

Generic mark scheme	
I	Introduction; defining and focusing on the question
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to introduce report.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title referenced but not deconstructed, although topic addressed. • Neither focus nor framework addressed. • One or two key terms partially defined.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some reference to title but limited deconstruction. • Focus of report implied but unclear. • Framework implicit but appropriate indication of framework, either by concepts and/or case studies. • Some accurate definitions of key terms.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear deconstruction of title. • Focus of report on geographical question/issue is both clear and rational. • Framework is both explicit and appropriate, either by places, environment and/or concepts. • Accurate definitions of all appropriate terms.
R	Research knowledge
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of research.
1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some case studies/concepts but lacks selection and range so significant gaps. • Concepts and/or theories may be referenced/stated but neither explored nor applied to question. • Very limited range of evidence presented with very limited use of numeric and qualitative data. • Processes not addressed directly but simply asserted.
6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range (scale/location) of all/mostly relevant case studies used. • A limited set of concepts/theories used that assist in focusing on the question. • Mostly accurate evidence used but with gaps in the numeric and qualitative data. • Some relevant processes explained but with inaccuracies.
11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide range of relevant case studies used (by scale and or location). • Relevant concepts and/or theories/models used to support focus. • Factual, accurate and topical evidence used which includes both quantitative and qualitative data. • Relevant processes, interactions and changes accurately explained.

A	Analysis, application and understanding
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding or analysis.
1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No obvious report. • A few simple statements related to topic as a whole but not to question asked. • Understanding stated in a few simple phrases but no development. • Statement that views/perspectives might vary but without evidence/support. • Any maps/diagrams are rarely used to support answer.
6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report is unclear and direction of argument is obscure. • Generalised material often weakly linked to question with focus unclear. • Some conceptual understanding delivered through basic unqualified statements. • Limited appreciation of how identifiable values/perspectives might vary with no support. • Any maps/diagrams are sometimes used to support answers.
11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report is clear but not always easy to follow with some hesitancy in the argument. • Most of the research is used to support the question which remains in focus. • Some conceptual understanding and argument although largely asserted/stated. • Some appreciation of how identifiable values/perspectives vary although limited support. • Any maps/diagrams are usually used to support answer.
16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report has a clear direction which is argued coherently. • All research interpreted and applied directly to the question set. • Strong conceptual understanding with coherent argument and counter argument. • Appreciation of different interactions/values/perspectives that are supported by evidence/examples. • Any maps/diagrams are accurate and used to support answer.

C	Conclusion and evaluation
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No conclusion or evaluation in report.
1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content of report weakly related to C and E. • Evaluation limited to statement of inadequate methods. • Conclusions made but much is unrelated to content. • No qualifications.
6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selective recall of content of report with some evidence ignored. • Some evaluation, either on-going or in final conclusion largely about methodological flaws. • Some conclusions although linkages with evidence occasionally tenuous. • One or two qualifications/exceptions stated but not explained.
11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly stated conclusion with explicit references to title. • Thorough use of content/case studies on places and environments used in report to inform conclusion. • Consistent return to the focus. • Evaluation offers a judgement, but also recognises the complexity of the question.

Q	Quality of written communication, methodology and sourcing
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic standards of quality of written communication not met.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disjointed organisation and sequencing although may have some subsections. • Many errors in punctuation and spelling that make report hard to follow. • Very limited use of appropriate geographical vocabulary. • Methodology unclear with no detail of rationale for selection of research evidence. • Almost no referencing evidencing/sourcing from very limited range of sources.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally clearly written with some report style subsections. • Sound standard of punctuation and spelling but with errors although meaning remains clear. • Some good use of appropriate geographical vocabulary. • Sound methodology demonstrating some rationale for evidence selection with simple comments about possible partiality. • Occasional but patchy referencing from several different sources.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherent structure and sequencing with obvious report style subsections. • Excellent standards of spelling and punctuation, including geographical vocabulary, with very few errors. • Clear methodology showing a rationale for evidence selection, including potential issues of partiality. • Accurate referencing of a wide range of sources.