

GCSE 2004

June Series



Report on the Examination

Geography

Specification C

- GCSE 3033
- GCSE 3038 (Short Course)

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

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

or

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

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

CONTENTS

Specification C 3033 (Foundation Tier)

Units 3033/1F, 3033/2F

	<i>Page No.</i>
3033/1F Decision-Making Exercise (DME)	4
3033/2F Managing Change in the Human Environment	8
Managing the Physical Environment	9
Managing Economic Development	9

Specification C 3033 (Higher Tier)

Units 3033/1H, 3033/2H and Coursework

	<i>Page No.</i>
3033/1H Decision-Making Exercise (DME)	10
3033/2H Managing Change in the Human Environment	12
Managing the Physical Environment	13
Managing Economic Development	13
3033/C F&H Coursework	14

Specification C 3038 (Short Course)

Units 3038/F, 3038/H and Coursework

	<i>Page No.</i>
3038/F Managing Change in the Human Environment	22
Managing the Physical Environment	24
Managing Economic Development	24
3038/H Managing Change in the Human Environment	25
Managing the Physical Environment	26
Managing Economic Development	26
3038/C F&H Coursework	27

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades	35
---------------------------------------	----

Specification C

Foundation Tier

Paper 1 - 3033/1F

General

Initial comments from centres indicated that candidates had found the examination a challenging, but fair test, which was closely related to the specification.

The issue was seen as a 'live and interesting issue', very much in the news during the past two years.

Most candidates attempted every part of each question, there were few gaps and consequently it appeared that there was sufficient time to address the paper.

The use of the resources was variable; it was clear that some centres had worked hard on preparing candidates in the use of resources while in other cases the resources were virtually ignored or simply copied.

Centres appear to be getting used to the style of the paper. There is no doubt, that a paper that tests the whole range of the assessment criteria is a challenge, particularly in terms of knowledge and application of understanding.

Focus for Development

The paper has a specific topic focus, which is used to assess skills, knowledge and applied understanding. It is worth considering how the assessment criteria might be reflected in the chosen topic. In order to prepare candidates effectively the following four areas might be worth considering.

1. Be aware of the precise commands of the questions and encourage candidates to respond to them. 'Describe' and 'Explain' are common commands but clearly mean different things and can reflect an increasing level of difficulty. However, even in the command 'describe' there are levels of difficulty and descriptions can be quite simple or increasingly complex.

In a resource based examination the prefix, 'with the help of Figure 1' is making the point that there are allocated marks for ideas or examples beyond the resource and that only using the resource will limit access to the highest mark levels.

2. Build up a revision worksheet on the topic, which identifies the key words and offers definitions. Also, include observations about the issues associated with the topic and remind candidates about comparative examples used during the course.
3. Issues based examination papers are always about identifying issues and conflicts and identifying management strategies. A philosophical element of the specification is an understanding that issues can have positive as well as negative impacts. This is a point worth emphasising – especially at the higher tier level.

4. There are a large number of marks linked to the application of skills and use of resources. Practice by using a range of resources throughout the course and ensure that candidates have a clear understanding of the type of skills required.

This is a different style of assessment and can come as a shock to candidates if they have not practised it. The use of a paper as part of a 'mock' exam may be helpful or using parts of questions in a class work or homework situation is a good way to develop confidence. The key is to ensure that good practice is built up throughout the course so candidates feel comfortable and confident in the final examination.

In particular, the following points need to be stressed.

- Ensure that candidates are well equipped. A pencil, ruler and a few coloured pencils would be useful for this type of paper.
- Stress the need for accuracy in the skills based questions. The questions are not always very difficult and so will demand a high level of accuracy.
- Check answers carefully, particularly the skills based questions. A number of small errors can add up to a loss of many marks.
- Use past papers to enable candidates to appreciate the style and concept of the paper.
- Practise by using a range of resources and getting students to identify the key points on them.
- Encourage students to mark up the key points in the resources (highlight/underline) in order to identify the relevant factors in relation to the questions.
- Stress the need to relate length and depth of response to the mark/space allocation.
- Encourage candidates to appreciate the developmental nature of levels marking, i.e. show them what a Level 1 response looks like and what it would take to make it Level 2.
- Make candidates aware of the distinction between copying the resource and actually using it to help them answer a question.
- Issues based questions are often about economic/environmental conflicts. Ensure that candidates have an awareness of this and understand the appropriate terminology.

Decision-Making Exercise (DME)

Question 1

(a) Most candidates used Figure 1 effectively and had a clear understanding of the terminology expressed in the question. Consequently, (a)(i) and (ii) presented few problems.

(b) The majority of candidates scored full marks for this question and showed a high level of applied understanding in organising the data in rank order.

(c) Virtually all candidates identified the link between wealth and energy use and were able to show some understanding about why it exists. Responses varied from simple points about wealthy countries having more money to spend on energy to more complex observations about comparative amounts of industry or energy using infrastructure. A number of candidates adopted a very individualistic approach, considering household appliances, cars, holidays, etc., as linked to both wealth and energy use. There were a small number of very sophisticated observations which identified considerations such as how difficult it is to access energy use in LEDCs since a proportion of it is generated by using fuel wood or animal manure.

Question 2

(a) The bar chart was completed successfully by virtually all candidates. Those that failed to get full marks either did not complete the key or had minor inaccuracies (often clearly linked to a lack of a ruler).

(b) This question presented few problems and candidates appeared to be comfortable with the terminology.

(c) The majority of candidates clearly understood the term 'fossil fuels' and many mentioned coal and oil in their responses. The understanding of the links between burning fossil fuels and pollution was variable with some candidates simply mentioning problems of 'smoke' and 'unclean air' while others expressed clear links to smog and associated health problems. A significant number of candidates quoted 'global warming' or 'acid rain', without always clearly showing that they understood how these link to burning fossil fuels, or the problems that they might cause.

Question 3

Most candidates made excellent use of the resource Figure 3 and were able to score high marks on this question.

Question 4

(a) This question tested basic Ordnance Survey map reading skills and in many cases, candidates achieved either full marks or no marks at all. A small number of candidates failed to answer the questions and clearly did not understand what was expected.

(b) The majority of candidates scored some marks on this question, many achieving full marks. Those that failed to score full marks usually had a lack of accuracy or failed to complete the key.

Surprisingly, a few candidates failed to complete part (a) and yet successfully completed part (b).

(c) Identifying physical features on an Ordnance Survey map appears to present a significant challenge for many candidates. There is a fundamental difficulty in understanding the word 'physical' and this was reflected in this question where many candidates named a range of human or built factors and failed to consider the physical landscape at all. Those that did recognise physical factors were often limited to simple descriptors such as 'a river' or 'hilly' and did not develop these basic ideas. A small number did mention the course of the river and its tributary and points about differentiated slopes.

(d) Responses to this question were variable with a number of candidates using the map very effectively to name and locate a range of factors, which illustrated that tourists used the area. At the highest level, candidates used the Tourist Information section of the key to build up a convincing case. At the lower level, candidates simply identified one or two points and did not fully develop the ideas. A small number of candidates misunderstood the question and addressed the idea of why people might be attracted to the area. This avenue of approach often yielded some credit but was often self-limiting.

Question 5

(a) Most candidates used the resource effectively to answer this question correctly.

(b) The idea of 'conflict' is clearly quite a challenging concept and this was reflected in many of the responses to this question. A significant number of candidates simply described the disadvantages of the proposed project and consequently failed to address the question. A small number of candidates addressed question in relation to the 'local negative' against the 'national good'. Since the focus of the question was conflict in the local community, this approach was often self-limiting.

Those candidates that did consider the question successfully usually began by identifying local people who might be affected positively or negatively and developed their response from there. This 'people centered' approach to conflict questions has obvious merits since it quickly gets to the heart of any potential conflicts.

(c) Responses to this question were excellent, with a wide range of possible answers expressed.

Question 6

Responses to this question were variable; from basic responses that did little more than copy isolated ideas from the resources to complex discussions, which offered detailed and sophisticated argument. The majority of candidates identified the fact that there might be both local and national perspectives and a small number reflected in some depth about future energy policy and links to global environmental management.

The most successful approach was to look back at all of the appropriate resources, rather than just Figure 5, and show a clear understanding of the range of positive and negative considerations. Having done this, a justifiable position could then be argued in some detail.

Foundation Tier

Paper 2 - 3033/2F

General

The paper proved to be an effective discriminator of geographical ability. It was accessible to candidates of all abilities at this tier and allowed them to demonstrate positive achievement. The majority of candidates gave very good responses to data. Geographical skills such as interpreting tables of figures, graphs, and pie charts were very good; however, use of map skills was more problematic for some candidates. Opportunities for extended writing were given in one or more parts of each question, and even the least able candidates were able to offer a response, which demonstrated some geographical understanding. The better candidates were able to offer more developed responses, demonstrating good understanding of geographical issues, backed up with some correct use of geographical vocabulary and some case study examples.

The vast majority of candidates completed the paper and there were relatively few parts of the questions that were not attempted.

Question 2 was generally the best answered, the subject matter appearing familiar to the majority of candidates.

Question 1: Managing Change in the Human Environment

In parts (a)(i) and (ii) most candidates were able to interpret the graph, but a significant number of candidates did not recognise that the figures were in millions. Part (a)(iii) was generally well done by a majority of the candidates.

Part (b) was well answered, with most candidates showing knowledge and understanding of problems caused by population growth. This was encouraging.

Similarly, part (c) was generally well done by a majority of the candidates, especially those opting for better food and health and equality for women. Most were able to offer a correct suggestion as to how population growth rate could be reduced and many did develop this response further. Sexual health and safe sex were often cited, but not linked in with population growth rate.

Part (d) was correctly completed by a majority of candidates.

In part (e), a significant number of candidates described 'pull' factors, not meeting the demands of the question. Candidates who gave lists of factors such as "drought", "war", "natural disasters", etc., failed to get beyond a Level 1 mark, i.e. a significant number of candidates, showed knowledge of the factors, but failed to develop their answers to explain their effects. The better candidates at this tier did offer some development as to how 'push' factors operated i.e. they explained how the negative changes in rural areas that lead to migration. Some candidates gave lengthy descriptions of the problems of shanty towns, when this was not required.

Parts (f)(i) and (ii) saw a widespread inability to use scale or direction. In part (iii) the majority of candidates showed knowledge and understanding of traffic schemes and the better candidates at this tier did offer some development as to how they operated. There were few good case study examples. In part (iv), straight lifts from the resource dominated the responses. A substantial number of candidates had little understanding of regeneration and tended to list general improvements. Only the most able offered some development as to the regenerative effects of the schemes.

Question 2: Managing the Physical Environment

In part (a)(i) most candidates were able to interpret the map in order to give the correct height, however a significant number did not give the units in their answer. Part (a)(ii) was generally well done by a majority of the candidates. Part (a)(iii) saw some confusion between human/physical attractions, but most candidates were able to identify a feature and link it to activities or specific map features. In part (a)(iv), most candidates were familiar with the concept of conflict, but a significant number stated separate problems for each chosen user. In part (a)(v), most candidates were able to give a solution, but again only the better candidates at this tier did offer some development as to how they operated.

Part (b) was well answered by a large majority of the candidates.

Part (c)(i) was correctly completed by a majority of the candidates, but a small number did incorrectly opt for site X and in (c) (ii), most candidates gained at least one mark, with some candidates recognising and using the term confluence and developing this to explain its effect. Many candidates recognised that the rivers met, but did not use the term confluence. In part (c) (iii), many candidates were able to offer a correct response however; there were a significant number of general statements, such as “it shows a big area”.

Part (d) elicited a wide range of responses. There were many simplistic references to ‘trees sucking up water’, but many candidates did explain hydrological processes, albeit often in simplistic terms.

Part (e) also elicited a wide range of responses. Most candidates were able to list schemes without development, fewer were able to go beyond possible solutions and explain how they reduced damage. Responses dealing with management of the effects of earthquakes and tropical storms were best done and ideas about long term, advance warning of earthquakes are widespread.

Question 3: Managing Economic Development

Parts (a) and (b)(i) did not prove problematic for a vast majority of the candidates. Part (b)(ii) was correctly completed by a majority of the candidates who attempted it. A significant number missed the question out, due to not reading the paper carefully. Part (b)(iii) was generally well done by a majority of the candidates, but where errors did arise, they tended to be over the nature of secondary products.

Part (b)(i) did not prove problematic for a vast majority of the candidates. Part (b)(ii) elicited a wide range of responses. A large number of candidates repeated the general principles of sustainability, without saying how these helped protect the environment or culture. There were however, some detailed accounts of small-scale tourist schemes in tropical rain forest areas, the Campfire scheme in Kenya and managed safari holidays in general. These tended to be centre-specific, but it was encouraging to see such detail of explanation appearing at this tier.

In parts (c)(i) and (ii) most creditable responses were generally vague and generalised observations about “money”, “job” and “pay back”. There was little evidence of prior knowledge of such schemes as those given in the resource. Only a small minority of candidates were able to develop their answers beyond simplistic statements.

Higher Tier

Paper 1 - 3033/1H

Decision-Making Exercise (DME)

Question 1

(a)(i) Most candidates clearly understood the relationship between energy use and GNP and were able to express a simple relationship. A small number failed to get the second mark by either using the data or identifying any slight anomalies in the relationship.

(ii) Most candidates used the data effectively to identify the energy use and GNP for Sweden and the USA. Having done this, a significant proportion of candidates then made a range of comparative points, often using the data to consider proportionate differences. A small number of candidates simply copied the data and failed to make any real comparisons.

(b) Virtually all candidates identified the link between wealth and energy use and were able to show some understanding about why it exists. Responses varied from simple points about wealthy countries having more money to spend on energy to more complex observations about comparative amounts of industry or energy using infrastructure. A number of candidates adopted a very individualistic approach, considering household appliances, cars, holidays, etc., as linked to both wealth and energy use. There were a small number of very sophisticated observations which identified considerations such as how difficult it is to access energy use in LEDCs since a proportion of it is generated by using fuel wood or animal manure.

Question 2

(a) Candidates used Figure 2 effectively to complete the pie chart. The majority of candidates achieved a high degree of accuracy in this task.

(b) The majority of candidates clearly understood the term 'fossil fuels' and many mentioned coal and oil in their responses. The understanding of the links between burning fossil fuels and pollution was variable with some candidates simply mentioning problems of 'smoke' and 'unclean air' while others expressed clear links to smog and associated health problems. A significant number of candidates quoted 'global warming' or 'acid rain', without always clearly showing that they understood how these link to burning fossil fuels, or the problems that they might cause.

(c) Candidates showed a high level of applied understanding to the question and the majority identified the fact that the reliance upon fossil fuels is short-term because of the finite nature of the resources. Many candidates also considered the environmental implications of continuing to use fossil fuels and the need to move towards environmentally friendly energy sources. A small number brought in the idea of political initiatives encouraging the use of the reliable energy sources.

Question 3

Most candidates used Figure 3 effectively to identify the environmental problems associated with renewable energy and man, which also showed an understanding of the economic and social issues linked to renewable development. The discussion about relative impacts was variable, with some candidates not getting beyond basic description while others made detailed and often very sophisticated comparative judgements.

At the highest level, candidates identified the command, 'with the help of Figure 3, and brought in a range of individual ideas to build up an impressive understanding.

Question 4

(a) This question tested basic Ordnance Survey map reading skills and in many cases, candidates achieved either full marks or no marks at all. A small number of candidates failed to answer the questions and clearly did not understand what was expected.

(b) The majority of candidates scored some marks on this question, many achieving full marks. Those that failed to score full marks usually had a lack of accuracy or failed to complete the key.

Surprisingly, a few candidates failed to complete part (a) and yet successfully completed part (b).

(c) Identifying physical features on an Ordnance Survey map appears to present a significant challenge for many candidates. There is a fundamental difficulty in understanding the word 'physical' and this was reflected in this question where many candidates named a range of human or built factors and failed to consider the physical landscape at all. Those that did recognise physical factors were often limited to simple descriptors such as 'a river' or 'hilly' and did not develop these basic ideas. A small number did mention the course of the river and its tributary and points about differentiated slopes.

(d) Responses to this question were variable, with a considerable number of candidates making excellent use of the Ordnance Survey map while others simply copied one or two points. The key to the question was explaining how the landscape might encourage visitors and not simply describing the landscape. The most successful approach tended to link the landscape with activities such as walking, climbing, water-based activities or passive activities such as photography. A small number of candidates failed to understand the basic idea of 'physical features' and described a range of visitor attractions.

Question 5

(a) This question presented few problems and candidates used Figure 5 effectively to describe the location of current and proposed wind farms.

(b) The idea of 'conflict' is clearly quite a challenging concept and this was reflected in many of the responses to this question. A significant number of candidates simply described the disadvantages of the proposed project and consequently failed to address the question. A small number of candidates addressed the question in relation to the 'local negative' against the 'national good'. Since the focus of the question was conflict in the local community, this approach was often self-limiting.

(c) Responses to this question were excellent and most candidates clearly understood how pressure groups operate, and the types of communication that are used to raise awareness about sensitive issues.

Question 6

Responses to this question were variable from basic responses that did little more than copy isolated ideas from the resources to complex discussions, which offered detailed and sophisticated argument. The majority of candidates identified the fact that there might be both local and national perspectives and a small number reflected in some depth about future energy policy and links to global environmental management.

The most successful approach was to look back at all of the appropriate resources, rather than just Figure 5, and show a clear understanding of the range of positive and negative considerations. Having done this, a justifiable position could then be argued in some detail.

Higher Tier

Paper 2 - 3033/2H

General

The paper proved to be an effective discriminator of geographical ability. It was accessible to candidates of all abilities at this Tier and allowed them to demonstrate positive achievement. The majority of candidates gave very good responses to data. Geographical skills such as interpreting tables of figures, graphs and pie charts were very good; however, use of map skills was more problematic for some candidates. Opportunities for extended writing were given in one or more parts of each question, and even the lesser ability candidates at this tier were able to offer a response, which demonstrated some good geographical understanding. The more able of the candidates were able to offer high quality, developed responses, demonstrating excellent understanding of geographical issues, backed up with the correct use of complex geographical vocabulary and detailed case study examples.

The vast majority of candidates completed the paper and there were relatively few parts of the questions that were not attempted.

Question 2 was generally the best answered, the subject matter appearing familiar to the majority of candidates.

Question 1: Managing Change in the Human Environment

Part (a) was correctly completed by a majority of the candidates, but figures were not cited to support descriptions in some cases. Some candidates did not recognise that the figures were in millions.

Part (b) was well answered, with most candidates offering clear, wide ranging problems in LEDCs, developed to achieve sufficient depth of description to gain maximum marks. Those candidates who did not offer development of problems did not reach the maximum, making lists of discrete statements.

Part (c) was generally well answered, with many candidates able to give examples of actual schemes to support their answer, e.g. China's one-child policy, Kerala in India, or specific programmes of birth control such as 'profamilia'.

In part (d), a minority of candidates offered detailed and balanced explanations of both 'push' and 'pull' factors. Those who did were able to explain the significance of industrialisation and economic growth in LEDC cities and the negative changes in rural areas that lead to migration. There were few good case study examples, many of those given, not going beyond a named city. Candidates who gave lists of factors such as "drought", "war", "natural disasters", "better paid jobs", etc., failed to get beyond a Level 1 mark, i.e. a significant number of candidates, showed knowledge of the factors, but failed to develop their answers to explain their effects. Some candidates gave lengthy descriptions of the problems of shanty towns, when this was not required by the question.

In part (e)(i) a small minority of the candidates described changes to LEDC cities, but most candidates were able to describe schemes and give some development of these, with reference to particular MEDC cities. In part (e)(ii), the better candidates did produce some excellent case study answers, giving fully developed, detailed descriptions of actual regeneration schemes, achieving a balance of economic and environmental improvements and their effects. However, many candidates merely described the features of a scheme such as London Docklands, but did not explain its regenerative effects.

Question 2: Managing the Physical Environment

Part (a)(i) most candidates were able to describe the map features in the correct order, but there was relatively little use of scale or direction in the description of the route. In part (a)(ii), a majority of the candidates were able to offer a correct definition, in many cases however, there was no reference to tourist pressure, i.e. “many tourists”. In part (a)(iii), most candidates were able to link features to activities or specific map features, however a significant number of candidates simply listed features without suggesting why they led to tourist pressure. Some candidates concentrated their answers on the effects of overuse, rather than the human/physical attractions. Again, in part (a)(iv), candidates who gave lists of schemes did not access the higher levels, i.e. candidates showed awareness of ideas, but did not explain them in any depth. A minority of the candidates did give some development, the best using case study examples from Malham, Dovedale, etc. The best responses dealt with footpath erosion, quoting specific schemes using synthetic materials, pitching, duck boarding, etc.

Part (b)(i) was correctly completed by a majority of the candidates, but a small number did incorrectly opt for site X and in (b)(ii), most candidates gained at least one mark, with the better candidates recognising and using the term confluence and developing this to explain its effect. In part (b)(iii), most candidates were able to offer a correct response however; there were a significant number of general statements, such as “it shows a big area”.

Part (c) was generally well done by a majority of the candidates. Many were able explain to in detail, the importance of trees in the hydrological cycle, using appropriate geographical vocabulary and correctly sequenced processes. Inclusion by the better candidates, of higher order concepts such as reduction in lag times and the consequences of this, were encouraging.

In part (d), those responses dealing with management of the effects of earthquakes and tropical storms were best done, especially many detailed descriptions of earthquake proof structures and training/education programmes. However again, a significant number of candidates simply listed schemes without development. Ideas about long term, advance warning of earthquakes are still prevalent.

Question 3: Managing Economic Development

Part (a) did not prove problematic for a vast majority of the candidates, but some merely cited the figures without making a comparison and a comparison of the overall levels of economic development was not always made.

Part (b)(i) was correctly completed by a majority of the candidates who attempted it. A significant number missed the question out, due to not reading the paper carefully. In (b)(ii), most candidates were able to describe a difference but figures were not cited to support descriptions in some cases. Many responses lacked reasons for the difference, which were specifically focused on primary employment. There were references to dependency on primary products, but few references to subsistence/plantation agriculture.

Part (c) elicited a wide range of responses. There were simplistic references to ‘will be able to be kept going’ without any further development, but a majority of the candidates could develop beyond this, mentioning renewable resources and examples of appropriate technology. The better candidates did produce some excellent case study answers such as the ‘give a goat’ scheme, or giving fully developed, detailed descriptions of schemes advocating ‘bottom up’ approaches and/or tools for self-reliance. Some candidates did say why the scheme was not sustainable e.g. borrowing from the World Bank, and therefore did not fulfil the demands of the question.

Part (d) was correctly completed by a majority of the candidates and part (e) again elicited a wide range of responses, with some excellent, very detailed, and well-researched accounts of small-scale tourist schemes in tropical rain forest areas, the Campfire scheme in Kenya and managed safari holidays in general. These tended to be centre-specific. A significant number of candidates repeated the general principles of sustainability, without saying how these helped protect the environment or culture.

Foundation and Higher Tiers

Centre-Assessed Coursework - 3033/C

General

It is encouraging to report that a large number of centres obviously made use of the advice given in last year's feedback forms and Standardisation Meetings. The quality produced and the accuracy of the application of the marking criteria suggests that the information they received and the materials they were given were put to great effect. Moderators were impressed with the variety of coursework and the breadth of knowledge displayed by many of the candidates. The vast majority of work was appropriate, in that, it related to the taught Specification and allowed differentiation between candidates. Some excellent geography and an increasingly high standard of ICT made the process of moderation, in most cases, a pleasurable experience.

Teacher-led enquiries continue to be by far the most common format. Indeed, the individual enquiry is becoming an endangered species. The range of topics submitted was varied, the most popular theme being urban studies, with CBD investigations, shopping hierarchies, tourism, and traffic being dominant. This is not surprising, as in most cases, the urban environment provides a range of topics that are very accessible for most candidates and gives easier opportunities to re-visit the sites. This year an increasing number of centres opted for a purely physical study, with rivers and coastlines by far the most popular.

There were a few examples where teacher direction was not only apparent in the planning stage but also in the writing-up process. In extreme cases, the work was so directed that the enquiries became almost identical, each candidate using the same section from the textbook as the basis for their introduction and teachers selecting the data presentation techniques to be used with little input from the candidate. As a result, only in the data interpretation and evaluation sections could the candidate's true ability be assessed.

Some centres allowed their candidates to consider a large number of sub-hypotheses that, in some cases, were nothing more than predictions. This type of enquiry tends to become rather repetitive and fails to provide candidates with an opportunity to give an overview or summative statement. As a result, links to achieve Level 3 in the interpretation section are never fully developed or identified, with centres 'cherry picking' isolated phrases to justify the awarding of Level 3. Furthermore, this approach tends to develop into extremely long enquiries which some centres assume justifies high marks. Teachers have a clear responsibility to guide their students appropriately in title and task selection, as well as encouraging wherever possible, quality not quantity.

Finally, although most centres remained within the marking tolerance set by AQA, there was evidence this year that centres were assuming that if a candidate fulfilled the criteria for a particular level, then automatically they would be awarded the top mark in that level; this is not the case. There is room for differentiation and progression within each level, allowance has to be made for the quality of application by the candidates to the marking criteria. Whatever the reason for centres adopting such a strategy, if used across all the marking criteria, then it will inevitably lead to a discrepancy between centre marks and the standard required by AQA.

Administration

The quality of administration was much improved on last year with centres justifiably deserving credit for the professional way they approached this aspect of the moderation process. There was a small minority, however, who failed to meet even the basic requirements and, thus, delayed the whole process.

The new sampling procedure continued to work well and made sure that the number and composition of the sample sent from the centre was correct in the majority of cases. Improvements were seen in the speed of response from centres, in particular with regard to Centre Mark Sheets, which were being posted to the moderator much closer to the deadline than last year. However, the time taken for centres to respond to requests by moderators for work or information did vary enormously.

It is clear that there is a strong correlation between the effectiveness of internal lines of communication within the centre, in particular, between the Examinations Officer and the Head of Department, and the efficient way in which the whole moderation process is negotiated.

The following points need to be stressed.

- Centres, with 20 or fewer candidates, should ensure that all their candidates work together with the second and third copies of the Centre Mark Sheets (or an EDI print out) should arrive with the moderator by the deadline indicated, allowing time for postal delivery. If a centre has more than 20 candidates, they should ensure that, the second and third copies of the Centre Mark Sheets (or two copies of the DI printouts) should arrive with the moderator by the deadline indicated, allowing time for postal delivery. (Some centres only sent one copy of the CMS, which meant a photocopy or note, had to be made by the moderator of the sample requested as well as asking the centre to return a copy of the CMS). The moderator will return the third copy of the CMS (or one of the EDI printouts) indicating which candidates work needs to be forwarded as the sample. The work must be dispatched within five working days of notification from the moderator. If any centre anticipates that they are not going to meet the coursework submission deadline, then they will need to inform the Board and apply for an extension.
- The Candidate Record Form should be attached to the relevant pieces of work. They should be filled in correctly, making sure that the candidate numbers are placed in the relevant boxes and that both the teacher and the candidate have signed the document. Sometimes it is not always possible from the teacher's signature at the bottom of the CRF to clearly identify the name of the teacher involved in the marking of a particular piece of work. To save any confusion it would help if the teacher also printed their name next to their signature. In a number of cases, centres used out of date CRF forms and, as a result, did not provide all the information required, such as summative statements and teacher signatures. The incorrect addition of marks on the CRF forms and the inaccurate transfer of the total mark to the Centre Mark Sheet also caused problems for the moderator. An increasing number of centres also failed to supply the Centre Declaration Sheet with the sample.
- Some coursework was sent with each page inside a plastic sleeve and this caused 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 AQA 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 splits in the post, it would be appreciated. Equally, there is no need to send the work by 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 their local sorting office.
- The work should be submitted in simple plastic or manilla folders and not in hardback files or ring binders and so reduce the cost of postage. In addition, if centres could ensure that if candidates are submitting large maps within their enquiry that they are not folded in such an intricate manner they prove impossible to open, this would be most helpful. It would also save moderators time if the candidate's name and total mark were placed on the outside of the folder.
- A number of candidates were given zero marks for the enquiry. If the candidate has submitted some work but it has been found to be worthless then 0 (zero marks) should be encoded in the 'Total Mark' box on the CMS. If the candidate has produced some evidence relating to the enquiry, no matter how basic, it would be extremely unlikely to be completely worthless. Centres need to examine the work of their lowest ability candidates carefully before giving zero, as experience has shown that, in a number of these cases, the work of the lower ability candidates is under-marked and that there is, within the work, elements that are indeed creditworthy. If a candidate has submitted no work or has withdrawn then 'X' should be encoded.
- The quality and quantity of teacher comments/annotation varied enormously. It was often excellent on the CRFs but less impressive in the body of the work as teachers did not always related comments to levels. There was ample evidence that comments were obviously provided by experienced specialist Geography teachers being detailed, informative and showing evidence of a clear understanding of the application of the marking criteria. However, a minority of centres provided only limited evidence that internal assessment had taken place.
- 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 had not been given priority and moderators spent more time dealing with the problems associated with administration than on assessing the quality of the Geography. It is also important that the internal standardisation process is carried out by the centre is rigorous. If there are problems with the marking, it is sometimes a result of one teacher's marking not being in line with the rest of the department.

Marking Criteria

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

Applied Understanding

In most cases, enquiries were well organised, based on a single, clear, manageable hypothesis, underpinned by sound geographical concepts that related to the taught Specification and were approached in an investigative mode. In the initial part of the investigation, the candidate through the use of a series of maps and written description located the study area in detail. Candidates then went on, through description and explanation to clearly identify the key concepts that were then constantly referred to throughout the work.

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

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

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

Some misunderstood the notion of 'application' and, as a result, this section was inaccurately assessed. Candidates were being awarded Level 3 applied understanding marks, sometimes as early as the first paragraph for very generalised and descriptive work. The key concepts were not clearly identified and were certainly not being applied. In extreme cases, this policy was adopted across the group and all candidates from the centre were given high applied understanding marks for explanations of theory that were almost identical, having been plagiarised from the textbook.

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

Applied understanding is relevant in all sections, but is particularly important when it comes to data interpretation where the theory needs to be used to explain the patterns of data collected. It follows, therefore, that this section can only be accurately assessed when the whole of the enquiry is taken into account.

Methodology

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

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

It must be stressed that this is the only section of the marking criteria where originality and initiative is credited. A number of centres assume evidence of originality in other sections notably data presentation is sufficient to justify the awarding of Level 3 in this section. Equally, it is important to remember that originality and initiative are not the only criteria required for Level 3 Methodology marks. For example, a number of potential Level 3 candidates often relied too heavily on a narrow range of data usually only collected by means of a questionnaire. Some failed to justify their techniques or the merits of different sampling procedures.

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

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

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

It must also be stressed that marks are not awarded in this section for a list of data collection methods per se. Methods described by the candidate can only be classed as valid, and therefore, creditworthy, if they are actually used in the investigation to collect a significant amount of primary or secondary data. Centres continue to award marks, particularly to weaker candidates, for describing the full range of data collection techniques that they intended to use in their teacher-directed investigation. In reality, these candidates used few, if any of the techniques described and this should have been reflected in the marking. If no data is forthcoming from a particular technique, for example, a candidate writing to a company for information and receiving no reply, there may be a justification in exploring the circumstances for a failed response in the evaluation section but there is no value or credit to be gained in the methodology section. Even some high ability candidates produce a disappointing amount of data from what appears to be a comprehensive and robust methodology section.

Data Presentation

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

It was common, however, for this section to be 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 different techniques were used, a great number of candidates failed to achieve Level 3 as the techniques chosen lacked complexity.

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

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

To access Level 2 and Level 3 marks in this section, all candidates have to provide evidence of at least two different types of ICT outcome in their enquiry. Candidates with no ICT had their marks in this section limited to Level 1, provided all other Level 1 criteria had been met. This compulsory element of ICT continues not 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 basic bar and pie graphs. To access Level 3 marks, there has to be evidence of 'more complex' techniques being used. It is not essential that the element of complexity indicated within the Level 3 statement is delivered by means of ICT, but if it is not, then it has to be shown by other means.

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

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

Data Interpretation

This section proved to be a useful discriminator. The majority of candidates described, as well as analysed, their results. In other words, they ‘ordered’ the data by calculating percentages, proportions and highlighted patterns or anomalies. Explanations were then provided that took full advantage of the opportunity to apply the theory underpinning the enquiry to the results. Candidates then went on to demonstrate links and draw valid conclusions that related to the original hypothesis.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments and annotation within the body of the work suggested that there was some confusion with regard to the crediting of conclusions. The awarding of marks for conclusions reached by the candidate, after examination and analysis of the data, should be considered in this section, rather than in the evaluation.

Evaluation

The majority of centres appeared to have an understanding of the need to cover all three components. Of the centres that appreciated the demands of this section, limitations of methods were usually covered comprehensively, allowing easy access to the top of Level 2, with more general comment being made about the effect of these limitations on the accuracy of the results. A number of candidates focused their evaluation on the accuracy of the results and then went on to identify problems in the methods that could have caused such discrepancies. Similarly, these candidates achieved Level 2 marks quite easily. It was the evaluation of the conclusions, however, that proved to be the weakest element. For example, candidates often failed to suggest why their conclusions, however valid, might be a reflection of the particular location and time when the enquiry was undertaken and so cannot be considered applicable in the wider content.

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

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

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

Specification C (Short Course)

Foundation Tier

Paper – 3038/F

General

Most candidates appeared to be well prepared for the examination and there were very few questions not attempted.

Initial comments from centres suggested that the papers were challenging but a fair reflection of the specification.

Most candidates completed the paper and time was not seen as an issue.

Candidates generally used the space and mark allocation effectively, and appeared sympathetic to the style of the papers.

Some candidates (especially in the higher tier) failed to fully address the commands and consequently drifted away from the focus of the question.

The use of locational examples was variable.

The examination paper is a combination of different styles. It has to cover the full range of the assessment criteria and the style of individual questions reflects the need to test skills, knowledge and application. This demands quick thinking and flexibility, which candidates do not always find easy.

Focus for Development

Be aware (and make candidates aware) that the examination paper reflects the specification in terms of content coverage.

Identify a small number of appropriate examples within each unit and encourage candidates to build an answer around an example rather than simply putting it in as an after thought.

The specification is essentially about understanding problems/issues and considering management strategies. Try to identify a particular issue within each sub-unit of the course through the teaching programme to ensure that candidates are comfortable with this approach.

There will always be an element of issues analysis and decision-making in the paper, the broad area of this is pre-released. Identify the key ideas from the pre-released topic and make sure candidates have clear understanding of them.

The paper will always have a range of resources attached to it. Encourage the use of resources, both in terms of identification and application. Practice the use of resources, especially maps and photographs which candidates can find challenging in examinations.

There are always skill-based questions in the examination paper. The expectation is that the skills will be carried out with a high level of accuracy. They are often easy marks but can be easily lost because of inaccuracy.

It is clear that a small number of candidates are often not properly equipped for the examination. Encourage candidates to make sure they have pens/pencils/rubber/ruler and perhaps some coloured pencils.

Questions about physical processes can be completed using diagrams/annotated diagrams.

The use of key words is a very effective way of showing basic knowledge. Make sure candidates have an awareness of the key words in each sub-unit of the specification. A definition box approach is starting to teach each sub-unit might be helpful.

The use of a revision grid for each sub-section might be a helpful technique. The grid could be used to identify the key word definitions/problems and challenges/management. In addition, possible examples could be added.

Question 1: Managing Change in the Human Environment

(a)(i) The resource was used effectively to identify changes that had been made to the urban area. In part (a)(ii) most candidates identified safety as the major advantage because of better traffic management and more safe places for children to play. Beyond that, responses were often quite vague, often simply describing more changes rather than explaining why they might be an advantage. The scale of the idea was a problem for a small number of candidates who suggested that the planting of trees in this area would have a significant impact on reducing global warming.

(b)(i) & (ii) These questions were generally answered very effectively and there were a wide range of appropriate responses.

(c)(i) This question presented few problems for candidates, the majority of whom clearly had a sound understanding of the terminology expressed in the question.

(ii) There was a mixed response to this question with some excellent answers identifying a range of possible reasons why people might want to live in the rural-urban fringe. However, a small number of candidates clearly had no understanding of what was meant by 'the rural-urban fringe'.

(d) (i) & (ii) These questions presented few difficulties and most candidates used the data effectively to arrive at the correct answers.

(iii) The key here was the instruction 'with the help of Figure 2'. Very few candidates picked this instruction up and consequently simply copied the resource or identified points just from the resource. They gained some credit for this but needed development of the ideas to achieve in the higher level. A small number of candidates did develop the ideas and made very strong points based around such ideas as drought/famine/war/agricultural change, etc.

(e)(i) The resource was used very effectively by most candidates and most showed a clear understanding of urban problems in LEDCs. At the lower mark levels, candidates simply copied selected parts of the resource, while at the higher levels; a number of candidates developed these ideas and included their own ideas and examples. Part (ii) of this question was generally completed quite effectively with most candidates identifying a range of potential advantages to their chosen scheme. Often the balance in terms of advantages and disadvantages was variable and this was consequently self-limiting.

Question 2: Managing the Physical Environment

(a) The photographs were not always used very effectively and comments were often very descriptive and vague. The use of photographs does require practice because candidates have to first identify and then use the photograph. Many candidates consequently did not get beyond the first step and simply made comments about the sea or beach and the open countryside.

(b) Responses to this question were variable with a few candidates clearly having very little idea of what was being asked. A small number identified a physical feature and were able to describe both process and the resulting feature. The most successful answers were based on glaciation where there was a very small number of excellent answers. Some candidates used annotated diagrams with varying levels of success.

(c) Responses to this question were quite poor with a considerable number of candidates making very vague comments or simply identifying ‘money’ or ‘jobs’ in general terms. A small number of candidates identified specific jobs associated with tourism and began to consider broader economic implications through a basic understanding of the multiplier.

Question 3: Managing Economic Development

(a)(i) & (ii) These questions presented few problems for candidates and it was clear that most candidates had a good understanding of the terminology associated with this topic.

(b) Most candidates had a clear understanding of what was meant by ‘global warming’ and were able to identify key impacts such as rising temperatures/melting ice caps/more storms, etc. The link to people was often more tentative with many candidates simply mentioning ideas such as flooding. A small number of candidates made some excellent observations about the effect on farming/problems of potential famine/specific impacts of flooding and links to tourism.

(c) The key to this question was an understanding of ‘how’ technology might reduce pollution.

A significant number of candidates considered management (more bus lanes, etc) rather than technology and only made tentative observations about technological change. Of those that did fully address the question, many identified fossil fuels as a major problem and suggested how alternative energy and transport might reduce the use of coal/oil and consequently reduce pollution.

Higher Tier

Paper - 3038/H

General

Question 1: Managing Change in the Human Environment

(a)(i) The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of the question and used the resource effectively to identify a number of points. At the high level, both housing and environmental points were identified and candidates showed a sound appreciation about 'quality of life' issues. In part (ii) candidates had no real problems with this question and identified a range of potential disadvantages including cost, general inconvenience, loss of housing, etc.

(b) Most candidates showed a good general level of understanding and were able to identify a range of points. The balance between advantages and disadvantages was not always very even; however, in the majority of cases candidates were able to identify both advantages and disadvantages. A small number of candidates included examples, most of which were clear and appropriate.

(c) Understanding of 'rural-urban fringe' was generally sound, although a small number of candidates focused on urban re-development schemes such as London docklands. In most cases, candidates were able to identify key land uses found on the urban fringe and these generally included housing, leisure, shopping and industry. The reasons for development were expressed quite effectively, most suggesting space, cost of land, better environment as the key decision-making factors. Few candidates made links between the types of development found on the urban fringe.

(d)(i) This question was effectively addressed by the majority of candidates and presented few problems. In part (ii) the key here was the instruction 'with the help of Figure 2'. Very few candidates picked this instruction up and consequently simply copied the resource or identified points just from the resource. They gained some credit for this but needed development of the ideas to achieve in the higher level. A small number of candidates did develop the ideas and made very strong points based around such ideas as drought/famine/war/agricultural change, etc.

(e)(i) The resource was used very effectively by most candidates and most showed a clear understanding of urban problems in LEDCs. At the lower mark levels, candidates simply copied selected parts of the resource, while at the higher levels; a number of candidates developed these ideas and included their own ideas and examples. Part (ii) of this question was generally completed quite effectively with most candidates identifying a range of potential advantages to their chosen scheme. Often the balance in terms of advantages and disadvantages was variable and this was consequently self-limiting.

Question 2: Managing the Physical Environment

The photographs were not always used effectively in an analytical sense. Most candidates identified key points from the photographs and were able to describe how the area was being or might be used, but then failed to fully address the question in terms of likely environmental aspects. Those that did develop the theme of environmental pressure tended to focus on problems of litter, footpath erosion or general points about pollution. Very few candidates thought about the broader aspects of land-use change or potential habitat loss.

(b) Responses to this question were variable with a few candidates clearly having very little idea of what was being asked. A small number identified a physical feature and were able to describe both process and the resulting feature. The most successful answers were based on glaciation where there was a very small number of excellent answers. Some candidates used annotated diagrams with varying levels of success.

(c) The majority of candidates clearly understood the concept of economy and were able to make general observations about money and jobs. Very few got far beyond this and considered the range of employment opportunities and the potential multiplier effect. Consequently, responses were often slight self-limiting and did not fully consider the idea of 'importance' as expressed in the question.

Question 3: Managing Economic Development

(a) The majority of candidates used the resource effectively to identify the local impacts of deforestation, and often responses were developed to include vocational examples. The ideas of soil erosion, local atmospheric pollution and habitat loss were very well considered.

The consideration of both local and global impacts were less well documented, although a significant proportion of candidates showed some understanding about the carbon balance and mentioned global warming as a key environmental consideration.

(b) Candidates tended to either know this or have very little idea. The majority showed a clear understanding of what an 'environmental pressure group' is, with a reasonable proportion using examples such as Greenpeace.

(c) The key to this question was an understanding of 'how' technology might reduce pollution.

A significant number of candidates considered management (more bus lanes, etc) rather than technology and only made tentative observations about technological change. Of those that did fully address the question, many identified fossil fuels as a major problem and suggested how alternative energy and transport might reduce the use of coal/oil and consequently reduce pollution.

Foundation and Higher Tiers

(Short Course) Centre-Assessed Coursework - 3038/C

General

It is encouraging to report that a large number of centres obviously made use of the advice given in last year's feedback forms and Standardisation Meetings. The quality produced and the accuracy of the application of the marking criteria suggests that the information they received and the materials they were given were put to great effect. Moderators were impressed with the variety of coursework and the breadth of knowledge displayed by many of the candidates. The vast majority of work was appropriate, in that, it related to the taught Specification and allowed differentiation between candidates. Some excellent geography and an increasingly high standard of ICT made the process of moderation, in most cases, a pleasurable experience.

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

It is also worth noting that, where centres did enter candidates for both courses and used identical coursework, the Short Course marking, in most cases, was more accurate than the Full Course. It would seem that teachers carry through the notion of one concept, three methods of data capture and three 'more complex' data presentation techniques to the Full Course and thus, over-mark their scripts. It is important to remember that the Short Course coursework and the Full Course coursework have discrete sets of marking criteria. Centres assume that they are interchangeable and that the number of data collection techniques, for example, identified for Level 3 Methodology in the Short Course automatically fulfils the definition of 'a comprehensive range' in the Full Course and, therefore, qualifies the candidate for the equivalent level in the Full Course.

Teacher-led enquiries continue to be by far the most common format. Indeed, the individual enquiry is becoming an endangered species. The range of topics submitted was varied, the most popular theme being urban studies, with CBD investigations, shopping hierarchies, tourism, and traffic being dominant. This is not surprising, as in most cases, the urban environment provides a range of topics that are very accessible for most candidates and gives easier opportunities to re-visit the sites. This year an increasing number of centres opted for a purely physical study, with rivers and coastlines by far the most popular.

There were a few examples where teacher direction was not only apparent in the planning stage but also in the writing-up process. In extreme cases, the work was so directed that the enquiries became almost identical, each candidate using the same section from the textbook as the basis for their introduction and teachers selecting the data presentation techniques to be used with little input from the candidate. As a result, only in the data interpretation and evaluation sections could the candidate's true ability be assessed.

Although the majority of centres remained within the marking tolerance set by AQA, there was evidence this year that centres were assuming that if a candidate was fulfilling the criteria for a particular level, then automatically they would be awarded the top mark in that level. This is not the case; there is room for differentiation and progression within each level and so allowance has to be made for the quality of the application by the candidate to the marking criteria. Whatever the reason behind such an approach, if adopted across all the marking criteria, then it will inevitably lead to a discrepancy between centre's marks and the standard required by AQA.

Finally, the profile of the typical Short Course centre and the function the Short Course performs within the school curriculum would appear to be changing. There are now an increasing variety of small institutions involved, a significant number of which could not 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 an impact on the quality of work produced, as a number of these candidates would appear to be frequently less motivated or have yet to fully develop their geographical skills. Centres expect, nevertheless, to achieve a full mark range, and in some cases, end up marking candidates and not work, giving marks for effort in exceptional circumstances.

Administration

The quality of administration was much improved on last year with centres justifiably deserving credit for the professional way they approached this aspect of the moderation process. There was a small minority, however, who failed to meet even the basic requirements and, thus, delayed the whole process.

The new sampling procedure continued to work well and made sure that the number and composition of the sample sent from the centre was correct in the majority of cases. Improvements were seen in the speed of response from centres, in particular with regard to Centre Mark Sheets, which were being posted to the moderator much closer to the deadline than last year. However, the time taken for centres to respond to requests by moderators for work or information did vary enormously.

It is clear that there is a strong correlation between the effectiveness of internal lines of communication within the centre, in particular, between the Examinations Officer and the Head of Department, and the efficient way in which the whole moderation process is negotiated.

The following points need to be stressed:

- Centres, with 20 or fewer candidates, should ensure that all their candidates work together with the second and third copies of the Centre Mark Sheets (or an EDI print out) should arrive with the moderator by the deadline indicated, allowing time for postal delivery. If a centre has more than 20 candidates, they should ensure that, the second and third copies of the Centre Mark Sheets (or two copies of the DI printouts) should arrive with the moderator by the deadline indicated, allowing time for postal delivery. (Some centres only sent one copy of the CMS, which meant a photocopy or note, had to be made by the moderator of the sample requested as well as asking the centre to return a copy of the CMS). The moderator will return the third copy of the CMS (or one of the EDI printouts) indicating which candidates work needs to be forwarded as the sample. The work must be dispatched within five working days of notification from the moderator. If any centre anticipates that they are not going to meet the coursework submission deadline, then they will need to inform AQA and apply for an extension.

- The Candidate Record Form should be attached to the relevant pieces of work. They should be filled in correctly, making sure that the candidate numbers are placed in the relevant boxes and that both the teacher and the candidate have signed the document. Sometimes it is not always possible from the teacher's signature at the bottom of the CRF to clearly identify the name of the teacher involved in the marking of a particular piece of work. To save any confusion it would help if the teacher also printed their name next to their signature. In a number of cases, centres were using out of date CRF forms and, as a result, did not provide all the information required, such as summative statements and teacher signatures. The incorrect addition of marks on the CRF forms and the inaccurate transfer of the total mark to the Centre Mark Sheet also caused problems for the moderator. An increasing number of centres also failed to supply the Centre Declaration Sheet with the sample.
- Some coursework was 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 AQA 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 splits in the post, it would be appreciated. Equally, there is no need to send the work by 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 their local sorting office.
- The work should be submitted in simple plastic or manilla folders and not in hardback files or ring binders and so reduce the cost of postage. In addition, if centres could ensure that if candidates are submitting large maps within their enquiry that they are not folded in such an intricate manner, they prove impossible to open; this would be most helpful. It would also save moderators time if the candidate's name and total mark were placed on the outside of the folder.
- A number of candidates were given zero marks for the enquiry. If the candidate has submitted some work but it has been found to be worthless then 0 (zero marks) should be encoded in the 'Total Mark' box on the CMS. If the candidate has produced some evidence relating to the enquiry, no matter how basic, it would be extremely unlikely to be completely worthless. Centres need to examine the work of their lowest ability candidates carefully before giving zero, as experience has shown that, in a number of these cases, the work of the lower ability candidates is under-marked and that there is, within the work, elements that are indeed creditworthy. If a candidate has submitted no work or has withdrawn then 'X' should be encoded.
- The quality and quantity of teacher comments/annotation varied enormously. It was often excellent on the CRFs but less impressive in the body of the work as teachers did not always related comments to levels. There was ample evidence that comments were obviously provided by experienced specialist Geography teachers being detailed, informative and showing evidence of a clear understanding of the application of the marking criteria. However, a minority of centres provided only limited evidence that internal assessment had taken place.
- 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 had not been given priority and moderators spent more time dealing with the problems associated with administration than on assessing the quality of the Geography. It is also important that the internal standardisation process is carried out by the centre is rigorous. If there are problems with the marking, it is sometimes a result of one teacher's marking not being in line with the rest of the department.

Marking Criteria

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

Applied Understanding

In most cases, enquiries were well organised, based on a single, clear, manageable hypothesis, underpinned by sound geographical concepts that related to the taught Specification and were approached in an investigative mode. In the initial part of the investigation, the candidate through the use of a series of maps and written description located the study area in detail. Candidates then went on, through description and explanation to clearly identify the key concepts that were then constantly referred to throughout the work.

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

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

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

Some misunderstood the notion of 'application' and, as a result, this section was inaccurately assessed. Candidates were being awarded Level 3 applied understanding marks, sometimes as early as the first paragraph for very generalised and descriptive work. The key concepts were not clearly identified and were certainly not being applied. In extreme cases, this policy was adopted across the group and all candidates from the centre were given high applied understanding marks for explanations of theory that were almost identical, having been plagiarised from the textbook.

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

Applied understanding is relevant in all sections, but is particularly important when it comes to data interpretation where the theory needs to be used to explain the patterns of data collected. It follows, therefore, that this section can only be accurately assessed when the whole of the enquiry is taken into account.

Methodology

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

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

It must be stressed that this is the only section of the marking criteria where originality and initiative is credited. A number of centres assume evidence of originality in other sections notably data presentation is sufficient to justify the awarding of Level 3 in this section. Equally, it is important to remember that originality and initiative are not the only criteria required for Level 3 Methodology marks. For example, a number of potential Level 3 candidates often relied too heavily on a narrow range of data usually only collected by means of a questionnaire. Some failed to justify their techniques or the merits of different sampling procedures.

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

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

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

It must also be stressed that marks are not awarded in this section for a list of data collection methods per se. Methods described by the candidate can only be classed as valid, and therefore, creditworthy, if they are actually used in the investigation to collect a significant amount of primary or secondary data. Centres continue to award marks, particularly to weaker candidates, for describing the full range of data collection techniques that they intended to use in their teacher-directed investigation. In reality, these candidates used few, if any of the techniques described and this should have been reflected in the marking. If no data is forthcoming from a particular technique, for example, a candidate writing to a company for information and receiving no reply, there may be a justification in exploring the circumstances for a failed response in the evaluation section but there is no value or credit to be gained in the methodology section. Even some high ability candidates produce a disappointing amount of data from what appears to be a comprehensive and robust methodology section.

Data Presentation

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

It was common, however, for this section to be 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 different techniques were used, a great number of candidates failed to achieve Level 3 as the techniques chosen lacked complexity.

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

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

To access Level 2 and Level 3 marks in this section, all candidates have to provide evidence of at least two different types of ICT outcome in their enquiry. Candidates with no ICT had their marks in this section limited to Level 1, provided all other Level 1 criteria had been met. This compulsory element of ICT continues not 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 basic bar and pie graphs. To access Level 3 marks, there has to be evidence of 'more complex' techniques being used. It is not essential that the element of complexity indicated within the Level 3 statement is delivered by means of ICT, but if it is not, then it has to be shown by other means.

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

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

Data Interpretation

This section proved to be a useful discriminator. The majority of candidates described, as well as analysed, their results. In other words, they ‘ordered’ the data by calculating percentages, proportions and highlighted patterns or anomalies. Explanations were then provided that took full advantage of the opportunity to apply the theory underpinning the enquiry to the results. Candidates then went on to demonstrate links and draw valid conclusions that related to the original hypothesis.

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

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

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

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

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

The main weakness among candidates was that they 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 that 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.

Comments and annotation within the body of the work suggested that there was some confusion with regard to the crediting of conclusions. The awarding of marks for conclusions reached by the candidate, after examination and analysis of the data, should be considered in this section, rather than in the evaluation.

Evaluation

The majority of centres appeared to have an understanding of the need to cover all three components. Of the centres that appreciated the demands of this section, limitations of methods were usually covered comprehensively, allowing easy access to the top of Level 2, with more general comment being made about the effect of these limitations on the accuracy of the results. A number of candidates focused their evaluation on the accuracy of the results and then went on to identify problems in the methods that could have caused such discrepancies. Similarly, these candidates achieved Level 2 marks quite easily. It was the evaluation of the conclusions, however, that proved to be the weakest element. For example, candidates often failed to suggest why their conclusions, however valid, might be a reflection of the particular location and time when the enquiry was undertaken and so cannot be considered applicable in the wider content.

Evaluation presented a problem for some centre with candidates having a tendency to write in congratulatory terms rather than highlighting limitations. Any evaluation statements tended to be vague and general, rather than detailed and specific. In the weaker enquires, the emphasis was placed solely upon what could have been done to improve the enquiry process. This approach frequently resulted in a ‘wish list’, without any attempt being made to state how these improvements would influence the methods, the results or the conclusions.

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

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

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Full Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3033/C	30	60	12.7	5.4
3033/1F	60	60	38.2	7.9
3033/2F	80	120	41.2	11.1
Foundation tier overall code	170	240	125.6	29.4

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3033/C boundary mark	raw	30	15	12	9	6	3
	scaled	60	30	24	18	12	6
3033/1F boundary mark	raw	60	45	39	34	29	24
	scaled	60	45	39	34	29	24
3033/2F boundary mark	raw	80	50	42	35	28	21
	scaled	120	75	63	52	42	32
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		240	148	125	102	80	56

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3033/C	30	60	21.4	5.2
3033/1H	60	60	36.8	7.1
3033/2H	80	120	44.2	9.9
Higher tier overall code	170	240	146.2	26.9

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
3033/1C boundary mark	raw	30	27	23	19	15	12	
	scaled	60	54	46	38	30	24	
3033/1H boundary mark	raw	60	46	41	36	32	26	
	scaled	60	46	41	36	32	26	
3033/2H boundary mark	raw	80	58	51	44	37	33	
	scaled	120	87	76	66	56	50	
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		240	186	165	144	123	102	91

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (7594 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	25.9	52.2	74.9	88.4	95.5

Higher tier (8286 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	9.8	30.6	60.4	85.4	95.3	97.8

Overall (15880 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	5.1	16.0	31.5	56.9	74.7	86.9	93.3	96.7

Short Course

Foundation tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3038/C	30	30	11.5	4.4
3038/F	60	90	31.8	8.7
Foundation tier overall code	90	120	59.4	15.8

		Max. mark	C	D	E	F	G
3038/C boundary mark	raw	30	15	12	9	7	5
	scaled	30	15	12	9	7	5
3038/F boundary mark	raw	60	37	32	28	24	20
	scaled	90	57	50	44	38	32
Foundation tier scaled boundary mark		120	70	61	52	43	34

Higher tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3038/C	30	30	17.2	4.7
3038/H	60	90	33.2	8.1
Higher tier overall code	90	120	67.3	15.2

		Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
3038/C boundary mark	raw	30	30	25	20	15	12	
	scaled	30	30	25	20	15	12	
3038/H boundary mark	raw	60	43	38	33	29	26	
	scaled	90	71	65	59	53	44	
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		120	91	80	69	58	51	

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation tier (163 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	26.4	44.2	62.6	77.9	94.5

Higher tier (135 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	8.9	24.4	44.4	70.4	85.9	91.1

Overall (298 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	4.0	11.1	20.1	46.3	63.1	75.5	83.9	93.0

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).