

Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
Geography (4GE0) Paper 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2016

Publications Code 4GEO_01_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

General comments

This was the third of five 3 hour/180 mark IGCSE papers to be set between 2014 and 2018. As might be expected for a paper with an identical format to that of 2014 and 2015, candidates were well prepared for both the rubric and the style of question. It was very clear that candidates knew exactly which question to opt for within a section on the basis of the teaching they had received. The most popular questions in Section A were 1 and 3, within Section B 4 and 6, within Section C 7 and 10 and within Section D 11. Significantly unpopular questions were 5, 9 and 13. Overall the best answered questions were 3 and 12.

This 2016 examination bears some resemblance to that in 2014 with a similarly sized entry and similar mean mark. The 5+ mark drop in the mean this year was not reflected in the cumulative percentages of grades awarded to candidates which are remarkably similar to 2015. Four comments are made in relation to this lower mean:

- A number of the 9-mark discuss items proved a particular challenge as shown by their mean marks, especially 2d, 5d and 6d(*). This may be due to their geographical content but in line with all discuss items candidates need to be fully aware that discuss implies some form of evaluation. These items also sometimes call on the use rather than mere recall of case study knowledge.
- The bi definitions tended to be a little less well done than in the past e.g. 2bi; 4bi; 5bi; 12bi; 13bi. Vagueness and straying into causes and consequences rather than sticking to pure meaning was more common this year.
- Certain areas of fieldwork investigation wanted e.g. graphing (7/8biii; 9/10bi); statistical methods (9/10bii); secondary data sources (7/8aiii).
- Students must read the precise wording of questions. It was felt that this examination more than many previous ones saw candidates answering the question that they wanted it to be instead of what was actually set.

It was interesting to observe that many candidates still hold stereotypical images of HICs and LICs which detract from the quality of their geographical thinking. Nevertheless, the examination was a positive experience for most candidates who were able to demonstrate many of their skills and values and much of their knowledge and understanding.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1ai

This opening item proved far less accessible than expected with only about half of the candidature scoring the mark. Significant numbers were insufficiently familiar with the meaning of the term, lag time. Some offered a reading in cumecs while others appreciated the answer was in hours but started their calculation at rainfall onset before peak discharge was reached.

Question 1aii

There was again some confusion over the meaning of lag time but most candidates managed to score at least 1 mark and the item generally performed better in terms of candidate scores than (a)(i) and in line with expectations. The concept of peak discharge was fairly widely known.

Question 1aiii

Some candidates failed to appreciate that only the dam would even out natural flow.

Question 1bi

This definition task worked well as an assessment item by providing both access to the marks and allowing candidates to differentiate their ability. A reasonable proportion of candidates managed to answer with discharge exceeding channel capacity or its equivalent for the full 2 marks. Most of the remaining candidates scored 1 mark for referring to the idea of overflow or overtopping the banks.

Question 1bii

In general this item was well answered with very many candidates scoring either 3 or 4 marks. The majority of candidates offered two valid causal factors with the better responses developing both factors so as to outline how it actually caused the river to flood.

Question 1c

There were really good answers to this item with a significant number of full mark responses. The item proved to be an effective differentiator with weaker candidates identifying relevant landforms but failing to deliver explanation and a range of Level 2 responses in which the response focused on only one landform and its formation. The best answers explained key erosional processes and their role in the formation of waterfalls, v-shaped valleys and interlocking spurs often with the aid of annotated diagrams. Differentiation came through the range of landforms and the depth in which erosion was treated.

Question 1d

There were various approaches taken by candidates in their responses to this item. Some focused on rising demand, some on water management, some on case study material. The better answers addressed how water is managed in terms of quantity and/or quality considerations. These answers developed and evaluated ways of achieving sufficient supply by using case study knowledge, often from the UK, Spain, Cyprus or China. Lower scoring responses tended to stray from the crux of the question and devote attention to causes of rising demand, why water needed to be

managed or offer irrelevant material from potentially relevant case studies e.g. The Three Gorges Dam.

Question 2ai

The vast majority of candidates scored the 1 mark with most of the remaining candidates not distinguishing between rock armour and sea wall and specifying hard engineering only.

Question 2aii

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 2aiii

Nearly all candidates recognised that hard engineering was costlier than soft engineering for 1 mark. However, the responses to environmental impact were more variable in outcome. Many stated that hard engineering had a greater environmental impact and gained credit but some confused environmental impact e.g. scenic change with defence effectiveness. Generally, a relatively high scoring item.

Question 2bi

Many were not able to define this specification term well. There was frequent repetition of the words, natural and system in the responses though most did seem to recognise that natural meant not being man-made/no human interference for 1 mark. Obtaining the second mark by at least clarifying that system referred to physical processes proved a challenge for around half of the candidates. The best answers referred to inputs and outputs or systems as a cycle.

Question 2bii

This item tended to score positively and generate a good range of processes. Most candidates focussed on different methods of erosion, longshore drift and transportation. Some unfortunately, commented on human rather than physical processes. Most of the answers not scoring 3 or 4 marks failed to indicate how their named processes impacted on the coastline.

Question 2c

Candidates generally had good knowledge of this topic with coral reefs being a popular choice of ecosystem though other responses focused on such as sand dunes and mangroves. The responses tended to be better when material related to a range of threats from a named case study was used e.g. the St Lucian coral reefs; the Great Barrier Reef. The problems brought by tourism was a frequent thrust in the answers. Some quite successfully sought to answer from the standpoint of ecosystem management.

Question 2d

A significant number of candidates failed to fully appreciate the concept of sea level change with levels rising and falling over time and having major coastal impact. The responses were often disappointing and there were too many references to coastal defences, flooding, human impacts, increased erosion and ecosystem impact. Too few responses focused on the landforms created along submergent and emergent coastlines. This was the correct focus of the question and where responses dealt in detail with landforms created by eustatic and isostatic change Level 3 marks were

awarded. There were many Level 2 responses where candidates mentioned submergent and emergent coastlines in broad terms or where this thrust of the question was not picked up and candidates wrote with some development about impacts such as flooding and retreat.

Question 3ai

The overwhelming majority of candidates correctly identified the eye of the hurricane as the area of lowest pressure.

Question 3aii

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 3aiii

Very many candidates scored 1 mark for their response to the visibility-pressure relationship as per the diagram provided but that between rainfall/wind speed and pressure was of greater challenge. A significant proportion of candidates failed to either accurately describe the broad changes across the system or to indicate how the simple relationship they pointed out related to either "in the eye" or "outside the eye." This restricted the numbers gaining maximum marks.

Question 3bi

This definition was generally well answered with most candidates recognising that earthquakes involved vibrations/shaking of the ground surface because of movements/tensions in the earth's crust beneath the surface. There were many of these full mark answers and most of the remaining candidature gained the initial mark as per the mark scheme. Some answers were far more detailed than was necessary with some development of plate tectonics. Equally, the weakest answers failed to address an actual definition and instead wrote about earthquake damage and earthquakes as natural hazards.

Question 3bii

This item was successfully answered with its mean mark being over 3. A large number of candidates were able to link two distinctive ways to the question asked about how they mitigated damage. There was good detail offered on building alteration and design, and early warning systems, evacuation and education. Prediction and re-location responses were often controversial as they generally lacked practicality.

Question 3c

A good discriminator of an item with Level 2 marks being the mean. Level 3 responses often included diagrams and actually explained how constructive and destructive plate boundaries formed volcanoes. References to hot spots as a cause were also found in these better answers. The many Level 2 responses tended to either deal only with one boundary type or failed to develop the processes that lead to the formation of volcanoes at both boundary types. Some of the weakest answers wrote about the effects of volcanoes rather than how they are formed.

Question 3d

This item tested a key idea and case study identified in the specification and as such proved to be the highest scoring 9-mark finale item on the paper. Many candidates achieve higher Level 2 and Level 3 marks. These better answers did understand the

idea of using case study material to back up points, of linking economic development to the range of impacts that occur, of contrasting and of not losing sight of the command word by giving a conclusion and some discussion. Most candidates did have an understanding of why there is a difference between HIC and LIC impacts. Many knew their tropical storm case study well, often hurricanes Katrina and Mitch, cyclone Nargis or typhoon Haiyan but did not always reach Level 3 because their responses were too descriptive and lacked any sense of conclusion and discussion.

Question 4ai

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 4aii

This item generally provided a positive opening for the candidates with most identifying two or three different benefits of rural/urban locations for high-tech industries. Frequently given benefits related to road access, attractive working environment, cheaper land, parking space and room for expansion.

Question 4bi

The two de-industrialisation items in (b) were not answered in great detail. The mean mark for this opening definition item was below 1; disappointing for a straightforward give-the-meaning question. It was a relatively small minority of candidates that offered a full definition for 2 marks. A reasonable proportion did identify one creditable point for 1 mark e.g. factories closing; decline in manufacturing; sector shift from secondary to tertiary. Responses were often in need of development with double-point responses relatively rare.

Question 4bii

A mean mark of below 2 indicates how candidates did not understand the term, this item was poorly answered. Some candidates were relatively unfamiliar with the meaning of de-industrialisation, some failed to come up with two distinctive and developed reasons and some wrote about effects rather than causes. Sadly, there were too few high-scoring answers containing two valid reasons developed into explanation. The best answers focused on de-industrialisation in an HIC urban setting, gave two well-developed causes and used good geographical vocabulary e.g. global shift in manufacturing with HICs importing from LICs; economic sector shift and the need for more services.

Question 4c

Overall candidates performed well with a pleasing degree of differentiation. Most were able to describe the difference in economic sector make-up between HICs and LICs, often with the help of employment percentages sometimes in each of the four sectors. The strongest responses quoted specific case study numbers for say, UK and Ethiopia and followed the command word into explaining why, with the aid of actual examples, these show contrasts in sector size. The most coherent and well-developed of these responses used the Clarke-Fisher model and factors such as TNCs and secondary sector in LICs to explain why these contrasts occur. The weakest candidates often did not name a HIC/LIC but could comment on the relative importance of the key sector in each type of country with occasional explanatory references e.g. farming and LIC primary sector.

Question 4d

This item proved to be accessible allowing candidates generally to have a fair attempt at the topic. A mean mark towards the top of Level 2 bears witness to this with a majority of candidates reaching Level 2 for fairly generic responses light on judgement and conclusion. There were many Level 3 responses with a significant number of candidates perceiving this as a topic lending itself to genuine discussion, judgement and conclusion. Candidates adopted three different approaches to answering this item, all creditable:

1. Argue the merits of both renewables and non-renewables.
2. Argue for renewables and against non-renewables.
3. Argue for renewables and raise the positives and negatives of non-renewables.

The middle approach was common but which ever was adopted, candidates were able to refer to types of renewable/non-renewable source and offer valid merits and de-merits from longevity of supply to efficiency considerations to environmental impacts to climate change mitigation. The key discriminator in this well answered item on a well understood topic was the quality of discussion and whether matters were fully argued, weighed against each other and a conclusion reached.

Question 5ai

Most candidates picked up on the shuttered up/abandoned property or the deserted road to score 1 mark. Those failing to gain the mark did so on the grounds of imprecision e.g. old buildings.

Question 5aii

Surprisingly underperformed. Rural depopulation is a specification term.

Question 5aiii

This item proved rather challenging for a part (a) item with a mean mark of less than 1. Few candidates scored maximum marks. The focus of the question i.e. farming changes provided the challenge. A significant number of candidates scored 1 mark for referring to labour-saving mechanisation but stumbled with a second farming change. There were many irrelevant suggestions e.g. reduced soil fertility; climate change.

Question 5bi

This definition item was generally well answered with many candidates appreciating the idea that national parks are areas reserved to protect the environment from "overdevelopment" and gaining an initial mark. Two-mark answers where some sensible answer development was required e.g. valuable scenery; recreation for urban dwellers were less frequent.

Question 5bii

Whilst many candidates were familiar with the concept of a national park, they were less strong on understanding the full reasons for their inception. Relevant factors behind their establishment were often stated e.g. conservation; tourism but too few showed the ability to develop an outline explanation as to why this warranted parks being set up. This lack of valid answer development depressed the marks awarded. There obviously were the strong answers which offered two well-developed valid reasons and scored maximum marks e.g. conserve rare species from poaching/illegal

hunting to protect biodiversity; tourism benefits local economy through increased spending and employment of local people.

Question 5c

This was a relatively low-scoring (c) item (6 marks) with Level 2 being the ceiling for the vast majority of candidates. Many candidates focused their answer around the basic classification of farming into arable, pastoral and mixed and produced generic and rather simplistic accounts of their associated landscape and climate e.g. sheep farming in hill country. Detailed explanatory links between a distinctive rural environment and farming type and method was relatively rare. Descriptive material dominated explanatory, case study knowledge was not very present and the influence of socio-economic influences was largely overlooked. The intensive-extensive and commercial-subsistence classifications of farming were given little attention but the basic problem was that the reasons why farming types are where they are only got full explanation in a small number of the very best answers.

Question 5d

Many Level 2 answers were given to this item with most candidates addressing as intended solutions rather than causes. Overwhelmingly, candidates answered in terms of farming strategies, often describing well various measures to increase food production e.g. Green Revolution/HYVs; GM crops; irrigation from an LIC standpoint. Better answers adopted the broader approach of farming techniques as well as population/birth control to ease the shortage and food distribution and security (e.g. better storage; food aid). Some of these better answers were also able to develop aid and trade agreement ideas e.g. staple food products rather than cash crops for export as well as discuss and evaluate the various options. Few responses addressed HIC food shortage either in terms of food banks and disparity between rich and poor or in terms of a global disparity between HICs and LICs.

Question 6ai

Most candidates identified a correct response by referring to either the area being cleared or it being a construction site or there being evidence of new/modern building nearby. Those that failed to obtain the mark tended to make statements that lacked precision and specificity to count as evidence e.g. main roads.

Question 6aii

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 6aiii

This item was generally answered well with many candidates scoring the full 2 marks. Popular answers were close to central London for jobs and its riverside views.

Question 6bi

Most candidates identified that Greenfield sites were areas of land that had never been built on for 1 mark but the second mark for location e.g. rural-urban fringe proved more elusive. For this reason the modal mark for this item was 1.

Question 6bii

The attraction of Greenfield sites to modern business was generally well known with many candidates offering two valid reasons for this attraction and being able to

develop at least one. There were many 3-4 mark answers based on ideas of pleasant working environment, room for expansion and car parks and access to road network. Weaker answers gave only one reason and tended to struggle with developing it into a business advantage.

Question 6c

The item did generate a varied quality of response but with a mean mark on the Level 2/3 border it can be said that on the whole it was well answered. Many responses were quite generic in nature referring to problems faced by cities in general both LICs and HICs. Good candidates did make clear the point that rapid urban growth does pose different problems to the urban growth process in general. These candidates often focused on LICs and took a shanty town case study approach to the cycle of poverty e.g. the Dharavi slum in Mumbai; La Rocinha favela in Rio de Janeiro; Heliopolis slum in Sao Paulo. Some did look at the problems e.g. traffic congestion and other infrastructure issues; house prices/rental costs ... occurring in rapidly growing urban areas in HICs but by and large, LIC urban problems were better done.

Question 7ai

Provided reasonable discrimination.

Questions 7aii-iii

The majority of candidates scored quite well on these questions worth 7 marks. Most were able to identify at least two pieces of fieldwork equipment for aii and score highly. aiii frequently proved less fruitful as candidates generally knew what sort of data would be useful but few were able to state precisely the secondary sources where it could be found. There were many vague sources identified e.g. the internet; other studies.

Question 7b

Overall these questions scored well.

bi suggested that many centres had actually undertaken a water quality investigation in the field. Candidates generally were able to successfully outline the fieldwork methodology involved in measuring pH values either electronically or by the traditional method.

bii discriminated quite effectively. Most were able to score modestly for reference to ICT-generated data presentation and/or internet research. Better answers referred also to data storage, spreadsheets and ICT as a primary data collection tool.

biii was generally disappointingly drawn. Candidates often struggled to choose a good scale to work with and had some difficulty in labelling the axes correctly and plotting the numbers accurately.

biv contained some well written conclusions from many candidates. The better answers drew conclusions not only from Figure 7c's graph but as expected from all the data as in Figure 7b. The weaker responses often failed to recognise the most basic of trends e.g. that water quality improved between sites 1 and 3 to fall off again between sites 3 and 7; they also often misinterpreted the site data.

Question 8ai

Provided reasonable discrimination.

Questions 8aii-iii

This fieldwork question was slightly less popular than its identical twin (Q7) and on average scored slightly lower. The majority of its candidates were able to identify at least two pieces of valid fieldwork equipment for a hazard management investigation and generally scores were good for aii. The secondary sources item (aiii) proved more problematic. Generally, candidates knew the sort of data they would need but found naming its precise source more difficult. Source names were often vague e.g. the internet, other studies; sometimes too vague for credit.

Question 8b

Overall these questions scored relatively well.

bi Candidates tended to find it slightly more difficult to identify equipment and fieldwork methodology procedures than for the river water quality survey assessed in 7bi. Consequently, marks were a little lower.

bii discriminated quite effectively. Most were able to score modestly for reference to ICT-generated data presentation and/or internet research. Better answers referred also to data storage, spreadsheets and ICT as a primary data collection tool.

biii the quality of the graphing again could have been better. There were issues of scale, axis labelling and bar plotting accuracy which prevented more from scoring maximum marks.

biv contained some well written conclusions but not always with supporting data. The better responses identified the trends/general pattern in Figure 8b as opposed to just that data plotted in Figure 8c. Weaker responses failed to interpret the data and merely wrote odd or a series of isolated points about the data set.

Question 9ai

Suggest some unfamiliarity with practical fieldwork. Some went for calipers or auger which are clearly not shown.

Questions 9aii-iii

Candidates were generally able to accurately describe how to use a quadrat though the thoroughness of the description did vary. Most candidates had recognised quadrat as the correct response in (A)(i); they were not penalised in (a)(ii) if they described the use of one of the other pieces of equipment listed in (a)(i).

Sampling strategies were not well known by all candidates and many found it difficult to either name one of the three classic types for 1 mark and/or outline its relevance to an ecosystem fieldwork investigation. Random and systematic were the two mostly commonly offered. The relatively few candidates familiar with sampling tended to do it rather well.

Question 9b

These questions did not score particularly well after bi where the pie-chart tended to be drawn accurately and attract high marks. bii generated few marks as few candidates appreciated the nature of a statistical technique; the few that could name a valid technique could also outline its usefulness in analysing field data. The

request for conclusions about plant diversity in biii was responded to at best satisfactorily and often poorly. The trends/patterns in plant species along the slope were rarely clearly pulled out and linking these to the abiotic components was done well in very few answers. Descriptive points scoring lowly rather than genuine conclusions looking across the data were more typical. Most candidates used reliability via repetition as their only means of evaluating results. The best answers produced a greater range of evaluatory ways which showed good understanding of the whole fieldwork process.

Question 10ai

Suggest some unfamiliarity with practical fieldwork. Some went for OS map which is clearly not shown.

Questions 10aii-iii

Q10 proved slightly more popular and slightly higher scoring than its identical twin Q9.

aii Town street plan was the most common option in (a)(i) meaning that in (a)(ii) the majority of students were describing its use in environmental quality investigations. They tended to do this quite well often referring to its use in identifying areas for sampling and/or for general navigation purposes.

aiii Many could not name a sampling strategy but those that could were frequently able to gain other marks by outlining its use in such fieldwork. There were blank scripts and incorrect responses, sometimes based on referring back to Figure 10a's street plan.

Question 10b

These questions scored moderately overall, partly because bii was poorly answered. Few candidates knew what a statistical technique is so few scored any marks on bii. The divided bar chart in bi was on the whole accurately drawn; lack of labelling was the major cause of ungained marks. The conclusions offered in biii were generally sound with reasonable understanding of the data and its pattern being evident. The better answers identified the city areas and commented on the components of EQ in some detail, including the anomalies in the data. There was some confusion over the term, CBD in the weaker responses where they confused the CBD edge with the main shopping area/CBD. Most candidates made some mark gains in biv where evaluation was interpreted as checking the accuracy and reliability of the data; there were some good responses that focused on examples of accuracy and reliability data checks.

Question 11ai

Surprisingly scored lower than expected for a straightforward piece of graph reading.

Question 11aii

A considerable proportion of candidates were confused by this item and relatively few were able to score full marks. Many failed to recognise that the graph showed how different each year's rainfall was to the long-term average. To some trends were changes in the long-term average; others referred to negative rainfall years. Only the abler candidates recognised such trends as the post-1970 drying trend.

Question 11bi

Defining deforestation split the candidature into two distinct halves. Hardly anyone failed to score at least the initial mark for referring to tree felling/cutting down. Around half of the candidature gained a second mark for reference to clearance and/or its scale.

Question 11bii

Most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of one or more causes of deforestation. Logging for timber and land clearance for agriculture or settlement were the most popular causes offered. The ability to develop the cause into an outlined answer did differentiate candidates.

Question 11biii

Very few candidates showed an understanding of the role of the FSC, local actions to control illegal logging and global strategies such as the encouragement of only sustainably-sourced/kite-marked timber for export to overseas markets. Many, however, were able to outline for moderate marks how countries worked together to help sustainability in a rather generic sense with some referring to carbon credits and trading schemes. Few managed to achieve high marks.

Question 11c

This item was generally understood and answered reasonably well by candidates. Almost all were able to offer some credible human impacts and consequences of global warming and climate change. However, there was considerably less knowledge and understanding of its impact on natural ecosystems and marine life. This answering imbalance between people and environments did depress the mark range and keep many decent responses in Level 2 as they focused only on human impacts. The best answers were detailed, often bringing in case study material (e.g. the Sahel, Bangladesh, Tuvalu) and showed how global warming is having knock-on effects, often environmental consequences (e.g. desertification) impacting on people (e.g. food shortages).

Question 11d

Candidates had been prepared well for this item on a specification-based case study. There was generally good awareness of the various international agreements, treaties, policies and protocols that relate to global warming and of the extent to which they have been successful/unsuccessful. There were valuable descriptions of the Kyoto, Copenhagen and Paris Conferences and their aims to reduce carbon emissions. Many were rather generic and lacking accuracy of detail e.g. actual conference dates but reference to measures such as conversion to renewables and carbon trading and capture received good credit. The evaluative comments leading to an overall conclusion relating to effectiveness and success pushed many answers to towards the top of Level 3.

Question 12ai

Almost universally correctly answered for 1 opening mark.

Question 12aii

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly.

Question 12aiii

The vast majority of candidates achieved the 1 mark available by identifying that the TNC operates in 150 countries or its equivalent e.g. many countries worldwide. The correct answer had to refer to global operations and not merely to working in different business sectors.

Question 12aiv

Responses were quite variable with a range of answers at each of the three possible mark levels, 0, 1 and 2. Many scored 1 or 2 with the 1 mark answers tending to focus on jobs, income and spending by employees in India. The second mark was often gained by either reference to multiplier effects/circular flow of income ideas/tax paid or to money returning to HQ in India from overseas branches. The mean mark was pleasingly over 1.0.

Question 12bi

Defining ecotourism proved not to be a straightforward task for some candidates. Some were unclear as to its precise meaning and gave incorrect or grossly vague statements. Sustainable and eco-friendly tourism were popular 1 mark responses. Candidates scoring full marks tended to refer to two facets of ecotourism e.g. protects fragile environments; provides jobs for local people.

Question 12bii

It was clear from these responses that many candidates did understand the concept of ecotourism and that Bhutan, Costa Rica and Amazonia provided a good context from which to extract ecotourism characteristics. Unfortunately in terms of marks awarded, characteristics were often merely listed rather than described. Those not understanding the term, ecosystem produced poor responses, often selecting such inappropriate examples as mass tourism destinations as the Spanish Costas where the characteristics of ecotourism do not fit.

Question 12biii

As one might have expected, this item scored well with many full mark answers. Many were able to develop to outlining requirements how such as increasing leisure time, longer retirement and higher disposable income have resulted in more global tourism. The mean mark for this item was pleasingly high.

Question 12c

This item challenged many candidates with a mean mark in 2-3 range. Most responses were partial, some just described commodity chains, some outlined the concept of globalisation while others looked at the concept of interdependence but few linked them all together fully to explain the growth of commodity chains. The better answers referred to cheaper labour in some countries, cheaper transport links and to outsourcing (to the BRICs and NICs) and the rise of commodity chains.

Question 12d

There seemed to be a link between the quality of the answer and the migrant flow named; two named countries was expected. Mexico to the USA and Poland to the UK tended to be good choices as they brought with them a range of detailed consequences for both host and source country. The best of these answers were clearly of at least AS standard and were awarded maximum marks; they were well

balanced as between host and source country, carried examples and gave both negative and positive consequences. The current European migration issue both African and Middle Eastern refugees and EU internal migration received attention in some answers; some of the knowledge displayed here was impressive e.g. the extent of the pressure on specific local services in host areas; dates of EU enlargement. It is very pleasing to note that there was little xenophobia or anti-migrant propaganda. A minority of candidates went off course and wrote about causes in terms of push and pull factors rather than about consequences.

Question 13ai

The overwhelming majority correctly identified Qatar for 1 mark.

Question 13aii

A number of candidates struggled to answer this question correctly.

Question 13aiii

Generally this item was well answered. Most candidates used Qatar as an example in their response recognising for the full 2 marks that whilst it had the highest GDP per person it did not have the highest happiness rating. Other candidates took countries such as Denmark and pointed out that while it had a high happiness rating it had a lower GDP per person ranking. More drew the contrast between a country's two rankings than compared countries.

Question 13aiv

There were candidates who left a blank or gave GDP/GNP but in the main, candidates came up with a range of suitable indicators from composites like HDI to single indicators such as life expectancy

Question 13bi

Intermediate technology was not particularly well defined. Most did manage to score at least 1 mark by referring to easy to use technology. Full mark answers were less common as only the better answers made the point that intermediate refers to appropriate to local needs and capabilities.

Question 13bii

Vague and generic answers predominated with few candidates able to recognise the key aspects of intermediate technology beyond its basic definition which kept marks generally low. The link to development and how it can help it was only made in better answers which tended to name the uses of specific pieces of intermediate technology in a particular place. For example, the use of simple water pumps in sub-Saharan Africa save women and children's time, raise production which can lead to investment in education, hence, development.

Question 13biii

Most candidates performed and scored well on this item. Many identified that debt relief, foreign aid and education could be catalysts for development; some referred to micro-financing and TNC involvement. The differentiator was whether they could offer some explanation as to how they helped the country to develop; some did so for both of their catalysts.

Question 13c

Most candidates understood the question and the term, quality of life. Responses were often written in general terms with few including named places or case study material. Quality of life effects were sometimes exaggerated with Malthusian references and some focused heavily on shanty towns. The general approach though taken by the candidates was to address a range of consequences rather than to offer depth. Responses frequently included references to rapid population growth leading to unemployment, to strain on public services, to declining health provision and to food shortages; the link to the cycle of deprivation was frequently made.

Question 13d

Most candidates described the global development gap with some referring to or describing the Brandt line as a demarcation between a rich North and poor South. There was some mention of changes in this broad demarcation with the emergence of NICs and the BRICs and the suggestion by some that the gap is narrowing. Surprisingly few candidates actually focused on the question set and discussed why there is a gap in the first place. These better answers did reach into Level 3 marks. The factors best understood as causes of uneven development and global inequality were debt, corrupt government, war, trade barriers and unfavourable physical environments including natural disasters. There were very few full mark answers because few candidates did both of offer a good range of causal factors and provide some evaluation as to the most important factors.

*Question 6d

Candidates generally found this item tough going with the majority either not understanding the term, stakeholder or failing to refer to any in their answer. There were many generic responses with little linkage to stakeholders. The best answers identified stakeholders and discussed their respective roles. While stakeholder posed problems for many candidates, most were familiar with the rebranding/regeneration process and were able to call on case study knowledge e.g. London Docklands; 2012 London Olympic site but without reference to the decision-makers involved. Many candidates merely described their chosen rebranding project without reference to stakeholders, what they did and when they were more effective in the process so discussion, evaluation and conclusion became difficult to achieve. Such answers discussing the contribution and relative influence of named stakeholders to a named rebranding project were rare. The reasons for rebranding were frequently better done than the question actually asked.