# CONTENTS

# FOREWORD

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers.  **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned**.

# GEOGRAPHY (BRUNEI)

## GCE Ordinary Level

| Paper 2230/01 |
|---|
| Multiple Choice |

| Question Number | Key | Question Number | Key |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | D | 21 | C |
| 2 | A | 22 | D |
| 3 | B | 23 | C |
| 4 | B | 24 | A |
| 5 | B | 25 | B |
| 6 | D | 26 | B |
| 7 | A | 27 | C |
| 8 | A | 28 | C |
| 9 | A | 29 | C |
| 10 | C | 30 | C |
| 11 | B | 31 | D |
| 12 | C | 32 | C |
| 13 | D | 33 | D |
| 14 | C | 34 | A |
| 15 | D | 35 | C |
| 16 | B | 36 | B |
| 17 | D | 37 | B |
| 18 | B | 38 | A |
| 19 | D | 39 | A |
| 20 | D | 40 | D |

**General comments**

The mean score of the 1009 candidates was 22.8 out of a possible 40 marks, equivalent to 57%. The standard deviation was 4.793. The best score of 37 marks was achieved by three candidates and no candidate scored fewer than eight marks.

Questions which candidates generally found easy were **1**, **2**, **3**, **4**, **5**, **6**, **9**, **19**, **24**, **25**, **27**, **30**, **31**, **33**, **35** and **40**.

Questions which many candidates found very difficult were **7**, **13**, **20**, **23**, **26** and **34**. However, there were a number of other questions where performance was poor with only some 40-50% of the candidates selecting the correct answer. Such questions were **8**, **14**, **15**, **17**, **18**, **22**, **28**, **37** and **38**.

It was surprising that **Question 14** caused problems, as it simply required the observation of a trend on a graph and the use of the key. Basic Techniques questions such as this should be comparatively easy. It is suggested that candidates are given plenty of practice in interpreting different types of graphs, diagrams and data.

**Comments on specific questions**

**Question 7**

As candidates were given the length of the road, no map measurement was needed. Since the V.I. (Vertical Interval) is 50 feet, the height at each end of this road can be approximately determined as 650 ft and 1250 ft, a difference of 600 feet. The gradient therefore is 600/3000 or 1:5. Apart from the mathematical calculation involved this question tests the ability of candidates to interpolate height from contours.

**Question 13**

Most candidates were clearly aware that slopes **B** and **C** show little sign of variation in steepness and opted for either **A** or **D**. The better candidates were able to distinguish between a concave and a convex slope, but it is apparent that many candidates were unfamiliar with the terms concave and convex.

**Question 20**

Some candidates had difficulty in distinguishing between the barrier reef located offshore and the fringing reef adjoining the land margin closely.

**Question 23**

The question revealed widespread uncertainty about the movement of the ITCZ. Not only did it result in most candidates answering incorrectly, but it was a poor discriminator.

**Question 26**

Over half the candidates chose the wooded site as the one with the best natural defence. This clearly would depend on the density of the trees. The expected answer was site **B** in the loop of a meander with only a narrow neck of land needing to be defended. Perhaps more information could have been provided to make the answer more obvious.

**Question 34**

Over half of the candidates attributed the population increase to a rise in the birth rate rather than to a fall in the death rate. The demographic transition model shows that the reverse is generally true.

+-----------------------------+
| **Paper 2230/02** |
| **Paper 2** |
+-----------------------------+

**General comments**

Differentiation was achieved as the performance of the candidates ranged from very good to poor. It is pleasing that some candidates scored very high marks. These were obtained because these candidates combined sufficient knowledge with a sound understanding of the question and the skill to present well balanced answers. However, many candidates did not have enough depth in each of the above criteria and thus produced poor results.

Candidates should always be encouraged to spend time reading the questions thoroughly. This should be the starting point of the examination as it stimulates a full understanding of the question requirement. However, a lack of understanding does not fully explain disappointing performances. Poor performance also results from limited knowledge, which leads to brief and under-developed answers. In the latter, irrelevant material is often introduced at length or vague comments are presented lacking geographical content.

Reference is made above to the importance of understanding the question requirement. Thus, one cannot reiterate too often the importance of key words/phrases in the question. Examples of these include 'describe', 'explain', 'why', 'what factors' and 'give reasons'. Of these, candidates often disappoint on descriptions especially of physical features as in **Question 1 (a)(ii)** and **(c)(ii)**. With regard to explanations, candidates encounter problems coping with explaining climatic features and the relationships between climate and vegetation characteristics, as in **Question 7 (b)(iii)**.

Examples of candidates showing a sound understanding of the question requirement and having sufficient knowledge to develop good answers were seen in **Questions 1 (c)(ii)**, **Question 2 (b)(iii)**, **Question 7 (c)**, **Question 8 (b)**, **Question 9 (b)(i)** and **Question 11 (b)(i)**, **(ii)** and **(c)**.

Candidates produced different responses to the variety of resources provided. In **Question 1**, most candidates recognised the stack in **(b)** and the atoll in **(c)** and the table in **Question 8** stimulated good responses in part **(a)**. A similar comment applies to part **(a)(i)** of **Question 11**. However, candidates made poor use of the map of the main air links to Brunei in **Question 3 (a)** and the details of rice cultivation in **Question 6 (a)**.

There were opportunities for candidates to express value judgement. Views were required in **Question 3 (c)** and although some candidates did not fully understand the question, there were also answers which detailed both the positive and negative views on the impact of tourism. Views also entered into answers to **Question 4 (b)(iii)**, **Question 7 (c)** and **Question 9 (b)(i)** and, in each case, some interesting comments were offered. Candidates also indicated good local knowledge in answers to **Question 3 (b)**, **Question 4 (b)(ii)** and **Question 11 (c)**.

Most candidates followed the rubric instructions and only answered four questions. Very few presented more than four questions and even fewer only answered three questions. Thus, time management did not appear to be a problem. The section in which the rubric was most frequently broken was **Question 8 (b)** as many candidates provided answers on both pollution and traffic congestion.

**Comments on specific questions**

**Question 1**

In **(a)**, only a minority of candidates presented sound definitions of the types of erosion. A surprising number confused corrasion with attrition. In **(b)** the diagram was recognised by most candidates, although few provided accurate descriptions of the stack. In contrast, the formation of this coastal feature was well explained. In **(c)** the atoll was identified by many candidates but yet again, detailed descriptions of this type of coral reef were limited and 'around a lagoon' was the main comment. However, in **(c)(iii)** many candidates clearly understood the sea water conditions favouring the formation of coral reefs.

**Question 2**

Candidates often experience problems with the concept questioned in part **(a)** and yet again, answers were brief and limited to the equatorial location and some explanations of high humidity. However, part **(b)** was answered much better with detailed knowledge, especially of the features of a rain gauge. Fewer scored the mark for a Stevenson Screen in **(b)(ii)** than for the instruments in **(b)(i)**. Part **(c)** achieved differentiation. Some candidates presented well labelled diagrams and/or explanatory text on each of the types of rainfall. In contrast, some candidates sketched poor, unlabelled diagrams while others were completely confused by the geographical terms.

**Question 3**

In part **(a)(i)** the resource material stimulated poor responses as many candidates ignored the command phrase 'How does this information suggest' and introduced irrelevant material. Part **(a)(ii)** was also poorly answered. In part **(b)** both parts **(i)** and **(ii)** were answered much better as candidates possessed good knowledge of how both the cultural background and the natural environment attract tourists. Too often in part **(c)** candidates either repeated or introduced material which was required in part **(b)**. The section, however, achieved differentiation as there were also interesting views on the impact of tourism on both the people and the physical background.

**Question 4**

In **(a)(i)** many candidates failed to identify the Primary and Secondary industries from the table provided. Most were aware of the disadvantages of working in the Primary industries and also of the attractions of employment in the Tertiary industries. Inevitably there was repetition of answers in **(a)(iii)** and **(a)(iv)**. Part **(b)** was generally disappointing. Sub-section **(b)(i)** posed few problems but surprisingly well developed answers on the fishing industry were rare in **(b)(ii)**. A complete range of responses were presented for **(b)(iii)** with some showing good local knowledge.

**Question 5**

This was not a popular question and appeared to be answered by candidates who could present detailed knowledge on both tin mining and a plantation crop.  A small minority, however, did not offer answers to **(a)(i)**.  In **(a)(ii)** answers were balanced between rubber, oil palm and tea, but very few dealt with coconuts. Answers were also well balanced between cultivation and processes in this sub-section.  In part **(b)** there were better answers on the problems of plantations than on tin mining.  In both alternatives, many candidates concentrated on environmental rather than on the economic problems involved.

**Question 6**

This was also not a popular question and all parts of it proved to be difficult for the majority of candidates. Most candidates possessed some knowledge of the traditional methods in **(a)(i)**, but few scored high marks. Sub section **(a)(ii)** was well understood by many candidates but not **(a)(iii)** which was beyond the comprehension of most.  Both part **(b)** and **(c)** were generally disappointing even though they tested concepts which have frequently been questioned and are basic to Asian agricultural geography.  Evidence of case studies were offered on Kedah, but only by a minority of candidates.

**Question 7**

A popular question with many accurate responses, especially to parts **(a)**, **(b)(i)** and **(c)**.  There were detailed descriptions of tropical rainforests, the most frequent choice in **(b)(i)**.  Although most candidates were aware of 'high temperatures' and 'high rainfall totals' in **(b)(ii)**, few elaborated on these features.  Sub-section **(b)(iii)** caused problems as, too often, the vegetation features were stated without indicating a relationship to climate.  Many answers to part **(c)** were pleasing as candidates presented well balanced answers on the different uses made of forest areas.  In addition, relevant examples illustrated these different uses.

**Question 8**

A very popular question which gained much credit from balanced answers on parts **(a)** and **(b)**.  In **(a)(i)** there was repetition of material presented in the table although this was often well amplified or new information was included in answers.  There was also clear understanding of sub-sections **(ii)** and **(iii)** though few candidates scored maximum marks on these.  All parts of part **(b)** were well done.  Although there is an overlap of acceptable material for both pollution and traffic congestion, it was surprising how many candidates broke the rubric and presented answers on both pollution and traffic congestion.

**Question 9**

This was not a popular question and not a high mark scorer.  Again, there were weaknesses on the 'describe' part of the question in **(a)(i)** and although some candidates scored maximum marks on the ways in which a river transports materials in **(a)(ii)**, others explained processes of erosion not transportation.  A range of responses were seen for **(a)(iii)** with many clearly understanding the concept.  Many candidates scored good credit on the different uses of rivers in **(b)(i)**, but struggled with the requirement of **(b)(ii)**.  It appeared that many confused 'river valleys' with 'river water' and thus there was much repetition of **(b)(i)** material.

**Question 10**

A popular question, but most candidates failed to reach a reasonable standard.  The question requirements of this topic regularly cause problems for candidates and yet again, with the exception of part **(a)**, all parts of the question proved to be difficult.  Many candidates wrote at length, but much of the material was either vague generalisation or not relevant to what was required.  Part **(c)** was particularly poor with inaccurate interpretation of the question.  Naturally candidates often chose Bandar Seri Begawan as their example, but unfortunately many answers made little or no reference to separate land use areas.

**Question 11**

A popular question which achieved differentiation and many good answers.  Candidates presented meaningful descriptions in **(a)(i)**, but **(a)(ii)** was not well answered.  Many did not refer to 'birth rate' and 'death rate' and even when they did, most did not apply these to the X, Y and Z on the graph.  Both sub-sections of **(b)** were well done as many candidates conveyed a clear understanding of the aspects of social geography questioned.  A similar comment applies to **(c)(ii)** and it was particularly pleasing to see evidence of local knowledge of the regional variation within Brunei.