



# **2009 Geography Folio**

## **Advanced Higher**

### **Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2009

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from the Question Paper Operations Team, Dalkeith.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's Question Paper Operations Team at Dalkeith may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

# National Qualifications 2009

## Geography

### Marking Instructions

The map interpretation question in the examination paper will be assessed using a numerical mark out of 30, the geographical methods and techniques question out of 20, and the scenario question out of 10 as specified on the examination paper. Detailed instructions for marking the written examination paper will be sent to Markers in time for the receipt of examination papers. These instructions may be clarified or modified at the Markers' Meeting on Friday 22/5/09. For the Folio, comprising a Geographical Study and a Geographical Issue, there are 4 separate elements of assessment for each of these two elements. These are explained in the marking schemes below. Different criteria are used for the Geographical Study and the Geographical Issue. A single whole number mark out of 20 (for the Study) or 15 (for the Issue) should be awarded by the Marker for each marking criterion, according to her/his judgement of quality of the work, using the information below.

Thus for every candidate there will be three marks, one out of 30, one out of 20 and one out of 10, for the written examination, four marks out of 20 for the Geographical Study and four marks out of 15 for the Geographical Issue. These should then be totalled by Markers to give **two** overall marks for each candidate – a mark out of 60 for the examination and a mark out of 140 for the Geographical Folio giving a total of 200 marks.

Exact entry of the total marks on the relevant Ex 6 form is **most important**, as this form is the basis of the data entry procedures and will be the primary element in determining candidates' final grades. These forms **must** be sent in a separate envelope to Dalkeith with the candidates' assessed work, no later than the specified date (26/6/09). All procedures are explained more fully in section III (Procedures) of this document and will be further discussed at Markers' Meetings.

### General Marking Instructions

When marking the examination scripts and Geographical Folios, justify the mark awarded by comments on the flyleaf cover supplied by SQA for each of these pieces of work. No comments should be written on any part of the work itself, with the exception that standard marking devices (ticks, brackets, underlines, etc) may be used in marking the examination scripts only.

All marking issues together with consideration of each element of assessment will be discussed in detail at the Markers' Meetings. Key word descriptors are given for the specific marking criteria employed in the marking of the Folio (comprising the Geographical Study and the Geographical Issue).

### Notes

1. The **general** relationship between total marks and grades awarded is shown in the table overleaf. This relationship will be moderated by the Principal Assessor and SQA Officers in light of the nature of responses to specific questions, the overall pattern of marks of candidates and evaluation of the relationship of this year's examination to benchmark standards.

Mark for whole AH programme	Literal grade relating to the mark for the whole Advanced Higher Geography programme
200-170	Upper A
169-140	Lower A
139-130	Upper B
129-120	Lower B
119-110	Upper C
109-100	Lower C
99-90	D
89 or less	No Award

2. Presentations that are over-length should be referred to the Principal Assessor as in note 5. Markers should deduct the standard penalty from the mark awarded as well as referring the work to the PA.
3. In cases of exceedingly bad spelling or lack of punctuation or illegible writing which makes the work almost unintelligible, this should be drawn to the attention of the Principal Assessor as in note 5.
4. Mark using whole numbers, using the whole range of the marks as appropriate.
5. If in so much doubt as to require a second opinion please indicate by “PA” on the **top right hand of the front cover of the examination script** or in the **top right hand corner on the flyleaf cover** supplied with the folio of submitted work.
6. Since candidates’ folios may be returned to them, markers **must not** write on or otherwise annotate them. Standard marking devices (ticks, brackets, underlines, etc) may be used in marking the examination scripts, but under no circumstances should markers write any words or comments on any piece of candidate work. However comments explaining and justifying marks awarded **must** be entered on the flyleaf cover provided for each piece of work.

## Specific descriptors and Marking Instructions

### Mark descriptors and instructions for the written examination (Paper 1)

Full instructions for this paper will be given in the specific Marking Instructions for the written paper, which will be sent separately to Markers. These instructions will relate to this year's paper only.

### Mark descriptors for the Geographical Issue (Folio element 1)

Essays that do not have any attempt to critically evaluate sources, and are simple essays about a chosen topic are unlikely to get more than a total of 45 out of 60, as little or no mark credit can be given in the critical evaluation element of assessment. Assessment for the other three elements should be according to the quality of the work submitted without further penalty.

Candidates should be permitted considerable latitude in their choice of topic. It should be able to be attached in some way to a Higher grade Environmental Interactions theme. Contemporary geography encompasses a wider range of research issues, approaches and paradigms than in the past, and candidates' choice of essay topics may reflect this. In any case of doubt contact the PA and mark the folio flyleaf cover PA noting choice of topic.

**15 – 13**     **Very well written** essays, written to a very high standard, containing a well-chosen selection of relevant material thoroughly analysed and **showing well-argued and substantial critical evaluation** of the sources. The essays are based on **appropriate sources that give a range of viewpoints** on the chosen themes. At the standard that may be at or close to being described as “**little or no more could be expected at this level**”.

#### Key word descriptors

*Presentation:* No more could be expected at this level; likely to include relevant illustrative graphical material that is clearly incorporated into and used in the text. A properly set out and accurate bibliography indicating that contextual research has been carried out is required.

*Research, content and relevance:* A well-chosen selection of relevant material drawn from the sources and effectively manipulated by the student. Most or all of the source material should be of intellectual substance, and supported by research contextualisation that is cited in the bibliography.

*Structure and logical development:* Very clearly organised specific arguments; thorough analysis that shows insight into the material.

*Critical commentary:* A clear, direct and explicit evaluation of the viewpoints in the sources is essential. The critical evaluation should be elegantly written, balanced and effectively incorporated into the essay structure.

- 12 – 11      **Well written**, containing good material, **a performance with an element of merit**. A clear **attempt to critically assess sources** is essential. Choice of themes for the essays is **sound**, and sources **relate clearly** to these themes.

**Key word descriptors**

*Presentation:* At a good standard in all respects, likely to include relevant illustrative material and bibliography.

*Research, content and relevance:* A selection of sound relevant material. Some contextualisation.

*Structure and logical development:* Clear specific arguments, and effective analysis. Sound structure to the essay.

*Critical commentary:* A clear attempt to critically evaluate the viewpoints in the sources, with some evidence of insight into the arguments in the sources.

- 10 – 9      **Workmanlike**, with a tendency to focus on description of the sources, **lacking insight**. Often **more descriptive than analytical**. Some critical assessment but may be **limited or largely implicit**. Essay presented to a **reasonable standard** but may tend to focus on describing the sources. Themes and/or sources may have **some deficiencies**.

**Key word descriptors**

*Presentation:* Generally sound though with some weaknesses, some illustrative material.

*Research, content and relevance:* Largely based on relevant material, but intellectual quality of one or more of the sources is very weak, thin in substance or of limited relevance.

*Structure and logical development:* Detailed arguments and analysis are reasonable, though generally lacking flair. An attempt to provide an organised structure to the essay.

*Critical commentary:* Some attempt to make explicit statements on the viewpoints in the sources, though text may provide an implicit review of viewpoints. Formulaic and/or with a tendency to hyperbole.

- 8      **Lacking in critical evaluation**. Generally **descriptive essays**. Essays, which are **ordinary**, rather than very poor in these respects. Conclusions not drawn, and generally the essay is lacking in structure and analytical substance. Themes and sources may be weak. Essays may have some **significant deficiencies** in presentation.

**Key word descriptors**

*Presentation:* Rather basic in all respects. Lacking flair and finish. Poor spelling and/or grammar.

*Research, content and relevance:* Descriptive, limited and sources may be inappropriate or poorly characterised. Not all sources need to be academically sound but an essay based largely on such is weak in this category.

*Structure and logical development:* Detailed arguments and analysis are lacking in substance and or clarity, but are ordinary rather than poor. Text not effectively organised.

*Critical commentary:* Weak attempt to make an explicit statement on the viewpoints in the sources, and reliance on an implicit review of viewpoints. Essentially “an essay about”, rather than a critical evaluation of viewpoints.

- 7 **Factually thin**, poor sources and **wholly deficient in critical evaluation and analysis**. **Significant errors** in content or use of methods. Fragmented text. **Poor presentation**, which may include poorly written and spelt text.  
**Key word descriptors**  
*Presentation:* Poor, with little or no relevant illustrative material. May have significant text errors and generally lack finish.  
*Research, content and relevance:* Thin content, limited review of sources. Sources are all/mainly lacking in substance.  
*Structure and logical development:* Limited coherence in structure. Descriptive essay lacks organisation.  
*Critical commentary:* Very limited and implicit at best.
- 6 **Not really at the appropriate standard for this level of work**. Superficial, descriptive, many errors and very poorly presented. **Shows little or no understanding of what is required** in respect of critical evaluation. Poor choice and use of themes. **Inappropriate** sources.  
**Key word descriptors**  
*Presentation:* Very poor and with few elements which are appropriate to expected AH standard.  
*Research, content and relevance:* Very weak, poorly chosen and explained sources.  
*Structure and logical development:* Incoherent, lacking any clear direction.  
*Critical commentary:* Effectively none.
- 5 – 0 **Very poor in all respects, lacking any attempt at critical evaluation, either explicit or implicit**. Essay text and content ranges from very poor to abysmal. May be a “token” presentation. **Shows no understanding of what is required at this level**. Give some credit where this is possible, and use 0 or near 0 only when there is little or nothing to mark.  
**Key word descriptors**  
*Presentation:* Not at AH standard in any respect. Containing many obvious errors.  
*Research, content and relevance:* May be very limited in scope and not at AH standard for an essay. Very poor sources.  
*Structure and logical development:* Unfocussed. Essay is a collection of unlinked elements with little or no structure.  
*Critical commentary:* No attempt. Essay is a descriptive account of a theme, and sources play little or no part in the arguments.

Use lowest range of marks in this category for incomplete or “token” essays.

## Mark descriptors for the Geographical Study (Folio element 2)

Choice of topic is important. Good studies generally attempt demanding topics, and this should be reflected in the overall mark for this part of the folio. The study may be based on primary or secondary data or a combination of both. Credit should be given for primary data collected in fieldwork where this has been done to a high standard. Good studies will show flair in both analysis and the commentary on results, and will be presented to a very high standard both in the written text and in graphical material. A range of relevant graphical presentation elements is essential.

- 20 – 17**      **Very well written** and set out, containing high **quality data content**. **Flair in analysis** using a good range of appropriate techniques. The study shows **insight** into the research questions of the study with **excellent and appropriate** use of techniques. Presentation in all dimensions of text and graphics is to the **highest standards** that could be expected at this level. At the **overall standard, which may be at, or close, to being described as** “no more could be expected at this level”.

### Key word descriptors

*Presentation:* Very high quality throughout. Error-free and well written text. Graphical and illustrative material of an exemplary standard. No more could be expected at this standard.

*Data and content:* High quality and appropriate quantity of data, which very clearly relates to the defined research questions, and has been carefully chosen and/or collected.

*Techniques:* A wide range of appropriate techniques is correctly used. Techniques focus very clearly on the research questions.

*Relationships:* Analysis very clearly relates to the research questions, and explains relationships involved lucidly. No more could be expected at this standard.

- 16 – 15**      **Well presented** reflecting a good intellectual standard of content and not merely “pretty”. Containing good material, **well analysed** and with some focus on defined research questions but without the element of perception and insight found in the best work at this standard, yet **a performance with an element of merit**. **Sound** database which is sufficiently large for meaningful analysis.

### Key word descriptors

*Presentation:* Very sound in all respects, with some evidence of flair.

*Data and content:* Good content. Appropriate data sources for research questions and sufficient data to support a good analysis.

*Techniques:* A good range of techniques is employed in a sensible manner. Techniques should be used in a way that brings out relationships from the data, as well as describing the data.

*Relationships:* Clear reflection on research question in the analysis of relationships. Goes beyond repetition of results of analytical techniques.

- 14 – 12**      **Workmanlike**, with relevant facts but less selective and analytical, **lacking insight**. Makes a clear attempt to analyse a **reasonable research theme**, which however may not have been well developed into clear specific questions. May be **more descriptive than analytical**. Database may be limited.

**Key word descriptors**

*Presentation:* Workmanlike with little or no evidence of flair but should be sound and clearly linked to the research aims of the study. Presentation should be largely error free.

*Data and content:* Sound as far as it goes. May represent a reasonable amount of work but is rather formulaic. May be limited in amount, thus restricting analysis. Some data may be rather inappropriate for the research questions of the particular study.

*Techniques:* Workmanlike. May not be the most appropriate available. A somewhat limited range has been used and there are some obvious ways in which a wider range of techniques might have been used.

*Relationships:* Tends to be descriptive rather than analytical. May be lacking commentary on some important relationships.

- 11**            **Rather limited** content and analysis. Tends to be **descriptive with weak analysis** of relationships and limited conclusions. **Not very effectively structured or presented**, and may contain a **significant number** of text errors and spelling mistakes. Overall **ordinary**, rather than very poor in these respects.

**Key word descriptors**

*Presentation:* Rather weak, with significant errors or poor elements.

*Data and content:* Limited database. No clear research objectives.

*Techniques:* Limited. There may be poor choice or use of some techniques.

*Relationships:* Largely descriptive with limited analysis of relationships.

- 10**            **Very limited** content and analytical techniques. **Deficient** in real geographical content, examination of relationships and analysis. There may be **significant errors** in content or use of methods. No real evaluation or conclusion. **Fragmented or poorly written text** with numerous errors. **Poor presentation**, which includes poorly written and spelt text and sub-standard graphical work.

**Key word descriptors**

*Presentation:* Weak. Unattractive and uninformative graphically, significant text errors.

*Data and content:* A limited database, which may be poorly linked to study themes. Themes and objectives poorly stated.

*Techniques:* A limited and poorly chosen range used.

*Relationships:* Mainly descriptive with little real analysis.



- 9**            **Not really at the appropriate standard for this level of work. Very limited** data content and entirely lacking analysis appropriate to the Advanced Higher Geography course. **Superficial, simplistic** and almost exclusively **descriptive**. Contains many errors and **very poorly presented**. Shows little understanding of what is required, and has **little real content** as required by the specification of the Geographical Study.

**Key word descriptors**

*Presentation:* Many text errors and very poor graphics. Not really at AH standard.

*Data and content:* Very limited data content in all respects, and little or no attempt to relate these to study themes. Simplistic.

*Techniques:* Extremely limited or inappropriate. Not really at AH standard.

*Relationships:* Limited description with no real analysis.

- 8 – 0**            **Very poor in all respects**, lacking any proper database or use of analytical techniques, containing gross errors and with no explanation. The standard of presentation ranges from very poor to abysmal. May be a “token” presentation. **Shows no understanding of what is required for an Advanced Higher Geographical Study**. Little or no geographical **content or relevance**. Whilst it is important to give marks where this is justified, if the study is a “token” very low marks will be appropriate.

**Key word descriptors**

*Presentation:* Very poor to abysmal in all respects. Clearly not at AH standard.

*Data and content:* Little substantial content at all. Gives clear impression that not much work has been done. Not at AH standard.

*Techniques:* Little or no use of techniques appropriate to AH course, and not at AH standard.

*Relationships:* Very weakly descriptive, with no proper analysis. Not at AH standard.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]