AQA

ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography 3033 Full Course
Specification C

3033/2F   Paper 2 – Foundation Tier

Report on the Examination

2008 examination - June series

3033/2F

General

The paper proved to be a very 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 bar graphs, line graphs, pie charts, tables of figures and maps were very good. Opportunities for extended writing were given in one or more parts of each question, and even the least able candidates were able to offer a response, which demonstrated some geographical understanding. The 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.

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

Question one was the best answered, the subject matter appearing familiar to the majority of candidates. Question two was the least well answered.

Question 1: Managing change in the human environment

In Part (a)(i), a significant number of candidates gave the answer as 100, rather than 100 000. Parts (a)(ii) to (iii) were well answered by a vast majority of candidates, with good interpretation of the graph.

Part (b)(i) did not prove problematic for a vast majority of the candidates. Part (b)(ii) was generally well answered, but some candidates did not gain the mark as no difference was stated i.e. population change was described in the USA or India only. Others failed to score as reasons for population change were given. In part (b)(iii), most candidates showed some knowledge of methods of reducing population growth rate. Contraception and China's one child policy were popular answers, and were ones that the better candidates did develop upon to gain the maximum mark.

In part (c), most candidates showed some knowledge of the problems found in shanty towns and many were able to develop their answers fully.

In part (d), there were many simplistic ideas about 'building better houses' and 'putting in clean water'. There were relatively few examples of actual schemes. Some of the better candidates however, did write clear descriptions of 'self-help' schemes.

In part (e), a large majority of candidates gained one mark for recognising that the project would improve quality of life, but far fewer were able to link this to its effect upon rural-urban migration. Some candidates misunderstood the question and described how the life of people in urban areas could be improved.

Parts (f)(i) and (f)(ii) did not prove problematic for a vast majority of the candidates and most were able two offer two correct pieces of evidence in part (f)(iii). Part (f) (iv) elicited a range of responses. Some candidates were able to offer only simple suggestions, lifted from the resource, but a significant number were able to develop these to show a clear understanding of how the stated improvement impacted upon the environment. Many candidates failed to score as they gave general benefits to people or the economy e.g. 'more jobs', 'more shops'.

Question 2: Managing the physical environment

Parts (a)(i) to (iii) were well answered by a vast majority of candidates, with good use of the resource.

In part (b), most candidates were able to describe simple effects of a weather hazard but only the better candidates were able to develop these effects further to give a clear description, especially when case study examples were used. Some candidates lost marks by describing the effects of an earthquake or volcanic eruption, or by explaining how a tropical storm formed.

In part (c), a large majority of candidates were only able to offer simple explanations such as 'because desertification has taken place' or 'it is too hot and dry'. Some of the better candidates at this tier did attempt to develop these and link them to soil erosion and population pressure. There were few case study examples used to support answers. Some candidates failed to score as their answers focused upon the problems of food distribution rather than production.

Part (d)(i) did not prove problematic for a vast majority of the candidates with most being able to interpret the graph. In part (d)(ii) most candidates were able to state that the cost of natural disasters was increasing, but fewer used data to support their answer. Many attempted to gain the second mark by explaining why costs had increased.

Part (e) elicited a range of responses. Some candidates were able to offer only simple explanations such as 'strengthen buildings to make them earthquake proof'. However, a significant number were able to develop responses to give a clear explanation of actual schemes, but relatively few candidates were able to sustain this and reach the maximum mark. Some candidates continue to describe damage or give the causes of the damage, when these are not asked for in the question. There also appears to be a misunderstanding amongst a significant number of candidates, that earthquakes can be predicted within a very short time frame.

Question 3: Managing economic development

Parts (a)(i) and (ii) were well answered by a vast majority of candidates, with good use of the resource.

In part (b), most candidates were able to give simple explanations such as 'a lack of resources', or 'war and corruption'. Only a few of the better candidates at this tier were able to clearly develop these explanations and gain a level 2 mark.

Part (c) (i) did not prove problematic for a vast majority of the candidates with most being able to interpret the pie chart. In part (c)(ii), a majority of the candidates were unable to state a non-renewable primary product. In part (c)(iii), most candidates showed some knowledge of the effects of the increasing use of natural resources, with a majority gaining 3 or 4 marks.

In part (d)(i) most candidates were able to interpret the map, but part (d)(ii) was not well answered, a significant number of candidates failing to score with unacceptable answers such as 'because it is big area' or, 'because there are lots of trees'.

Part (e)(i) was well answered by a majority of candidates and in part (e)(ii), a vast majority of candidates were able to suggest at least one correct reason why recycling helps to manage the use of natural resources, with many being able to sustain the explanation and gain the second mark.

Part (f)(i) did not prove problematic for a vast majority of the candidates with most being able to interpret the map. In part (f)(ii) many candidates were able to link the spread of acid rain to the prevailing wind, but a significant number merely described the wind direction. In part (f)(iii) a majority of candidates were able to suggest at least one correct effect of global warming, but there were many very vague answers and some candidates wrongly chose acid rain. Part (f)(iv) was well answered by a majority of candidates and in (f)(v), most candidates were able to suggest a problem caused by acid rain, but fewer could sustain the description to gain the second mark. There was widespread confusion of the terms erosion and weathering.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the **Results statistics** page of the AQA Website.