Version1.0: 0605

ASSESSMENT and QUALIFICATIONS ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography 3033
Geography 3038 (Short Course)

Specification C

Examiners' Report

2005 examination - June series

- 3033 Full Course
- 3038 (Short Course)

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

Contents

Specification C 3033 (Foundation Tier)

Units 3033/1F, 3033/2F

Specification C 3033 (Higher Tier)

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

Specification C 3038 (Short Course)

Units 3038/F, 3038/H and Coursework

This page has been left intentionally blank

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 topical and mainstream issue which is commonly explored in textbooks and forms a significant part of the course.

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

- The use of the resources was generally good; it was clear that many centres had worked hard on preparing candidates in the use of resources while only in a small number of cases were the resources 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 five 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 ……' is making the point that there are allocated marks for ideas or examples beyond the resource and that using only 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. Practise by using a range of resources throughout the course and ensure that candidates have a clear understanding of the types of skills required.

5. 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 whole paper as part of a 'mock' exam may be helpful or using parts of questions in 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, so will demand a high level of accuracy.
   - Check answers carefully, particularly the skilled-based questions. A number of small errors can add up to a significant loss of 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 markings, i.e. show them what a Level 1 response looks like and what it would take to make it a 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.

Question 1

In parts (a) (i) & (ii), the majority of candidates used Figure 1 effectively to identify the correct response to these questions.

In part (b), most candidates scored full marks for the line graph. The general level of accuracy was good and there appeared to be a marked improvement with this type of question.

As always, a small number of candidates were clearly not properly equipped with pencils, etc.

In part (c), most candidates identified a number of points from Figure 1 to suggest why visitor numbers to National Parks has increased. A significant number then went on to identify additional ideas from their own knowledge to develop a full response to the question.

Question 2

The photographs in part (a) were used very effectively by the majority of candidates. In most cases, a range of potential activities was identified, and candidates clearly appreciated the potential for both land and water-based activities. At the highest level, candidates considered a range of both and included active and passive recreational pursuits. A small number of candidates failed to appreciate that the focus of the question was not just about water sports.

However, in part (b), many candidates found the idea of conflict very challenging and often simply identified issues such as 'footpath erosion' or 'noise' or 'litter'. This brought some credit if it had tentative 'conflict' links, but tended to be self-limiting.

In order to address the idea of conflict, responses need to be 'people-based' and focus on individual activities. The most successful responses were usually those who considered passive and active activities, and went on to express the idea that they are not always compatible. The best examples were fishing/speed boating or hiking/bird-watching.

Question 3

Candidates had no real difficulty with part (a) and had a good understanding of the terminology expressed in the question.

In parts (b), (c) (i) and (ii), candidates used the resource very effectively to address these questions and a significant proportion of candidates achieved high marks.

It was noteworthy to see a number of candidates who had used a highlighter to identify key points from the resource - always a helpful technique. The use of part (b) (ii) and (c) to consider both the advantages and disadvantages of tourism was clearly successful and allowed candidates to show a high level of understanding.

Question 4

Use of the Ordnance Survey extract in parts (a) (i) & (ii) was variable, with a number of candidates scoring quite low marks. This was often a case of a lack of care, or accuracy in relation to basic skills. It was evident that a number of candidates had poor basic map work skills.

A number of candidates achieved full marks by carefully selecting the correct data from the resource. However, a significant proportion of candidates made elementary mistakes on at least one of the questions.

Most candidates in part (b) used the resource effectively to identify a number of pressures on the physical environment. A number then went on to develop the ideas and explain how the physical environment was affected. The idea of habitat loss or damage was a strong theme, often backed up with the use of appropriate examples. A number of candidates identified building pressure/land-use change as an important factor. When linked to tourism this provided a useful avenue of approach.

At the lower level, candidates simply used descriptive observations such as 'pollution' or 'erosion' with little or no real development.

Question 5

In part (a), the element of decision-making was quite complex in that a choice had to be made and then justified in relation to a number of stated aims. This required quite sophisticated thinking and cross-checking with the resource. The majority of candidates coped with this very effectively and made thoughtful and logical observations. At the higher levels, there were clearly identified links to the stated aims and clear explanation of the chosen approach. At the lower levels, responses were slightly vaguer, with clear justification for the choice, but only tentative links to the stated aims.

Candidates approached part (b) in different ways, each of which was acceptable. The three main avenues of approach were firstly, the idea that local people live there and should have priority (often in this approach justification was rather limited and the debate somewhat emotional!). Secondly, a more measured approach, which suggested that local people have to go about their daily business (work, school, shopping) and therefore, need to be treated in a different way. The third approach, which was suggested by a small number, was that tourists need to have priority so they are not put off. The reasoning was that they are very significant to the local economy, as stated in Figure 3.

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 maps, tables of figures, graphs and satellite images were very good. Opportunities for extended writing were given and the vast majority of candidates were able to offer a response. Even the least able candidates demonstrated some geographical understanding. There were relatively few scripts where candidates omitted question parts. The more able of the 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.

Question 1 was generally the best answered, the subject matter appearing familiar to the majority of candidates.

Question 1: Managing change in the human environment

In part (a) (i), most candidates were able to interpret the table of figures, but some did write the name of a country rather than a city. Part (a) (ii) was correctly completed by the majority of candidates.

In parts (b) (i) and (ii), most candidates were able to interpret the map and key.

Part (c) (i) was generally well done, with a majority of the candidates being able to suggest either 'push' or 'pull' factors, or both. In part (c) (ii) relatively few of the candidates were able to describe actual schemes. Many were aware of the names of schemes such as 'self-help', but failed to explain how they benefited the urban poor. The majority of responses tended to be general statements such as "they should improve houses/water supply/sewerage systems" without stating how this could be done, or who would fund the projects. The majority of attempts at case study examples simply gave the name of cites such as Sao Paulo. The better candidates at this tier did offer some development of answers, or were able to describe actual schemes they had seen on video.

In part (d) (i), most candidates were able to suggest at least one purpose of 'greenbelt', with many reaching the maximum mark. Part (d) (ii) was also well done.

Part (e) (i) did not prove problematic for the vast majority of the candidates and part (e) (ii) was generally well done, with only a small minority of candidates failing to understand the term 'land-use.' In part (e) (iii), many candidates did not develop their responses. There were widespread references to the motorway or railway, but often these did not go on to outline its benefit to a housing development. The better candidates offered a reason e.g. how the motorway/main road would benefit commuters living in the area. Part (e) (iv) elicited a range of responses, with a significant number of candidates not understanding the concept of 'brownfield' land. The better candidates did however give some well-developed arguments on 'brownfield' versus 'greenfield' development.

In part (f) (i), many candidates were unable to explain the purpose of a ring road. There were many vague responses, such as "it provides another road", without the sense of advantage being clear. Part (f)(ii) also saw a range of responses, with detailed descriptions of a cycle of decline in the CBD from the best candidates, to simple ideas about "shops will lose out" from the candidates of lesser ability. Some candidates recognised the attraction of an out of town development, but neglected to state its impact on the CBD.

Question 2: Managing the physical environment

In parts (a) (i) (ii) and (iii) most candidates were able to interpret the map successfully. Only a minority had difficulty understanding the key and the isohyets.

Part (b) was well answered by a large majority of the candidates, with relatively few offering very general responses such as "they will die", or "they will become ill."

Part (c) was not well answered. The physical processes leading to desertification were not generally known. Many candidates were able to offer factors arising from population pressure as causes, e.g. 'overgrazing' or 'overcultivation', but were unable to develop these responses by stating how these led to desertification. There were many misconceptions about the spreading of wind blown sand and people 'deserting' the area due to lack of food.

In parts (d) (i), (ii) and (iii), most candidates were able to interpret the satellite image successfully, and in (d) (iv) offered valid effects of a volcanic eruption.

Part (e) elicited a wide range of responses. There were many simplistic references to "they should evacuate the area" or "they should monitor the volcano", but many did develop these further through case-study knowledge, to gain the maximum mark.

Question 3: Managing economic development

In parts (a) (i) and (ii), most candidates were able to interpret the choropleth map successfully. However, in part (a) (ii), some candidates ticked only one box as opposed to two as stated in the question.

In part (b), most candidates showed a good understanding of the factors affecting life expectancy.

Parts (c) (i) and (ii) posed few problems for the great majority of the candidates and most were able to interpret the bar chart. Part (c) (iii) was not well answered, with few candidates showing knowledge of the causes of tertiarisation.

Parts (d) (i) and (ii) were generally well done, with the large majority of the candidates being able to interpret the graph. In part (d) (iii), most candidates were able to suggest factors affecting quality of life, but many failed to develop their responses to access a Level 2 mark.

Part (e) elicited a wide range of responses. There were many simplistic references to 'money' and 'jobs', but many of the better candidates did use case study knowledge to illustrate their answers. The highest marks tended to come from candidates who chose tourism and trans-national companies, but amongst those who chose appropriate technology, many could not distinguish between high technology and intermediate technology.

Part (f) (i) caused difficulty for many candidates; an inability to separate cause and effect was evident as was confusion between the effects of global warming and ozone depletion. Given the significance of these issues, this was disappointing. Misconceptions about the effects of acid rain were common, as were exaggerated effects of global warming. In part (f) (ii), many candidates were able to suggest a simple management strategy, but many were unable to develop this further.

Higher Tier

Paper 1 - 3033/1H

Question 1

In part (a) (i), most candidates used Figure 1 effectively to identify the reasons why the Peak District attracts many visitors. The majority of responses focused on levels of access and closeness to large urban centres.

In part (ii), the majority of candidates scored full marks and provided a neat and accurate bar chart. A small number lost marks because of a lack of accuracy; in most cases, it was clear that these candidates did not have a ruler or pencil.

In part (b) virtually all candidates showed a clear understanding of the question, and were able to identify a number of relevant points from the resource. The majority then went on to add additional individual ideas, such as increases in wealth, increased holiday time or greater awareness of environmental qualities. A small number of candidates failed to identify the command, "and your own knowledge" and consequently, only used the resource. This was self-limiting and restricted those candidates to Level 1 on the mark scheme.

Question 2

The photographs in, part (a) were used very effectively by the majority of candidates. In most cases a range of potential activities were identified and candidates clearly appreciated the potential for both land and water-based activities. At the highest level, candidates considered a range of both and included active and passive recreational pursuits. A small number of candidates failed to appreciate that the focus of the question was not just about water sports.

Responses to part (b) were variable, with a number of excellent answers detailing clear ideas about conflicts, with candidates developing their ideas by the use of types (farmers, hikers, etc). This was often a very productive avenue of approach and showed a very clear understanding. The other type of response was often 'issues-based' where candidates identified issues such as 'litter', 'pollution', 'footpath erosion', etc. Whilst these are legitimate issues in National Parks, the question demanded more than a simple statement of problems. This approach tended to limit responses to Level 1 in the mark scheme.

Question 3

Part (a) presented few problems and most candidates were able to offer a sound definition, often with the use of an appropriate example.

In part (b), candidates used the resource effectively to identify the employment opportunities brought by tourism in National Parks. A number then developed this theme further by offering ideas about the multiplier and the range of linked employment possibilities. A small number considered the view that without tourism, opportunities would be limited to agriculture, quarrying, etc., and that most people would have to commute to urban areas for employment.

Part (c) proved to be quite challenging for a number of candidates. Most were able to consider the impact of holiday homes on local house prices and local house buyers in a negative way and see that holiday homeowners might bring trade for local shops in a positive way. Beyond those ideas, development was often quite limited. A small number recognised the possibility that holiday homeowners might generate local work such as builders, cleaners, etc., and money generated could be used in other areas. At the same time, these candidates often saw the rise of holiday home ownership as damaging to community facilities and community spirit. This broader approach showed a clear understanding beyond the resource and offered a balanced appraisal of the issue.

Question 4

Use of the Ordnance Survey extract in parts (a) (i) & (ii) was variable, with a number of candidates scoring quite low marks. This was often a case of a lack of care, or accuracy in relation to basic skills. It was evident that a number of candidates had poor basic map work skills.

In part (a) (iv), identifying physical features on an Ordnance Survey Map appeared to present a challenge for many candidates. A small number identified human features and appeared to have no real grasp of basic terminology. The majority of candidates were able to offer a basic identification by using simple descriptors such as 'river', rocks', 'hilly'. Whilst this was credit-worthy, in order to achieve at the highest level, a little more detail was required. The use of terminology (river features, type of slope, valley, etc.,) is often a useful discriminating facture in this type of question.

Most candidates in part (b) used the resource effectively to identify a number of pressures on the physical environment. A number then went on to develop the ideas and to explain how the physical environment was affected. The idea of habitat loss or damage was a strong theme, often backed up with the use of appropriate examples. A number of candidates identified building pressure/land-use change as an important factor. When linked to tourism this provided a useful avenue of approach.

At the lower level, candidates simply used descriptive observations such as 'pollution' or 'erosion' with little or no real development.

Question 5

In part (a), the element of decision-making was quite complex in that a choice had to be made and then justified in relation to a number of stated aims. This required quite sophisticated thinking and cross-checking with the resource. The majority of candidates coped with this very effectively and made thoughtful and logical observations. At the higher levels, there were clearly identified links to the stated aims and clear explanation of the chosen approach. At the lower levels, responses were slightly vaguer, with clear justification for the choice, but only tentative links to the stated aims.

In part (b), responses varied from simplistic observations which suggested that the best points from each option could be combined, without actually stating what they might be, to more complex debate. At the higher level, candidates identified points from each approach and made a strong case for a combination of these ideas, linking them back to the original aims.

Candidates approached part (c) in different ways, each of which was acceptable. The three main avenues of approach were firstly, the idea that local people live there and should have priority (often in this approach justification was rather limited and the debate somewhat emotional). Secondly, a more measured approach, which suggested that local people have to go about their daily business (work, school, shopping) and therefore, need to be treated in a different way. The third approach, which was suggested by a small number, was that tourists need to have priority so they are not put off. The reasoning was that they are very significant to the local economy, as stated in Figure 3.

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 maps, tables of figures, graphs and satellite images were excellent. 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 very few instances of questions that were not attempted.

Question 1 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 the comparison in some cases.

In part (b) (i), most candidates were able to give the correct direction, but even at this tier, a surprising number gave an incorrect answer. Part (a) (ii) was a familiar topic to most candidates and was well done.

In part (c), there were responses ranging from very general suggestions, where a sense of an actual scheme was not clear, to some very detailed descriptions of case studies, often from Brazilian or Indian cities.

In part (d) (i), most candidates were able to suggest at least one purpose of 'greenbelt', with many reaching the maximum mark, but there were some misconceptions about 'greenbelt' being land put aside for development. Part (d) (ii) was also well done by a majority of the candidates, as was part (e) (i), with only a small minority of candidates failing to understand the term 'land-use.'

Part (e) (ii) elicited a range of responses, from basic statements of problems such as 'it will destroy/not destroy countryside, to the better candidates giving detailed arguments of why the regeneration of brownfield sites was an environmentally better option than new green field development. There was some good use of case studies, often London Docklands or local examples. Candidates who set their answer out as a table of advantages and disadvantages, or as bullet points, rarely got beyond a Level 1 mark, as there was no development of points.

Question 2: Managing the physical environment

In part (a), the map was well used by most candidates, there was widespread use of the isohyets and named examples to illustrate the relationship between average annual rainfall and lack of regular food supply.

Part (b) was not well answered by a majority of the candidates, even at this tier, the physical processes leading to desertification were not generally well known. As with Foundation Tier, many candidates were able to offer factors arising from population pressure as causes, e.g. 'overgrazing' or 'overcultivation', but were unable to develop these responses by stating how these led to desertification.

In part (c), most candidates were able to interpret the satellite image successfully.

In part (d), most candidates showed a good understanding to gain maximum marks.

Part (e) elicited a range of responses, from basic statements of strategies such as "they should evacuate the area" or "they should monitor the volcano", but many did develop these further to describe how the strategy would operate. The better candidates used some very detailed descriptions of case studies, often on Mt Etna, Mt St Helens, or the Soufriere Hills volcano in Montserrat.

Question 3: Managing economic development

In part (a), the term 'distribution' was not always fully understood, with responses such as "they are MEDCs" being common, along with inaccuracies such as "they are all above the equator."

Part (b) was also a familiar topic to most candidates and was well done, as were parts (c) (i) and (ii), which posed few problems for a great majority of the candidates.

Part (c) (iii) also had a range of responses, most candidates were able to offer at least one reason for differences in employment structure, but the better candidates were able to sustain their answers and demonstrated some good geographical understanding.

Part (d) (i) also proved to be an effective discriminator of geographical ability. Many candidates made only simplistic references to 'money' and 'jobs', but many of the better candidates did develop their answers to clearly show the impact on the economy. There were many references to a multiplier effect and many used case study knowledge to illustrate their answers. The highest marks tended to come from candidates who chose tourism and trans-national companies. When choosing tourism, some candidates tended to give lengthy descriptions of the attractions of tourist destinations, which was not required. There were some very detailed descriptions of the use of appropriate technology, but often these did not focus upon the economic advantages, they tended to concentrate on the environmental gain or the social benefits for shanty town dwellers. The majority of candidates choosing fair trade and aid tended to offer Level 1, undeveloped responses. In part (d) (ii), most candidates were able to suggest a problem such as "debt" but only a minority were able to further develop the point to gain the second mark. Many candidates offered several suggestions, when the question requested only one.

Part (e) elicited a wide range of responses, with the better candidates giving some extremely detailed descriptions of problems resulting from the issues, especially when choosing global warming or acid rain. However, an inability to separate cause and effect was also evident at this tier. Many candidates wrote at length and in considerable detail about the causes of the issue, when this was not demanded by the question. Many had used up most of the answer space before they began discussing the effects and were thus, disadvantaged. Also evident at this tier was confusion between the effects of global warming and ozone depletion, although this was not as widespread as on the Foundation Tier. Relatively few candidates showed a clear understanding of the international/global nature of the issues and thus the need for international/global co-operation. Many were unable to go beyond naming an international agreement, or stating, "all countries should agree to reduce the use of fossil fuels."

Some general points for development

- The best answers directly address the demands of the question. Good practice is evident amongst those candidates who highlight or underline the command words and key terms in the question. This helps them focus their answer and helps avoid inclusion of peripheral information.

- A brief 'answer plan' in the margin also helps to structure the response and is useful in that it encourages the full development of one idea, before the candidate moves on to the next idea in their plan.

- Errors still persist in answers to short data response questions. Accuracy in these questions is essential.

Foundation and Higher Tiers

Centre-Assessed Coursework - 3033/C

General

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

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

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

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

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

Administration

This year was no different to any other year in that the quality of administration varied greatly. Whilst some centres were quite superb in all aspects of administration and justifiably deserve credit, others failed to meet even the basic requirements and thus delayed the whole process. The sampling procedure continued to work well and made sure that the number and composition of the sample sent from the centre was correct in the majority of cases. Centre Mark Sheets were posted to the moderator much closer to the deadline than last year with the time taken for centres to respond to requests by moderators for work or information varying enormously.

The following points need to be stressed:

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

- The Candidate Record Form should be attached to the relevant pieces of work. They should be filled in correctly, making sure that the candidate numbers are placed in the relevant boxes and that both the teacher and the candidate have signed the document. Sometimes is not always possible from the teacher's signature at the bottom of the CRF to clearly identify the name of the teacher involved in the marking of a particular piece of work. To save any confusion it would help if the teacher also printed their name next to their signature. For the first time this year the total mark was supposed to be placed in a box on the front of the CRFs. This would allow moderators to place the work from a centre in rank order without having to open every plastic wallet in order to access the total mark on the reverse side of the form. The majority of centres ignored these boxes or chose to simply place a tick in the relevant box. In a number of cases centres are using out of date CRF forms and, as a result, did not provide all the information required, such as summative statements and teacher signatures. The incorrect addition of marks on the CRF forms and the inaccurate transfer of the total mark to the Centre Mark Sheet continue to be common problems for the moderator. A number of centres continue to fail to supply t**he Centre Declaration Sheet with the sample.**

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

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

- An increasing number of centres are submitting their work in appropriate folders. However, there are still some centres that use **hard back files or ring binders** and so increase the cost of postage. Also, if centres could ensure that if candidates are submitting large maps within their enquiry, that they are not folded in such an intricate manner they prove impossible to open. It would also save moderators time if the candidate's name and total mark were placed on the outside of the folder.

- A number of candidates were given zero marks for their enquiry. If the candidate has submitted some work but it has been found to be worthless then 0 (zero marks) should be encoded in the 'Total Mark' box on the CMS. If the candidate has produced some evidence relating to the enquiry, no matter how basic, it would be extremely unlikely to be completely worthless**. Centres need to examine the work of their lowest ability candidates carefully before giving zero,** as experience has shown that, in a number of these cases, the work of lower ability candidates is under-marked and that there is, within the work, elements that are indeed creditworthy. If a candidate has submitted no work or has withdrawn then 'X' should be encoded.

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

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

Marking Criteria

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

Applied Understanding

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

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

In the weaker enquiries, many of the hypotheses were inappropriate, poorly structured or over-ambitious and, as a result, failed to set an effective agenda for an enquiry. Locating the study area involved basic statements and simplified maps that were badly drawn and lacked the normal conventions. There was little or no conceptual base, understanding was delivered through background information or scene setting and as a result it was very difficult to identify where the geography could be credited.

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

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

It was pleasing to see an increase in the use of annotated maps in the majority of enquiries. Maps of varying scales both hand drawn and ICT produced were used effectively by candidates to accurately locate study areas. It must be remembered, however, that the critical factor in determining the mark level in this section is how well candidates have applied their understanding throughout the investigation and not the quality or detail of the location statements. Some centres were giving too much credit for locational detail, equating detailed location with Level 3. In one or two instances, candidates failed to find the right balance, spending most of their time and energy describing the location whilst neglecting the concepts underpinning the work.

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

Methodology

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

Originality in data collection and the justification of the techniques used are the major 'triggers' to accessing Level 3 marks in this section. The amount of teacher involvement in the organisation and direction of the enquiry is the critical issue. Heavily teacher-directed work and group activities would now appear to be the norm but centres must realise that this approach prohibits Level 3 methodology marks, as the candidate is not being given the opportunity to show originality and initiative.

In some cases, Level 3 marks were awarded to candidates whose definition of originality was questionable, little more than a minute difference in data collection technique. 'Originality' in this context must reflect initiative on the part of the candidate to produce a significant element of uniqueness in their enquiry. Centres need to find ways of giving fieldwork extensions so able candidates can demonstrate a clearly defined element of uniqueness in their data collection.

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

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

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

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

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

the methodology section. Even some higher ability candidates produce a disappointing amount of data from what appears to be a comprehensive and robust methodology section.

Data Presentation

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

In many cases centres impressed with the quality of work produced in this section and the wide range of techniques and skills exhibited by their candidates. It was common, however, for this section to be overmarked. Some centres confusing 'attractive' with 'more complex' so Level 3 was frequently being awarded for a limited range of what were basic techniques. Even when a range of different techniques was used, a great number of candidates failed to achieve Level 3 as the techniques chosen lacked complexity.

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

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

To access Level 2 and Level 3 marks in this section, all candidates have to provide evidence of at least two different types of ICT outcome in their enquiry. Candidates with no ICT had their marks in this section limited to Level 1 provided all other Level 1 criteria had been met. This compulsory element of ICT did not present many problems to centres. Most candidates satisfied the basic ICT requirement on the front cover of the enquiry and so had the opportunity to progress beyond Level 1. A significant number of candidates submitted entirely ICT generated enquiries. A number of these particular enquiries were outstanding, in terms of data presentation, but the majority were disappointing containing, as they did, a large number of fairly basic bar and pie graphs. To access Level 3 marks, there has to be evidence of 'more complex' techniques being used. It is not essential that the element of complexity indicated within the Level 3 statement is delivered by means of ICT, but, if it is not, then it has to be shown by other means.

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

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

Data Interpretation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation

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

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

In the most effective enquiries candidates referred in detail specifically to problems relating to their data collection methods and how these problems impacted upon the accuracy of their results. Candidates then went on to explain how these inaccuracies brought into question the validity of their conclusions.

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

Summary

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

(Short Course) - Foundation Tier

3038/F

General

- Very few candidates filed to complete the examination paper. Time was clearly not a problem.
- Most candidates appeared to be well prepared for the examination.
- Initial comments from centres suggest that the papers (F and H) were challenging but a sound reflection of the specification.
- Candidates used the space and mark allocation effectively and appeared to be very comfortable with the style of the paper.
- In most cases candidates addressed the commands effectively, although in a limited number of cases, candidates drifted away from the focus of the question.
- The use of locational or topic-based examples was variable.
- It was evident that a small number of candidates may have been better served by entering the other tiered examination paper. (In both directions).

Focus for development

- The use of a single examination paper means that it has to cover the full range of the assessment criteria. Consequently, the questions reflect the need to test skills, knowledge and application. This demands quick thinking and very careful reading of the questions. Candidates do not always find this easy - practice is an essential part of the preparation for this paper.
- The examination paper reflects the whole of the specification and not just parts of it. Candidates need to be made fully aware of this and also need to appreciate the style of the paper.
- The use of resources is increasingly sound; however, candidates do not always fully appreciate the need to add their own ideas or examples to resource-based questions.
- A number of questions will always use key geographical terminology expressed in the specification. It is worth identifying the important terms and perhaps setting up 'key definition' boxes throughout the course or during the revision phase.
- The use of locational or topic-based examples is important, especially on the higher tier paper. Identify a small number of appropriate examples within each unit and encourage the practice of building an answer around an example, instead of simple naming a pace at the end of a response.
- Ensure that candidates appreciate the context of a question. The most fundamental error is often using MEDC examples to a question based in LEDC; or vice versa. However, there are also other common contextual errors; for example expressing a rural context in an urban question or mixing up the ideas of global warming and acid rain.

- 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 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 a 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 skills-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 a revision grid for each sub-section is a helpful technique. The grid could be used to identify the key word definitions/problems and challenges and management strategies. Also possible locational or topic examples could be included.

Question 1: Managing change in the human environment

In parts (a) (i) and (ii), the resource was used effectively in most cases to identify the correct answers to these questions.

In part (iii) most candidates identified the fact that urban populations had increased, while rural populations had decreased. A small number then went on to identify more precise changes such as the increase in rural numbers up to 1960, or used statistics to describe rates of change or actual numeric changes.

The majority of candidates clearly understood the concept of push/pull migration in part (b) (i) and were able to express their understanding through the use of examples. In a small number of cases, candidates were confused between push and pull ideas or failed to address the question in relation to rural-urban migration (as expressed in the question).

In part (ii), quality of life was often seen as housing quality, with many candidates describing conditions in shanty towns; often offering quite detailed descriptions which included broader points about lack of services. This type of response was often quite effective and enabled candidates to show a good understanding of the question. At the higher levels, candidates began to link living conditions to quality of life issues such as the spread of disease, health and crime problems.

A small number of candidates adopted a slightly extreme approach by suggesting that developing cities have **no** healthcare, **no** water, **no** sanitation, etc.

Many candidates found part (iii) of this question quite challenging. Responses were often quite general with observations which were not particularly focused on rural areas. Comments such as 'improve housing', 'create jobs', etc., gained credit but were usually not well developed. In a number of cases, candidates addressed the question with a totally inappropriate MEDC context or described urban housing schemes.

A small number of candidates identified agricultural improvement schemes or water based schemes as suitable development projects. This type of response was generally very successful.

In part (c) (i), most candidates used the resource successfully to identify the characteristics of declining areas in MEDC cities. A significant number developed their ideas beyond the descriptive and made broader observations about lack of jobs or investment, problems of crime and poor quality housing.

A very small number of candidates failed to appreciate that the context of this question was 'MEDC cities' and continued with their ideas from the previous question.

Responses to part (ii) were variable, with a number of candidates simply repeating descriptive observations from the previous question, and not suggesting reasons for urban decline.

In part (iii), most candidates had a sound general understanding about how redevelopment can improve city centres. Responses tended to either offer general observations, which included ideas about 'new shops' or 'improved housing' or described actual projects such as 'new shopping centres' or 'traffic management schemes'. At the higher levels, candidates made a clear link between methods used to improve city centres and how these improved living conditions or based their response around actual examples. This approach was often very impressive and showed an excellent understanding of the question.

In part (d) (i), candidates appeared to have a good general appreciation that the 'rural-urban' fringe was at the edge of an urban area. A number of candidates developed this idea further describing characteristics of the 'rural-urban fringe'.

In part (ii), a significant number of candidates clearly appreciated the advantages of living in the rural-urban fringe. Many mentioned the idea of open space, cleaner environments and reduced crime. A number were more specific and brought in ideas about cheaper (or larger) house, more open space in relation to gardens or safety for children. Only a small number of candidates picked up the idea that these areas offer distinct advantages as places to live, while at the same time, being close to city centres for work and leisure opportunities.

Question 2: Managing the physical environment

Most candidates used the resources in parts (a) (i) and (ii) effectively to answer these questions correctly.

In part (iii), most candidates identified clear points from the resource to suggest how tourism created employment. Consequently, nearly all candidates achieved Level 1 marks with ease. A significant number of candidates failed to identify the command, 'with the help of Figure 3', and consequently did not develop or add to their response.

There were a number of excellent responses to part (b) and a significant number of candidates made a strong case for their chosen approach. In many cases, they then cross-referenced their ideas with the key aims expressed in the resource. A small number of candidates made comparative observations about each approach as a justification for their choice. It was clear that the key idea of decision-making and justification is being taught effectively in most centres.

Question 3: Managing economic development

Most candidates used the resource in part (a) effectively to answer this question correctly, although a small number named gases rather than sources of gases.

It was clear in part (b), that the majority of candidates had some appreciation of economic development and realised that it usually means more energy use, increased numbers of vehicles and growing industry. Consequently, candidates generally did well on this question.

In part (c), most candidates did well and either knew the definitions or were able to work them out.

Responses to part (d) were variable, with relatively few candidates picking up the idea of 'affecting people' in any detail.

The majority of candidates mentioned sea-level rise and made tentative observations about flooding but then failed to develop the idea with strong people links. However, a small number of candidates did express links to agriculture and potential famine ideas or made general observations about the impact on health. At the higher levels, candidates began to bring in examples; the most common being flooding in Bangladesh or the Netherlands or increasing drought in Africa. A small number of candidates appeared to be somewhat confused and drifted into acid rain or ozone ideas.

(Short Course) Higher Tier

3038/H

Question 1: Managing Change in the Human Environment

In part (a) (i), most candidates used the resource effectively to describe the changes to urban and rural populations. A significant proportion then went on to suggest reasons for the changes.

In part (ii), candidates showed a good level of understanding about this question, with the majority identifying clear push and pull migratory factors as reasons for urban growth. A range of factors was identified, some with locational exemplification. A small proportion of candidates also identified population structures and birth rates as contributory factors to urban growth.

In part (b), quality of life was often seen as housing quality, with many candidates describing conditions in shanty towns; often offering quite detailed descriptions which included broader points about lack of services. This type of response was often quite effective and enabled candidates to show a good understanding of the question. At the higher levels, candidates began to link living conditions to quality of life issues such as the spread of disease, health and crime problems.

A small number of candidates adopted a slightly extreme approach by suggesting that developing cities have **no** healthcare, **no** water, **no** sanitation, etc.

Many candidates found part (c) of this question quite challenging. Responses were often quite general with observations which were not particularly focused on rural areas. Comments such as 'improve housing', 'create jobs', etc., gained credit but were usually not well developed. In a number of cases, candidates addressed the question with a totally inappropriate MEDC context or described urban housing schemes.

A small number of candidates identified agricultural improvement schemes or water based schemes as suitable development projects. This type of response was generally very successful.

In part (d) (i), most candidates used the resource successfully to identify the characteristics of declining areas in MEDC cities. A significant number developed their ideas beyond the descriptive and made broader observations about lack of jobs or investment, problems of crime and poor quality housing.

A very small number of candidates failed to appreciate that the context of this question was 'MEDC cities' and continued with their ideas from the previous question.

In part (ii), most candidates identified a range of ways in which redevelopment could improve the central areas of towns or cities. Ideas expressed, included 'building or improving urban housing', 'development of infrastructure', 'redeveloping shopping centres'. A number of candidates then went on to discuss how these changes would improve living conditions and economic opportunities, often including the use of appropriate locational case studies.

Candidates showed a sound understanding to part (e) (i) and were able to describe a range of different developments in the rural-urban fringe. A small number illustrate their ideas with the use of specific examples.

Responses to part (ii) were variable. The majority of candidates considered 'environmental pressures' in the broadest sense, many mentioning 'pollution' or 'erosion', often in quite general ways. A small number developed their answers more specifically by including ideas about land-use, land and habitat loss.

Question 2: Managing the physical environment

In part (a), the majority of candidates had a clear idea about the concept of 'honey pot', with a number developing their answer with the use of examples.

Part (b) clearly required a balanced response, which identified both advantages and disadvantages of tourism. A small number of candidates realised that this was required and offered quite detailed evaluative observations. However, a number of candidates simply identified the problems caused by tourism and offered no real debate.

It was clear in part (c), that the majority of candidates had some appreciation of economic development and realised that it usually means more energy use, increased numbers of vehicles and growing industry. Consequently, candidates generally did well on this question.

Question 3: Managing economic development

In part (a), most candidates showed some understanding about the processes involved in global warming and used the resource effectively. A small number were clearly confused and brought in ideas about acid rain or ozone holes.

Responses to part (b) were variable, with relatively few candidates picking up the idea of 'affecting people' in any detail.

The majority of candidates mentioned sea-level rise and made tentative observations about flooding but then failed to develop the idea with strong people links. However, a small number of candidates did express links to agriculture and potential famine ideas or made general observations about the impact on health. At the higher levels, candidates began to bring in examples, the most common being flooding in Bangladesh or the Netherlands or increasing drought in Africa. A small number of candidates appeared to be somewhat confused and drifted into acid rain or ozone ideas.

In part (c), candidates appeared to either know what was meant by 'sustainable development' or had no idea at all. The majority offered some level of understanding while a very small number simply left the question unanswered.

Foundation and Higher Tiers

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

General

As in previous years, in the majority of cases, there was no obvious difference between the coursework submitted for the Short Course and that produced for the Full Course. This was highlighted in centres that had candidates entered for both courses, it was impossible to distinguish between the two sets of enquiries. In the vast majority of cases, the work was identical and, therefore, interchangeable. Generally, no allowance was being made for the reduced word limit or the more detailed and specific Marking criteria that was designed to lessen the demands made on candidates in completing Short Course enquiries. Centres generally asked too much of their Short Course candidates, working on the principle that more work, equalled more marks. In reality, more work usually meant more at the same level.

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

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

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

Finally, the profile of the typical Short Course centre and the function the Short course performs within the school curriculum continued to change. There was an increased variety of small institutions involved, a significant number of which cannot be classed as mainstream schools. Centres no longer entered candidates in large numbers and the entry was no longer limited to Key Stage 4. This had an impact on the quality of work produced, as a number of these candidates would appear to be frequently less motivated or have yet to fully develop their geographical skills. Centres expected, nevertheless, to achieve a full mark range and, in some cases, end up marking candidates and not work, giving marks for effort in exceptional circumstances. As a result, an increased number of centres this year were well outside the mark tolerance. This was disappointing considering this academic year how much the time and effort the Board has put into coursework support. The advice centres received from the previous years' feedback forms, information provided at standardisation meetings, and the ongoing guidance from coursework advisers had in large part gone unheeded.

Administration

This was no different to any other year in that the quality of administration varied greatly. Whilst some centres were quite superb in all aspects of administration and justifiably deserve credit, others failed to meet even the basic requirements and thus delayed the whole process. The sampling procedure continued to work well and made sure that the number and composition of the sample sent from the centre was correct in the majority of cases. Centre Mark Sheets were being posted to the moderator much closer to the deadline than last year but the time taken for centres to respond to requests by moderators for work or information did vary enormously.

The following points need to be stressed:

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

- The Candidate Record Form should be attached to the relevant pieces of work. They should be filled in correctly, making sure that the candidate numbers are placed in the relevant boxes and that both the teacher and the candidate have signed the document. Sometimes is not always possible from the teacher's signature at the bottom of the CRF to clearly identify the name of the teacher involved in the marking of a particular piece of work. To save any confusion it would help if the teacher also printed their name next to their signature. For the first time this year the total mark was supposed to be placed in a box on the front of the CRFs. This would allow moderators to place the work from a centre in rank order without having to open every plastic wallet in order to access the total mark on the reverse side of the form. The majority of centres ignored these boxes or chose to simply place a tick in the relevant box. In a number of cases, centres are using out of date CRF forms and, as a result, did not provide all the information required, such as summative statements and teacher signatures. The incorrect addition of marks on the CRF forms and the inaccurate transfer of the total mark to the Centre Mark Sheet continue to be common problems for the moderator. A number of centres continue to fail to supply t**he Centre Declaration Sheet with the sample.**

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

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

- An increasing number of centres are submitting their work in appropriate folders. However, there are still some centres that use **hardback files or ring binders** and so increase the cost of postage. In addition, if centres could ensure that if candidates are submitting large maps within their enquiry that they are not folded in such an intricate manner they prove impossible to open. It would also save moderators time if the candidate's name and total mark were placed on the outside of the folder.

- A number of candidates were given zero marks for their enquiry. If the candidate has submitted some work but it has been found to be worthless then 0 (zero marks) should be encoded in the 'Total Mark' box on the CMS. If the candidate has produced some evidence relating to the enquiry, no matter how basic, it would be extremely unlikely to be completely worthless**. Centres need to examine the work of their lowest ability candidates carefully before giving zero,** as experience has shown that, in a number of these cases, the work of lower ability candidates is under-marked and that there is, within the work, elements that are indeed creditworthy. If a candidate has submitted no work or has withdrawn then 'X' should be encoded.

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

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

Marking Criteria

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

Applied Understanding

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

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

In the weaker enquiries, many of the hypotheses were inappropriate, poorly structured or over-ambitious and, as a result, failed to set an effective agenda for an enquiry. Locating the study area involved basic statements and simplified maps that were badly drawn and lacked the normal conventions. There was little or no conceptual base, understanding was delivered through background information or scene setting making it difficult to identify where the geography could be credited.

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

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

It was pleasing to see an increase in the use of annotated maps in the majority of enquiries. Maps of varying scales both hand drawn and ICT produced were used effectively by candidates to accurately locate study areas. It must be remembered, however, that the critical factor in determining the mark level in this section is how well candidates have applied their understanding throughout the investigation and not the quality or detail of the location statements. Some centres were giving too much credit for location detail, equating detailed location with Level 3. In one or two instances, candidates failed to find the right balance, spending most of their time and energy describing the location whilst neglecting the concept underpinning the work.

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

Methodology

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

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

It must be stressed that this is the only section of the marking criteria where originality and initiative is credited. A number of centres assume evidence of originality in other sections notably data presentation is sufficient to justify the awarding of Level 3 in this section. Equally, it is important to remember that originality and initiative are not the only criteria required for Level 3 Methodology marks. For example, some failed to justify their techniques, preferring to spend most of their time discussing the advantages and disadvantages of each technique or the merits of different sampling procedures.

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

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

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

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

Data Presentation

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

Nevertheless in many cases centres impressed with the quality of work produced and the wide range of techniques and skills exhibited by their candidates. It was common, however, for this section to be over-marked. Even when three techniques were used, a great number of candidates failed to achieve Level 3 as the techniques chosen lacked complexity. These centres were confusing 'attractive' with 'more complex' so Level 3 was frequently being awarded for what were basic techniques.

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

To access Level 2 and Level 3 marks in this section, all candidates have to provide evidence of one ICT outcome in their enquiry. Candidates with no ICT had their marks in this section limited to Level 1 provided all other Level 1 criteria had been met. This compulsory element of ICT did not present many problems to centres. Most candidates satisfied the basic ICT requirement on the front cover of the enquiry and so had the opportunity to progress beyond Level 1. A significant number of candidates submitted entirely ICT generated enquiries. A number of these particular enquiries were outstanding, in terms of data presentation, but the majority were disappointing containing, as they did, a large number of fairly basic bar and pie graphs. To access Level 3 marks, there has to be evidence of 'more complex' techniques being used. It is not essential that the element of complexity indicated within the Level 3 statement is delivered by means of ICT, but, if it is not, then it has to be shown by other means.

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

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

Data Interpretation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation

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

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

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

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

Summary

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

Mark 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	25.4	10.4
3033/1F	60	60	36.5	7.8
3033/2F	80	120	62.4	15.5
Foundation Tier overall code	170	240	124.3	27.9

		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	41	37	33	29	25
	scaled	60	41	37	33	29	25
3033/2F boundary mark	raw	80	50	43	36	29	22
	scaled	120	75	65	54	44	32
Foundation Tier scaled boundary mark		240	142	123	104	85	66

Higher Tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3033/C	30	60	42.1	10.4
3033/1H	60	60	39.6	6.6
3033/2H	80	120	62.5	15.9
Higher Tier overall code	170	240	144.3	27.9

		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	29	
	scaled	60	46	41	36	32	29	
3033/2H boundary mark	raw	80	55	48	41	34	29	
	scaled	120	83	72	62	51	44	
Higher Tier scaled boundary mark		240	176	155	134	113	97	89

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation Tier (6585 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	27.4	53.8	74.8	88.1	94.4

Higher Tier (7929 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	allowed E
Cumulative %	13.7	35.0	63.4	87.1	95.3	97.3

Overall (14514 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	7.5	19.1	34.6	60.0	76.5	87.1	93.1	96.0

Short Course

Foundation Tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3038/C	30	30	11.4	5.4
3038/F	60	90	49.8	13.7
Foundation Tier overall code	90	120	61.2	16.4

		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	33	29	26	23
	scaled	90	56	50	44	39	35
Foundation Tier scaled boundary mark		120	67	60	53	46	39

Higher Tier

Component	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
3038/C	30	30	18.2	5.4
3038/H	60	90	53.9	12.2
Higher Tier overall code	90	120	72.1	16.3

		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	39	35	32	27	
	scaled	90	65	59	53	48	41	
Higher tier scaled boundary mark		120	94	82	72	63	48	

Provisional statistics for the award

Foundation Tier (117 candidates)

	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	30.8	54.7	62.4	79.5	84.6

Higher Tier (36 candidates)

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

Overall (298 candidates)

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Cumulative %	4.6	12.7	19.3	46.2	67.5	74.1	84.3	87.3

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).