rock represented in the third year as evidence of footpath repair. Some answers to (b) gained no credit because the candidate failed to indicate a conflict of interest which invariably led to very generalised answers and non identification of the protagonists. This was despite a very generous interpretation of the mark scheme. Very often these zero credited answers confined themselves to the problems caused by tourists.

Question 5

This question generally scored well, with most candidates scoring full marks in part (a). The main weakness was the failure to specify the type of pollution. The Reports on the Examination every year indicate that candidates gain no credit for pollution, which is not qualified. In (b), the less able candidates failed to read the question carefully enough to realise the consideration of only one solution. They often gave a whole series of possible solutions without giving any detail to any of them. Better candidates often failed to reach full marks, although concentrating on one solution, because they failed to really add much of significance to what information they had given in (a). For example if the congestion charge was given as a possible solution, the opportunity was missed to show how by raising money from the congestion charge which could be used for improvements to public transport would increase the incentive for the public not to use their cars.

Question 6

Candidates seemed familiar with a systems diagram and so were able to complete the diagram. The most common way in which marks were lost was to include information not shown on Figure 7, e.g. seeds. Candidates rather over emphasised the amount of aid the farmers get from the CAP, thinking of it in terms of large financial gains. There were many vague answers and there was a tendency in (a)(ii) for simple descriptive points about the different policies to be made without linking them to the impact on farming. For example, the impact of the old subsidy system should have been seen in terms of increased use of fertilizers, leading to greater yields and hence greater profits. a(iii) produced a wide range of responses. There were those largely relying on vague climatic statements, like 'warm summers' with no link to the farming. 'Good', 'perfect' and 'suitable' climate and soils still abound, even in these higher tier scripts. Candidates need to realise that these will gain no credit even at the lowest Level 1 basic level. The most common linked statement was the relationship between the flat relief and the use of machinery. On the other hand there were some very good answers. It is obvious that some schools had used Lynford House farm as their case study, perhaps using the information on the FACE website. This is an excellent way of gaining up-to-date information. They were able to produce some excellent answers, particularly dealing with the soil types enjoyed by this particular farm. There were some candidates who related flat to sea level and appeared to have confused East Anglian farming with the farming on the alluvium of the Ganges Delta, merely substituting wheat for rice. (b) was not well done despite it being specified clearly in the specification. There were many vague generalities about fresh produce, organic produce etc, without any details of the influence of the supermarkets. Many candidates failed to recognise that there was an internal choice within this question and either tried to deal with both the effects of supermarkets and food processing firms or treated them as it they were the same thing. The picture of all farms having to be within 45 minutes of a supermarket is an interesting one! The best answers dealt with contracts,

scientific methods, on-site packaging facilities, and the greater specialisation in a limited range of crops or a nearness to a food processing facility such as a sugar beet factory or a freezing plant.

Question 7

There was a great deal of carelessness in the quality of the sketch in (a). Rivers started beyond the watershed and there was imprecision in the location of a confluence. Generally the understanding of the term 'watershed' was variable and the representation of the drainage basin often did not include the whole extent. Most were able to list the four tourist attractions. There were some examples of four figure references, which gained no credit, but the most common failing was where the name of the feature was linked to its location by a blue arrow. The reference was given to the name rather than the actual location. Candidates often failed to show evidence of the use of the O.S. map extract in (b)(ii), or merely referred generally to good access and so did not gain full credit. The lack of evidence of the use of the map was also evident in (b)(iii). The greatest weakness however was the result of a misreading of the question. Candidates described the use made of river basins without recognising that the question required them to show how the river basins are actually managed in order to develop the different uses. There was a concentration on the tourist use of water, without showing how the building of a dam would be necessary to create a reservoir which could be use for recreational activities. Candidates were content to say that river basins could provide a supply of fresh water without indicating the need for a water treatment works or pumping station. Kielder was by far the most common choice of reservoir in (c). A sizeable number of candidates choose a reservoir from off the O.S. map extract, despite the fact they were all very obviously lowland reservoirs, which are not a requirement in the specification. There was still a lack of detailed answers justifying gaining Level 3. There was a need for some representative climatic figures, details of the nature of the uplands in the area where Keilder is located, reference to the impervious nature of the rock type and precise reference to the human usage of both the actual reservoir and the market for its water. Any development of the information given was often fairly tenuous. As referred to in last year's report, centres should make sure they have covered all the case studies required at the local scale in the specification content.

Paper 2 – Foundation Tier (3032/2F)

General

Overall the quality was similar to or just below last year's papers. The higher/foundation split was understood by centres to a much greater extent, so there were fewer candidates sitting this paper who would have been better served by attempting the higher paper. Candidates who wrote linked statements invariably accessed Level 2 and therefore gained more marks. Continuing the trend of recent years, locational knowledge was often poorly developed by many candidates at F level. Centres should not try to predict what questions will come up in an exam by looking at the previous year's paper.

Detailed comments on questions deserving of special mention

Question 4(b) was probably the best-answered question on the paper. A high percentage of candidates were able to make use of the data in 4(b)(iii) and there were some good answers in 4(b)(iv) on the after effects of tropical storms. However, the development project in question 5(e) again proved beyond the majority of Foundation Tier candidates. A large number of candidates made no attempt to answer this question. Of those that did attempt it, a significant number of candidates gave the 'Cassa' as their development project (and gained no credit), or made only a few brief statements about CAFOD or Christian Aid, which was enough for Level 1 only. Very few candidates mentioned a specific development project.

There seemed to be an increase this year in the vague and over generalised answers, which, whilst gaining some credit, lacked any specific geographical detail. The two six mark questions on Spain and Southern Italy afforded the candidates a chance to develop a detailed geographical answer. However, hardly a single candidate named the Autostrada del Sole or a market such as Naples. This specification is place based and it would be pleasing to see candidates using their knowledge to write about these specific places which they have studied in preparation for the examination. Too many candidates still insist on writing vague words such as "good" or "bad" in response to soils and their influence on farming.

There also seemed to be an increase this year in the numbers of candidates who failed to answer the question set. The advice has been offered on many previous occasions that candidates should read each question carefully and underline the key phrases in the stem of the question.

With reference to questions 4(d)(i) and (ii), there was widespread misunderstanding about this topic and, as so many made no attempt, one wonders if some centres actually teach the Green Revolution. Some centres may need to review their teaching of this part of the specification and the study of a development project.

Question 1

Generally well answered with many candidates gaining full marks or nearly full marks. The main errors were in (a)(i), the M2 often given, in (a)(iv), 'pull' factors were often selected and in (a)(vi), global warming was frequently given as the answer.

Question 2

Most candidates could access Question (b)(i) and gained a minimum of one mark. The most popular response in question (c)(i) and (ii) was Dover, although a common misconception amongst candidates is the belief that the M20 serves the port.

Rotterdam/Europoort was the most popular region chosen in part (d), whilst the Ruhr conurbation was the least popular. In general the question was poorly answered with little specific geographical detail offered by the majority of candidates.

Question 3

Many candidates scored poorly on (a) through a combination of a lack of specific knowledge and the incorrect location of names of holiday resorts. Benidorm on the Costa Blanca was by far the most common correct answer.

Some candidates, by careless plotting of the temperatures for June and July in (b), scored poorly. Candidates need to be accurate in such questions and aim to replicate the mode of presentation of information as shown in the partially completed chart. Disappointing responses to (b)(iv) were common. Hardly any linked statements were provided and very few candidates mentioned the seasons. A typical answer was "*it's warmer in Spain*" or "*there's more rain in UK*". The answers to (b)(v) were very disappointing. Many candidates either restricted themselves to the photograph or were only able to state briefly problems of litter, noise and sewage pollution. There were very few linked statements and few answers contained any real geographical information, so only the most able reached Level 2. The trees in the photograph were often seen as a problem, as were tidal waves and tsunamis!
Most candidates were able to access part (c)(i) and full marks were common, although a minority did not give characteristic features of the physical environment. The majority of candidates scored some marks in (c)(iii). These were usually for comments relating to industrial development and tourism.

Question 4

High scores were common here in (b)(ii) and (iii). It was pleasing to see so many access Level 2 in part (iii) where the use of linked statements was impressive. Although the responses to part (iv), on the after effects of the storm, were not quite as detailed, there were nevertheless some good answers and many candidates were able to access Level 2. The answers to (d)(i) and (ii) were disappointing. Very few candidates appear to have any knowledge of the Green Revolution. Many believed it to be some scheme to save the rain forests or reduce global warming.

Whilst there were some accurate answers to (e), a significant number of candidates presented irrelevant information, by either offering information on both birth rates and death rates, or misinterpreting the question and writing about why there was a high death rate.

Question 5

Most candidates found parts (a) and (c)(ii) and (iii) easy and so were able to gain full marks. (e) was not well answered. Too many candidates could not name a development project and proceeded to offer very vague and generalised information about developments that could have been anywhere. A minority offered examples from the MEDC, usually Southern Italy. Answers were generally disappointing also to (f)(iii). Too many candidates did not use the data to develop their answers and some misinterpreted the data, believing fossil fuels to be increasing. All too common was the answer which said that one source of energy had risen and another had gone down without any explanation.

Paper 2 – Higher Tier (3032/2H)

General

This year there were some very able candidates, who showed excellent knowledge of many of the topics and scored highly. Less able candidates did not score as highly on certain questions, particularly the tropical storm, 2(e), and the development project in 5(c). These proved to be very discriminatory questions. Only the most able candidates scored highly on 5(c). However, less able candidates did find a number of sections that they could score well on, especially 1 and 4(c)(i) on the effects of tropical storms. There is a general weakness in answering data stimulus question – including distributions, weather statistics and making comparisons. This is true not only of the less able candidates but also many of the more able candidates as well. Centres should not try to predict what question will come up in an exam by looking at the previous year's paper.

Detailed Comments on the Paper

This year the paper provided the candidates with slightly less support material than in previous years. This seemed to benefit most candidates who were able to write in detail about the Mezzogiorno and tropical storms with little stimulus material. Candidates were more aware this year of the phrase 'and with your own knowledge' and seemed to appreciate that they did need to use their own knowledge in order to access the higher levels and should not restrict themselves to the data provided. This may, however, have been due to a reduction in the stimulus material provided for them rather than a realisation of what was required.

One of the surprising outcomes from the paper was the lack of knowledge about global warming and the greenhouse effect. Whereas most candidates showed good knowledge about why the amounts of carbon dioxide were increasing as a result of deforestation, the overwhelming majority could not explain the enhanced greenhouse effect resulting from this increase in carbon dioxide. The majority of candidates stated that CO_2 trapped sunlight/solar heat/or stopped heat from the sun and hardly a single candidate mentioned that it trapped outgoing/long wave radiation from the ground! This is quite alarming. A number of candidates also still associate the greenhouse effect with the 'hole in the ozone layer'.

Once again 5(c) also proved to be a most discriminating question. There were some excellent answers provided by students who had clearly studied a development project (usually the dyke building in Vietnam) and could accurately describe the project and name the location. But there were an equal number of candidates who gave vague answers without any locations – Action Aid/ CAFOD/Oxfam/ Aid in Africa were perhaps the most popular. Such answers could only reach Level 1 in marking. A significant number of candidates again gave the 'Cassa' as their development project and clearly either had not read the question properly or believed Italy to be an LEDC! A small number of candidates 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 students.

Question 1

Generally well done, with many candidates able to achieve full marks. The main errors were on (a)(i), M2 often given, in (a)(iv), 'pull' factors were often selected and in (a)(vi) global warming was frequently the answer. In (b), a minority of candidates seemed to confuse harvest and cultivate, believing that you harvest before you cultivate.

Question 2

(a) was quite well answered and the islands of Hokkaido and Kyushu were well known. However, Mt. Fuji was not as well known and Kobe/Osaka also caused some problems, many candidates believing it was Tokyo. There were many good answers to (c) on the functions, but in the cross-section on (e) many

candidates could not get beyond the 'eye' and very few scored four marks. A number of candidates did not know the meaning of the term cross-section and tried to give an aerial view instead and so penalised themselves.

Question 3

The Costas of Spain and the Balearic Islands were well known in (a), but the holiday resorts were frequently placed in the wrong Costa or were placed inland! (b)(i) was very disappointing, as the majority of candidates were unable to recognise summer and winter seasons. Far too many candidates simply listed individual months and figures, so restricting themselves to Level 1. Hardly any linked statements were provided in (b)(ii) and again very few candidates mentioned the seasons. A typical answer was "*It's warmer in Spain and they have less rain*." Candidates are reminded that a question requiring 'reasons' should contain linked statements if they are to gain Level 2 credit. In (b)(iii), many candidates restricted themselves to the photograph and few candidates gave details about air pollution from hiring vehicles, destruction of habitats from clearance of the natural vegetation, noise and air pollution from the construction of hotels, disease caused by lack of water in some hotels and the lack of disinfection of swimming pools. Global warming was not considered relevant to this question. (c), however, contained some excellent descriptions of the improvements made in the Mezzogiorno and the majority of candidates provided good linked statements. Unfortunately, few candidates made specific reference to named improvements (e.g. Autostrada del Sole) or made 'accurate' reference to improvements in their 'standards of living'. These details were necessary in order to gain Level 3, so many candidates were restricted to the top of Level 2.

Question 4

The Brahmaputra was known only by a small number of candidates in (a). Most candidates managed to achieve Level 2 on the formation of the Ganges delta in (b) but few candidates achieved Level 3. Marks for this question were slightly better, however, than in the past. There was little mention of vegetation colonisation or the effect of the sea in the formation of the delta. (c) was like 3(c), very well answered up to Level 2 but there was a lack of 'specific' material, which was necessary for Level 3. (c)(iii) was probably the worst answered question on the paper and hardly a single candidate managed to give a good, detailed statement sufficient for Level 2 credit. The reasons for the monsoon climate in (d)(iii) were known much better than in previous years, indicating that the topic is now being well taught in many centres.

Question 5

The previous comments about 'skills' are relevant to part (a) and (d)(i). Very few candidates recognised patterns from the data in 5(a) and far too often lists of countries were given. In (d)(ii) few candidates were able to 'compare' the carbon dioxide levels and a lot of the data quoted was incorrect. The graph was often misinterpreted and a frequent mistake on this question was calculating the LEDC emissions as having risen by 16 million tonnes instead of 11 million tonnes. Also a significant number of candidates digressed into irrelevant reasons for the changes.

GCSE Geography B – Short Course

Centre-Assessed Coursework (3037/C)

General

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

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

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

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

Administration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Marking Criteria

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

Applied Understanding

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

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

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

Methodology

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

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

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

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

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

Data Presentation

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

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

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

To be able to access Level 2 and Level 3 marks in this section, all candidates have to provide evidence of at least two different types of ICT outcome in their enquiry. Candidates with no ICT had their marks in this section limited to Level 1 provided all other Level 1 criteria had been met. This compulsory element of ICT did not seem to present many problems to centres. Most candidates satisfied the basic ICT requirement and so had the opportunity to progress beyond Level 1. A significant number of candidates submitted entirely ICT generated enquiries. A number of these particular enquiries were outstanding, in terms of data presentation, but the majority were disappointing containing, as they did, a large number of fairly basic Excel produced bar and pie graphs. To access Level 3 marks, there has to be evidence of

three 'more complex' techniques being used. It is not essential that the element of complexity indicated with the Level 3 statement is delivered by means of ICT, but, if it is not, then it has to be shown by other means.

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

Data Interpretation

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation

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

In the most effective enquiries, candidate's evaluation statements were detailed and specific to the enquiry rather than being vague and generic. Furthermore instead of discussing the three components of

the criteria separately they proceeded to link the three components identifying the fact that poorly/faulty methodology led to inaccurate results and that conclusions based upon such results had, therefore, questionable validity.

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

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

Summary

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

Foundation Tier (3037/F)

The entry for this course was very small so it is difficult to make any generalisations. It was felt that this year's cohort was of a higher standard than in previous years. It was pleasing to note that they appeared to be better prepared in terms of examination technique and particularly in their 'place' knowledge, which is such a feature of this particular specification. However, centres should not try to predict what question will come up in an exam by looking at the previous year's paper.

Question 1(a) was generally well answered showing some knowledge of terms across the specification, with counter-urbanisation being the least well understood. The shading of the 'in-bye' caused more problems than was expected but candidates were generally able to link the correct letter to a problem suffered by farmers in the Lake District in part 1(b)(ii). Question 2 was not well answered. It was not clear whether the candidates had not studied a large urban area in sufficient depth to be able to name examples of streets/districts as required by the question or that the concept of urban morphology was difficult for candidates at this level. Map reading skills were adequate but there were still examples of candidates misreading the question and giving four figure as opposed to six figure grid references in Question 3(a).

Most candidates were able to show knowledge of their chosen conurbation in the European core in Question 4, by choosing the majority of the correct responses from the list of words provided. This was a definite improvement over previous years. It is hoped that it showed an improvement in factual knowledge rather than the candidates merely responding better to the form that the question on this topic took this year. The field sketching required in Question 5 based on the photograph generally provoked some good responses, with most candidates being able to draw in the beach, road and give some indication of the built up nature of Benidorm, whatever their artistic ability. They failed however, to appreciate what was required in labelling their completed sketch. Many merely used one word such as 'beach' or 'road'. It was hoped that the completed example would have given them a clue as to what was required. Perhaps the question should have used the word 'annotate' rather than 'label'. The different opinions given in Question 5(a)(iii) were often very generalised and lacking in specifics.

The graph in Question 6 was usually correctly plotted although there are still examples of candidates not having the necessary equipment, such as a ruler, so they were unable to draw a straight line or were using a pencil/pen which was too thick to give the necessary degree of accuracy. Parts 6(a)(ii) and (iii) proved difficult and few candidates could relate the information on the graph to the difficulty of Japanese industry in having to import most of their raw materials. Question 6(b) was very poorly answered, the significance of 'mass production techniques' and the 'just-in-time system of production' for Japanese industry was not known. The candidates made a good attempt to evaluate the different aspects of the Green Revolution in Question 7 but perhaps the wording of part 7(ii) was at fault in that many candidates merely counted up the number of advantages and disadvantages they had given and the side with the most was the basis of their decision.

The meaning of the cartoon in Question 8 proved more difficult than was expected. The question on global warming produced the usual range of responses from those who had no knowledge to those with a full explanation. The fixation with the hole in the ozone does not seem to go away. Failure to read the question in 8(b)(ii) meant that candidates often did not restrict their answers to the information on Figure 9. Part 8(b)(ii) was disappointing, in that candidates wrote in very generalised terms and did not show any real appreciation of what the effect of flooding would be. The specification requires knowledge of this in a regional context, namely Eastern England or the Ganges Delta. This was certainly not present in term of details of Eastern England. It might be that if the question had referred to the Ganges Delta then some better answers may have been seen.

Higher Tier (3037/H)

The entry for this course was very small so it is difficult to make any meaningful generalisations. It was felt that this year's cohort was of a higher standard than in previous years. It was pleasing to note that they appeared to be better prepared in terms of examination technique and particularly in their 'place' knowledge, which is such a feature of this particular specification. However, centres should not try to predict what question will come up in an exam by looking at the previous year's paper.

Question 1(a) was well answered, the candidates showing an appropriate knowledge of terms, with only counter-urbanisation causing any real difficulty. The position of the 'in-bye' was not always correctly shaded. Part 1(b)(ii) did result in some candidates giving a general account of difficulties of farming in the Lake District without using the information given in Figure 1. It was not clear whether this was due to poor examination technique or a misreading of the question. A frequent response was simply that they were not making enough money. Question 2 proved to be quite demanding. This was a common question with the Foundation tier and so was specifically aimed at the Grade C candidates. As indicated on the report on the Foundation tier it was not answered well. It was not clear whether the candidates had not studied a large urban area in sufficient depth to be able to name examples of streets/districts as required by the question or that the concept of urban morphology was difficult for candidates at this level. Candidates were generally able to give six figure references in part 3(a). The wording of Question 3(b) was aimed to give the higher ability candidates an opportunity to show their worth.

The candidates entered for this tier made quite good attempts to explain the reasons for the growth of their chosen European conurbation in Question 4. The most common conurbations chosen were Europoort-Rotterdam and the Paris Region. The reasons for growth were clearly known but there was still a disappointing lack of detailed regional knowledge. The field sketches in Question 3(a)(i) were not as good as the equivalent question on the Foundation tier. Questions which deal with different peoples' opinions on the development of tourism in Mediterranean Spain, did not give the candidates examples of suggested people to choose and this led to some very generalised answers. Part (b) was poorly answered. Many candidates did not confine their answers to economic factors and many did not read the question carefully enough to see that it was dealing with parts of Europe outside Mediterranean Spain.

Part 6(a)(ii) revealed a lack of precise knowledge about the location of the Japanese motor vehicle industry. Most answers, even from able candidates, consisted of a generalised account of Japanese industry and largely consisted of information about the fact that it was confined to the coast gave reasons why it was not found in the interior of the country. Few specific Japanese place names were given, and those indicated were largely confined to the names of islands. Just as indicated on the report on the Foundation tier, candidates had little knowledge of the significance of 'mass production techniques' and the 'just-in-time system of production' for Japanese industry.

The Green Revolution was generally well known although the information given in Question 7 was not always as closely tailored to the needs of the question as would have been hoped.

Candidates are not particularly good at describing distribution on a map, which is a fundamental skill expected of geography students. This was evident from their answers to Question 8(b)(ii). Part 8(b)(iii) was disappointing, in that candidates wrote in very generalised terms and did not show any real appreciation of what the effect of flooding would be. The specification requires knowledge of this in a regional context, namely Eastern England or the Ganges Delta. This was certainly not present in term of details of Eastern England. It might be that if the question had referred to the Ganges Delta then some better answers may have been seen. Higher Tier candidates coped quite well with the explanation of the link between global warming and the increased risk of flooding. Part 8(c) resulted in the usual plea for the country to give up entirely the building of fossil fuels and to go over entirely to the use of renewable

energy. Candidates should be given some appreciation of the impracticality of such a fundamental change in governmental energy policy!

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	35.6	14.4
3032/1F	75	90	35.5	11.3
3032/2F	120	135	57.4	16.9
Foundation tier overall 3032F	--	300	128.5	36.1

		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	37	33	29	26	23
	scaled	90	44	40	35	31	28
3032/2F boundary mark	raw	120	66	58	50	43	36
	scaled	135	74	65	56	48	41
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		300	152	133	114	95	76

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3032C	30	75	56.4	12.4
3032/1H	75	90	52.6	12.7
3032/2H	120	135	69.9	19.7
Higher tier overall 3032H	--	300	179.0	38.9

		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	51	46	41	36	30	-
	scaled	90	61	55	49	43	36	-
3032/2H boundary mark	raw	120	76	69	62	56	44	-
	scaled	135	86	78	70	63	50	-
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		300	219	187	165	144	116	102

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (3547 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	22.7	46.5	64.9	78.6	88.4

Higher tier (3545 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	16.2	42.3	63.3	80.8	95.5	97.5

Overall (7092 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	8.1	21.1	31.7	54.2	71.0	81.2	88.0	92.9

Short Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3037/C	30	30	15.3	5.4
3037/F	70	90	38.7	11.0
Foundation tier overall 3037/F	--	120	54.0	14.7

		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	43	40	37	34	31
	scaled	90	55	51	48	44	50
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		120	70	63	57	51	45

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3037/C	30	30	17.0	2.8
3037/H	70	90	44.7	11.8
Higher tier overall 3037/H	--	120	61.7	11.3

		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	44	40	36	33	26	-
	scaled	90	57	51	46	42	33	-
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		120	82	73	65	57	45	39

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (43 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	20.9	32.6	44.2	51.2	65.1

Higher tier (58 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	3.4	19.0	37.9	63.8	93.1	98.3

Overall (101 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	2.0	10.9	21.8	45.5	67.3	75.2	78.2	84.2

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).