



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In AS Geography
Paper 2

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 Candidates at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2024

Publications Code 8GE0_02_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

8GE02 assesses knowledge and understanding about Globalisation, followed by a choice of questions on Regenerating Places or Diverse Places.

This year the synoptic questions focussed on the development of Hambantota port, Sri Lanka, with candidates asked to evaluate the impacts on people and environment (Regenerating Places) and the impacts of migration on people in Jamaica (Diverse Places). Approximately 85% answered the Regeneration option.

Candidates for the 2024 examination series have been less directly affected by school closures as a result of the Coronavirus Pandemic. There were no adjustments to the examination process in 2024. However, some AS candidates may have had less experience of fieldwork in their early years of secondary school which may have had some effects on their performance on questions 3 and 6.

- The structure of answers for the 12 and 16 mark essays has continued to improve, with many showing the ability to organise their answers logically, making relevant connections and relationships across the ideas they discussed, with some also able to make judgements/ conclusions.

1a	The vast majority were able to score one mark here, with the most commonly seen answers being overcrowding and over population. Others mentioned shortages of housing and water resources. A wide interpretation of a social challenge was accepted. Brevity was the key to this one mark question, which most managed with one-word responses. Some used a whole sentence but a few managed to cram in several points in 2 or 3 sentences and could have scored between 2 & 4 marks had they been available. This was not good use of time.
1bi	This two mark 'compare' question caused a problem for many. Comparative wording and change in Carbon Dioxide was required for each mark, and there were many routes to achieve this. There were good attempts at a comparison but not all successfully achieved both marks. The second mark was elusive for many, most scored 1 for saying UK/Germany /USA are decreasing while China and India are increasing. Most scored one mark, with many making one over long comparison, as the follow-up point was usually not comparative, just a statement or quoting of data. A few did manage to further say that China had increased the most or that UK decreased the most or that USA decreased the least. Statements that simply stated facts about Carbon Dioxide emissions in different places without comparison did not score marks.
1bii	Here a reason for the change in CO ₂ was required, and then extended for a total of three marks.

	Most commonly seen answers made reference to global shift to Asia linked to cheap labour (or another advantage), so there were more factories and therefore more fossil fuels used. This was generally well answered. If candidates were unable to gain the third mark it was usually because the final point was vague or repetitive. Some started a separate reason which could not be credited as the question asks for one reason. Centres are advised to practise these 'chains of 3' marks as a classroom activity. One student could identify a reason, and a second and then a third student could build on their answer, each beginning with the word 'because'. This skill is useful for 3 and 4 mark questions on all three GCE papers, so it is well worth developing.
1c	Again, this question was generally well answered, and 3 or 4 marks were frequently awarded. Two social problems were needed here, each explained and then developed Unemployment, mismatch of skills, outmigration, rising house prices, decline in services were the most common focus of answers with appropriate explanation. However, a few candidates did not notice the change to 'developed countries' and carried on from the previous question and focused on developing countries and problems with the rise of industrialisation. A few looked at purely economic or environmental problems and occasionally some comments could be salvaged and given a mark for a social point, but not often. Some students failed to get the extension point as they did not expand on what this could lead to or the implications of this. A number of students talked about the shift to tertiary jobs and commented how people were not qualified, implying that tertiary jobs are always higher skilled jobs, which without further detail is an over-generalisation.
1d	In response to the question about why some groups retain their cultural identity, most scored 3 or 4 marks. There were frequently a couple of briefly outlined examples in support. Although the question asked 'Why' there had to be an element of 'How' for support. Some candidates spent too long on an introduction that discussed in more generalised terms the 'Why' without reference to 'How' to back up their argument. That said, there were some detailed examples. Frequently seen were France's attempts to preserve their language through media, North Korea or China's censorship, Papua New Guinea, or ethnic enclaves in various, usually named, cities To achieve 5 or 6, fuller knowledge of the routes the groups took to preserve their identity was required.

1e	This essay differentiated well, and there were good essays seen when candidates focussed on TNCs. The mean mark was just over 6 marks. There was generally a greater focus on ICT than Mobile Communications, usually with appropriate support. Some candidates, when referring to mobile communications took this as solely mobile phones. Better answers assessed importance of these changes alongside other developments including the role of changes in transportation such as containers, jet engines etc in the spread of TNCs. Higher scoring responses also looked at other potentially important factors such as government policy, SEZs, cheaper labour or land, the existence of lax pollution laws or being 'switched off', as well as physical factors such as isolation and being landlocked. These concepts were discussed in terms of how they contributed to the spread of TNCs, in contrast to ICT/mobiles. There was good use of support in terms of Disney, e-commerce, just-in-time approaches etc., alongside the role of improved transport and social media sites. Some assessment was limited to comments about overall they have been a success or very important in TNC spread, but better responses did manage to attempt assessment by saying one was more important than the other (they argued both ways) or that one would not have been as influential without the other.
2a	'Connectness' was an idea that some candidates struggled to relate to, but acceptable answers could be related to transport or wifi so a range of interpretations was credited. A change had to be identified, which could be improving (faster broadband, or a new motorway link) or decrease (closure of a rail link or worsening due to a fall in income as jobs moved elsewhere).
2bi	The majority were able to select the appropriate data and calculate the mean correctly. Candidates are reminded to follow instructions about giving the answer to one decimal place, as stated in this question.
2bii	Overall this was answered well with most students choosing to discuss jobs, links with university graduates and higher wages. The most able took this further to describe the impact on taxes or the multiplier effect. Centres are again reminded that there must be a direct link from the resource, as there is one AO2 mark here, which must then be developed with AO1 knowledge for two further marks. Many candidates were able to develop a theme along the lines of knowledge-based quaternary jobs, perhaps linked to university investment, which would be more highly paid, and therefore there would be more tax paid to local government (allowed the benefit of

	the doubt about this) or more spending in the local economy for goods and services, or that this would attract more investment. Some candidates addressed the environmental advantages of the location, but often struggled to gain the third mark. Candidates who did not score generally focused on 'Parks' rather than the full 'Science Parks' and so went along a tourism route which generally missed the point of the question. It seemed they had not studied science parks specifically although this is on the specification (4A.8a).
2c	Overall this was not answered well. Many answers were too vague as they did not concentrate on a specific group or else did not identify the methods used to affect the decision making such as protests or using social media, or working with planners. Protesting or campaigning was a popular choice, scoring a second mark where specifics were explained, and environmental motivation was popular also. Many misread the question, giving reasons 'why' and not 'how' so there were quite a few 0s were scored. There were not many responses that identified specific interest groups and too many referred generally to 'local interest groups'. There didn't appear to be a lot of awareness of how these groups can apply pressure to situations/proposals they object to. There was also evidence in some responses of misinterpretation of the question, as it was read as 'may be affected by' rather than 'may affect' which put an entirely different slant on the question and therefore the response. Centres are encouraged to focus on 4A.8b in the specification and discuss with candidates about how local interest groups play a role in decision-making about regeneration. Two times two reasons were needed here for this 4-mark question. Some candidates gave one developed idea for 2 marks, and some gave two 1-mark answers.
2d	This was reasonably well answered overall, with a mean mark of 3. The highest-level students exemplified their answers with case studies to discuss how the UK government decisions could lead to regeneration and economic growth. There were several ways that candidates tackled this question. Some named particular schemes such as HS2, or targets for house building, or decisions about the Olympics or Docklands, but did not develop the answer to explain how they encouraged regeneration/ economic growth. Others focused on one example and narrated a case study which was often descriptive rather than explanatory. As the question said 'may encourage' there was an opportunity to explain the limitations of the examples used the ways and reasons that aspects of the projects linked to the decisions were unsuccessful.

	To gain level 3 marks, it is recommended candidate use at least two different scenarios to demonstrate the 'broad range of geographical ideas' required.
2e	Overall on this 12 mark question there were some missed opportunities for better marks. Candidates were asked to assess the advantages in using a range of evidence measuring the success of regeneration. Too few discussed what 'success' means in the context of regeneration, or how this could be measured. They often were unable to recognise that this perception of success changes depending on the stakeholder's point of view. The mean mark was just over 5 marks. Some candidates focussed on primary data and treated this as a fieldwork question. This was not a problem and was marked according to the levels-based mark scheme. Lower scoring answers only gave generic advantages and disadvantages of collecting a range of data without specifying any types of data collection. Too many described the results of their data with little or no reference to the importance or benefits of using a wide range of evidence. The very best mentioned stakeholders and how regeneration may be viewed differently by some individuals and focused on specifics. There were not many Level 3 answers as the assessment component was often a single sentence at the end of each paragraph or one or two sentences at the end. Good answers discussed clear examples of what data sets could be used as different sorts of evidence towards judgements of success. They referred to IMD data, use of the census, different types of media, local and national government websites, Police websites, house prices and footfall and explained how each was useful. The best answers were supported by examples of where these were used effectively, and assessment was made about their relative value in judging success. Candidates often struggled to develop the idea of the value of a range beyond saying it avoided bias or gives a better overall/holistic view. Those that could incorporate these ideas into their examples scored more highly than those with a brief summary assessment or a mention within the text or at the end. There was usually some acknowledgment that different stakeholders use different criteria but, again, this was not always developed within the exemplar.
3ai	By far the majority successful scored the 1 mark available here and showed they could calculate a simple range.
3aii	The vast majority chose B and were able to quote evidence and give a reason, usually relating to jobs or services. Those that chose A tended to struggle for a reason to explain the lower footfall.

3aiii	Most responses were appropriately focused on one limitation of the design of the data collection method, but a few commented about the presentation method or the use of a bar graph so did not score marks. Most identified the time of day or choice of the day of the week being unrepresentative, as it missed out on the commuter rush hour, or schools finishing or else commented on the changes at a weekend or in the evening.
3aiv	This two-by-two mark question was answered poorly by some, but most were able to score at least 3 of the 4 marks available. There were plenty of ideas for secondary data types, although candidates were not always clear on the source of data. Zoopla, IMD, and census were the most frequently quoted sources followed by various social media sites, Trip Advisor or police crime data sites. Some answers were specific about the sources of data but were not able to explain how they could be used to measure success which restricted the answer to a single mark. Photos were a popular choice, but many did not elaborate on this in terms of how the photos could be used or comment on the changes that might be identified between past and present photos.
3b	This year's fieldwork question asked candidates to assess how far their conclusion answered the question they had posed at the start of their investigation. There were fewer L3 answers than in previous years. The mean and the modal mark were both 4. There was detailed description of findings from fieldwork, with comments about the methods used, and where and why these were used to investigate the question. However, many missed the focus of the question about how far their conclusion(s) answered the question. Most were able to offer some criticism of their methods and how these might affect their conclusions. Most of the assessment was at the end of the answer or each paragraph, and was usually a comment of whether it did help or not. There wasn't much weighing up of 'how far', just a brief comment of it either did, did mostly or did not. The highest-level students presented their findings and developed this to talk critically about their methods/data used to come to this conclusion, and the top students provided some suggestions for improvements to the approach used.
4	This question was well answered by most, as long as they gave themselves enough time to complete it. The difference across the responses was based on the range of points and detail as well as the evaluation. The majority of answers did show balance. All responses that had some degree of length could identify economic benefits (most commonly, jobs/using local rubber to provide an

	income for farmers / the potential multiplier effect) and disadvantages (most commonly, loss of jobs/farmland) along with the corresponding social and environmental pros and cons. In this way there was some implicit evaluation and often summary sentences at the end of each section. Most answers were focused on the resource which was generally well used. Better responses were able to look beyond the resource. Ideas discussed were the neo-colonial activities of China hence the clash with the Buddhist monks, also consideration of profits going back to China so how far this development really benefited Sri Lanka, and whose workers might take the higher paid jobs. Some also considered the risk of disease due to air/land/water pollution which was linked by some back to industrialisation in China. There was reference to cancer villages and problems of air quality and contaminated water sources leading to a range of complaints. The loss of farmland and fishing was argued both ways, as on the one hand it caused a loss of jobs and a local food source leading to higher prices to buy from elsewhere, or else it could be seen as a push needed to get out of a subsistence economy and earn a higher (for them) wage, either in the factories or resort which might represent a more stable income and less affected by the weather. There were also differences seen in the views taken about the resort and the lagoon, with some taking the view that they were there before and therefore the lagoon was particularly under threat along with possible reduction in visitor numbers, or they were created as part of the development. The majority took the former view, but either was acceptable. Most conclusions that were not rushed gave a careful weighing of the relative importance of the pros and cons, the general consensus was that social and economic pros and environmental cons were foremost, but this could change in the future and likely that the social and economic factors would become negative considerations. The best responses also considered the extent. Some sat on the fence and said there were benefits and costs to each factor, and this tended to hold back their answer to level 3.
5a	A one- or two-word answer was sufficient here, and migration and social clustering were most commonly seen. Brevity was the key to this one-mark question, but some used a whole sentence or even crammed in several points in two or three sentences and could have scored between 2 and 4 marks had they been available. This was not good use of time.

5bi	The majority were able to select the appropriate data and calculate the mean correctly. Candidates are reminded to follow instructions about giving the answer to one decimal place, as stated in this question.
5bii	Most used the resource to identify a change in culture shown in the photograph, and successfully developed the reasoning for a second mark, but candidates did not always manage to get the third mark as the further extension was too vague.
5c	Two times two reasons were needed here for this 4-mark question. Some candidates gave one developed idea for 2 marks, and some gave two 1-mark answers. A large number were able to achieve between 3-4 marks. The best answers focused on identified residents or groups rather than writing a generalised answer about the problems of rural life. Centres are advised discuss the ways perceptions of place vary, for example by comparing different age groups or income groups, and how and why different residents have contrasting perceptions of the same place. A simple survey of the class and their views about their community or the centre's local place, compared to older members of their families might highlight this.
5d	This 6-mark question asked for an explanation of why changes to the built environment might create challenges for some groups of people. Contrasting groups and their views of what constituted challenges were identified but support and detail in some instances were too brief. The best answers used real place examples and gave detailed and developed reasons. Places might be considered diverse in terms of ethnicity, culture, age of residents, or length of residence amongst other categories. The Pepys estate and Southall in London, Boston in Lincolnshire, and Luton were successfully used as examples. As the question said 'may create challenges' there was an opportunity to explain the ways groups of people may show cooperation or work together to reduce challenges experienced in the built environment. Another route was to discuss how the use of places may evolve over time without conflict occurring. To gain level 3 marks, it is recommended candidates use at least two different scenarios to demonstrate the 'broad range of geographical ideas' required.
5e	Overall, on this 12-mark question there were some missed opportunities for better marks. Candidates were asked to assess the advantages in using a range of evidence measuring the success of management of change. Too few discussed what 'success' means in the context of management of change, or how this could be

	measured. They often were unable to recognise that this perception of success changes depending on the stakeholder's point of view. The mean mark was just over 5 marks. Some candidates focussed on primary data and treated this as a fieldwork question. This was not a problem and was marked according to the levels-based mark scheme. Lower scoring answers only gave generic advantages and disadvantages of collecting a range of data without specifying any types of data collection. Too many described the results of their data with little or no reference to the importance or benefits of using a wide range of evidence. The very best mentioned stakeholders and how the management of change may be viewed differently by some individuals and focused on specifics. There were not many Level 3 answers as the assessment component was often a single sentence at the end of each paragraph or one or two sentences at the end. Good answers discussed clear examples of what data sets could be used as different sorts of evidence towards judgements of success. They referred to statistics measuring a reduction of hate crime or racist incidents, awards won by projects or organisations, IMD data, use of the census, different types of media, local and national government websites and Police UK and many others and explained how each was useful. The best answers were supported by examples of where these were used, and assessment made about their relative value in judging success. A wide range of sources of evidence were quoted and there was some reasonable support with Slough and Reading used in many responses. Weaker answers tended to use one location only, rather than drawing contrasts. Candidates often struggled to develop the idea of the value of a range beyond saying it avoided bias or gives a better overall/holistic view. Those that could incorporate these ideas into their examples scored more highly than those with a brief summary assessment or a mention within the text or at the end. There was usually some acknowledgment that different stakeholders use different criteria but, again, this was not always developed within the exemplar.
6ai	By far the majority successful scored the 1 mark available here as they were able to calculate a simple range.
6aii	In this question the split between A and B as the location where deprivation was highest was even. Those who chose A argued that there would be fewer services, or that people might not feel safe due to an increased likelihood of crime. Those opting for B tended to say that there would likely be less public transport, so people walked.

6aiii	Most responses were appropriately focused on one limitation of the design of the data collection method, but a few commented about the presentation method or the use of a bar graph so did not score marks. Most identified the time of day or choice of the day of the week being unrepresentative, as it missed out on the commuter rush hour, or schools finishing or else commented on the changes at a weekend or in the evening.
6aiv	This two-by-two marks question was answered poorly by some, but most were able to score at least 3 of the 4 marks available. There were plenty of ideas for types of secondary data, but candidates were not always clear on the source of data. Zoopla, IMD, and census were the most frequently quoted sources followed by various social media sites, Trip Advisor and police crime data sites. Some answers were specific about the sources of data but were not able to explain how they could be used to measure success which restricted the answer to a single mark. Better answers suggested the changes to look out for such as specific IMD data showing a decrease or increase indicating deprivation levels. Photos were a popular choice but many did not elaborate on this in terms of how the photos could be used to indicate the level of deprivation or to comment on the changes that might be identified between past and present photos.
6b	This year's fieldwork question asked candidates to assess how far their conclusion answered the question they had posed at the start of their investigation. There were fewer L3 answers than in previous years. The mean and the modal mark were both 4. There was detailed description of findings from fieldwork, with comments about the methods used, and where and why these were used to investigate the question. However, many missed the focus of the question about how far their conclusion(s) answered the question. Most were able to offer some criticism of their methods and how these might affect their conclusions. Most of the assessment was at the end of the answer or each paragraph and was usually a comment of whether it did help or not. There wasn't much weighing up of 'how far', just a brief comment of it either did, did mostly or did not. The highest-level students presented their findings and developed this to talk critically about their methods/data used to come to this conclusion, and the top students provided some suggestions for improvements to the approach used. Stratford, London was often used as the focus for fieldwork in the answers seen.

This question was well answered by most, as long as they gave themselves enough time to complete it.

The difference across the responses was based on the range of points and detail as well as the evaluation. The majority of answers did show balance.

All responses that had some degree of length could identify benefits and costs for both migrants and their families.

In this way there was some implicit evaluation and often summary sentences at the end of each section. Most answers were focused on the resource which was generally well used.

Answers that relied heavily on quotes or lifts from the resources often stayed in level 2, but there were also some that looked at the benefits for both sides and weighing these against possible negatives. Some up-to-date knowledge about the Windrush generation's problems with the right-to-stay that is ongoing at the moment were discussed along with the effects on specific groups.

Most conclusions that were not rushed gave a careful weighing of the relative importance of the benefits of international migration for migrants and their families. The best responses also considered the extent. Some sat on the fence and said there were benefits and costs for each group, and this tended to hold back their answer to level 3. Evaluation was usually a sentence at the end of each section or a paragraph at the end, but these were not particularly well developed.

