

# **Geography B (Avery Hill)**

General Certificate of Secondary Education 1987

## **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2008**

**1987/MS/R/08**

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 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### General Certificate of Secondary Education

### Geography B (Avery Hill) (1987)

#### REPORT ON THE UNITS

| <b>Unit/Content</b>                  | <b>Page</b> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Chief Examiner's Report              | 1           |
| 1987/01 Paper 1 Foundation Tier      | 3           |
| 1987/02 Paper 2 Higher Tier          | 8           |
| Introductions: Papers Three and Four | 12          |
| 1987/03 Paper 3 Foundation           | 13          |
| 1987/04 Paper 4 Higher               | 16          |
| 1987/05 Coursework                   | 18          |
| Grade Thresholds                     | 23          |

# Chief Examiner's Report

## General Comments

### Entry

|                   | 2003         | 2004         | 2005         | 2006         | 2007         | 2008         |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>Foundation</i> | 22345        | 21631        | 20395        | 19122        | 18168        | 16263        |
| <i>Higher</i>     | 20330        | 19996        | 19788        | 20025        | 20673        | 21089        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      | <b>42675</b> | <b>41627</b> | <b>40183</b> | <b>39147</b> | <b>38841</b> | <b>37352</b> |

While Avery Hill continues to fair well, it is disappointing to note that our subject is still being squeezed out of the Post-14 curriculum in many centres. A drop of 5323 entry over the six year duration of this specification represents a loss of approximately 1 in 8 candidates. Perhaps the new specifications, introduced for first teaching in September 2009 will do something to redress the balance.

The table above also shows a continuation of the acceleration in the shift in entry towards the higher tier. This has another feature of the duration of this specification. As last year, this shift continues to be reflected in the increase in A\* to C grades from 63.4% in 2006 to 64.2% in 2007 and to 64.8% at this award.

The statistical evidence also suggests that the entry policy of centres is substantially appropriate with, as last year, just 0.1% of candidates entered by the higher tier route failing to gain an award. This does, though result in the failure of some candidates who would have almost certainly gained an award if entered through the foundation tier. Centres are reminded that the situation that existed in earlier years of the specification where candidates who narrowly failed to satisfy the grade 'D' standard were awarded grade 'E' no longer applies.

As in previous years, while forecast grades were a *little* ambitious at all grade boundaries, centres are to be congratulated on the overall accuracy of their predictions. The rise from last year in predicted grades has been shadowed by the actual award at all bar the lower grade boundaries.

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

1. The appeal to a small number of centres to train their candidates for the Paper 2 experience continues. The paper setters have worked very hard to reduce the time demands of this paper and candidates in most centres now find it wholly accessible in the permitted time. There is, though, still a situation in some centres where the message has not got through and where candidates are more than likely to produce extremely lengthy responses to low tariff questions, thus making completion of the paper difficult.
2. There continues to be issues across the examination concerning the apparent inability of candidates to take into the examination an understanding of key geographical terms. Not only are these tested directly but failure to respond correctly to a term like 'distribution' or 'rural' could result in loss of marks.
3. The situation regarding the rubric improves year on year. Very few candidates on either Paper 1 or 2 selected questions incorrectly and choice across the question pairs suggests greater reflection than was the case only a few years ago.

## *Report on the Units taken in June 2008*

4. While very few candidates on either tier fail to respond to the case study questions, the answers they provide often contain little or no specific information. Such 'anywhere' responses have been highlighted in previous reports. They attract very few marks and centres are urged to train their candidates in the retention and selection of information from a small range of appropriate case studies.
5. We reported last year that the introduction of a new matrix for Paper 4 had resulted in better attainment of candidates in that element of the final task but such improvements in identifying the relative sustainability of different options did not necessarily find their way into the reports. The situation has been somewhat different this year with a much greater proportion of candidates managing to interweave sustainability into their rationales.
6. This was not the case on Paper 3 where the division of the final task made matrix completion more difficult than previous years. Such division did, however, aid organisation and enabled the majority of candidates to access the letter with some conviction. As a result overall performance was on a par with last year but with a greater percentage attaining their marks through the letter as opposed to the matrix.

### **Administrative Matters**

Centres are advised of the following administrative matters:

1. While fewer candidates now fall foul of the rubric, there is still evidence that candidates in some centres do not read the front page of the question booklet carefully enough. On Papers 1 and 2 this results in failure to indicate on the front of the booklet the questions they have answered which is an obvious inconvenience to the examiners. It also still results in the sending of resource booklets from some centres to the examiners.
2. Most centres have now come to terms with the relatively new coursework documentation requirements. Some, however, do not complete the authentication sheet for each coursework item and consequently need to be contacted by the moderator for such material following receipt of the sample.
3. There are some experienced Avery Hill centres that still do not realise that coursework is entirely the responsibility of the WJEC. It is this organisation that must be contacted in all matters relating to this element of the examination.

# 1987/01 Paper 1 Foundation Tier

## General Comments

The paper proved to be accessible for the vast majority of Foundation candidates. As in 2007 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, and there appeared to be fewer who were disaffected. The paper seemed to differentiate well.

It was pleasing to see People, Work and Development questions (particularly C6) score as highly, if not more so, than questions on People and Place. However, it was noted that question A1 was answered by the vast majority of candidates, and more attempted questions B3 and C6. The level of knowledge and understanding of weather demonstrated in B3 was pleasing to see. Centres have obviously worked hard on this aspect of the Specification.

There is still a noticeable misunderstanding of key geographical terms like 'services', 'commuter', 'rural out-migration', 'climate', 'transpiration', 'ecosystem', and 'soil erosion'. Centres are encouraged to keep working at this particular aspect of the Specification.

Once again 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 continue to 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 popular with the majority of candidates, and was mainly answered well.

- (a) The circling of the correct answers in the passage was completed well by the candidates who had read the map closely. Few candidates had problems completing the sentences based upon the extract. In (iii) most candidates recognised 'close to work / shops' and 'good transport links'. A few made reference to being 'close to the River Danube' without stating why this was an advantage.
- (b) Candidates often selected two benefits from the passage, and explained these extremely well to obtain high marks. Part (ii) was a good discriminator. Many tried to lift answers from the passage and so lost out on two marks. Good answers came when they made reference to issues affecting the area during the redevelopment for example 'shops closed.....people lose jobs', 'displacement as they are building where old properties used to be'. Many answers were less defined such as 'noise' and 'overcrowding' with little explanation.
- (c) Overall there was clear understanding of environmentally friendly types of transport. Many gave 'cycling' and 'tram' but some gave 'bus' without appropriate qualification. In part (ii) some candidates repeated answers, often relating to 'reduces traffic' throughout. Where they gave three different explanations, such as 'safer – fewer accidents', 'reduces air pollution', 'relieves congestion', marks were high. There was a little overlap in part (iii) but many candidates gave reasonable explanations as to the benefits of Park and

Ride. Some answered 'reduces the stress of finding parking spaces'! Weaker candidates often did not qualify the term "pollution".

- (d) CASE STUDY** This was generally answered quite well, but often with generic answers based on such places as Sao Paulo, Rio, Nairobi and concentrating mainly on the shanty towns. To obtain high marks candidates needed to give more specific detail, and refer to different types of housing within the city. Description was much stronger than the explanation. Some candidates penalised themselves to L2=3 max because the example was inappropriate, for example choosing a country and not a city, or selecting a MEDC city.

## Question 2

This was a relatively unpopular question, but one that was answered reasonably well by more able candidates.

- (a)** Many candidates read the map well, and scored high marks. The compass direction aspect proved a weakness for some.
- (b)** The majority gained three marks in part (i). The most common incorrect answer was 'the planning applications....'. In part (ii) most could give two reasons, but few could explain their answers well enough. Most correct answers were about loss of countryside and damage to habitats. Part (iii) proved to be an effective discriminator. Most recognised increase in traffic, but few actually explained the issue resulting from this. Better answers realised that jams / queues lead to road rage, tension, delays, accidents etc. Weaker candidates described the effects on the village and not the motorway.
- (c)** The multiple choice question on the dormitory village helped more candidates to achieve a mark than if they had been asked to define it. Part (ii) proved a good differentiation question for grade 'C' candidates. Candidates attaining higher marks provided a clear definition, but many showed this as a gap in their knowledge. In part (iii) many candidates had a problem with the concept of services and this proved to be an effective discriminator. There were some vague hints at the general pressure of more people, but little explanation of effects on particular services. Good answers recognised that more people means more business therefore more profit, or shops get bigger so there is an increase in job opportunities. A few candidates referred to transport, schools and pubs. The brownfield site question proved quite challenging, and stretched their knowledge. Many referred to the fact that use of them will save countryside, or is cheaper. Explanation proved to be a problem and few candidates obtained three or four marks.
- (d) CASE STUDY** There were many inappropriate examples where candidates could not identify a specific rural area, and often merely named a particular country such as Mexico or Brazil. This meant that a maximum mark of L2=3 was achieved by otherwise strong candidates. Explanations of why migration happened were far better than the descriptions of the effects on the 'donor' area. Candidates were, though, able to describe the effects on the areas they moved to focusing on their 'shanty town' knowledge. Better answers were ones that knew actual areas around places like Mumbai or Sao Paulo. Centres are advised to be more place-specific in dealing with this issue to enhance the performance of their candidates.

## Section B

### Question 3

Overall this question was answered quite well.

- (a) Most candidates read the map well and a few got the compass direction wrong. Many selected polar continental air and recognised it was cold. Responses to the 'tick box' climate question were a little disappointing with a significant minority selecting 'day to day changes in weather'.
- (b) The table completion exercise was done well by the majority of candidates. Centres are to be congratulated on their candidates' improved performance in weather questions. Answers to part (ii) were rather hit and miss with only a small percentage gaining four marks. A number of candidates selected depression instead of anticyclone. This question was a good discriminator. In part (iii) many good answers recognised that there were clear skies. Others suggested it was too cold to rain therefore it snowed, or forgot the month was January and suggested it was not raining because it was summer!
- (c) Most candidates obtained one mark for 'very cold / below freezing'. More able candidates gave a good second answer such as 'lack of clouds allows heat to escape'. A few were convinced it had snowed. Part (ii) proved to be a good discriminator. Some merely repeated 'traffic accidents' from the question, thus attracting no marks. Good answers recognised such 'ways' as illness and travelling or heating issues and more able candidates provided effective explanations. Some candidates who had not recognised the weather event as an anticyclone referred to the effects of strong winds, heavy rain or snow. Part (iii) was answered well by many candidates. Weather warnings and road gritters were extremely popular, and there were references to government subsidies on heating for the elderly.
- (d) **CASE STUDY** Where candidates selected specific climate types, such as tropical (equatorial), desert, monsoon, or Mediterranean, responses were quite good. However, some candidates were confused regarding climate and ecosystem, so that description became a mixture of climate and vegetation. The British climate described in the main body of the question was repeated with no new information by some candidates who, therefore, only received a mark for QWC. There were too many inappropriate examples, and a number of candidates wrote 'rain', 'hot', 'wet', as the climate type. Others erroneously referred to weather events such as Hurricane Katrina or summer anticyclones, and could only achieve a maximum mark of L2=3. It is essential that centres prepare their candidates on specific climate types as clearly stated in the Specification.

### Question 4

This question was answered reasonably well.

- (a) Most candidates demonstrated good map reading skills but a significant number gave north as the first answer because they did not read the passage carefully. It was good to see many candidates recognising the ecosystem definition.
- (b) A surprising number thought that the hottest month was April, and had difficulty reading temperature and precipitation on the same graph. Most candidates answered part (ii) well. In part (iii) not many were able to describe the continuum, and often attempted to explain the changes rather than just giving a straightforward description. Many confused latitude with temperature, and a number said vegetation got smaller, a response which could not be credited. Fortunately, many candidates picked up a mark for the start or end point. Part (iv) was answered well, but many wrote evaporation instead of transpiration. This error has been mentioned in previous reports. In point (v) most



recognised that there would be more herbivores and that this would lead to fewer producers. Often they were unable to gain the third mark by looking at, or explaining consequences. Most described the chain reaction, but only in very simple terms.

- (c) Many candidates gained both marks in part (i) for recognising the simple reasons required. However, some lost marks by just choosing answers from the passage. In part (ii) good answers were those that recognised how the main issue was the loss / loosening / damage of top soil which then makes it easier to be washed or blown away. Most answers recognised damage to soil but failed to explain how this led to erosion. In part (iii) many answers referred to adding nutrients but few recognised that walls and hedges were controls of soil erosion. Poor answers may be typified by 'cutting branches is better than cutting down trees'.
- (d) **CASE STUDY** Excellent answers were often those that referred to small ecosystems the candidates had visited, for example. mud flats, sand dunes and nature reserves. However, the vast majority chose the Amazon Rainforest with the quality of response varying according to the ability of the candidate. Descriptions of the changes were mainly quite good, but explanations of the effects on people were weaker. Centres are advised to encourage their candidates to revise specific information to obtain the highest marks. Some candidates repeated the Savanna grasslands from the main body of the question usually providing no new information and thus only received a mark for QWC.

## Section C

### Question 5

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

- (a) There were some good responses from those who had the skill to plot a more detailed pie chart. The more able candidates spotted that it was easier to plot 'Other' and 'Ford' first as these were 20 and 15 per cent respectively. Small inaccuracies lost some candidates three marks. Most candidates answered part (ii) well. Sometimes '3' was given instead of the correct answer of '4' for the number of multi-national companies.
- (b) Part (i) was answered well by many candidates who read the map well and managed to work out the area of the factory. Part (ii) was an effective discriminator, and many candidates failed to understand the term 'economy'. The most common correct answers were 'creates jobs' and 'sell cars' to make money for the economy. Better candidates recognised the link of 'wages and tax' and 'company and taxes' to 'government'. In part (iii) there were some good answers, although occasionally 'pollution' was unqualified.
- (c) Most candidates scored one mark for 'better pay' in part (i), and many generalised that 'more jobs would be created', which is not true. As in previous years the concept of 'services' was misunderstood by many candidates in part (ii). There were some weak answers relating to how Fiat would benefit service stations on the motorway, and the effect on car dealerships. Part (iii) saw the more able candidates display good knowledge of why multi-national companies set up in LEDCs. Even the least able often referred to cheap labour. Some did suggest it would 'make the country better', 'put the country on the map'! Such responses missed the point of the question.
- (d) **CASE STUDY** Overall this was poorly answered and was the one Case Study which some candidates did not attempt. Most reasonable answers came from candidates who had chosen historical decline of, for example, the coal or steel industry. Location was weak with very few attempting sketch maps or being specific about location. Explanations were not clear, and often limited to 'raw materials ran out'. or 'competition from LEDCs'. Some candidates used the decline of Lucky Goldstar in Newport

successfully discussing how technical change from analogue to HD digital TV sets and the resulting unwillingness of this factory to retool had led to decline. There were few car companies discussed, which is surprising when MG Rover was highlighted in the 2007 examination, and Ford at Dagenham in a question on an earlier paper. Centres are reminded that using Case Studies from past papers can be beneficial to candidates.

### Question 6

Although the candidates had to study a number of resources this was a very accessible question. Candidates scored very well.

- (a) There were some very good pie chart completions, and performance on this was much more successful than on the one in C5. Most candidates gained one mark for recognising a difference in the employment structure, but few were able to explain why to show their true understanding. This failure has been highlighted in previous reports, and Centres need to work even harder at addressing it.
- (b) Some excellent skills and basic knowledge were shown in this question.
- (c) A scatter graph was used for the first time in many years, and overall was used well by the candidates. In (i) many gave '30' instead of '30,000' dollars but virtually all got '100 per cent'. In part (ii) the candidates responded well to the provision of four alternatives and mainly worked out the correct patterns. It is likely that they may have had difficulty if they had simply been asked to describe the patterns without support. However, they were also able to recognise the trends shown on the graph. Most candidates scored well on part (iii). The most common error related to the GDP where many put '24.5' or '27,000'. Inequality has always been an important 'Avery Hill' theme, and knowledge / understanding of such issues is extremely important. In part (iv), though, very few offered explanation in terms of inequality, cultural practice, etc. Answers were mainly confined to the role of women 'at home' or 'working in fields'. Many also struggled when they approached it from the standpoint of why males had a higher literacy rate. They often referred to men having to go to work and so needing to get an education.
- (d) In part (i) the majority of the candidates used their comprehension skills well, though some chose answers from the bullet points. In part (ii) many candidates scored two marks and were unable to go into detail with explanations. Most answers were for the 'fair wages' or 'better conditions' including 'days off', where many discussed buying food for the family, and being able to have a rest. Some candidates only repeated the given improvement. In part (iii) few had a real understanding of the correct response that is 'loans to fund small business'. Answers were confined to basic ideas such as improving homes, although a few did recognise improving health or education. A number of candidates put to 'buy food' which was not credited. Centres are advised to look at the various schemes to improve quality of life for both females and children in particular LEDCs.

**CASE STUDY** Despite advice in previous reports a large number of candidates chose 'Africa' or 'Asia' as *countries* that received Aid. Clearly more work is still required in many Centres on this aspect of the Case Study. Nevertheless, many candidates displayed a sound knowledge of the Aid received by the country, and why it was needed. They often used responses in recent disaster areas which have been in the news. For example, the Aid given to China following the earthquake, to Burma following the cyclone, to the U.S.A. following Hurricane Katrina, and that given to Thailand after the tsunami. Although much of it was superficial, the Case Studies were far better than any based on trade in previous examinations. Centres are advised to build upon these improvements by encouraging candidates to explore specific examples of Aid, NGO's and charities.

## 1987/02 Paper 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 comparable 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.

There was some evidence that a number of candidates had been entered for the wrong tier and would have been better served if they had been entered for Paper 1. Case studies for these candidates were often poor and they may have benefited from the greater amount of guidance that comes on the Foundation Tier.

The terms “dormitory village” and “weather systems” were clearly not understood by a number of candidates. Many candidates wrote about the village being used by tourists and few recognised that they were dealing with a high pressure system.

There was some improvement over previous years in relation to case studies, with many candidates achieving maximum marks. However the generic response, where candidates wrote about the “anywhere” case study again limited them to a maximum of credit at the top of Level 2. Candidates were generally poor at locating places using geographical terms. Some failed even to use compass bearings by quoting that places were left or right of a central point.

Candidates were, though, generally excellent at interpreting and describing graphs.

There were virtually no rubric errors though examiners are still inconvenienced by those centres that did not inform their candidates to indicate on the front page of the answer booklet the questions that they had answered. Centres are reminded that this must be done, even if external invigilators are being used.

### Comments on individual questions

#### Section A

##### Question A1

This was the most popular question on the Paper, completed by over 75% of candidates. The question was fairly competently handled by the candidates. Many were able to acquire marks quickly and easily from the early data response based questions.

- (a) Well answered by the overwhelming majority of candidates who could ascertain from the map the location of the apartments, however there were still too many using vague “close to” or “near” responses instead of accurate geographical location. Almost all of the candidates were able to state who the apartments were built for.
- (b) Many candidates looked at the long term problems and benefits that would exist if and when the planned changes come to fruition rather than looking at the consequences of applying the plan and the range of problems and benefits that would be caused in the shorter term.

- (c) Quite a number of candidates assumed that trams, trains and the underground would run on electricity but few recognised that the electricity would have to be generated somewhere. Pollution was often not qualified with reference to noise or air pollution.
- (d) **Case Study:** There were some excellent examples of housing provision and how that housing provision affected the lives of different groups of people. However, far too many candidates focused on just one element, “favelas”, and few could describe different types of housing. Nonetheless there were many generic examples, in particular when describing how the housing affected people’s lives; many candidates simply described the conditions in the squatter settlements, failing to mention specific groups of people. This limited the candidate to a maximum of L2 and was an example of a vague ‘could have been anywhere’ type of answer. Candidates need to write about specific people and areas within that housing provision.

### Question A2

This proved to be the least popular question on the paper but, conversely, the best marks were achieved on this question.

- (a) Candidates generally answered this question well but many wrote too much and this often resulted in timing issues later. A number of candidates failed to use the map to describe the location of Thorpe Hesley and some even confused west with east, thus penalising themselves.
- (b) Candidates were able to describe the effect of the development on the countryside but few could give qualified answers on the action group opposition to the plans. Some candidates misread the question on the motorway and answers focused on the village rather than the motorway as demanded.
- (c) Describing the term ‘dormitory villages’ caused many problems for candidates. Some lengthy response still attracted no marks. Some candidates stated that the increase in population would cause locals to lose their jobs rather than seeing the problems as those of pressure on resources or the benefits for the community. Brownfield sites seem to be well understood and many candidates were able to access four or five marks.
- (d) **Case Study:** Excellent case studies by a few candidates included describing the Caatinga in Brazil. Many candidates often described the countryside outside major cities and then went on to describe push and pull factors which affected migration. This was accepted but candidates must be prepared to name specific rural areas.

## Section B

### Question B3

- (a) Most candidates could identify either Aberdeen or Lerwick, although many just gave facts couched in terms of north and south, rather than identifying the pattern. Few had problems explaining the temperature patterns often using the stimulus material on the map. Almost all candidates could give a definition of climate.
- (b) Few candidates could name the correct weather system, but many were able to describe the conditions at Weather Station A. Few candidates could use the weather map to explain the conditions at A with many just repeating the symbol information. Likewise, not many were able to link the idea of the high pressure system isobars to the effects they had on the weather. Similarly, the question concerning differences between A and B was answered quite poorly.
- (c) Most candidates were able to give a reason why the roads were icy but answers tended to be overlong with many writing 16 or 17 lines for just one mark. Candidates gave good

answers for the possible effects on people, but many thought that the NHS would be brought to its knees, as a result of the high number of hospital admissions due to broken bones.

- (d) **Case Study:** A case study that demanded a climate type although some still went for a weather event like Hurricane Katrina or Europe's recent heat wave. Some candidates, misguidedly, tried to use an ecosystem. Dealing with the features of the climate proved to be problematic, with far too many generalised and simplistic comments rather than specifics which would clearly have shown their understanding of patterns. There were some excellent case studies of the Tundra and the Tropical Monsoon.

#### Question B4

- (a) Most candidates correctly identified the Savanna grasslands between the two tropics but few could give a detailed description of an ecosystem.
- (b) Weaker candidates misread the climate graph using the wrong scale and confusing temperature with rainfall. However, most candidates answered this question well but spent up to half a page in their description thus losing valuable time for just 1 mark. Many candidates achieved only two marks on the 'adaptations' question as a result of their failure to give detailed reasons for the adaptations. Most candidates were, though, able to explain well the changes in the food web.
- (c) There were many poor answers here, suggesting that soil erosion and its processes are not being understood by many candidates. Many answers seemed to equate soil erosion with the decline of soil fertility. There was little mention of exposed soil being prone to the action of the agents of erosion; wind or heavy rain. Many candidates just took the information from the text box and tried to explain that drought could be reduced by watering the soil.
- (d) **Case Study:** Quite a few candidates chose to write everything they knew about the rainforest without reference to the questions. Some answered very superficially with little other than the loss of trees and few effects on people. The better case studies were, as in previous years, written about coral reefs and the effect of changes to the lives of local people.

#### Section C

#### Question C5

- (a) Many candidates were able to recognise that Fiat produced 18% of cars. While many were able to give a good definition of a multi-national company few candidates could explain why South America is dominated by MNCs, other than by quoting cheap labour.
- (b) Many candidates could not describe the location and size of the Fiat factory using appropriate terms like 'close to motorway' or 'near Betim'. Several candidates answered this question from the point of view of the MNC, in other words, how Fiat benefited from the Brazil economy rather than how the local economy benefited from Fiat. There was little explanation of the multiplier effect. Almost all candidates could, though, explain the damage to the local environment.
- (c) Candidates seemed to find this section difficult. There was much repetition of the idea that Fiat exploited Brazil and Betim but little further expansion. Many just lifted quotes from the statements but did not explain the possible social and economic problems that could arise if Fiat suddenly pulled out of Brazil.
- (d) **Case Study:** Overall this case study was not answered well. There were some very limited answers using coal mining/ steel production in South Wales even referring to the

**Industrial Revolution.** Candidates would have benefited from using a local example of an industry that has declined, for example the decline of High Street shopping or of a secondary industry in the area where they lived.

**Question C6**

- (a) Many candidates were able to interpret the pie charts but often failed to compare the two countries. Most understood the term 'life expectancy' but often did not express themselves well. Quality of Life is still being used as a catch all phrase by some candidates.
- (b) Almost all candidates could explain what is meant by adult literacy but there were a few strange variations in terms of English literacy such as "Weather a person can read or wright" A number of candidates achieved some marks but few could explain the relationship between adult literacy and GDP, most simply stating there was a positive correlation. Most candidates could give two reasons for the Adult Literacy Rate for males and females but often did not express it very well.
- (c) Selection from the stimulus information allowed most candidates to explain how two improvements for women could be made but few could explain ways that organisations could improve the lives of the low paid women workers in Bangladesh.
- (d) **Case Study:** There were some very good case studies completed by the candidates including references to multi-lateral, bi-lateral and tied aid. These were often well exemplified through reference to Burma, China and Thailand. However, a few candidates just quoted 'aid to Africa' and went on to write rather simplistic and generic accounts which could have applied to anywhere and which, consequently, limited the candidates to a mark at the top of Level 2.

## **Introductions: Papers Three and Four**

### **General Comments**

The 2008 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 sixth cycle, the examinations appeared to hold few surprises for them.

As in previous years, the two examinations introduced the candidates to the geography of a place where a particular problem needs to be solved. For the 2008 examination the paper was based on the 'Water, Landforms and People' specification unit and the place was Scarborough, a resort on the coast of North Yorkshire. The areas of North Sands and the promontory of Marine Drive have been the subject of recent coastal defence work in the form of hard engineering and the candidates are asked to consider future management of other parts of the resort's coastline.

The papers afforded the opportunity to test both traditional knowledge based geography and more modern aspects of understanding and sustainability.

Being an issue concerning management in a More Economically Developed Country, this set of papers provided a clear contrast with the previous 'Water, Landforms and People' papers set under this specification which had explored the concept of river management in the form of the creation of a dam at Bujagali in Uganda, a Less Economically Developed Country.

While this year the problem-solving papers targeted Water, Landforms and People, centres are reminded that these papers rotate around the Units and that the Unit carrying them in 2009 will be 'People, Work and Development'.

## 1987/03 Paper 3 Foundation

### General Comments

In most respects this paper preformed well. Many candidates were able to demonstrate at least some understanding of coastal process and the prioritisation required to select an area for protection. Much of the paper was based on information from an Ordnance Survey excerpt. Exposure to such a resource has proven problematic at this level in previous examinations. Candidates seemed to relate to the map with a great deal more success than may have been anticipated.

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

### Part A

While some questions proved quite challenging, overall candidate performance on this Part was impressive.

(a) Most candidates were capable of recognising the two features at points 1 and 2 on the sketch map and of labelling the A165 road. Few, though, read the question relating to the South Cliff Golf Course carefully enough with many merely copying the symbol at the location shown on the OS map. Others were incapable of using the current symbol and a significant minority actually drew the symbol at the intersection point 0586. Most recognised the Holbeck Hall Hotel as being at point Z on the map. Those who broke the rubric and actually circled 'Z' on them map *did* gain credit.

(b) Responses were mainly convincing although east and west were confused too frequently.

(c) Most candidates recognised two differences between the two photographs but, as when similar questions demanding description have been previously asked, a small minority resorted to 'emotive' or predictive' responses. This didn't usually disadvantage them when tackling the next task where many were capable of fully explaining two valid effects of the changes on people, even if many 'explanations' were quoted under 'effects' and vice versa. Those who couldn't often restated the effect in their attempt at explanation.

(d) Responses to this question were extremely disappointing and demonstrated that few candidates entered by this tier go into the examination room armed with an understanding of the basic terminology. Many inaccurate, but close, responses gave examples rather than a definition or defined it as the material as opposed to the process.

(e) Many candidates found this question difficult although those who performed well on the paper as a whole were usually those who managed to attract full marks here. Many of those who did not do so either incorrectly applied one of the two 'given' statements and then created their own 'similar' statement for the correct box or applied the two 'given' statements correctly and were incapable of completing the final box.

### Part B

This Part provided some very effective responses at its beginning but with a very mixed situation in its middle.

(a) Most candidates were capable of demonstrating a clear understanding of the process of longshore drift by circling the correct responses in the passage. Many were also capable of attracting one mark when asked to explain how a build up of sand may help protect the coast from erosion. The second mark, though, proved quite elusive with the demonstration of an inability to get further than describing the sand as a barrier or similar. Responses to parts (iii) and (iv) were also rather patchy with many statements being made that could have applied to



any protection method. However, there were pleasing 'lack of protection elsewhere' and 'appearance' answers to (iii) and 'cost' and 'greater beach/tourism' responses to (iv).

(b) A surprisingly large minority of candidates were unable to name the two protection methods, again demonstrating a disappointing lack of 'unit' knowledge from this cohort. While many were capable of referring specifically to the advantages of two protection methods and to specific gains from these particular methods in (ii) there were many that were again too vague or 'all protection method' advantages to gain credit. In (iii) responses to the effects of these methods on tourism usually gained some credit although many candidates got no further than describing an effect on 'tourists' rather than 'tourism'.

(c) This proved to be a good discriminator and, perhaps, most benefited those candidates who had been given the opportunity to *explore* aspects of 'values geography' as envisaged by this Specification. In (i) clear links were often made between the proximity of the gardens to the cliff top, through the danger of collapse and destruction to the direct effects on the gardeners and their activities. Likewise, in (ii) some candidates clearly understood the effects of distance decay inland with reference to the likelihood of being affected, the demands for natural scenery from some tourists, for natural process from naturalist and the negative effects of protection of one point on the coast on geomorphological process at another. Unfortunately, there were also many vague 'local people' responses and references to places as opposed to the people being demanded by the question.

### Part C

This Part proved to be an effective discriminator.

(a) In terms of table completion for the nature of the shore, responses often showed map reading ability as opposed to understanding. For example, the term 'outcrop' appeared as frequently as 'rock' and names were frequently given, for example 'Black Rock'. Some candidate found 'land use next to the shore' quite challenging and often strayed too far inland with their responses.

(b) Although only the better candidates made clear links between the general concepts related to the proximity of a 'zone' to built up areas, the town centre or to the tourist activities based on Zone A, others gained credit for stating places where employment opportunities might be found.

(c) Similar comments apply here as to the previous question. Candidates found it harder to gain full credit here though, presumably due to the fact that it is more difficult to express reasons for a lack of activity. That does not, however, excuse responses that claimed that there was 'nothing there'. At the other end of the spectrum, some candidates gave impressive accounts that took on board a lack of formal tourist activities, the distance of Zone C from the centre of Scarborough or the nature of rural employment.

(d) The final, problem-solving task proved to be a more effective a discriminator than in previous examinations.

Certainly, the matrix had less impact than had previously been the case. This might perhaps be explained by the nature of this year's task in which the candidates were asked to state both which zone to protect and to offer a means of protection. This did not lend itself quite so well to matrix completion in that many only filled it in for the zone that they had decided to protect. This, unfortunately, followed through to the letter where explanations for not choosing zones were mainly either absent or inept.

It was this inability that proved to be a major stumbling block for otherwise sound candidates in their attempts to score in the highest level. It is fair to say that the reduction in hurdles to reach Level 3 did not result in as great a number of candidates actually getting there as anticipated. The other reason for the relatively lower impact of the matrix was the decision made to reward Level 1 responses up to a maximum of only two marks. This gave a much better spread of marks than had previously been the case.

## *Report on the Units taken in June 2008*

Candidates at the upper end of the mark range *did* clearly justify their chosen zone and demonstrated an impressive understanding of coastal process and protection in their choice of method. While Zones A and B were relatively easy to justify, few candidates scored highly if they chose Zone C.

Where a definite choice of protection method was made the candidates usually clearly justified their choice in relation to the needs of their chosen zone, choosing, for example, groynes and beach replenishment related to the tourist functions of Zone A or hard engineering as a response to the cliff slumping of Zone B. Less impressive were those candidates who provided a tour of different methods without clearly expressing a preference.

Although some candidates now do so there are still some who think in terms of the shorter and longer term, and draw from the experience of case studies explored in the classroom or beyond and who relate their measures to the development of a sustainable future.

As in most previous years, while the problem-solving task was a positive experience for most candidates, it is clear that in a minority of centres there is still little preparation for it. Candidates from these centres continue to be severely disadvantaged.

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 Paper 4 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 with tiering continues with few candidates failing to achieve a grade on this paper. The very best centres continue to fully prepare their candidates to respond appropriately to the rubric of the questions, so developing an understanding of how to earn all the marks available. A minority of candidates limited their achievement by not having basic geographical skills.

A majority of candidates had a good knowledge of the processes affecting coastal management and the consequences of it. A significant number had only a very superficial understanding of sustainability and of how to locate somewhere on a map. Some candidates did not understand the concept of groups of people, an Avery Hill standard over the years, and so struggled to engage with the paper at times.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Part A

- (a) While many candidates were able to label simple elements of the map a majority were unable to correctly locate the hotel using a six figure grid reference.
- (b) Part (i) was well answered by candidates but many ignored the instruction to explain the likely effect on different groups of people.
- (c) This question was a little bit of a departure from the usual and candidates scored well. What the very best candidates were able to do was use precise terminology rather than a blunderbuss approach of writing a description of every possible process. The weakest candidates failed to appreciate the difference between process and feature.
- (d) Candidates scored well on this question and were able to make a connection between the question and the number of marks available.

#### Part B

- (a) It was surprising how many candidates struggled to score well on such a tried and tested topic as longshore drift. A minority were able to deduce the direction of longshore drift and only slightly more were able to describe the process in any meaningful detail. The opportunity to use a diagram was taken by many and the very best centres' candidates were to earn most of the marks with very little writing. Very many candidates did not know how groynes worked, often confusing the barrier with the beach. Many wrote about the groynes absorbing the wave's energy and did not know the significance of the beach that they maintain.
- (b) This section was answered well and most candidates scored well.
- (c) It is clear that some of our candidates understand the concept of managed retreat but that the advantages appear to have been undervalued in their lessons. This, coupled with poor map skills, meant that many candidates were unable to score at all in part (ii). The very best candidates appreciated the variety of scales that their answers could be at.

**Part C**

- (a) While some students were able to calculate the length of *Zone C* from the map (although one candidate entered 37,000 km!) many were unable to adequately describe a land use. Some candidates appeared to be confused by the symbols while others did not seem to understand the term.
- (b) The very best centres had obviously taught their candidates a comprehensive definition that they were able to adapt to fit the question. Weaker candidates did not include the appreciation of the future and the weakest did not understand the fundamental concept of sustainability.
- (c) It was symptomatic of the performance of a sizeable number of students that they did not follow the emboldened instruction to “use map evidence” when completing this task. As such they limited their score. The best candidates understood that such a weighted question would require more than a recap of everything they had been given by the paper.
- (d) The extended matrix now allows candidates to access up to half the possible marks and this helped a good number of candidates to get a higher mark than their report alone merited. Its desired outcomes; more extended reasoning, greater focus on the key components of the task, improved structure in the report were also largely met. Some centres appear to still coach their candidates to ignore the matrix. The subsequent responses were characterised by poor reports which, taken in context with the rest of the candidates’ answers, often represented underachievement. Ironically, several examiners identified a small minority of able candidates who had spent too long on the matrix to the detriment of their final score.

The weakest reports added little that had not been already covered by the questions or indeed the resources. However, the very best reports were able to evaluate and analyse the options and bring in other ideas from their studies. They also responded to the emboldened text appropriately. The standard of reports is definitely continuing to rise, although many candidates would benefit from a deeper understanding of sustainability. Too often they let themselves down by not dealing with what is a complex issue in a mature and intelligent way.

Few candidates appeared to have time problems and almost all attempted the report. Most of the comments in last year’s report seem to have been taken on board, particularly the advice to avoid regurgitation. The Resource Booklet’s role as stimulus material rather than answer booklet had been made more obvious in an attempt to stop this. Consequently, the examination differentiated well with a good number of candidates able to score fifty or more marks out of the 60 available.

## 1987/05 Coursework

### General Comments

As reported last year, almost all centres now operate 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.

The number of centres using inappropriate coursework has now stabilised as a very small percentage of the total. Within these centres, though, the students continue to be severely disadvantaged. The use of inappropriate items almost invariably results 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. Despite the short time left for this particular Specification and the move towards a future of 'Controlled Assessment', 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. If unknown to them, 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 do not follow this model invariably create problems for the candidates resulting in their Studies being incapable of fully accessing the mark scheme.

As reported previously, 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. By far the majority of centres are now capable of meeting both the letter and spirit of the Specification in relation to this requirement.

Most of the very small minority of centres where this is not the case 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, 'service' or 'housing' Studies have managed to relate the findings to position within an urban or rural area and the dynamics of change. 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.

There are still a few centres where consideration has yet to be given to this aspect of the Study. Here 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 shopping without considering such principles as hierarchy and spheres of influence 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.

From the early years of the Specification a pattern was 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. This trend has been galvanised partly by difficulties experienced by some departments 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 an incident has occurred on a field excursion.

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.

In a sizeable proportion of centres there has been a move away from the use of a traditional write up structure for this item. 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 processing of data to no apparent purpose and its lack of use to explore the hypothesis.

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.

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. Fortunately, this message appears to be getting through and there appear to be fewer centres where this is happening.

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 further improvements continue to be made year on year. 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, although these are still inflicted on some candidates.

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. Very few centres now merely 'bolt on' a section to meet one or other 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. A small, though stable, number of centres target "Water, Landforms and People" and a "human" Unit. Such items include coastal management and flood plain issues. Others items 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.

Although relevant to all aspects of the coursework assessment, the issue of plagiarism and the use of "uncredited" information from the Internet, in particular, must be mentioned at this point. For both coursework items, both candidate and teacher must confirm that the work is indeed that of each candidate. In a small minority of cases this is, demonstrably, not the case and some candidates are passing off the work of others as their own. Examples related to the Cross-Unit Task include the direct copying of information from educational web sites exploring the exploitation of, for example, Antarctica or various rain forest areas. These are clear instances of plagiarism and, as such, carry the risk of quite severe penalty from the awarding groups.

The use of oral presentations has stabilised with similar numbers of centres examining in this way compared to the past few examining cycles. 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. These invariably result in relative under-achievement.

Centres following the oral route to assessment 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 centres' expectations of the electronic gadgetry a coursework moderator might own. Although some have access to a Powerpoint reader 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 adopted by an increasing number of 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. Pressures on teachers are certainly not inconsiderable and, in the main, teachers are to be congratulated on their efforts in this respect. 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.

The changed, and more detailed, authentication requirements were in their second cycle for this examination and most centres complied 'to the letter' with its completion. However, it was necessary for Coursework Moderators to contact the few centres where this important aspect of documentation had been ignored to insist on the correct completion of the forms.



*Report on the Units taken in June 2008*

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 final two cycles that form 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.

# Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education  
Geography B (Specification Code 1987)  
June 2008 Examination Series

## Component Threshold Marks

| Component | Max Mark | A*  | A   | B  | C  | D   | E   | F   | G |
|-----------|----------|-----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 1         | 90       | N/A | N/A | 58 | 49 | 40  | 32  | 24  |   |
| 2         | 90       | 56  | 48  | 40 | 27 | N/A | N/A | N/A |   |
| 3         | 60       | N/A | N/A | 38 | 32 | 26  | 21  | 16  |   |
| 4         | 60       | 42  | 37  | 32 | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A |   |
| 5         | 50       | 39  | 32  | 26 | 21 | 16  | 11  | 6   |   |

## Specification Options

### Foundation Tier

|                                | Max Mark | A*  | A   | B   | C    | D    | E    | F    | G    |
|--------------------------------|----------|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| Overall Threshold Marks        | 200      | N/A | N/A | N/A | 120  | 101  | 82   | 64   | 46   |
| Percentage in Grade            | 200      | N/A | N/A | N/A | 34.1 | 30.1 | 19.9 | 10.0 | 4.4  |
| Cumulative Percentage in Grade | 200      | N/A | N/A | N/A | 34.1 | 64.2 | 84.1 | 94.1 | 98.5 |

The total entry for the examination was 16,261

### Higher Tier

|                                | Max Mark | A*   | A    | B    | C    | D    | E    | F   | G   |
|--------------------------------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Overall Threshold Marks        | 200      | 151  | 133  | 115  | 98   | 68   | 53   | N/A | N/A |
| Percentage in Grade            | 200      | 11.0 | 23.5 | 31.7 | 22.3 | 10.9 | 0.5  | N/A | N/A |
| Cumulative Percentage in Grade | 200      | 11.0 | 34.5 | 66.2 | 88.5 | 99.4 | 99.9 | N/A | N/A |

The total entry for the examination was 21,086

### Overall

|                                | A*  | A    | B    | C    | D    | E    | F    | G    |
|--------------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Percentage in Grade            | 6.2 | 13.3 | 17.8 | 27.5 | 19.2 | 9.0  | 4.3  | 2.0  |
| Cumulative Percentage in Grade | 6.2 | 19.5 | 37.3 | 64.8 | 84.0 | 93.0 | 97.3 | 99.3 |

The total entry for the examination was 37,352

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2008

