Examiners' Report Summer 2009

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.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/

Contents

Unit 1313 Paper 1F

General comments

As usual, the resource booklet contained a wide variety of materials, including text, maps, statistical tables, various types of graphs and cartoon diagrams. Generally candidates handled these resource materials well, although there was evidence of misinterpretation of some of the statistical tables and graphs.

The paper proved to be generally accessible for the target grade candidates, with relatively few blank responses. Candidates seemed comfortable with the topic presented, and it was clear that many found it relevant to their own experience. There was, however, rather too much simple repetition of the content of the resource booklet, rather than an attempt to develop and expand upon the information. Sometimes marks were lost due to a failure to follow instructions, notably in q2bi. The answers to the final question were generally rather mediocre; weaker candidates could gain some marks by describing relatively obvious arguments, but more able candidates seemed unable to really develop their answers to gain the top marks.

Many were able to select or give the correct definitions of geographical terms (e.g. natural increase, net migration, life expectancy); relatively few were able to define an ageing population accurately, however. As has been stated in this report in previous years, candidates would do better if they thoroughly learned definitions of all the words italicised in the advance information booklet. Far too many candidates completed the graph in q2c very carelessly, without the use of a ruler; basic graphical skill has always been tested in this specification, and commented upon in this report many times.

Question 1

(a) Most candidates found these introductory questions on the statistical table very straightforward.

(b) Some candidates found this a little more difficult, since it required some fairly precise measurement from the map.

(c) Most were able to identify the correct definitions of natural increase and net migration.

(d) Life expectancy was generally correctly defined.

(e) The majority of candidates correctly identified better health care as a reason for increasing life expectancy; fewer gained the second mark for a further reason, however.

(f) Many candidates correctly completed two or three of the statements related to the map of population change in Europe.

Question 2

a) In (i), choices were quite variable; the more able candidates were able to identify the three correct statements. In (ii), nearly all candidates correctly identified net migration.

b) In (i), some candidates failed to answer the question appropriately, writing about the comparison between numbers of immigrants and emigrants, rather than just describing the changes in the number of immigrants. This obviously reduced the number of marks earned. Those who did concentrate on the number of immigrants often scored the fill three marks without difficulty.

In (ii), most candidates correctly described two reasons; looking for work, and for study were the most common responses.

In (iii), nearly all candidates correctly identified 2004 as the year with the biggest difference between the number of immigrants and the number of emigrants.

c) As mentioned in the opening paragraphs, far too many candidates completed the graph very carelessly, without the use of a ruler, and/or without the correct shading. This report has highlighted careless graphical skill many times in previous years; many candidates this year gained only two marks, when three should easily have been achieved.

Question 3

a) In (i), most correctly identified Poland as the A8 country providing most migrant workers. A few candidates did not understand, or did not read the word 'country', suggesting Northampton as the answer.

In (ii), the majority of candidates scored three marks without difficulty.

In (iii), many candidates easily scored two or three marks by describing straightforward advantages such as the willingness of immigrant workers to do low paid jobs, or to work long hours, or disadvantages such as racial tension or the taking of jobs from the local population.

Question 4

a) The term 'ageing population' was defined poorly by the vast majority of candidates. Most merely suggested that it was when there were more old people than young, failing to make the point that the *percentage* or *proportion* of elderly was *increasing*. Again, as mentioned in the opening paragraphs, this should not have been a difficult question – provided that candidates had learnt the definitions of terms italicised in the advance information booklet.

b) In (i), many candidates correctly completed three or more of the statements related to the statistical table of population by age groups in the UK.

In (ii), many candidates had difficulty in describing the effects of a decreasing percentage of the population aged under 15. Suggestions were often related to a decreasing percentage of working aged people, such as not enough workers; this was more relevant to part (iii). The most commonly successful answers related to fewer schools being needed.
In (iii), candidates were usually able to describe the fact that there were fewer to support the elderly; relatively few candidates gained a second mark here, however.

Question 5

a) and b) Many candidates gained two marks in each of these sections, by describing fairly straightforward disadvantages such as the need for more pensions and healthcare, or advantages such as doing voluntary work or providing childcare for grandchildren. A few candidates failed to earn credit, however, because they simply copied the captions from the resource – e.g. being able to spend time with grandchildren – without describing the disadvantage / advantage e.g. the provision of childcare for grandchildren allows parents to continue working / contributing to the economy.

Question 6

The number not attempting this last question was relatively few. Many answers were, however, rather mediocre; as mentioned in the opening paragraphs, weaker candidates could gain marks at Level 1 by describing relatively obvious arguments, and by quoting from Figure 12 in the Resource Booklet, but more able candidates seemed unable to really develop their answers to gain the top marks at Level 2. Marks were awarded not for the rank order suggested, but for the reasons which candidates gave in support of their chosen order.

In a) and b)(i), many ranked both Options B and D in their top two.

For Option B, the most common reasons for thinking this to be the best were that to encourage continued immigration of working aged people with skills which are needed in the UK would help to fill vacant and unpopular jobs, whilst the taxes they paid would help to pay for services and facilities needed for the increasing numbers of elderly and retired people. Although the question did not ask for disadvantages of the top-ranked Option, a few candidates recognised that migrant workers would also be entitled to benefits, which could be a drawback; this proviso was relevant to their evaluation of the relative strength of the Options.

For Option D, many thought that the increasing life expectancy, ability and willingness of the elderly to carry on working would similarly provide continued tax income for government, to finance services and facilities – although there might be less need for these if the elderly were still employed. Again, in some candidates' evaluation of the relative strength of this Option, it was pointed out that a major drawback with this might be the fact that more elderly workers might mean fewer vacancies for the decreasing number of working aged people in the future.

Those who ranked Option C first generally did so simply for the goodwill reason that the elderly had worked all their lives, and deserved to have facilities and services in their retirement / old age.

The very few who ranked Option A first usually justified their decision by repeating the information from Figure 12 about the need to reduce the population increase due to net migration. There was rarely any further detailed argument put forward.

In b)(ii), a large number of candidates placed Option C last, simply because of the high cost of providing facilities and services for the retired and elderly, and the burden this would place on taxpayers / those of working age.

Where Option A was placed last, it was frequently argued that this policy would be difficult to control. A few also correctly stated that preventing immigration would not actually be possible, due to freedom of movement rules between member countries of the EU.

Where Options B and D were ranked last, most candidates described the drawbacks mentioned in a) or b)(i), arguing that these outweighed the benefits which these Options might provide.

Candidates seemed comfortable with the idea of putting all the options into a rank order. A very few had obviously been pre-prepared, and gave advantages and disadvantages of all four options, without explaining their relative merits / deficiencies; these candidates did not really succeed in justifying their best and worst choices. Responses ranged from vague, very basic answers at the bottom of Level 1, to more developed accounts at the top of Level 1. There were also some quite detailed responses including developed points, which therefore reached Level 2. In general most candidates seemed to engage with the issues and enjoy giving their views.

Unit 1313 Paper 2F

QUESTION A1 – Planning for Change

(a) This exercise provided a straightforward start to the examination for all candidates.

(b) Most scored full marks here. Some did choose fast rather than frequent in part (iii).

(c) This was generally well understood. Most realised many car drivers would switch to using the metro and so leave the roads freer of traffic. However many wrote vaguely about "pollution" instead of being specific (i.e. air pollution, noise pollution).

(d) This was quite well understood. Just half the candidates correctly worked out the percentage that was composted.

(e) Most correctly defined the terms incineration and landfill. However knowledge of their advantages and disadvantages was less secure. Often the answers were too vague to credit: e.g. "landfill takes up too much space" and "incineration is dangerous".

(f) Most gave the correct definition of sustainable waste management. Part (ii) was usually tackled successfully and many candidates also correctly suggested "use less packaging" in (iii).

(g) Child labour was the more popular option. Many candidates mentioned problems of low pay, long hours and poor working conditions, and details were sometimes included. Nike or Primark were often mentioned in this context. Unfair trade was generally less well understood. On the whole the responses were vaguer about campaign activities than the problems, though some explained the role of the Fairtrade Foundation quite well. Some answers conflated the issues of child labour and unfair trade, and there were also several blank responses to this question.

QUESTION A2 – Coping with Environmental Change

(a) Most candidates scored at least one mark.

(b) Many gave two correct land uses, with nature reserve, golf course and visitor centre the most commonly mentioned. However, candidates often either did not locate points R and S on the OS map accurately or misread the key. Some assumed the words must begin with R and S and suggested rocks and shingle for instance.

(c) Pleasingly many candidates understood long shore drift and the diagram sufficiently well to score at least two marks.

(d) Most correctly identified the River Exe. A few recognised that the spit sheltered Eastdon from rough seas or that it offered a sandy beach. However, very few scored two marks. Many had the idea of tourism bringing money to Eastdon but few made the link with the spit by suggesting it could increase the flow of visitors to Eastdon.

(e) Part (i) was usually answered well. The ban on barbeques was often understood too: e.g. the risk of fire damage was mentioned. A few candidates thought the restrictions on dogs were to save them from drowning in the sea, but most did recognise the threat that unleashed dogs posed for birds or the hazard of dog excrement on beaches.

(f) Most candidates correctly identified the coastal defences as rock armour and a sea wall. Many showed a good understanding of the pros and cons of the sea wall: its strength and effectiveness in preventing floods/erosion were often seen as advantages, while its high cost and ugliness were often given as disadvantages. Most candidates knew that groynes were designed to control long shore drift and that beach recharge was a soft engineering technique.

(g) Most were able to give some basic effects and responses for an earthquake or volcano and there were also some good Level Two answers with plenty of detail. There were many good accounts of the eruption of Chances Peak and the earthquakes at Kobe and Izmit. Less successful choices included Mt St Helens, Pompeii and the Indian Ocean tsunami. There were few blank responses to this question.

SECTION B

62% of candidates chose the water question. 38% opted for weather and climate.

QUESTION B3 – Use and Abuse of the Environment (Water option)

(a) This was fairly straightforward. The vast majority of candidates deduced Australia's water availability accurately from the map and two-thirds gave the correct answers to (ii) and (iii).

(b) Most correctly identified the term domestic. In part (ii) some merely quoted figures from the table without comment or explanation, but most scored at least one mark. Part (iii) was generally understood although " the USA imports a lot of farm produce from other countries" distracted quite a few.

(c) Only half the candidates calculated the correct figure in (i) but most gave at least one problem in (ii). Part (iii) proved very difficult. Responses just stating " towns are richer so can afford clean water" were not credited. Some surprisingly confused urban and rural, or suggested less people were in urban areas so there would be more water to go round.

(d) There were some weak or vague answers and a few inappropriate examples (e.g. river navigation schemes or pollution incidents) but generally candidates responded quite well. The strongest answers usually referred to the Aswan High Dam. The Three Gorges Dam was also quite a common choice but candidates tended to have less information on this. In most cases effects on people were better explained than effects on the environment. There were some fine responses explaining how the Aswan High Dam affected different sections of the Nile in different ways.

QUESTION B4 - Use and Abuse of the Environment (Weather and Climate option)

(a) The vast majority of candidates selected appropriate problems from the map in (i) and (ii). Part (iii) was more difficult, with less than a third scoring full marks.

(b) Melting of ice caps and loss of animal habitats were the most common correct answers. Many candidates though gave problems that were already covered by Map 2 (e.g. rising sea level and illness) and some gave erroneous answers such as acid rain. Answers to part (ii) were disappointing. Many tried to give a supposed benefit from a problem shown on the map (e.g. "water from coastal floods will make crops grow better"). Specific areas or countries were seldom mentioned. Some candidates did write about benefits for the UK such as increased income from tourism and the ability to grow different crops, but very few gave enough detail to score all the marks.

(c) Many answers to (i) and (ii) earned maximum marks. Part (iii) proved difficult. Most candidates did state that India's carbon emissions would increase or even double, but many misread the question and tried to explain why those emissions would increase. Understanding the link between carbon emissions and global warming was often shaky, with several answers referring erroneously to the ozone layer.

(d) Most chose acid rain and the strongest answers referred to Scandinavia and the link to UK emissions. Many candidates could explain the formation of acid rain simply and some mentioned an appropriate gas such as sulphur dioxide. The role of prevailing winds was also occasionally recognised. However many candidates irrelevantly described the effects of acid rain rather than its causes. Fewer chose urban climate and not many could give any reasons for an urban heat island other than heat released from buildings and vehicles. There was sometimes confusion with global warming, whilst other answers discussed both acid rain and urban climates together.

SECTION C

20% of candidates chose the farming question. 80% opted for recreation and tourism.

QUESTION C5 - Use and Abuse of the Environment (Farming option)

(a) Part (i) was very straightforward and most candidates scored full marks. In contrast only a small minority defined irrigation correctly. Some confused it with immigration.

(b) Surprisingly, part (i) was rarely answered correctly. Overgrazing was normally chosen in (ii) but few responses went beyond "all the grass is eaten" to explain effects such as soil erosion. Over-cultivation was even less well understood. There were many vague rambling responses and several blank ones too.

(c) Only a minority of candidates gave an acceptable definition of organic farming. Parts (ii) and (iii) were quite straightforward for most. In (iv) many could give one example of a new habitat (usually the planted trees). In part (v) many suggested low cost or the boost for local businesses, and a few said local stone would fit in the landscape.

(d) Few responses named an appropriate region and some outside the European Union were mentioned. The most able candidates chose a UK region such as East Anglia and usually described water pollution by fertilizers and soil erosion due to the removal of hedges. Some of these answers reached Level Two. However, there were many weak and confused answers (e.g. "fertilisers make the soil infertile") and in particular the effects on natural vegetation were poorly understood and described. This was the least well done of all the case study questions on the paper.

QUESTION C6 - Use and Abuse of the Environment (Recreation and Tourism option)

(a) This was very straightforward and nearly all the answers earned maximum marks.

(b) Part (i) was easy but in (ii) many candidates merely listed features from Figure 11 and did not explain why they were environmentally friendly. When explanations were given they were often too vague to credit: e.g. "cars are banned so there will be no pollution" or "pedalos will not cause any damage". Again in part (iii) features were often lifted without explanation or were not explained precisely enough. The most commonly credited answers here were the wasteful use of energy by air conditioning,

the removal of caged animals from their natural habitats and the air pollution caused by coach and boat trips.

(c) This was usually tackled better than (b), although those candidates who simply repeated the wording of the question (as in for example "motorbikes damage the paths") could not be credited. Many noted that litter could harm animals or spoil the scenery but candidates often found it harder to explain the banning of horses and vehicles. Some did mention footpath erosion and a few mentioned the risk of accidents to walkers.

(d) Many candidates defined accessibility satisfactorily but the term rural area proved surprisingly difficult. In part (ii) several referred to an example outside the European Union and/or an area that was not a national park (e.g. a country park or even a theme park). The majority who did identify a national park referred to a UK example, usually the Lake District or Peak District. Many realised that its visitors were local and/or from cities and some could name the latter. In the second task of part (ii) some candidates referred to accessibility and some gave reasons for escaping the cities such as noise and congestion. However many just gave the attractions of the national park as the reasons and these were not credited as they failed to address the question.

Unit 1313 Paper 3H

General comments

As usual, the resource booklet contained a wide variety of materials, including text, maps, statistical tables, various types of graphs, and cartoon diagrams. Generally candidates handled these resource materials well, although there was evidence of misinterpretation of some of the statistical tables and graphs.

The paper proved to be generally accessible for the target grade candidates, with relatively few blank responses. Candidates seemed comfortable with the topic presented, and it was clear that many found it relevant to their own experience. There was, however, rather too much simple repetition of the content of the resource booklet, rather than an attempt to develop and expand upon the information. Sometimes marks were lost due to a failure to follow instructions, notably in q2a and q2bi. The answers to the final question were generally rather mediocre; weaker candidates gained some credit by describing relatively obvious arguments, but only the most able candidates seemed able to really develop their answers to gain the top marks.

Many were able to select or give the correct definitions of geographical terms (e.g. natural increase, life expectancy). For net migration, many simply asserted that it was the difference between immigrants and emigrants; most failed to include 'the amount of' or 'the number of' in their definition, so that net migration was not actually defined. Relatively few were able to define an ageing population accurately. These questions should not have proven as difficult as they did; as has been stated in this report in previous years, candidates would do well to thoroughly learn definitions of all the words italicised in the advance information booklet. Far too many candidates completed the graph in q2c very carelessly, without the use of a ruler; basic graphical skill has always been tested in this specification, and commented upon in this report many times; despite this, candidates' skill still fails to improve!

Question 1

(a) Most candidates found these introductory questions on the statistical table very straightforward.

(b) A few candidates found this a little more difficult, since it required some fairly precise measurement from the map.

(c) (i) and (ii) Most were able to define natural increase correctly, but many were too imprecise with net migration. As described in the opening paragraphs, many simply asserted that it was the difference between immigrants and emigrants; most failed to include 'the amount of' or 'the number of' in their definition, so that net migration was not actually defined.

(d) Life expectancy was generally correctly defined.

(e) The majority of candidates correctly identified better health care as a reason for increasing life expectancy; fewer gained the second mark for a further reason, however.

(f) Most candidates appropriately identified the general increase in population in Western Europe, and the decrease in Central / Eastern Europe. Many also gained the third mark by quoting rates of change from the resource.

Question 2

a) As described in the opening paragraphs, this was a question where marks were lost due to a failure to follow instructions. Many candidates simply described the *trends* shown on the graph – the general rise in net migration, and the fall, steadying and then increase in natural increase. Nowhere in these answers was there reference to a comparison of the *amounts* of net migration and natural increase; two marks could easily have been gained by pointing out that natural increase was greater than net migration until 1998, whilst net migration has been the greater since 1999.

b)(i) This was answered rather more successfully, although as in the previous question, there were too many candidates who failed to answer the question appropriately - writing about the comparison between numbers of immigrants and emigrants, rather than just describing the changes in the number of immigrants. This obviously reduced the number of marks earned. Those who did concentrate on the number of immigrants often scored the fill three marks without difficulty.

In (ii), most candidates correctly explained how the difference in the unemployment figures and the GDP per person amounts between Poland and the UK caused a large number of migrants.

In (iii), nearly all candidates correctly identified 2004 as the year with the biggest difference between the number of immigrants and the number of emigrants.

c) As mentioned in the opening paragraphs, far too many candidates completed the graph very carelessly, without the use of a ruler, and/or without the correct shading. This report has highlighted careless graphical skill many times in previous years; many candidates this year gained only two marks, when three should easily have been achieved.

Question 3

a) In (i), most correctly identified Poland and Lithuania as the A8 countries providing most migrant workers. A few candidates did not understand, or did not read the word 'countries' in the question, suggesting Northampton and Peterborough (from the table of Local Authorities with the most A8 Nationals, at the bottom of Figure 7) as the answer.

In (ii), the majority of candidates scored two marks without difficulty.

In (iii), many candidates easily scored one mark by suggesting that most migrant workers were males between the ages of 18 and 34 because they might not have family ties. Fewer candidates gained the second mark, however; many described facts such as the willingness of immigrant workers to do low paid jobs, or to work hard – which is not specific to males, nor to those between the ages of 18 and 34.

In (iv), many candidates easily scored two or three marks by describing straightforward advantages such as the willingness of immigrant workers to do low paid jobs, or to work long hours, or disadvantages such as racial tension or the taking of jobs from the local population.

Question 4

a) The term 'ageing population' was defined poorly by the vast majority of candidates. Most merely suggested that it was when there were more old people than young, failing to make the point that the *percentage* or *proportion* of elderly was *increasing*. Again, as mentioned in the opening paragraphs, this should not have been a difficult question – provided that candidates had learnt the definitions of terms italicised in the advance information booklet.

b) In (i), many candidates correctly stated that the percentage of the population aged under 15 in 1981 would be the same (21% - although the figure was not essential) as the percentage aged over 60. A few candidates clearly miscalculated the data, and gave wrong answers.

In (ii), many candidates correctly stated that the percentage of the population aged under 15 in 2031 (predicted) would be half (15% compared with 30% - although again the figures were not essential) that of those aged over 60. Again, a few candidates clearly miscalculated the data, and gave wrong answers.

c) Many correctly stated that the percentage of the population aged 15-59 would decrease by 5% (or from 60% to 55%) between 2001 and 2031. Here, a number of candidates gained only one mark because they did *not* give the relevant data. Only one mark was also awarded (for the 'decrease') where candidates had not aggregated the data for those aged 15-44 and those aged 45-59.

d) Most candidates gained one mark for describing the fact that there would be fewer to support the elderly; disappointingly few candidates gained three or four marks for this question, however. Many effects which might have been relevant were inaccurately expressed, since candidates ignored the point that the question was asking about the continuing decrease, *until 2031*, in the percentage of the population aged under 15. The idea of fewer of working age *in the future,* and fewer taxes / less services able to be provided *in the future* was therefore often not clearly explained.

Question 5

Many candidates gained four or five marks here, by describing fairly straightforward disadvantages such as the need for more pensions, healthcare, public transport e.g. bus passes, which are costly for government / taxpayers – or advantages such as doing voluntary work or providing childcare *for grandchildren*. A few weaker candidates failed to earn credit, however, because they simply copied the captions from the resource – e.g. being able to spend time with grandchildren – without describing the disadvantage / advantage e.g. the provision of childcare for grandchildren allows parents to continue working / contributing to the economy.

Question 6

a) The number not attempting this last question was extremely few. Many answers were, however, rather mediocre; as mentioned in the opening paragraphs, weaker candidates could gain marks at Level 1 by describing relatively obvious arguments, and by quoting from Figure 12 in the Resource Booklet, but only the most able candidates managed to really develop their answers to gain marks at Level 3.
Marks were awarded not for the rank order suggested, but for the reasons which candidates gave in support of their chosen order.

Many candidates ranked Options B and D in their top two; a large number placed Option C last.

For Option B, the most common reasons for thinking this to be the best were that to encourage continued immigration of working aged people with skills which are needed in the UK would help to fill vacant and unpopular jobs, whilst the taxes they paid would help to pay for services and facilities needed for the increasing numbers of elderly and retired people. Quite a few candidates recognised that migrant workers would also be entitled to benefits, which could be a drawback; this proviso was important in their evaluation of the relative strength of the Options. Despite this, very few felt that such a drawback was sufficient to rank Option B in the last two places.

For Option D, many thought that the increasing life expectancy, ability and willingness of the elderly to carry on working would similarly provide continued tax income for government, to finance services and facilities – although there might be less need for these if the elderly were still employed. Again, it was commonly pointed out that a major drawback with this Option might be the fact that more elderly workers might mean fewer vacancies for the decreasing number of working aged people in the future. Once again, however, it was rarely thought that this justified a rank of third or fourth place for Option D.

Those who ranked Option C first generally did so simply for the goodwill reason that the elderly had worked all their lives, and deserved to have facilities and services in their retirement / old age.

A large number of candidates placed Option C last, simply because of the high cost of providing facilities and services for the retired and elderly, and the burden this would place on taxpayers / those of working age.

The few who ranked Option A first usually justified their decision by repeating the information from Figure 12 about the need to reduce the population increase due to net migration. There was rarely any further detailed argument put forward.

Where Option A was placed last, it was frequently argued that this policy would be difficult to control. A few also correctly stated that preventing immigration would not actually be possible, due to freedom of movement rules between member countries of the EU.

Candidates seemed comfortable with the idea of putting all the Options into a rank order. Many did seem quite well prepared to give advantages and disadvantages of the Options; quite often, however, there was an imbalance in the references to all four. Many wrote at fair length about why their top-ranked Option had been chosen, and could state why they had chosen their bottom-ranked Option – but most did not really justify the intermediate rank positions.

Responses ranged from vague, very basic answers at Level 1, to more developed accounts at Level 2. There *were* some quite detailed and well balanced responses including very well developed and argued points, which therefore reached Level 3; these tended to be those answers where candidates had clearly made use of other resources in the booklet, and referred to them e.g. explaining the possible effect of Option A on how the data about population change and migration in Figures 5 and 6 might change in the future, and its impact on the population change graph in Figure 9; how Option B might affect the information about migrant workers in Figure 7; how Options C and D might affect the population by age groups in Figure 10 and the information about the elderly and retired population in Figure11. It has been pointed out in previous Reports that this use of as many resources as possible can help

candidates to achieve the highest marks; it was therefore rather disappointing that so few actually did so this year.

In general most candidates seemed to engage with the issues and enjoy giving their views. Interestingly, there were often stronger views about the elderly than about migration issues.

b) Although this last part of question 6 was clearly visible to candidates, there were many blank responses. Overall, responses to this last question were very disappointing. Answers were frequently not related to the question asked. Candidates often listed other resources they *had* used, such as television and newspaper reports, or input from teachers! Others merely continued their answer from part a), commenting on how they had decided on their rank order. Credit was most commonly gained for suggesting that costs, and the timescales for the Options would have been useful.

Unit 1313 Paper 4H

Question 1

QUESTION A1 – Planning for Change

(a) Almost all candidates scored full marks in parts (i) to (iii) and at least one in part (iv). In (v) stronger candidates explained the benefits of the metro to the motorist (e.g. cheaper travel) and to the environment (electric-powered) and this helped them gain full marks. Weaker candidates only referred to there being fewer cars on the roads and scored lower marks. The weakest candidates just referred to "pollution" and this vague term was not accepted; air and/or noise pollution had to be mentioned.

(d) On the whole the pie chart was done well. However some candidates drew one of the dividing lines inaccurately and a few did not use a ruler. Some made it more difficult for themselves by working anticlockwise.

(c) Most candidates defined incineration correctly but there were some vague or ambiguous definitions of landfill (such as "a place where rubbish is dumped" or "where waste decomposes") that could not be credited. In part (ii) many said incineration was expensive and produced harmful fumes. For landfill the scores were lower, mostly due to vague answers like "it takes up a lot of space". Part (iii) was quite well answered, with many referring to the rapid disposal of waste and energy recovery.

(f) Only half the candidates realised that all the statements were features of sustainable waste management. In part (ii) most did give a valid explanation (e.g. recycling uses more energy) though many merely rephrased what the person was saying. Most suggested "use less packaging" in (iii) but, as expected, only the most able candidates gave a second method such as "make longer-lasting products". Many of the answers given were examples of recycling or reusing so were not accepted.

(g) Child labour was the more popular choice. Most candidates mentioned low pay, long hours and poor working conditions, and many gave details on these problems. Nike and Primark were often mentioned as targets in this context. Unfair trade was chosen less frequently and the problems were less well understood too. In both cases the answers tended to be weaker on the campaigns, where some candidates wrote about the group's aims rather than its activities. However some explained the activities of the Just Don't Do It Campaign, Oxfam, the Fairtrade Foundation or the Kuapa Kokoo Co-operative very well indeed.

QUESTION A2 – Coping with Environmental Change

(a) Part (i) was very well answered. Only a few lost marks by giving beach or marsh, or land uses from outside the spit. Part (ii) was answered correctly by fewer candidates: some got mud and sand the wrong way round and others thought R was a marsh.

(b) Many showed a good understanding of long shore drift and scored maximum marks. Some correctly used terms such as swash, backwash and prevailing wind. Yet part (ii) proved surprisingly difficult, only two-thirds answering correctly. Many gave the direction wrongly as north or east.

(c) Some candidates only lifted information from Figure 7 or gave vague explanations such as "camping would damage the environment". Others used evidence from the passage or map to point out specific ways in which the wildlife or environment would be protected. There were many fine answers, some making particularly good use of the OS map. A few candidates wrote irrelevantly about the natural protection provided by beaches or about coastal defences for which there was no evidence.

(d) Part (i) was poorly done, with only two-thirds naming Langstone Rock. Some candidates identified a landform (arch, cliff or headland) rather than the name from the OS map. Answers such as Congers Rock revealed a failure to orientate the photograph with the map. In part (ii) the vast majority did identify the coastal defences as rock armour and a sea wall, but as expected very few deduced the sea wall was protecting the railway line. Many gave two valid disadvantages of the sea wall. Some underestimated its size and said it was too low to protect the coast. Few said reinforcement had been necessary.

(e) This was meant to be challenging but proved far more difficult than intended. In part (i) many candidates could explain managed but curiously few understood the word retreat. Many thought it referred to people fleeing from the coast whilst others thought the sea was moving away from the land. Too many just repeated the two words from the term. In part (ii) many resorted to lifting quotes from the news item without further elaboration. For instance many said the scheme was "better for wildlife" but did not add "because the new salt marsh would be a habitat for birds". Some stronger candidates explained how the marsh would protect the coast against future flooding/erosion or explained why managed retreat was cheaper or more visually appealing than traditional hard engineering schemes. However, very few candidates scored full marks.

(g) The eruptions of Paricutin and Chances Peak and the earthquakes in Kobe and Izmit were popular examples. There were many good detailed Level Three accounts which were well balanced between the immediate and long term responses. Many candidates wasted time writing irrelevantly about the effects of the volcano or earthquake, without relating them to the people's responses, but most answers reached at least Level Two. Less successful choices included Mt St Helens and the Indian Ocean tsunami, where few candidates had enough information to reach the top level.

SECTION B

62% of candidates chose the water question. 38% opted for weather and climate.

QUESTION B3 – Use and Abuse of the Environment (Water option)

(a) Almost all scored full marks in parts (i) and (ii), but the definitions were challenging. Only a third understood distribution of rainfall though slightly more understood reliability.

(b) Most candidates identified the countries as either LEDCs or MEDCs and many could explain their uses of water well. A few referred to the arid climate of Afghanistan. However some answers were largely descriptive, merely repeating information from the table without further explanation.

(c) Few candidates revealed much knowledge of aquifers. The stronger answers mentioned costs of drilling, recharge time or contamination. A few candidates were aware of conflicts between countries sharing an aquifer or of the problems with hard water obtained from chalk aquifers.

(d) There were many good answers on the Aswan High Dam which included both positive and negative effects on people and the environment. The detail in many Level Three answers was very impressive. There were also good answers on the Lesotho Highlands Project and the Colorado River but many of those on the Three Gorges Dam lacked the detail needed to reach Level Three. Most answers reached at least Level Two and there were few inappropriate case study choices or blank responses.

QUESTION B4 - Use and Abuse of the Environment (Weather and Climate option)

(a) Almost all scored the mark in part (i) although a few misread the map and gave deforestation. Those who chose coastal flooding usually scored both marks in (ii) but those opting for lower crop yields rarely did, often because they overlooked the role of a lack of moisture.

(b) Part (i) was more difficult than expected and few candidates scored both marks. The answers on illness/disease concentrated on multiplying bacteria or insects and rarely mentioned a specific illness/disease. Tropical storms were poorly explained because few candidates referred to higher sea temperatures. Declining fishing grounds were also poorly understood (rising sea level was often invoked as the cause). Part (ii) was much better answered. Melting of ice caps, drought and loss of animal habitats were the most frequent correct answers. Some candidates however gave acid rain or problems that were already covered by Map 2 (e.g. rising sea level and illnesses such as heat stroke or skin cancer).

(c) Some misunderstood part (i) and chose to explain why carbon emissions in 2001 were lower than they are today. However most identified the areas as either LEDCs or MEDCs and could explain their contrasting levels of emissions quite well. Most correctly named all three areas in part (ii). Understanding of the link between carbon emissions and global warming was rather limited. Many said greenhouse gases trap heat in the earth's atmosphere, but further explanation was usually absent. Few stated the differences between incoming radiation from the sun and outgoing radiation from the earth. Quite a few answers referred erroneously to the ozone layer.

(d) Most candidates chose acid rain and the best answers referred to Scandinavia or the Black Forest with a link to emissions from further west. A few explained acid rain formation in some detail though many wrote irrelevantly about its effects. Fewer chose urban climate but they included less irrelevance. Nevertheless the reasons for an urban heat island were sometimes only vaguely understood. There were fewer Level Three responses on urban climate due to a lack of place-specific details, but there were some excellent explanations of London's urban climate that included statistics and covered wind and precipitation as well temperatures.

SECTION C

Only 9% of candidates chose the farming question. 91% opted for recreation and tourism.

QUESTION C5 - Use and Abuse of the Environment (Farming option)

(a) This was straightforward as the photograph provided plenty of scope. As expected, many candidates scored maximum marks but a few confused natural and human features.

(b) Overgrazing was usually identified and there were some good answers explaining how this led to problems such as soil erosion and reduced fertility.

(c) Part (i) was straightforward. Part (ii) was meant to be challenging and so it proved. A few more able candidates realised that the farm being organic was significant for wild plants and insects, so they had little difficulty in scoring high marks. The majority only referred to wildlife habitats (such as rushes and planted trees) and found marks harder to accumulate. Weak candidates just lifted information from Figure 10 without explaining its relevance, or thought the farmer had planted the wild flowers.

(d) Most responses named an appropriate region though some outside the European Union were mentioned. The most able candidates chose a UK region such as East Anglia and usually described water pollution by pesticides and fertilizers (sometimes with considerable detail on eutrophication) and soil erosion due to the removal of hedges. The effects on natural vegetation tended to be less well described. There were a few weak, confused answers but most reached Level Two. There were also a few Level Three responses but many otherwise excellent accounts failed to reach the top level because they lacked place-specific detail such as the name of a polluted river or drained marsh, or a statistic on the rate of soil erosion or hedge removals.

QUESTION C6 – Use and Abuse of the Environment (Recreation and Tourism option)

(a) This was straightforward as the photograph provided plenty of scope. Very few confused natural and human features.

(b) This question revealed some candidates had a shallow understanding of eco-tourism. Too many referred very generally to eco-tourists looking at plants or watching birds. Better answers mentioned "electric carts produce less air and noise pollution than cars which are banned", "local people can earn money from jobs as forest guides" or "tourists are educated about the natural environment through studying insects and plants". In part (ii) an example of a weak response was "you are not supposed to watch TV on an eco-tourist holiday". In contrast "air-conditioning and Jacuzzis waste energy and water" and "foreign restaurants will import food at great expense while the local culture is ignored" are examples of good answers. In both (i) and (ii) a few weak candidates merely lifted features from Figure 11 and gave no explanations at all.

(c) This was meant to be challenging and differentiated well. Many candidates identified appropriate data but did not compare Park E's figures with those of the other national parks. This was essential to provide evidence that park E was under the greatest pressure from visitors. In (ii) many candidates suggested at least one further valid measure such as data on footpath erosion, litter or traffic congestion. We only accepted evidence that clearly indicated visitor pressure, so for example data on the amount of accommodation in the park or the income received from tourism were not credited.

(d) A few answers referred to examples outside the European Union (e.g. Daintree) and/or areas that were not national parks (e.g. country parks and local rural honey pots). The majority who did identify a national park referred to a UK example, usually the Lake District or Peak District, but sometimes Dartmoor, the North York Moors or the Yorkshire Dales. Candidates were often unable to describe their chosen park's location precisely and some were sidetracked into describing its landscapes or attractions. When sketch maps were drawn they were usually quite rudimentary, although a few were really superb. The answers to part (ii) sometimes mentioned significant routes, centres of population supplying visitors to the park and travel times, but many were very general accounts of accessibility. Few candidates included statistical data on the origins of the national park's visitors or distinguished between tourists and day-trippers. Level Three responses were rare.

1313 Statistics

1313 Foundation Tier

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	100	62	52	42	33	24

Paper 1F

Grade	Max. Mark	C	F
1F Raw Mark Boundaries	60	41	22

Paper 2F

Grade	Max. Mark	C	F
2F Raw Mark Boundaries	100	62	34

1313 Higher Tier

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	100	77	68	59	51	45	42

Paper 3H

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	D
3H Raw Mark Boundaries	60	39	27	23

Paper 4H

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	D
4H Raw Mark Boundaries	100	68	51	47

Coursework

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