

Geography B (Avery Hill)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **1987**

Report on the Units

June 2007

1987/3987/MS/R/07

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography B (Avery Hill) (1987)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
1987/01	Paper 1 Foundation	3
1987/02	Paper 2 Higher	9
1987/03	Paper 3 Foundation	13
1987/04	Paper 4 Higher	17
1987/05	Coursework	19
*	Grade Thresholds	23

1987

General Comments

Entry

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<i>Foundation</i>	22345	21631	20395	19122	18168
<i>Higher</i>	20330	19996	19788	20025	20673
TOTAL	42675	41627	40183	39147	38841

At 38,841 the cumulative entry for the Avery Hill Specification has held up well over the last year. Hopefully this sees an end to the reduction in entries experienced in recent years. It must be reflected upon, though, that Avery Hill appears to have fared better than other geography Specifications during this difficult time and the number of centres entering candidates continues to hold up well.

The table above also shows changes in tiered entries. It shows some acceleration in the shift in entry towards the higher tier that has been evident throughout the life of this Specification. This appears to be reflected in the increase in A* to C grades from 63.4% to 64.2% over the year and the fact that the proportion failing to gain an award by the higher tier route fell from 0.02% to 0.01%. The percentage of candidates gaining some award from the experience fell slightly from 99.2% in 2006 to 99.1% this year.

As in previous years, while forecast grades were a *little* ambitious at all grade boundaries, but especially at C/D, centres are to be congratulated on the overall accuracy of their predictions.

All examinations were considered appropriate by examiners. Detailed reports on each element follow this introduction but a small number of general points are worth highlighting:

- 1 Paper setters have worked very hard to reduce the time demands of Paper Two in particular. Candidates in most centres now find it accessible and, while there will never be time to spare, it is possible for candidates operating at all higher tier levels to effectively access the entire paper. Centres are urged, though, to train their candidates in the art of responding to written tasks.
- 2 Reports from the Principal Examiners suggest a much more balanced approach to the pairs of questions than in previous years where there had been evidence that, boys especially, tended to choose the first question in each pair. While not entirely absent there also appears to have been some further reduction in the numbers on Paper One who attempted to answer all six questions.
- 3 The trend shown in 2006 for there to be an improvement in performance through People, Work and Development has been continued into this examination. Centres are to be congratulated in the work they must have put into teaching what proved previously to be a relatively inaccessible part of the curriculum.
- 4 Centres continue to prepare their candidates well for questions that demand extended answers. This has been especially noted in Paper Four where the new-style matrix had a great deal of success, although the Principal Examiner reports the need to further integrate sustainability into the reports.
- 5 Paper Three also produced extended answers to its final task but, even where sufficient geographical quality was evident, few candidates managed to surmount the quite high hurdles necessary to score in the highest level. At the opposite end of the attainment range, too many candidates scored in Level Two as a result of quite weak completion of

the matrix. This caused a compression of marks rendering such an important task quite a weak differentiator. **Centres are advised that from, and including, the 2008 examination the mark scheme will be changed slightly to reduce the number of marks available in Level One and also reduce the hurdles necessary for candidates to gain credit in Level Three. In this way it is anticipated that access to the mark range for this question will be stretched with correspondingly increased differentiation.**

- 6 While it was possible for candidates to avoid being exposed to large scale maps during this year's examination, there being only a Spanish Survey map of 1:50 000 scale, centres are reminded of one of the aims of the present examining team. **Wherever possible in future we intend to ensure that all candidates are examined in the use of Ordnance Survey maps or equivalent as a part of the terminal examination experience.**

Administrative Matters

Centres are advised of the following administrative matters:

- 1 There appears to have been no significant reduction in the number of candidates who do not read and follow the instructions on the front of the examination booklet. This especially affects Papers 1 and 2 where, on Paper 1, it can result in the completion of too many questions and, on Paper 2, the candidates do not indicate on the front of the answer booklet the questions they have attempted. Centres where this is happening are also often the ones that forget to remove the Resource Booklets prior to sending the scripts to the examiner.
- 2 Administrative arrangements for the moderation of coursework changed slightly for the 2007 examination. Please remember that in all future examinations both teacher and candidate must complete a separate authentication form for each item of coursework produced. Forms will be sent from the WJEC with other coursework documentation in early 2008.

1987/01 Foundation Tier

General Comments

The paper proved to be accessible for the vast majority of Foundation candidates. As in 2006 the candidates were able to achieve higher marks than in previous years. The structure of the paper clearly enabled this to happen. Very few candidates scored low marks. The paper appeared to differentiate well.

A pleasing aspect of this paper was to see question pairs in each of the three sections being attempted fairly equally. Although Section A, testing Climate, Environment and People, possibly saw slightly higher marks, it was particularly pleasing that many candidates scored well on Questions C5 and C6. This continues the upward trend for the People Work and Development section which was noted in 2006.

There is still a noticeable misunderstanding of key geographical terms like “temperature range”, “deposition”, “sustainable development”, “tertiary employment”, and “multi-national company”. Centres are encouraged to keep working at this particular aspect of the Specification.

Case Study questions were attempted by a higher percentage of candidates than in previous years, which is clearly a positive step. However, there were a number of inappropriate examples chosen by the candidates. This issue is explored in greater detail in the comments on individual questions. It is essential that centres prepare their candidates to answer a range of Case Studies and train them in Case Study selection.

Timing seems to be no problem for most candidates. Rubric errors, although present, seemed fewer than in previous years. Centres are advised to remind their candidates about question selection in their pre-examination briefings.

Comments on individual questions

Section A

Question 1

This question was answered quite well by many candidates.

- (a) Candidates read the diagram extremely well, and the vast majority recognised the direction of prevailing wind and a gas responsible for acid rain. Many also selected four correct answers in the passage. The most common error was “nuclear” instead of “coal”. In (iii) most candidates recognised cars and factories as the main activities contributing to acid rain. Terms like emissions, gases, carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide were acceptable answers for the causes by cars. However, many candidates merely repeated the same explanation for factories which was not accepted.
- (b) Most candidates read the map extremely well.
- (c) Few candidates had problems completing the pie chart, although some did not attempt it. Most answered hydro-electric power as the renewable fuel with a few weaker candidates wrongly selecting natural gas. Part (iii) was a good discriminator where most candidates selected at least one way of reducing acid rain. More able candidates elaborated their answers well. A significant number suggested driving cars less, but failed to explain how this would reduce acid rain. Many explained how they would make people drive less. Some candidates suggested using natural gas instead of coal! In (iv) there was the opportunity to gain marks in a variety of ways, the most common being “litter” and

“deforestation”. These were elaborated well by more able candidates. Some candidates gave global warming as a way the activities of people affected the natural environment. This would have been acceptable if a cause was incorporated in the answer. This question differentiated well.

- d) **CASE STUDY.** Many candidates selected Tropical Rainforest examples but the description of the ecosystem was often limited to “plants and trees”. More able candidates recognised the four different layers and some specific wildlife living in these. Explanation of how ecosystems and changes to them affect the lives of people generally produced better responses. Centres are advised to address specific details of ecosystems to enhance the performance of their candidates.

Question 2

Overall this question was answered well.

- (a) The climate graphs were completed correctly by most candidates. However, a surprising number of even overall high scoring candidates missed this question. Nearly all candidates gave the May temperature accurately, but few were able to give the “range” correctly. Many gave it as 24. This was an effective discriminator. The passage relating to rainfall was very well answered, and even some of the otherwise weaker candidates were able to identify June and the Western Ghats.
- (b) Candidates used the map to good effect. The vast majority knew their compass directions. There was recognition of the basic ways in which Monsoon rain helps people, with candidates quoting such ideas as watering crops and providing drinking water. More able candidates were able to elaborate these ways to generate the second marks.
- (c) The article provided a good stimulus for many candidates. Many gave a correct answer to explain why the rains were considered extreme. Weaker candidates sometimes erroneously gave statements from the text relating to effects of flooding. In Part (ii) many identified two problems from the article, and elaborated them quite well. Part (iii) proved to be an effective discriminator. Where candidates had taken on board the term “immediately” the responses were very good. Some focused on longer term strategies like constructing flood defences and building new houses thus gaining no credit.
- (d) **CASE STUDY.** The Case Study produced far too many inappropriate answers mainly relating to hurricanes and tsunamis. Where hurricanes were chosen many did not describe the weather event but concentrated on their formation. Most candidates were, though, able to explain how they affected people and the environment very well. These answers were limited to a maximum of Level 2=3. Those candidates who chose a high pressure weather event selected summer anticyclones over the UK / Europe in 2003 and 1999. These had been on previous “Avery Hill” examination papers. Some candidates chose anticyclones in desert areas. These were often very successful. It is essential that centres prepare their candidates for both high and low pressure weather events as clearly stated in the Specification.

Section B

Question 3

Overall this question was answered reasonably well.

- (a) Most candidates demonstrated good map reading skills and the gaining of full marks was common in response to this question.
- (b) Virtually all candidates scored two marks in (i) by simply reading the information provided. Answers were rather basic in (ii) with mainly dry weather or tourists being quoted. Very few candidates gave elaborated answers relating to demand. In (iii) most candidates were able to identify the reason as a spatial imbalance in water supply, but this limited them to a maximum of two marks. Only a relatively small proportion of candidates suggested any other reason. These two questions discriminated well.
- (c) Nearly all candidates were able to identify the trend, but few were able to accurately quote figures. There was sound understanding of the changes with reference to rainfall, and greater demand being common. Some candidates successfully connected high temperatures with high levels of evaporation.
- (d) Most candidates correctly answered (i) and (ii). Discrimination was evident in (iii) with more able candidates elaborating using specific map evidence. Others picked up odd marks for answers such as “highland” and “many rivers”. In suggesting ways Spain might solve the water shortage many chose to build more reservoirs but often failed to provide the elaboration required for a second mark. Higher attaining candidates looked at desalination, national policies such as hosepipe bans and water rationing. However, a number of answers were wrongly related to individual action at home.
- (e) **CASE STUDY** The Case Study was completed well by the majority of candidates. There were some fine efforts based on Boscastle and New Orleans. It was pleasing to see that very few used Lynmouth as an example! Some candidates selected inappropriate LEDC examples like Bangladesh or simply Africa. There was some repetition of material on Mumbai but often there was no new information and therefore these candidates’ efforts only received a mark for QWC. Description of how the flood affected people was often excellent, while explanation of the causes proved to be an effective discriminator.

Question 4

Overall this was the least well answered question. The question is clearly set up to both differentiate and discriminate but there appeared to be a distinct lack of preparation by even more able candidates.

- 4
- (a) Most candidates read the maps very well.
 - (b) Few candidates labelled all four features correctly. Many recognised the arch and the wave cut notch, but the other two were often the wrong way round. This is probably because the features in the photograph do not fit exactly the “generic” text book model. Many candidates understood that the features were created by erosion, but few were able to define deposition without repeating the word “deposit”.
 - (c) Part (i) was a low scoring question with the most common answers being “views” and “going to the beach”. Overall elaboration was poor and the photograph could have been *used* much better by the candidates. There were better answers in (ii) based mainly on litter and erosion.

Sustainable development was answered reasonably well, possibly because of the multiple choice nature of the question. However, a number still think that preservation equates to sustainability. In (iv) most candidates could provide satisfactory completions for litter bins and restricting vehicle access but only a few were able to explain how charging admission would work. In (v) there were some sound answers relating to education or restricting access to areas. However, some responses were not related to sustainable development of the environment, for example “providing cafes for visitors” and “picking up dog poo”.

- (d) CASE STUDY** Where candidates actually wrote about river landforms there were good explanations of their formation. Descriptions of the main features of the chosen landform were relatively poor unless diagrams were drawn. Popular examples included Niagara Falls and the Nile Delta. There were many inappropriate examples such as the use of a specific river, and a large number of candidates wrote about coastal landforms. These were often about stacks and arches and gained few marks due to no information being given other than that provided in the earlier parts of the question. This also occurred last year and again centres are advised to prepare their candidates for both river and coastal landforms as stated in the Specification.

Section C

Question 5

The question was answered quite well by many candidates.

- (a) Candidates used the map to complete the passage very well. Surprisingly in (ii) a number of candidates scored one mark by either recognising middle income countries in South America being south of the Brandt Line or that the high income countries of North America and Western Europe were still north of the line. More able candidates gave some sophisticated answers. In (iii) there were some excellent answers with good use of figures and comparative words. These techniques have clearly been emphasised in the classroom. Many candidates scored three or four marks on this part.
- (b) A limited number of candidates defined tertiary employment correctly. Misconceptions ranged from “privately owned” to “working for someone else”. Many examples were given, but there were few definitions. In (ii) most candidates attracted at least one mark but a significant number appeared to read the wrong graph to quote 40% being employed in tertiary industry. There were some excellent answers describing employment structure changes but very few adequate reasons were given for these changes. Successful candidates mainly recognised the roles played by the exhaustion of raw materials and the use of machinery in reducing percentages in the primary workforce. Also tourism was used as a reason for increases in tertiary employment.
- (c) There were many correct answers in part (i) with candidates usually selecting appropriate information from the boxes. However, some candidates also copied information from the boxes in part (ii). This did not attract marks. More able candidates recognised the role of jobs and money in supporting Mexico’s economy. Most candidates managed to quote basic bad effects of the factories in part (iii) while elaboration of these led to clear discrimination. Many candidates were awarded a maximum of two marks for merely listing effects.
- (d) **CASE STUDY** The question specifically asked for imports and exports relating to one country. These have been highlighted on the two previous examination papers in 2005 and 2006. Nevertheless, responses were often very vague or just exports were given for a country, for example bananas from Ecuador. Few candidates understood the good and bad points of trade beyond making reference to money and cheap wages. Many confused China and Japan. Africa appeared far too often quoted as a country. This was also highlighted in last year’s report. Trade is a key part of the Specification and more specific preparation is needed.

Question 6

This question was answered well by many candidates, and proved quite accessible for weaker candidates.

- (a) In parts (i) and (ii) candidates read the map and information given to answer the questions well. In (iii) candidates were able to suggest that a multi-national company is located in more than one country to attract one mark. The most common mistakes offered were “sells all over the world” and “is well known over the world”. Very few candidates referred to it having “its headquarters in one country”. Part (iv) was well answered with the most familiar responses given being “cheap labour” and “cheap land to build factories on”.

- (b) Many candidates selected two reasons for choosing the Leipzig site from the extract, and were often able to successfully elaborate at least one of these, for example “flat land which is easy to build on”. There were mixed responses to the way in which the new car factories might affect the environment. Some candidates referred to the destruction of the countryside and the effects on plants and wildlife, or air / noise pollution from workers’ vehicles and lorries coming in and out of the factory. Weaker candidates often did not qualify the term “pollution”.
- (c) In part (i) virtually all candidates managed to extract the correct answer from the article. In (ii) most candidates had difficulty accessing the full four marks. The most common answer provided was “no money to pay bills / rent / mortgage”. Part (iii) was, though, poorly answered. Very few recognised negative multiplier effect or a spiral of decline. Few candidates were able to relate their answer to the economy. Parts (ii) and (iii) proved to be effective discriminators.
- (d) **CASE STUDY** Some centres had prepared their candidates for a specific economic activity, for example Toyota at Burnaston, Nissan at Sunderland and LG at Newport. Those that had specific sketch maps were generally answered well. Unfortunately these were the exceptions. Activities chosen ranged from Nike in India, through tourism in the Peak District to coal mining in South Wales (There is still one working mine in the area!). Most attempts were characterized by a distinct lack of specific detail. Sketch maps were mainly relatively poor and description of the location was often limited. Many simply stated “near a motorway” or “close to a port”. Fortunately most were able to offer some explanation as to why the economic activity had located there. Centres are advised that, in addition to the specific areas mentioned above, local shopping centres and retail parks may be used. Candidates can often provide well annotated sketch maps for these based on their own local knowledge.

1987/2 Higher Tier

General Comments

This paper proved to be accessible to the vast majority of candidates who were able to demonstrate their geographical knowledge, understanding and skills in a concise style of prose. Time did not appear to be a problem for the majority of candidates, although some candidates did write five or six pages for the first two questions and then had to shorten the answers for the last question, however they achieved compatible marks with the two previous questions. Some candidates wrote several sentences or even paragraphs for one mark answers where just a single word would have given them the mark.

The terms “prevailing westerly wind” and “the Brandt Line” were clearly not understood by a number of candidates. Many candidates wrote about the wind blowing in from Russia and many made reference to above or below the Brandt Line. The use of a Spanish O.S. map unsettled a number of candidates and many of these failed to recognise the deep valleys with steep sides being an ideal place to construct a dam. There was some improvement with case studies, with many candidates achieving maximum marks. However the generic case study, where candidates wrote about the “anywhere” case study again limited them to a maximum of credit not beyond Level 2. Candidates were generally poor at locating places using geographical terms and some even managed to describe the course of the Ebro River from its mouth to the source. Candidates were generally excellent in interpreting and describing graphs. Rubric errors were virtually nil. There were still complaints from examiners that certain centres did not inform the candidates to fill in the spaces for the questions that they had answered.

Comments on individual questions

Section A

Question A1

- (a) Well answered by the overwhelming majority of candidates who could ascertain from the diagram the two main gases that contribute to acid rain. However a number of candidates were unable to explain how car emissions produced carbon monoxide.
- (b) There were far too many locational answers not involving compass directions and many candidates misinterpreted how the prevailing westerly wind blew in acid rain from Western Europe. Too many candidates were under the belief that the winds came from Russia and the Ukraine, as a result few candidates achieved maximum marks in this section.
- (c) Quite a number of candidates assumed natural gas was a renewable fuel although the vast majority were able to interpret the pie chart. Answers to ways that acid rain could be reduced were good and there were many good answers to the ways people affect the natural environment which involved the use of specialist terms such as deforestation, urbanisation and global warming.
- (d) **Case Study:** There were some excellent examples of features of an ecosystem and how that ecosystem affected the lives of different groups of people. Nonetheless there were many generic examples, in particular when describing how the ecosystem affected lives, many simply described rain forest destruction, failing to mention specific groups of people. This limited the candidate to a maximum of L2 and was an example of a ‘could have been anywhere’ type of answer. Candidates need to write about specific people and areas within that ecosystem.

Question A2

- (a) Candidates generally answered this question well but many wrote too much and this had timing issues later. A number of candidates failed to use the map to describe the temperature pattern and thus penalised themselves. The explanation of why relief rainfall occurred was often accompanied by a diagram and this allowed many candidates access to maximum marks.
- (b) Candidates were very good in describing the movement of wind in June but the accompanying explanation was often poor. Ways in which the Monsoon rainfall affected people were often vague and not explained very well e.g. rains help grow crops and fill rivers without any further explanation.
- (c) Describing the problems mentioned in the article was correctly answered by almost everyone, but why write up to ten sentences for two marks? Suggesting how aid money could relieve the immediate problems proved to be a good discriminator. Good candidates gave lucid answers to this question whilst less able candidates often wrote about erecting flood barriers.
- (d) **Case Study:** Excellent case studies by a very few candidates included describing an anti-cyclone over the U.K. in July but the vast majority described low pressure events, in particular Hurricane Katrina. Candidates need a better understanding of the differences between high and low pressure events in order to tackle a case study of this nature.

Section B

Question B3

- (a) Most candidates could describe the course of the Ebro River and so gained maximum marks however a number of candidates failed to notice this question and started their answers with section (b). A worrying concern is the small number of candidates who described its course flowing the opposite way, from the Balearic Sea flowing north west to Leon.
- (b) Few candidates failed to describe the water transfer correctly but many did not realise that the demand for water in the south was fuelled by the tourist trade and the needs of agriculture. Candidates then often repeated the same answers in solving the problems of the south.
- (c) The bar charts were interpreted well and the figures given were usually accurate. Candidates gave good answers for the possible reasons for the changes citing drought and increased demand.
- (d) Good candidates were able to give map evidence to explain why this was a good site for a reservoir explaining well, the deep, steep sided valleys, the large numbers of streams and the lack of population that may have been affected. Most candidates gave evidence that the number of roads would aid water transfer or that the small villages would be assured of water or they would provide a ready made workforce. It would appear that the candidates do not understand the hydrology involved. Perhaps it was the use of a Spanish O.S. map that prevented candidates from being able to interpret the map evidence, although a clear key was provided.

- (e) **Case Study:** A case study that allowed candidates to achieve very high marks. There were excellent examples of recent flooding in Boscastle, Shrewsbury, Carlisle and Northampton. New Orleans was allowed but candidates could not explain in any detail what caused the place to flood.

Question B4

- (a) Most correctly identified the location of the Great Ocean Road although again a small number of candidates failed to notice the question.
- (b) Most candidates answered this question well and the use of diagrams allowed a clear majority to gain maximum marks. Coastal processes appear to be well taught in schools and candidates were able to show their understanding
- (c) The explanation of why visitors were attracted to this area allowed candidates to use photographic evidence plus reasons of their own, and marks tended to be high. However the response to the consequences of such numbers of visitors was poorly answered, many just gave problems of litter and use of cars. Sustainable development at last appears to be grasped by candidates, many gave good answers. In contrast to this the setting up of the Otway National Park caused problems for candidates. Many put forward vague suggestions such as protect the area, prevent development, and then failed to develop their ideas to access full marks.
- (d) **Case Study:** Quite a few candidates chose to write about a coastal landform and were therefore limited to a maximum of L2. Candidates who chose to describe waterfalls often included comprehensive diagrams which were well annotated, this allowed them to access maximum marks. Not so well done were landforms such as ox-bow lakes and meanders.

Section C

Question C5

- (a) Many candidates referred to the high income countries being above the Brandt line. Some even ignored the Brandt line and talked of hemispheres instead. Few candidates could get to grips with the question of how appropriate is the Brandt line today, many just regurgitated the same answers for (i). Few candidates could add an explanation to why Mexico had a higher life expectancy and just used figures from the table.
- (b) Many candidates could compare the changes and could then go on to explain them in Mexico since 1975.
- (c) Candidates seemed to find this section difficult, there was much repetition of the idea that the USA exploited Mexico but little further expansion. Many just lifted quotes from the problems in the statements but did not explain how people were affected.
- (d) **Case Study:** Overall this case study was not answered well. Often it was generic on the problems a TNC causes in a LEDC. Many candidates found it difficult to actually give concrete advantages or disadvantages of the trade in their chosen country. Few gave examples of imports.

Question C6

- (a) Few candidates did not know where the location of the largest BMW plant was, many good give a basic definition of a multi-national company but few obtained a mark for the headquarters. Many failed to refer to the Brandt line in reference to the car production factories and assembly factories. Few could give an explanation for these differences.
- (b) Almost all candidates could explain the reasons why Leipzig was a good site for the new factory. Many then went on to explain ways the factory could affect the environment.
- (c) The stimulus information allowed all candidates to explain how the loss of jobs at Longbridge would have affected families but few could explain the impact the negative multiplier would have on the local and regional economy.
- (d) **Case Study:** There were some very good case studies completed by candidates including Toyota at Burnaston and Nissan in Washington. Candidates were able to describe the location, often with the use of a sketch map, although the quality of sketch maps tended to be poor. Advantages and disadvantages were explained well. Candidates who wrote about places such as Nike in Thailand tended to achieve lower marks than those that used UK examples.

Papers Three and Four

General

The 2007 problem-solving papers continue to adopt the format that was introduced with the 2003 examination. Candidates in almost all centres are fully familiar with the demands such an examination is likely to make and, in this the fifth cycle, the examination appeared to hold no surprises for them.

As in previous years, the two examinations introduced the candidates to the geography of a place where a particular problem needed to be solved. For the 2007 examination the place was a Less Economically Developed Country, Vietnam and the problem, the prioritisation of government spending on the development of either urban or rural areas in response to the increasing urbanisation being experienced in the country.

This provided a clear contrast with the previous 'People and Place' Paper set under this Specification which had explored the concept of responding to greater housing demand to meet the needs of the residents of Glasgow.

This year the problem-solving papers targeted People and Place but centres are reminded that these papers rotate around the Units and that the Unit carrying them in 2007 will be 'Water, Landforms and People'.

1987/03 Foundation

A more detailed consideration of performance on each part question is found below.

Part A

Overall candidate performance on this Part was impressive.

- (a) Almost all candidates scored full marks on the map completion exercise. Those who didn't almost invariably shaded both Mexico and the Caribbean Sea. There were candidates, though, who did not attempt the task in spite of the fact that the activity was emboldened. Responses to part (ii) were also strong with most scoring the full three marks. The most common error was not to realise that the world map was turned through 90° and to assume that countries having over 60% of their population living in rural areas were to the east of the Brandt Line. Most candidates were able to define rural areas satisfactorily but too great a minority could not. In this question it was not adequate to merely state what it is not.
- (b) Most candidates recognised Vietnam's standard of living as being worse than that of the UK. Those who considered it to be similar were not credited in this question but could gain credit in part (ii) for a maximum of two marks by quoting the two indicators that were similar; life expectancy and the percentage of adults able to read and write. Part (ii) was very well answered with most candidates quoting three pieces of evidence from the table. A small minority gained full credit by quoting two differences and explaining how one of these supports the notion that standard of living is poorer in Vietnam than the UK.
- (c) Most candidates were able to correctly read the graph and scored a full two marks. Those who didn't ticked either too few or too many boxes in spite of the question clearly requiring two.

- (d) Most candidates recognised some form of farming activity in part (i) although some candidates variously thought they saw water collection or fishing. Part (ii) was the first question on the paper that a large proportion of candidates found quite challenging. The question demanded reasons why a number of factors supported the decision to leave a rural area. It was not asking about the pull of urban areas. It was also not asking for an explanation as to how each factor had come about. Many candidates did not recognise these. Also many of those who did link the factors to the push of the countryside failed to provide the 'so what?' element thus losing the two marks for elaboration of the basic ideas. Part (iii) proved to be an extremely effective discriminator with the higher scoring candidates often managing to describe a continuum in which the demands on local government were well linked. Many of those at the other end of the scale continued to attempt to explain why the people were leaving. While positive factors were acceptable, almost all of the high scoring attempts explored mainly negative effects of the migration.

Part B

This Part proved to be an extremely effective discriminator.

- (a) Most candidates responded well to the map completion activity with by far the majority scoring full marks. Those who failed to do so usually failed to draw an arrow of acceptable width. As with the opening question on the paper there was a small minority who apparently failed to see the task. Reading of the map was quite mixed with very few candidates recognising that 15% of migrants came from North-central region, but most realising that migration to Hanoi decreased with distance from it. Pagination of the paragraph did not help some candidates who thought that the greatest percentage of migrants came from the east. The last word of the sentence, 'region', would have better served them had it been on the same page as the space for the response.
- (b) While part (i) was generally well answered, there were, as in previous examinations, too many candidates who ignored the instruction to describe what they saw and attempted explanation as to how it affected quality of life. How much effect this had on responses to the next questions can only be surmised. Responses in parts (ii) and (iii) were mainly quite positive with the majority of candidates recognising disadvantages of the location in relation to the houses being built over water and advantages of the location a mixture of the proximity of water and of services and jobs in the built up area. Responses to part (iv) were quite mixed. High scoring candidates often managed to make clear links between the buildings and quality of life with elaborated statements being common. Those who scored poorly often merely re-quoted statements that would have gained credit in part (i). There were some very perceptive responses to part (v) with a great deal of clarity of linkage between the characteristics of slum settlements and/or its occupants and their effects on local government. Many candidates, though, failed to establish such links and invariably scored low marks.

Part C

Candidate performance in this Part was in the main quite disappointing.

(a) Almost all candidates scored highly when relating to the photograph. Usually they gained their marks for recognition of the possibility of acquiring housing and the opportunities that house and flat building may have for the provision of jobs.

(b) Parts (i) and (ii) mainly resulted in candidates gaining the full two marks. Those who failed to do so usually either erroneously quoted 'non-farming' as a type of employment that has increased or, also in part (i) assuming that higher rice yields meant more people involved in rice farming despite the statement in the table to the contrary.

The part relating to the reasons why people might stay in the village was generally quite poorly answered. Many responses were extremely vague statements about more jobs being available when the candidates really need to specify the line(s) of work. Likewise 'trading' responses very rarely elaborated beyond the information given.

(c) The final, problem-solving task proved to be no more effective a discriminator than in previous examinations. This seems to be a function of two processes.

The first of these is the improved abilities of the candidates to relate effectively to the matrix. It is quite common now for them to recognise that any one impact from the Factfile might have both positive and negative effects. These initial statements were backed up by elaboration demonstrating clear geographical understanding.

Thus most candidates are now scoring in the middle of Level Two through the matrix alone.

The second is the inability of all bar the very best candidates to provide letters that demonstrate the quality of geography to take them into Level Three. Some, otherwise pleasing accounts, failed to follow the rubric and did not explore both urban and rural strategies nor look at both positive and negative effects. More often, though, accounts that cleared all of the technical hurdles to get into Level Three just did not have the geographical quality to award in that level.

Perhaps centres could concentrate on developing the quality of response through extended writing and emphasise the importance of thinking in the shorter and longer term, of drawing from the experience of case studies explored in the classroom or beyond and of relating measures to the development of a sustainable future.

As last year, while the problem-solving task was a positive experience for most candidates, it is clear that in a minority of centres there is little preparation for it. Candidates from these centres are severely disadvantaged as are those who do not attempt to complete the matrix.

All evidence suggests that candidates had ample time to complete this final task with many writing a letter of more than two sides. As in previous years, though, there still wasn't necessarily a correlation between the length of the letter and its geographical quality.

1987/04 Higher General Comments

Candidates were able to access all the marks in all three sections of this paper and few candidates failed to attempt all of the questions. The progress made last year with tiering has continued with very few candidates being wrongly entered for this tier and thus failing to achieve a grade. The very best centres continue to fully prepare their candidates to respond appropriately to the rubric of the questions, most notably with understanding how to earn all the marks available. Too many candidates limited their achievement by lifting large amounts from the resources provided in the printed materials rather than using their own knowledge. Some candidates would do much better if they remembered that the purpose of exams is to encourage them to demonstrate their skills, knowledge, and understanding and their ability to apply these to a new situation.

The vast majority of candidates had a very good knowledge of the processes and effects of urbanisation. A significant number had only a very superficial understanding of sustainability and of what pattern means in geography.

Comments on Individual Questions

Part A

- (a) Almost every candidate was able to correctly shade the map. Part (ii) was a good differentiator with most scoring one but few scoring 3 marks. Many candidates used 'below', instead of 'south', of the Brandt Line.
- (b) While every candidate was able to gauge the standard of living using development indicators many were unable to explain how they affected the Vietnamese people.
- (c) This question asked candidates to describe a graph. Most were able to describe the trend well but some did not use data from the graph in order to earn a second mark.
- (d) The very best candidates used extended explanations in order to score highly. Too many candidates scored very few marks here because they simply lifted statements from the Resource Booklet. Those who did this tended to score poorly throughout the paper. Answers in part ii were much better seemingly because there were not the resources to fall back on as in the previous question.

Centres should remember that the Resource Booklet is common to both tiers of entry and advise their candidates entered for the Higher Paper that one of the main uses of its content is as a stimulus.

Part B

The themes in Part B are firmly embedded in the Avery Hill Specification and prior learning. Sustainability and patterns are both important elements of our Specification and of the Key Stage 3 National Curriculum. Within this context flow maps are a traditional way of showing data for movements such as those shown, so it is surprising that so many candidates struggled to do well with these topics.

- (a) A majority of candidates were able to accurately draw the appropriate flow arrow, especially those who had a ruler! Some could identify the pattern of distance/decay and then explain it rationally. Too many, though, failed to appreciate the significance of the

arrow's width and misinterpreted the frequency of the arrows and so got the pattern wrong. Some candidates thought that the arrows were actual transport routes.

- (b) Candidates were eager to demonstrate their knowledge of typical squatter settlements but sometimes lost marks by assuming stereotypical features rather than responding to the photograph-particular context as directed. Part iii was answered well by most as it allowed candidates to demonstrate their generic knowledge of the conditions in these settlements. The final question asked why this growth might be considered unsustainable. Responses to this question polarised centre by centre with some excellent responses from candidates in schools where the concept was well taught and the opposite extreme where this appeared not to be the case. It is worth emphasising that this is a centre issue that begs many questions about the varied practice in the teaching of sustainability in our schools. The best centres have explored with their students the wider implication and varied nature of sustainability. Many centres were able to use a core definition but the weakest centres' students talked vaguely of pollution, litter and planting trees. Sustainability as defined in the Specification is very much more than this and the concept will continue to feature prominently in this paper. It is, in fact, very difficult to imagine a geographical problem to be solved where sustainability is not intrinsic to the solution. An in-depth evaluation of sustainability can be found in several resources including tinyurl.com/2uvqwy.

Part C

- (a) Most candidates were able to access marks in this section.
- (b) In a similar way to the last question in Part B, responses from centres tended to polarise. Many were unable to use the standard terminology (of primary, secondary, tertiary industry) or summarise the information given to them. Again, the weakest candidates simply rewrote the resource materials.
- (c) Part C used an extended matrix for the first time. Centres had been informed of this evolution and its desired outcomes of more extended reasoning, greater focus on the key components of the task, improved structure in the report were largely met. Some centres had obviously coached their candidates to ignore the matrix. The subsequent responses were generally characterised by rambling, unfocused reports which it was hard not to imagine represented underachievement. The matrix now allows candidates to access up to half the possible marks for this final task and a significant number were able to improve their mark because of it.

The weakest reports were again a rehash of the Fact File included in the Resource Booklet. The very best reports were able to succinctly argue for one decision while weighing up the pros and cons of both. Authors of these reports also responded to the emboldened text appropriately. The overall impression is one that this year's reports are overall the best that the examiners have seen under the current Specification.

Few candidates appeared to have time problems and almost all attempted to write a report. Most of the comments in last year's Report to Centres seem to have been taken on board except for the advice to avoid regurgitation of information from provided sources. The weakest candidates continue to do this and fail to appreciate the Resource Booklet's role as stimulus material rather than answer booklet.

1987/05 Coursework

General

For the cycle culminating in the 2007 examination by far the majority of centres operated coursework packages that have benefited from lessons learned since the inception of this Specification in 2003 and from positive input from their Consultative Moderators during the intervening years. Bearing this in mind, most centres have strategies that now actively encourage the candidates to effectively target the published mark schemes and the candidates, in turn, are mainly responding positively to produce work that appears fully representative of their geographical abilities.

It is clear that very few centres are now using inappropriate coursework. Where this is the case, though, their students continue to be severely disadvantaged. Such items could result in a failure of the students to fully demonstrate their geographical abilities and/or to produce work that fails to effectively target the mark schemes. If they have not already done so, centres in these circumstances are requested to contact their Consultative Moderator as a matter of urgency so that such negative effects are not carried forward to the next examination cycle. The name of their Consultative Moderator may be obtained from the WJEC.

The Study

Most Studies now comprise hypothesis-testing exercises presented through the vehicle of an extended piece of investigative writing as demanded by the Specification. Those that are not invariably create problems for the candidates resulting in their Studies being incapable of fully accessing the mark scheme.

Where improvements are still needed they often relate to:

- the requirement to include some data derived from an ICT source. For most centres this has been fulfilled by such strategies as encouraging the candidates to take information from the Internet or by placing a bank of digital photographs on the centre's Intranet. Many have encouraged individual candidates to contribute such data as questionnaire returns to a common data processing package from which all may take collated results. On the whole, each cycle sees increasingly more impressive use of ICT as a source of data.

While in some centres the Geography Department's access to computers is still unreliable, the situation continues to improve. A very small minority of centres now have to resort to the provision of hard copies of ICT-derived material. It must again be emphasised, though, that this fall back situation is preferable to operating a system of privilege in which only those candidates who have access to a computer at home can fulfil the ICT requirement.

- the specific criterion of "application" in the mark scheme requires candidates to be able to relate their findings to geographical principles and processes. Most centres have by now ensured that this is now wholly targeted. For example, "shopping" Studies have managed to relate the findings on individual shopping centres to such ideas as hierarchies and spheres of influence. Likewise, mainly geomorphological coastal or river studies usually manage to relate the findings in relation to individual coastal areas or stretches of rivers to processes of erosion and deposition and often to management options.

In the few centres where consideration has yet to be given to this aspect of the Study there is a tendency towards completed work that lacks a sense of place and is often more a sociological report than a geographical study. Studies that, for example, look at quality of life in towns and cities without relating the findings to the position of the place within the overall urban area may still be found. Likewise, some coastal Studies still do not relate the candidates' findings to the

processes operating on the particular stretch of coast. These are unlikely to be able to attract high marks for application.

A pattern is now established of the vast majority of Studies being based on field study in urban areas, often to take advantage of the area local to the centre. This has been a strategy of many centres in the past because of its perceived relevance to the candidates and also the ability to revisit the area if more information is required than was capable of being collected on the day. It seems that the proportion falling into this category continues to grow and that this is in part being increasingly triggered by difficulties in getting the candidates out of school for field activities and in part by the justified concern of professional associations over the problems encountered by some teachers when a field excursion has gone wrong.

At the other end of the spectrum are those centres that are still able to take their students out of the local area and into a geographical context that is totally different from their usual experiences. While this has a possible negative effect of being assessed on geography with which the candidate is relatively unfamiliar, it has the distinct advantage of almost invariably increasing their interest levels. A significant proportion of these Studies are based on Key Ideas from one or other of the “physical” Specification Units but almost always the successful ones contain a significant “human” element. An increasing number of centres operate more than one Study, often because of difficulties in taking some candidates away from the home environment. While this is not a problem in principle, centres adopting this approach need to be mindful of the additional challenges this could present in terms of internal standardisation of the work.

The number of centres encouraging a traditional write up structure has reduced further during this cycle. These comprise introduction, methodology, data processing, data analysis and conclusions sections. A methodology section is definitely not a requirement of this Specification as candidates are expected to critically explore their own performance through their evaluation. Likewise there is strong evidence that the separation of data processing and analysis results in the processing of data to no apparent purpose and its lack of use to explore the hypothesis.

As last year, a worrying aspect concerns those centres where all of the candidates produce page after page of identical computer-generated graphs, many of which are not even described, let alone analysed, and for which there is no established relevance. Such work is not the purpose of the Study and its completion can only attract low marks for skills. The purpose of data processing is to aid exploration of the hypothesis and is not an end in itself.

In many cases such traditional structures have been replaced by a format that seems to more effectively encourage the candidates to maintain a tighter focus upon addressing the hypothesis in question. It also enables them to create work in which there is greater integration and use of processed data. Although almost all centres are now aware of the model it is repeated again in this report for the benefit of those who have not yet been exposed to it.

- Statement of hypothesis
- An introduction to the place and hypothesis
- two or three organising questions directly relating back to the hypothesis
- Conclusion
- Evaluation of the candidate’s own performance, often through the use of an evaluation table similar to the methodology tables used by some AS Specifications.

Although significant improvements continue to be made, the issue of time still exists. It is clearly stated in the Specification that the write up of this item should take 8 hours teaching time. If one is to add a further 4 hours *normal* homework there should be the realisation that a completed Study should be a much smaller piece of work than currently produced by many candidates. Centres are urged to concentrate on this aspect of the assessment and to endeavour to place much greater emphasis on geographical quality as opposed to mere quantity, with the additional benefit of taking some pressure off candidates who have quite substantial overall coursework

requirements. It also seems to be consuming much greater curriculum time than required with subsequent negative effects on coverage of other parts of the Specification.

Cross-Unit Task

Very few Cross-Unit Tasks now fail to, at least in part, deliver the assessment criterion of “application” and some further improvements have been made since the 2006 examination. To obtain the highest marks for “application” it is not sufficient for a candidate to merely rehearse the views of different groups followed by a statement of their own feelings on the issue. The mark scheme clearly states that they must also “explain *why* they (different groups of people) react in different ways to the issue”. It seems impossible for a task that is not issue-based to deliver this essential “viewpoints” element.

It should also be clear that all Cross-Unit Tasks must be firmly based on an issue that *synthesises* the human and physical worlds and should operate at a different scale to the Study. It is not sufficient, as with a handful of centres) merely to “bolt on” a section to meet either of these requirements.

Issues growing out of Key Ideas from the Climate, Environment and People and People, Work and Development Specification Units continue to be popular. These include rain forest destruction, global warming and the development of Antarctica. The number targeting Water, Landforms and People and a “human” Unit, for example, coastal management issues continues to increase. Others are located in the vicinity of the school looking at such issues as the development for housing of a local area and its potential effects on a distinctive ecosystem.

The Cross-Unit Task is presented by a variety of mainly appropriate vehicles that at best are designed to allow the candidates to demonstrate their geographical abilities through relatively short pieces of work. These items are capable of being completed within the 4 hours teaching time required by the Specification. The most popular vehicles in current use include the newspaper report and the combination of two leaflets and an associated commentary. When set up well they actively encourage the candidates to fully target all areas of the mark scheme.

There is, though, a danger with the former that candidate opportunity could be closed down if a strict paper allocation is adhered to and in the latter that the leaflets become little more than low skill “cut and paste” exercises that contain little geographical knowledge or understanding.

Although employed by few centres, when managed well the production of a notice board continues to be effective. As with newspaper reports, there is the danger of notice boards merely becoming cutting and pasting exercises and, if not managed sensibly, of their not allowing enough space for the candidates to present anything more than a superficial treatment of the issue.

The use of oral presentations has stabilised with similar numbers of centres examining in this way compared to the 2006 examination. Few centres that adopt this route to assessment return to a written item for their Cross-Unit Tasks.

The oral presentation offers a vehicle that is of great advantage to some candidates who find it difficult to demonstrate their full geographical abilities through the medium of writing. It is normal for the candidates to bring to the presentation a maximum of three pieces of illustrative material to accompany their talk and a prompt card containing a maximum of ten words or brief phrases. In an increasing number of centres, the candidates are choosing to use PowerPoint illustrations. As with other illustrations, these can work well if there is a small number but can ruin the presentation if there are too many or they are text heavy thus encouraging the candidates to merely read from them. One worrying aspect of the oral presentation in some centres is the lack of emphasis placed on the quality of selected and processed material used to illustrate the presentation.

There are also centres that do not appreciate the candidate-centred nature of an oral *presentation* and, unfortunately, adopt the teacher-centred approach of a question and answer session.

Centres are reminded that they must, each year, inform the WJEC of the date(s) of oral presentations at least six weeks in advance. It is possible that the WJEC will send someone to the centre to supervise the event.

There continues to be a minor issue concerning some centre's expectations of the electronic gadgetry a coursework moderator might own. Although some have access to PowerPoint this is not always the case and centres are requested to send hard copy of PowerPoint slides with their samples. Likewise, it is unrealistic to expect ownership of a digital camcorder and, if the presentations are taped using one, the centre should transfer the contents to a VHS tape for sending to the moderator. To balance these negative comments, it is worth noting that the use of a CD Rom or a memory stick for recording the presentations considerably helps moderators with the technology to access the work of individual candidates. On that note, it must be stressed again that moderators are each year considerably inconvenienced by some centres where the position of individual candidates on either video or audio tapes is not clearly enough indicated.

As with the Study, a model for the Cross-Unit Task has been shared with centres over the past few years. Whatever the geographical content or the vehicle, its four elements encourage the candidates to fully access the mark scheme:

- An introduction to the place and issue
- The views of groups/people on one side of the issue and why they hold these views
- The views of groups/people on the other side of the issue and why they hold these views
- The justified views of the candidate.

Administration

Most centres are now exemplary in their coursework administration; no mean feat when one considers the pressure we continue to operate under. There are still, though, centres that have not quite got it right.

“The story of a coursework package”, available on the Avery Hill web site, continues to guide the progress of the coursework through an entire cycle and centres are asked to follow its detailed timeline to reduce the possibility of error.

Almost all centres came to terms with the changed authentication requirements in place for the first time during this cycle. Centres are still required to sign the statement at the bottom of Form A3 but candidates are now also expected to complete an individual statement of authentication.

Finally, all centres should now be aware that, providing the centre, Coursework Moderator and Consultative Moderator are happy with the performance with of a coursework package, there will be no requirement to change its elements for the life of this Specification. It should go without saying that, if either element of the package appears to be disadvantaging the candidates or in any way falls outside Specification requirements, there will still be a requirement for change.

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography B (1987)

June 2007 Assessment Series

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	90	N/A	N/A	56	47	39	31	23
2	90	58	48	41	28	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	60	N/A	N/A	39	33	28	23	18
4	60	36	31	26	16	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	50	39	32	25	20	15	10	5

Specification Options

Foundation Tier

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	N/A	N/A	N/A	119	100	82	62	46
Percentage in Grade	200	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.3	30.3	19.7	10.5	4.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	200	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.3	63.6	83.3	93.8	98.2

The total entry for the examination was 18,117

Higher Tier

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	149	130	111	92	64	50	N/A	N/A
Percentage in Grade	200	10.5	23.6	32.3	23.9	9.1	0.5	N/A	N/A
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	200	10.5	34.1	66.4	90.3	99.4	99.9	N/A	N/A

The total entry for the examination was 20,630

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	5.7	12.8	17.5	28.2	18.8	9.3	4.8	2.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	5.7	18.5	36.0	64.2	83.0	92.3	97.1	99.1

The total entry for the examination was 38,841

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2007