

Examiners' Report Summer 2008

GCSE

GCSE Geography B (1313)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2008

Publications Code UG020190

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2008

Contents

1.	Unit 1313 Paper 1F	5
2.	Unit 1313 Paper 2F	9
3.	Unit 1313 Paper 3H	15
4.	Unit 1313 Paper 4H	21
5.	Unit 1313 Paper 05	27
6.	Statistics 1313	30

Unit 1313 Paper 1F

General Comments

The resource booklet contained a wide variety of materials: e.g. texts, maps, diagrams, ground and aerial photographs, statistics and - for the first time - a number of satellite images. Generally candidates handled these resource materials well, with only the weather satellite image causing notable difficulty.

The paper proved to be generally accessible for the target grade candidates, with only Q3 a)ii) and 4a)ii) having many blank responses. However, it proved a demanding paper and candidates often struggled with questions on physical processes. Sometimes the loss of marks was due to a failure to follow instructions, notably in Q6a)i and 7. There was nevertheless an improvement in the answers to the final question where candidates had to make and justify their decision about the options.

Good knowledge of some geographical terms (e.g. river discharge, sediment and dredged) was evident, though others proved more difficult. Many candidates would do better if they thoroughly learned definitions of all the words italicised in the advanced information booklet. Sound skills were usually displayed in interpreting the satellite image of New Orleans and the text on the Mississippi River, but some candidates found compass directions problematic when describing Katrina's track on Figure 6.

Question Specific Comments

Question 1

(a) Most candidates found these introductory questions on the satellite image very straightforward.

(b) Identifying the urban land and the direction of river flow were also easy tasks for the vast majority. However part iii) proved too difficult. Although many candidates knew what a floodway was, most had difficulty applying this knowledge to the situation in the satellite image. Many thought the floodway took water from the lake to the river, not vice versa.

Question 2

a) Most correctly stated that the Mississippi flows into the Gulf of Mexico but the term tributary was poorly understood. Towns were sometimes quoted here whilst others mistakenly said the Tennessee or Atchafalaya was a tributary of the Mississippi.

b) The meanings of the terms were generally understood and many candidates scored full marks. Discharge however was sometimes confused with speed.

c) Some wrote vaguely about rubbish, litter, sediment or sewage whilst others wrote only about pollution of the river rather than the sea. However most used specific information from the resource booklet appropriately and many scored full marks here.

Question 3

Many understood that dredging involved removing sediment from the river and/or made it deeper. Some irrelevantly focused on navigation for large ships rather than flood control, or referred to dredging at sea. Most candidates classified at least three of the flood management techniques correctly; channel straightening was the one that caused most difficulty. Part iii) was more challenging. Few could explain how levees worked sufficiently to score full marks. Some clearly thought levees were channels for diverting water away or confused them with dams and sea walls.

Question 4

a) The command word **describe** requires more than a one-word answer so those who just wrote marsh or swamp were not credited. Most did score full marks by referring to "swamps where trees grow" and "marshes where grasses grow". However some candidates lost the marks by confusing barrier islands or sand dunes with wetland. Part ii) proved difficult with few candidates mentioning that wetland reduced the energy of a hurricane. Many answers merely stated that a hurricane would cause less damage in a wetland than in a city, or were too vague to credit: e.g. "wetland absorbs water".

b) Defining the term marine erosion was surprisingly difficult for most candidates and very few scored both the marks. Several focused on the impact of jetties on long-shore drift or even the impact on sea life. Others repeated a word they were supposed to be defining: e.g. "it is when the delta gets eroded". Part ii) was also challenging, with less than half the candidates scoring both marks. Long-shore drift is quite a difficult concept to understand and in particular to apply in an unfamiliar context.

Question 5

a) Nearly all candidates identified the levee but many were unable to give an advantage of it for a settlement site. A common but unacceptable answer was "the surrounding land was swampy". "Above the swampy land" or "less likely to flood" was needed here instead.

b) This was poorly understood. Many gave the height of the floodwall rather than the height of the levee, and some gave a correct figure but forfeited the mark because they omitted the word metres.

c) Many scored full marks whilst others gave inaccurate data (usually missing off one or both of the units of measurement) or gave no data at all. Some referred erroneously to the speed of the hurricane rather than the wind, or mentioned mph rather than km/hr.

Question 6

Some candidates described the sea temperatures rather than Katrina, which suggested they did not understand precisely where the hurricane was on the satellite image. Others ignored the instructions and referred to Katrina's wind speeds and category size (not evident on Photograph D), or tried to explain why Katrina developed there. A short concise description such as "a large spiralling area of cloud" was enough to score full marks. Most candidates did score one or two. Abler

candidates noted that Katrina was spinning anticlockwise or used the scale to measure her size.

Question 7

a) Most wrote irrelevantly about changes in Katrina's strength and several did not mention changes in her location at all. Many were too vague ("it moved over the land then over the sea") or used ungeographical terminology such as "above" Cuba instead of north of Cuba, or turned "left" instead of west. Other candidates confused west with east, and a few even overlooked the dates on the map and thought Katrina had travelled from New Orleans to Cuba. Again a concise description was sufficient to score full marks: e.g. "Katrina moved west into the Gulf of Mexico, then turned north and hit New Orleans". Most candidates scored at least one mark but few managed all three.

b) Surprisingly few could give an acceptable definition of a storm surge. Several thought it meant the size of a storm or the distance a storm travelled. Many responses were too vague (e.g. flooding caused by a hurricane) or unspecific (e.g. rising sea levels).

Question 8

a) Many showed understanding of the circumstances or attitudes of those who did not evacuate, and there was very little confusion between the two different groups of people. Candidates choosing those who could not leave were more likely to score both marks. The most frequent reasons given for this group were poverty, illness or a lack of transport. The reasons given for people wanting to stay were often too vague to credit: e.g. "they did not want to leave their home".

b) This was designed to be challenging and it discriminated well. To achieve a high score it was necessary to study carefully the map as well as the text in Figure 7. Few candidates scored full marks. Many thought that rain from Katrina was the main cause of flooding; that the Mississippi River overflowed its banks; and/or that all the land that flooded was below sea level. Many also did not appreciate that storm surges entered the city.

Question 9

Many resorted to one word answers to i) and ii) (e.g. wind, rain, hurricane) which were insufficient. Candidates found it easier to explain the damage to the roof than the collapse of the bridge. In part iii) most simply lifted two incidents from Figure 8 instead of **explaining** how or why they were hazardous, as the question asked. To score marks it was necessary to link outcomes such as disease, dehydration or injury to specific hazards, or to explicitly identify a hazard by saying for example "the water supply was polluted". Some candidates referred to problems that were not due to flooding (e.g. injuries possibly caused by Superdome's wind-damaged roof) and these were not accepted.

Question 10

This proved more difficult than expected. Whilst some identified the floodwall in the photograph many thought it was a levee, groyne or floodgate. Many did realise that sandbags were being dropped but fewer could explain the purpose of this. Others

thought the helicopter crew were dropping food, rescuing people, collecting water, measuring the water depth or even trying to blow water away.

Question 11

The number not attempting this last question ("the decision") was reduced. This may be because more information was given in the resource booklet about each of the options than is usually the case. The performance on "the decision" also improved, with more top L1 answers being produced. Again this is possibly because candidates had more information to work from.

a) Marks were awarded not for the decisions that candidates made but for the reasons they gave in support. Most chose Option A, and often argued that Category 5 protection was essential in view of predicted future climate changes. Its high cost was recognised but some considered it a price worth paying for added safety. The re-building of the whole city was often welcomed too. The next most favoured choice was Option C. This was seen as cheaper than Option A but still offering improved protection by resisting Category 4 storms. The plans for the improved shelters and high-rise buildings were also praised. Option B was more popular than Option D. Its advocates praised the re-building of the whole city, its low cost compared with Options A or C and the inclusion of improved evacuation procedures and windproof building designs. Supporters of Option D favoured its low cost and soft engineering solutions, including the conversion of low-lying areas to swamps.

There were many low L1 answers consisting entirely of vague material or unsubstantiated opinion, but there were fewer than last year. More candidates reached the top of L1 by including a range of precise material that was relevant albeit lifted from Figure 12. More candidates than last year also reached L2 by including developed points in their answers, i.e. they elaborated on or explained material from the booklet, or made explicit comparisons. For example, some had calculated the respective costs of the options from the data in Figure 10 and used this information to good effect.

b) Most candidates chose to write about Options B and D. Option B was criticised on safety grounds, particularly because all the flood-damaged areas were being rebuilt when only Category 3 protection was offered, and also because landfilling would be used. Option D too was criticised for only having Category 3 protection, and also for lacking new evacuation procedures or shelters. Many thought building the new port was unnecessary. The main disadvantage given for both Options A and C was the cost. Additionally Option C was sometimes rejected because Category 4 protection was considered insufficient in view of global warming and its possible impact on hurricanes in the future.

Candidates tended to find part b) more difficult than a), and were sometimes tempted into describing the advantages of their rejected options as well as their disadvantages. Most responses ranged from vague, thin answers at the bottom of L1 through to more comprehensive accounts at the top of L1. Nevertheless there were also plenty of quite detailed responses including developed points which therefore reached L2. In general most candidates seemed to engage with the issues and enjoy giving their views.

Unit 1313 Paper 2F

General comments

The overall demands of the paper were similar to previous years. Again there were resource based questions, and some requiring the use and interpretation of data; as usual, there were also photographs and an Ordnance Survey map extract to be interpreted. There were a variety of tasks to challenge all candidates in the target range, with a balance between shorter, fairly straightforward questions, and some which were more demanding. The presentation of some questions was designed to make them more accessible than the equivalent questions on Paper 4H e.g. A1(d)(ii), A1(d)(iii), A2(a)(i), A2(a)(ii), A2(b)(iii), B3(c), B4(b)(i)-(ii), B4(c), C5(a)(iii), C5(b), C5(c)(ii), C6(c), C6(d). Some of the more straightforward questions were common to papers 4H and 2F.

The longer answers were rather variable again this year. There were some good, focused accounts - e.g. Germany's population problems in A1(f); equally, however, there were some very vague and generalised answers - e.g. about waste disposal problems and management in A2(f).

Once again more candidates answered question B3 (Water) than B4 (Weather and Climate), although the majority was smaller than in previous years. Far more candidates answered question C6 (Recreation and Tourism) than C5 (Farming); this was consistent with previous years.

Generally, the paper seemed accessible for the target grade candidates; indeed, there were some high marks, and there were few questions left completely blank. Rubric offences, such as those where candidates attempted all the questions, were relatively few. Question B3(e) was the only one to consistently pose particular problems for some candidates.

Question Specific Comments

Section A

Question A1 - Providing for population change

(a) (i) and (ii) These were straightforward for most candidates.

(iii) The table was correctly completed by most candidates, although a few gave natural gas as renewable, and biogas as non-renewable.

(b) This was straightforward, with many gaining three or four marks, for example by suggesting that greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide were emitted, contributing to global warming which led to rising sea levels, or acid rain.

(c) Many gained one or two marks for suggesting that non-renewable supplies were widely used, and would run out.

(d) (i) Many correctly identified a (population) pyramid, although there were sometimes inappropriate references simply to a bar chart.

(ii) and (iii) These were straightforward for most candidates.

(iv) Many scored the two marks by identifying the larger number of children in Sudan, and the larger number of elderly in the UK. Some candidates, however, gave *reasons* here, which should have been in part (v).

(v) Most correctly gave the fact that Sudan was an LEDC whilst the UK was an MEDC. Some also gained the second mark for giving a correct contrast in birth rate, death rate or life expectancy.

(e) (i) The key was completed correctly by the majority of candidates, but a few did make errors.

(ii) Most scored three marks, although some did choose incorrectly, particularly in the second and third sentences.

(f) The quality of the answers here varied considerably. The best responses identified the ageing population in Germany or the UK, with additional reference to the low / falling death and birth rates - often with some reasons given (although this was not a requirement of the question). Problems were sometimes identified quite well e.g. the effect on healthcare, accommodation, pensions; government action regarding increasing the retirement age, private pensions, and the provision of healthcare were also often quite detailed.

In contrast, there were some much weaker responses which failed to identify a population *change*, merely describing the fact that there were a large number of elderly; in these cases the associated problems and government action were more relevantly explained, however.

A number of candidates gained limited credit because they chose China as their example of an MEDC. Centres should be aware that the specification guidance for section 1.3 on page 12 does, however, list China as an LEDC.

Question A2 - Planning for change

(a) (i) and (ii) These questions were all generally straightforward; only a few candidates failed to gain the marks available. Unfortunately, if an error was made in (i), it was also made in (ii) - meaning a double loss of marks. It is essential that Foundation Tier candidates should at least be secure in their knowledge of basic terms, in order to prevent this loss of relatively easy marks.

(b) (i) and (ii) These were very straightforward.

(iii) A few candidates only crossed one or two boxes, whilst others crossed more than three. Most, however, did cross three boxes, and many scored three marks.

(c) (i) and (ii) These were straightforward for most candidates.

(d) (i) Some candidates found this question more difficult than it ought to have been. Many did score two, three or four marks by describing problems such as congestion, air / noise pollution, accidents and the tourists visiting the many tourist sites. The distance from the motorway and difficult access was also mentioned. Some candidates, however, failed to identify actual transport problems, and therefore gained little credit. Typical of these answers were those which simply stated that there was only one railway station, or only one park and ride, or stated vaguely that narrow roads cause 'traffic problems' - without specifying them.

(ii) Many candidates easily gained the two marks for explanations of the park and ride scheme or the cycle route, in particular. Others, however, seemed to miss the map evidence for these, and gave rather vague answers about more main roads or a better rail link, which gained no credit.

(e) (i) The responses here were very varied. Many gained two or three marks for reference to factors such as the flat land, accessibility, the nearby motorway, the space for expansion, and the nearby labour supply from Warwick. Some candidates, however, gave answers which were not relevant to the industrial estate, such as the advantage of the nearby school, or the hotel for the tourists who would visit the estate! There were also incorrect references to a tunnel and its advantages, presumably where the A46 passes through the cutting in grid square 2663.

(ii) Many candidates correctly suggested air / noise pollution, or destruction of wildlife / habitats, to gain one or two marks.

(f) As in question A1(f), the answers here varied considerably. Those which were clearly related to specific urban areas e.g. Manchester, Bristol, and in some cases, London, tended to more easily reach the marks at Level 2. These were the case studies which were able to refer to actual problems of household waste collection, and of landfill sites in particular - sometimes with some statistical information to illustrate. They also explained some management strategies implemented by the city council - most often to do with a variety of recycling / composting bins for named waste products.

Some answers were rather more general, however, with only vague reference to problems of litter and the introduction of more recycling. These tended to reach only Level 1 - as did many of those answers which used shanty towns such as Rio de Janeiro as their focus.

Section B

Question B3 - Use and abuse of the environment (Water)

(a) (i) and (ii) These were straightforward for almost all candidates.

(b) Many candidates gained one or two marks for suggesting that LEDCs are poor, and people had to walk a long way to obtain water/ did not waste it. Relatively few, however, managed to score the full three marks. A few recognised that LEDCs used less water for industry/ recreation/ domestic appliances. Some, however, merely stated that water use was less because LEDCs were drier / had less rain; this gained no credit.

(c) Many candidates found this straightforward, and scored the full four marks. Some did, however, match domestic and recreational use incorrectly.

(d) (i) Most candidates recognised that the water became polluted by fertilisers / pesticides which were used on crops, but failed to describe *how* they got into the water i.e. when it rains or when irrigation is carried out. A simple statement merely saying that fertilisers *got into* the water was insufficient for credit. A few candidates also wrote about the effects of the polluted water in this part of the question rather than in part (ii).

(ii) Many scored the two marks, by explaining about fish dying and drinking water becoming contaminated.

(e) This was not answered well. Most responses were very vague and poorly explained, and there was a lack of clarity as to which were physical and which human factors. Valid explanations of either type of factor were credited throughout the answer - otherwise marks gained would have been even fewer. There were many answers which simply dealt with the fact that it was necessary 'to make sure the location was suitable' - without any exemplification. There were also many answers focusing on the need to ensure that 'land does not flood' - showing a lack of understanding of what a reservoir is. The best responses were those which did at least recognise factors such as the need for a valley, a river to supply the water, hard rock, the need to avoid flooding of farmland / housing, and the need for a demand for water supply / power. Relatively few answers managed to reach Level 2, however.

Question B4 - Use and abuse of the environment (Weather and Climate)

(a) Nearly all candidates found this question very straightforward.

(b) (i) and (ii) Many found this easy, gaining full marks without difficulty. Some weaker candidates, however, inevitably described aspects of the scenery rather than the weather, and therefore did not score so well.

(c) Many candidates found this straightforward, and scored the full four marks. Some did, however, match irrigation and cloud seeding incorrectly.

(d) (i) Many scored two marks easily, identifying the melting of ice caps and the rise in sea level.

(ii) Most also scored the mark here; unsurprisingly, the most common responses were to do with reducing the use of coal and oil, and increasing the use of renewable energy. There were also many who identified energy saving by switching off appliances, and using cars less and public transport more.

(e) The vast majority chose the sun and wind, and many reached Level 2 by explaining simply how solar panels and wind turbines allowed energy to be produced. A few even referred to the strength and / or reliability of the sun / wind, or to the fact that hills or offshore locations were the sites with most wind. Observations about the best locations for solar power production were much less common.

Only a very few chose rain, and those that did tended only to be able to mention that HEP could be produced.

A few of the weakest candidates did not really understand the question, and simply offered suggestions that sun and rain was used by plants for growth.

Section C

Question C5 - Use and abuse of the environment (Farming)

(a) (i) Many correctly identified an orchard from the map key, or suggested fruit growing.

(ii) The majority correctly identified about 8 kms.

(iii) Most identified the correct definition.

(b) Nearly all candidates found this easy, scoring the full three marks.

(c) (i) This task was completed accurately by the vast majority of candidates.

(ii) Many scored three marks, although some did choose incorrectly, particularly in the third sentence.

(d) There was a fairly even number of candidates choosing each of the two options in this question.

Most of those who chose organic farming explained simply that it was natural and involved no chemical fertilisers; a few went on to give some details about the fact that only manure was used, and crops could be more susceptible to pests and diseases; these responses were the ones that reached Level 2. Perhaps rather surprisingly, very few answers explained that organic farming did not have adverse effects on the environment.

For genetic modification, most were able to explain simply about using genes from one plant or animal in another. Some did develop this to refer to higher yielding crops, or resistance to disease, and there was occasionally some reference to both advantages and disadvantages of GM crops, which helped to produce marks at the top of Level 2.

QUESTION C6 - Use and abuse of the environment (Recreation and Tourism)

(a) This was straightforward for most candidates, although some curiously stated that there was a National Park - presumably confusing the yellow road for the N.P boundary in the map key.

(b) Most candidates were able to identify two relevant features from the map - although some quoted attractions which were too far away from Warwick to be credited, such as the Deer Park at Charlecote. A very few wrongly quoted attractions from Stratford-upon-Avon.

(c) Most candidates correctly identified three or four statements correctly, to score well. It is to be wondered whether those candidates who gained three marks identified the fourth statement incorrectly simply because they assumed that all four could/ would not be true!

(d) Nearly all candidates found this easy, scoring the full three marks.

(e) This task was completed accurately by the vast majority of candidates.

(f) Many candidates reached Level 2 by describing several problems, or by explaining one or two. The most commonly suggested problems were, unsurprisingly, erosion of footpaths, litter and disturbance of wildlife / habitats. Unfortunately, answers often tended to be very repetitive, and lacked specific detail; as a result, some candidates were unable to reach the top of Level 2. There were a few well explained answers which were related to specific locations such as the Lake District; equally, however, there were some answers which gained little credit because they described conflicts e.g. between tourists and the local population, rather than focusing on problems for scenery and wildlife. In addition, too many answers referred to the effect of tourists on farms and farm animals - which is not the same as *wildlife*.

Unit 1313 Paper 3H

General Comments

The resource booklet contained a wide variety of materials: e.g. texts, maps, diagrams, ground and aerial photographs, statistics and - for the first time - a number of satellite images. Generally candidates handled all these resources well, although the weather satellite image proved difficult for some.

The paper proved to be accessible for the target grade candidates. There were, however, many blank responses to question 11b where it became clear that a high percentage of candidates had failed to turn the page for the final question. A paper adjustment of plus 3 marks was therefore applied to the paper to ensure that no candidate was disadvantaged.

There were several questions on physical processes (including some unfamiliar ones) where candidates tended to struggle. There were also more instances this year of candidates losing marks through failing to follow instructions, notably in Q5a), 6a)i, 7 and 9a). Centres should ensure their candidates are well trained in examination technique.

Question 1

(a) The meanings of the terms sediment and river discharge were generally known and most candidates scored full marks. Discharge however was sometimes confused with river speed or industrial waste. The role of the Atchafalaya in reducing the Mississippi's discharge was appreciated by more candidates than expected, but only 20% realised that reservoirs on the tributaries had caused the reduction of sediment in the sea.

(b) The vast majority of candidates understood that pollution was the root of the problem for the sea fishing industry and explained it sufficiently to score full marks. Many referred explicitly to eutrophication. There were a few weak responses suggesting navigation was the issue.

Question 2

a) Most candidates found this straightforward and scored full marks, although some thought the Red River's channel was straight.

b) This was designed to be challenging and many candidates failed to identify landform R as a barrier island. More than expected correctly identified the areas of algae and sediment. Surprisingly numerous candidates wrote S or T in every box in part ii).

Question 3

a) Many understood that dredging involved removing sediment from the river to make it deeper and explained how this reduced flood risk. Those who chose channel straightening often found it more difficult to score full marks, although most did realise it caused a faster flow of water.

b) Some candidates chose an inappropriate example, such as levees, diversion gates and even straightening or dredging (which were identified as hard engineering techniques in part a)'s stem). Most chose planting forests and there were some good explanations that correctly used hydrological terms such as interception, infiltration and run-off. There were also some vague comments e.g. "trees absorb water" that were not credited and even misconceptions e.g. "trees block the floodwater". Washlands were also often cited though this technique and was less well understood and full marks were achieved less frequently here.

Question 4

a) This proved difficult. Many merely said a hurricane would cause less damage in a wetland than in a city, whilst some confused barrier islands with wetlands. Most answers did not go beyond stating that "wetland reduces the strength/energy of a hurricane". Very few mentioned that wetlands reduced wind speeds or the height of a storm surge, or explained how. Often the answers were too vague to credit: e.g. "wetland absorbs water"

b) Surprisingly many opted for cutting canals or saltwater intrusion and the effects of these were not well understood. Few mentioned that canals provided easy access for storm surges (a major element of the Katrina tragedy) or that the wakes of ships wear away the canal banks. Even fewer realised saltwater kills freshwater plants which hold the soil together and provide a buffer against waves. Those who opted for jetties blocking long-shore drift usually scored better, although even here some candidates did not explain the effects clearly. Able candidates did say that the land beyond the jetty would be starved of beach material and that without this natural protection the land was more exposed to wave attack. Few stated that long-shore drift operates on the downdrift side of the jetty and is responsible for removing the beach.

Question 5

a) This was poorly answered. Most candidates ignored the instruction to look at the relief cross-section and tried to answer the question from the map. The frequent answer "0-5 metres" was not accepted. Some who did use the cross-section gave the height of the floodwall not the levee, or gave a correct figure but omitted the unit of measurement (metres). Only 25% of candidates scored the mark here.

b) Although most scored one mark (usually for saying New Orleans was below sea level) few scored two. Again, most candidates probably did not look at the relief cross-section, which clearly showed the city lies in a "bowl" surrounded by water. The mere proximity of the site to the river or lake was not credited. The problem of subsidence was credited provided candidates related it to the site's geology (sediments).

Question 6

a) The answers to a)i were rather disappointing. Some candidates described the sea temperatures rather than Katrina, which suggested they were unsure about where exactly the hurricane was on the satellite image. Others ignored the instructions and described Katrina's wind speeds and category (which were not evident in Photograph D), or tried to explain why the hurricane developed or where it went. A short concise description such as "a large spiralling area of cloud" was in fact enough to score full marks. A few candidates noted that Katrina was spinning anticlockwise or used the scale to measure her size. In part (ii) the majority of candidates did correctly work out Katrina's category at the time.

b) Most recognised that the sea surface temperatures were high and many either noted this was the hurricane's source of energy or gave a statistic on the temperature required for a hurricane to develop. A few gained credit for further explanation (e.g. by mentioning the evaporation of seawater) but some misconceptions were also apparent here.

Question 7

a) Many ignored the instruction and wrote irrelevantly about changes in Katrina's strength and some did not mention changes in her location at all. However, most candidates did score some marks and some managed all four. Again a concise description was sufficient to score full marks: e.g. "Katrina travelled in a northwest direction to Florida then moved westwards into the Gulf of Mexico. It turned north, struck New Orleans and continued in a northerly direction inland". Some weak candidates used ungeographical terminology such as "above" Cuba instead of north of Cuba, or turned "left" instead of west, and this was not credited. A few made good use of the latitude and longitude scales, but others tried to give four-figure grid references from them. To get full marks it was necessary to include at least one precise location (i.e. name or latitude/longitude) and not just give compass directions.

Question 8

This was designed to be challenging and it discriminated well. To achieve a high score it was necessary to study carefully the map as well as the text in Figure 7, and relatively few candidates scored full marks. Many thought that all the land that flooded was below sea level or that the Superdome was in an unflooded area. A few even thought that rain from Katrina was the main cause of flooding or that the Mississippi River overflowed its banks. Several also did not appreciate that some canal floodwalls were not fit-for-purpose

Question 9

a) Weaker candidates just lifted incidents from Figure 8 instead of explaining how or why they were hazardous. Thus it was necessary to link outcomes such as disease, dehydration or injury to specific hazards, or to explicitly identify a hazard such as "the water supply was polluted". Mentioning specific diseases such as cholera or malaria as examples also gained credit. Some candidates referred to problems that were not due to flooding (e.g. possible injuries caused by Superdome's wind-damaged roof) and these were not accepted.

b) This was generally well understood. The vast majority of candidates noted that a relatively high percentage of black people were poor and many also realised this meant they could not afford the safer properties on higher land (or lived in cheaper housing on flood-prone land). A few stated that their poverty meant that many could not evacuate through lack of transport - a true statement but of course not relevant here.

Question 10

Most candidates did not distinguish between the responsibilities of city politicians and those of the US government (although these were made explicit in the resource booklet) and in some cases this spoilt the case they were trying to make. Thus some wrongly blamed city politicians for the poor design of the levees/floodwalls, the late arrival of troops with supplies, or the delay in removing all the floodwater. Most candidates thought the criticisms were fair, usually citing the short notice given to evacuate and the insufficient supplies and toilets at the Superdome. The failures to adequately provide for the many poor people without a car, or for elderly people, were also criticised. Some of the strongest answers argued the criticism was unfair or at least partially so. These sometimes recognised the failings of the US government or its agency USACE. More often they explained the problems associated with issuing an earlier evacuation order; gave city politicians credit for evacuating as many as 80% of the population in a day; or argued that the politicians could not be blamed if many citizens ignored their order to evacuate. This question generated many passionate responses that were interesting to read.

Question 11

a) The withdrawal of Option A from the original list of four was unusual for this paper, but it did not appear to faze candidates at all. Hardly any mentioned Option A, let alone discussed it, in their answers, and the quality of the latter was at least comparable to previous years (the mean score for scripts marked online was 7 - i.e. towards the top of L2). Candidates need to be ready to think flexibly in the last part of the paper and not just rely on reproducing a prepared answer. If they have analysed all the options, assessed their advantages and disadvantages, and ranked them accordingly beforehand, then candidates will be able to respond well whatever task they are set in the examination.

It was noted that candidates at a few centres answered this last question first, spent excessive time on it and therefore did not have enough time to complete all the earlier questions. This practice needs discouraging because it clearly results in underachievement as some easier-to-obtain marks are sacrificed. Moreover, answering the earlier questions that explore the issues can provide candidates with insights that help them make a more informed decision at the end.

Marks were awarded not for the decision that candidates made but for the quality of reasoning they showed to support it. Most chose option C, often arguing that Category 4 protection was essential in view of recent climatic history and in the light of predicted future climate changes. Its high cost was usually acknowledged but considered a price worth paying for added safety. The plans for improved shelters and high-rise buildings were also praised. Option D was more popular than B. Many said D was the cheapest option and favoured its soft engineering solutions and the reduced risk of the Mississippi flooding. Some argued that withdrawing to higher land and building a new port on the Atchafalaya was the only sustainable solution in the long term, particularly with the prospect of continuing subsidence. Option B was least popular, although its advocates often praised the re-building of the whole city,

its low cost compared with Option C and the inclusion of improved evacuation procedures and windproof building designs.

Candidates tended to give less explanation for rejecting the remaining two options. Option B was usually criticised on safety grounds, particularly the rebuilding on flood-damaged areas when only Category 3 protection was offered. Option D was also criticised for only having Category 3 protection and for lacking new evacuation procedures and shelters. The long time needed to build a new port and the serious impact of this port on New Orleans' economy were also sometimes mentioned. Option C was frequently rejected for its excessive and unnecessary cost. Here a few stressed the difference between the strength of hurricanes when out at sea, and the reduction in strength after they reached land.

As always, the "decision" produced a huge range of responses. There were very few low L1 answers consisting entirely of vague material or unsubstantiated opinion. Far more answers reached the top of L1 as they included a lot of precise material that was relevant albeit lifted from Figure 12. Most candidates however produced L2 responses by including developed points, i.e. they elaborated on or explained material from the booklet, or drew explicit comparisons. Many, for example, had calculated the respective costs of each option from the data in Figure 10 and used this information to good effect. There were also numerous L3 answers where candidates showed a thorough understanding of the issues, considered a range of criteria and included several developed points in very detailed evaluations. Some candidates marshalled evidence superbly well, and produced outstandingly well argued answers that were worth far in excess of the maximum mark. In general candidates seemed to engage with the issues and enjoy giving their views.

b) As noted above, few candidates attempted this part of the paper. Some of those who did misunderstood the task, and merely continued their argument or restated their case from 11a). The most common valid suggestions for extra information were the total costs of the options; the costs of particular projects (e.g. landfilling the lowest areas in Option B and building the new port in Option D); the time needed to complete each option; and the views of New Orleans residents on the various proposals.

Unit 1313 Paper 4H

General comments

The overall demands of the Paper were similar to previous years. Again there were resource based questions, and some requiring the use and interpretation of data; as usual, there were also photographs and an Ordnance Survey map extract to be interpreted. There were a variety of tasks to challenge all candidates in the target range, with a balance between shorter, fairly straightforward questions, and some which were more demanding - e.g. A1(d), A2(c)(i), A2(d), B3(b), B3(c), B4(c), C5(c)(ii), C6(c); some of the more straightforward questions were common to Papers 4H and 2F.

The longer answers were rather variable again this year. There were some very good, focused accounts - e.g. Germany's population problems in A1(f); equally, however, there were some very vague and generalised answers - e.g. about waste disposal problems and management in A2(e).

Once again more candidates answered question B3 (Water) than B4 (Weather and Climate), although the majority was smaller than in previous years. Far more candidates answered question C6 (Recreation and Tourism) than C5 (Farming); this was consistent with previous years.

Generally, the paper seemed accessible for the target grade candidates; indeed, there were some very high marks, and there were very few questions left completely blank. There were only a few questions - B3(e), C5(a)(iii), C6(c) - which seemed to pose particular problems for some candidates.

Question Specific Comments

Section A

Question A1 - Providing for population change

(a) The table was correctly completed by most candidates, although a few gave natural gas as renewable and biogas as non-renewable.

(b) A few candidates suggested renewables such as solar and biogas, but the vast majority correctly gave coal, oil or natural gas.

(c) This was straightforward, with many gaining three marks in the first few lines of their answer, by suggesting that greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide were emitted, contributing to global warming.

(d) Many gained one mark for suggesting that renewable supplies would be used; relatively few, however, scored 2 marks.

(e) (i) Many correctly identified a (population) pyramid, although there were frequent incorrect references to the demographic transition model or to ageing or youthful population structures.

(ii) and (iii) were generally correct.

(iv) Most correctly gave the fact that Sudan was an LEDC whilst the UK was an MEDC, and gained the second mark for giving a correct contrast in birth rate, death rate or life expectancy.

(v) Relatively few scored all three marks; most gained one or two marks for suggestions about changes in birth and / or death rates. Migration / immigration was suggested less commonly than expected.

(f) (i) and (ii) were not well answered. Many referred to the relationship between the *working* population and dependents; only relatively few candidates correctly identified *working aged* / *non-working aged*, or *economically active* / *non economically active*. In (ii), there was frequent reference merely to many 'young' people, without reference to ages, although many did gain a mark for identifying a large number of children / aged under 15.

(g) The quality of the answers here varied considerably. The strongest responses identified the ageing population in Germany or the UK, with additional reference to the low / falling death and birth rates - often with some quite detailed reasons given (although this was not a requirement of the question). Specific problems were clearly identified e.g. the effect on healthcare, accommodation, pensions; government action regarding increasing the retirement age, private pensions, and the provision of specialist accommodation and healthcare were also often well detailed.

In contrast, there were some much weaker responses which failed to identify a population *change*, merely describing the fact that there were a large number of elderly; in these cases the associated problems and government action were more relevantly explained, however.

A number of candidates gained limited credit because they chose China as their example of an MEDC. Centres should be aware that the specification guidance for section 1.3 on page 12 does, however, list China as an LEDC.

Question A2 - Planning for change

(a) (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) These questions were all generally straightforward; only a few candidates failed to gain the marks available.

(v) Most candidates also scored well here, by mentioning reasons such as the increased use of technology/ machinery in mining/ agriculture, the importing of primary goods, and the fact that the UK's raw materials were running out.

(b) (i) and (ii) These were very straightforward.

(c) (i) Some candidates found this question more difficult than it ought to have been. Those who described the problems of congestion, air / noise pollution, accidents and the tourists visiting the many tourist sites easily scored three or four marks. The distance from the motorway and difficult access was also frequently mentioned. Too many candidates, however, failed to identify actual transport problems, and therefore gained little credit. Typical of these answers were those which simply stated that there was only one railway station, or only one park and ride, or stated vaguely that narrow roads cause 'traffic problems' - without specifying them!

(ii) Many candidates easily gained the three marks for explanations of the park and ride scheme, the cycle route or the edge of town car parks. Others, however,

seemed to miss the map evidence for these, and gave rather vague answers about more main roads or a better rail link, which gained no credit.

(d) Again, the responses here were very varied. Many gained two, three or four marks for reference to factors such as the flat land, accessibility, the nearby motorway, the space for expansion, and the nearby labour supply from Warwick. Some candidates, however, gave answers which were not relevant to the industrial estate, such as the advantage of the nearby school, or the hotel for the tourists who would visit the estate! There were also incorrect references to a tunnel and its advantages, presumably where the A46 passes through the cutting in grid square 2663.

(e) As in question A1(g), the answers here varied considerably. Those which were clearly related to specific urban areas e.g. Manchester, Bristol, and in some cases, London, tended to more easily reach the upper marks at Level 2 or even Level 3. These were the case studies which were able to refer to actual problems of household waste collection, and of landfill sites and incineration - often with statistical information to illustrate. They also explained specific management strategies implemented by the city council - most often to do with a variety of recycling / composting bins for named waste products, public amenity sites, and public awareness / education schemes.

Some answers were rather more general, however, with only vague reference to problems of litter and the introduction of more recycling. These tended to reach only Level 1 - as did many of those answers which used shanty towns such as Rio de Janeiro as their focus.

Section B

Question B3 - Use and abuse of the environment (Water)

(a) (i) and (ii) These were straightforward for almost all candidates.

(b) Most candidates gained one or two marks for suggesting that LEDCs are poor, and people had to walk a long way to obtain water/ did not waste it. Many also recognised that LEDCs used less water for industry/ recreation/ domestic appliances. Too many, however, merely stated that water use was less because LEDCs were drier/ had less rain; this gained no credit.

(c) This was often poorly answered, simply because candidates failed to recognise that the question asked about *increasing* water use rather than just high use. Consequently, answers which merely stated that there was *a lot of water* used in homes/ for industry etc. failed to earn the credit which they would have done if the answers had said *more/ an increasing amount of water* was being used. This was disappointing, as this point has been highlighted in previous reports when a similar question has been set. Those who had read the question more carefully easily scored two or three marks.

(d) (i) Most candidates recognised that the water became polluted by fertilisers / pesticides which were used on crops, but failed to describe *how* they got into the water i.e. when it rains or when irrigation is carried out. A simple statement merely saying that fertilisers *got into* the water was insufficient for credit. A few candidates also wrote about the effects of the polluted water in this part of the question rather than in part (ii).

(ii) Most easily scored the two marks, by explaining about algae growth/ eutrophication killing fish and/ or drinking water becoming contaminated.

(e) This was not answered well. Most responses were very vague and poorly explained, and there appeared to be a lack of clarity as to which were physical and which human factors. Valid explanations of either type of factor were credited throughout the answer - otherwise marks gained would have been even fewer. There were many answers which simply dealt with the fact that it was necessary 'to make sure the location was suitable' - without any exemplification. There were also many answers focusing on the need to ensure that 'land does not flood' - showing a lack of understanding of what a reservoir is. The best responses were those which did at least recognise factors such as the need for a deep valley, impermeable rock, the need to avoid flooding of farmland / housing, and the need for a demand for water supply / power.

Question B4 - Use and abuse of the environment (Weather and Climate)

(a) There were a wide variety of possible responses here, which nearly all candidates found very straightforward.

(b) Many found this very easy, gaining full marks without difficulty. Some weaker candidates, however, inevitably described aspects of the scenery rather than the weather, and therefore did not score so well.

(c) Answers here were variable. Many easily scored full marks by explaining how greenhouses provide more warmth, and planting windbreaks prevented soil being blown by wind. There were also some good explanations of cloud seeding. Some weaker candidates, however, could only offer suggestions about growing crops when there is sufficient rainfall or suitable temperatures.

(d) There were various correct suggestions given here, and many scored well. Unsurprisingly, the most common responses were to do with reducing the use of coal and oil, and increasing the use of renewable energy. There were also many who identified energy saving by switching off appliances, recycling, using cars less and public transport more, and avoiding the use of spray cans which emit CFCs.

(e) The vast majority chose the sun and wind, and many reached Level 2 by explaining simply how solar panels and wind turbines allowed energy to be produced. Relatively few, however, were able to reach Level 3, and it was only the ablest candidates who referred to the strength and / or reliability of the sun / wind; quite a few were able to identify hills or offshore locations as the sites with most wind, although actual locations were only rarely mentioned. Observations about the best locations for solar power production were also relatively rare.

Only a few chose rain, but a few who did were able to give good accounts of HEP production. Again, however, only a few abler candidates were able to suggest the best locations.

A very few weaker candidates did not really understand the question, and simply offered suggestions that sun and rain was used by plants for growth.

Section C

Question C5 - Use and abuse of the environment (Farming)

(a) (i) Many correctly identified an orchard from the map key, or suggested fruit growing.

(ii) The majority correctly identified about 8 kms.

(iii) This was very poorly answered, suggesting that centres had not explained this term to candidates. It is, however, clearly included in section 6.2 of the specification content on page 20.

(b) Most candidates chose hedgerow removal and using chemical pesticides, and many scored well, finding these quite straightforward. The few who chose land drainage were less successful, although some of these candidates scored three marks for their other chosen method.

(c) (i) This task was completed accurately by the vast majority of candidates.

(ii) Whilst not always gaining the full three marks, most candidates scored one or two. The use of crop rotation and fertilisers were most commonly suggested to reduce the effects of overcultivation, whilst reducing the number of cattle and moving them around were frequently identified as ways to reduce overgrazing.

(d) There was a fairly even number of candidates choosing each of the two options in this question.

Most of those who chose organic farming explained simply that it was natural and involved no chemical fertilisers; some went on to give some details about the fact that only manure was used, and crops could be more susceptible to pests and diseases; these responses generally gained marks at Level 2. Perhaps rather surprisingly, relatively few answers explained that organic farming did not have adverse effects on the environment, or gave any detail on this; as a result, Level 3 marks were relatively uncommon.

For genetic modification, most were able to explain simply about using genes from one plant or animal in another. Some did develop this to refer to higher yielding crops, or resistance to disease, and there was some reference to both advantages and disadvantages of GM crops, which helped to produce more top Level 2 and Level 3 marks.

Question C6 - Use and abuse of the environment (Recreation and Tourism)

(a) This was straightforward for virtually all candidates.

(b) (i) Not all candidates managed to include the fact that *many/ a lot of* tourists were attracted.

(ii) Most candidates were able to identify two relevant features from the map - although some quoted attractions which were too far away from Warwick to be credited, such as the Deer Park at Charlecote. A few wrongly quoted attractions from Stratford-upon-Avon.

(c) This was sometimes poorly answered, simply because candidates failed to recognise that the question asked about why *more* tourists were visiting *than in the*

past. This was disappointing, as this point has been highlighted in previous reports when a similar question has been set. Answers frequently merely suggested why people visit this area, referring to the attractions from part (b)(ii), or to the need to escape from busy towns and cities. Those who had read the question more carefully often scored three or four marks, by referring to factors such as greater accessibility/ the building of motorways, and to the increases in car ownership, leisure time, paid holidays and disposable income.

(d) This was straightforward for most, who identified conflicts of visual pollution / noise/ congestion between tourists and residents, or tourists damaging crops/ frightening livestock thereby conflicting with farmers. A very few candidates gained no credit, because they failed to identify the conflicts, simply stating that 'tourists cause problems' for locals and farmers.

(e) This task was completed accurately by the vast majority of candidates.

(f) Many candidates comfortably reached Level 2 by describing several problems, or by explaining one or two. The most commonly suggested problems were, unsurprisingly, erosion of footpaths, litter and disturbance of wildlife/ habitats. Unfortunately, answers often tended to be very repetitive, and lacked specific detail; as a result, many candidates were prevented from reaching Level 3. There were some very well explained answers which were related to specific locations such as the Lake District; equally, however, there were a few answers which gained little credit because they described conflicts e.g. between tourists and the local population, rather than focusing on problems for scenery and wildlife. In addition, too many answers referred to the effect of tourists on farms and farm animals - which is not the same as *wildlife*.

Unit 1313 Paper 05 (coursework)

In general, the moderators detected an improvement in the standard of coursework in 2008. Some commended the originality of studies and also the diversity of approaches to work seen this year. Furthermore, most topics chosen were appropriate to the Specifications, although two moderators commented that work based around the topic of re-cycling rubbish was inappropriate, since it lacked the rigour necessary to allow students to score well on the marking criteria. The most popular topics which differentiated well between candidates tended to be CBD studies or physical studies of rivers and coasts. Coastal management studies often lacked a true thread of logic and it was very difficult for candidates to collect data relevant to the stated aims or hypotheses.

Where teachers had set up well-structured studies for their students and had created the opportunities for them to gather different sets of data related to the aims, candidates performed well. It is vital for teachers to give guidance to students for them to complete coherent studies. A sound structure at the outset is the best determiner of purposeful data collection, meaningful data presentation and clear analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

Introductions were generally sound and most gained at least Level 2 marks on Criterion 2. Most candidates had included a map but there was still a reluctance to annotate the map, to show where the work had been carried out. Many candidates had used ICT to produce their location maps.

Some candidates had included far too much extraneous material from textbooks and other sources in their introductions which in no way enhanced the work and in many cases detracted from its overall coherence. A number of students had not made clear the sequence of work to be carried out. This was especially true (although not exclusively so) of centres using the old-style ICRS form.

Most candidates had included a discreet section on data collection. Candidates with weaker literacy skills had certainly benefited from using a methodology grid to structure writing about their data collection and usually this facilitated their reaching Level 2 on Criterion 2. However, students from some centres seemed to rely exclusively on this which tended to limit the marks of more able candidates to top Level 2 marks at best. Training offered by Edexcel on this issue had clearly solved this problem for a number of centres. It is vital that more able candidates use an expandable grid to facilitate extended explanation of methods. Students are advised to write about their methods as well, but not to repeat what has been said in the table.

There was some good use of annotated photographs in some methodology sections which showed and explained how and why particular equipment and methods had been used. Some candidates struggled to explain why they were collecting particular data when they had not had sufficient guidance, to collect data appropriate to address their aims. One example was where the focus of the studies was coastal management, yet candidates had been guided to collect data on pebble roundness. This did not help them to address their aims at all.

Fewer candidates this year relied on just one questionnaire for data collection. Most centres had given candidates ample opportunities to collect several sets of data. Some students had included secondary data but in most cases it was not made clear why this particular data was useful to the enquiry.

There was the greatest variation across the entry in the marks for data presentation (Criterion 3). Many candidates had used ICT very well, to construct sophisticated and appropriate graphs, maps and diagrams, warranting Level 3 marks. In a substantial number of cases, however, there was a lack of variety of presentation methods. There was an over-reliance on bar graphs and pie charts and the scales of graphs in general were wrong or had been omitted. Inappropriate line graphs, to represent discrete data, were once again in evidence as were graphs without dedicated legends (Series 1 etc). Where students could not use colour printing for their data presentation, graphs sometimes lacked clarity and made it difficult for them to analyse their data. Some excellent photographs had been included in the data presentation of some candidates. In only a few cases were such photographs annotated in an explanatory way.

Overall, there still seems to be a reluctance to actually locate work and to locate results on maps, even though this is a geography examination. Techniques such as located bars, isolines and flow maps are all higher level presentation skills which would earn Level 3 marks on Criterion 3.

Analyses were of variable quality. However, where centres had facilitated a well-structured study to be set up, weaker candidates could access Level 2 marks, since they were at least able to describe their data and to make some comments about it related to their aims. More able candidates had cross-referenced well between different sets of data and showed the potential to analyse, synthesise and evaluate their findings.

However, even the most able students really struggled to demonstrate such high order skills when the centre had set up open ended studies where the data collected had little or no relevance to the stated aims of the work. It is also important that students realise that subjectivity is not intrinsically wrong but that it should be encouraged and then complemented by comments about actual data.

Evaluations were still far too frequently limited to the perceived limitations of physically collecting data rather than about the validity or reliability of the findings.

Overall, it was felt that there had been an improvement in the coherence of studies this year. The use of ICT had also improved across the entry, with few centres offering no opportunities for using ICT at all. However, there is still a reluctance of students to use the spell-check facility for their written accounts across the ability range.

The use of residential study centres has not been so evident this year. However, in a few cases, the studies based on such centres lacked clarity and structure because schools relied on centre staff to structure the work. Where they had been planned and carried out by the teachers in charge of the party, such studies met the assessment criteria well.

Some studies lacked pagination although many had a bibliography and a contents page. Teachers should remind students how useful page numbers can be when cross-referencing between different sets of data. Use of pagination could facilitate improved marks on Criteria 4 and 5.

The standard of administration was very variable this year and caused moderators to have to spend hours chasing correct information from centres. There were numerous arithmetic errors on ICRS forms, very many transcript errors on to OPTEMS and in far

too many cases, candidate numbers and names had not been written on ICRS forms and the work. It really is vital that this issue is addressed if candidates are to be awarded the marks they have earned and not those of another candidate. The work of one centre had to be returned as it was impossible to detect whose work was whose.

About 10% of centres are still using the old-style ICRS form. It is vital that the current one is used, to ensure that the marking criteria are correctly applied. Whilst it is true that most centres still marked their work, as advised, by using the Specification document, it was clear that a few had incorrectly marked pupils' work as a direct result of using the old form.

Cross-moderation within centres had clearly not taken place in a few cases although fewer centres had to send a second sample this year for this reason than in previous cohorts.

Some centres still persist in using plastic page liners and heavy ring binders. Simple card covers and treasury tags represent much more sensible presentation and are light to handle.

Authentication of work by candidates was much more widespread this year. Centres had made an effort to include the work of the highest and lowest scoring candidates in their samples in the main, thank you.

I would like to congratulate centres on a year of generally good or excellent coursework which was a joy to moderate, even after the few negative points made above have been taken into account. Teachers have worked very hard to structure meaningful work for their students to complete.

1313 Statistics Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

1313 Foundation Tier

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	100	59	48	37	26	15

Paper 1F

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	F
1F Raw Mark Boundaries	60	30	24	12

Paper 2F

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	F
2F Raw Mark Boundaries	100	64	53	32

1313 Higher Tier

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	100	77	68	59	50	43	39

Paper 3H

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	D
3H Raw Mark Boundaries	60	38	25	21

Paper 4H

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	D
4H Raw Mark Boundaries	100	70	51	46

Coursework

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	D	F
Coursework Raw Mark Boundaries	63	45	36	29	16

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UG020190 Summer 2008

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH