

PAPER 1F

Introduction

Performance among the candidates was sound for this tier with some variability between the candidates. All questions generated a fair range of marks with the bottom of the range on questions 2, 4 and 6 in Section A and on question 7 in Section B being disappointingly low. All candidates chose question 7 in Section B.

Comments on individual questions

Section A

- 1. Water** This was one of the better scoring questions in Section A. Part (a) was invariably answered accurately though (a)(ii) tended to be answered with too little specificity; *how* water is low quality, rather than *why*, dominated answers. A similar answering style emerged in part (b); loose, broad or very personal uses were too common. The final question was better answered, with all candidates able to write proficiently about reservoirs, purification and pipelines.
- 2. Hazards** Performance was more variable on this question than on Question 1. (ii) and (iii) of part (a) were not well done; answers were often vague and inaccurate. Part (b)(ii) was equally not well answered; only one candidate offered a response of Level 2 quality. References to heat sources and energy were rare. However, (b)(i) and (c) were pleasingly answered. Appropriate adjectives were used to describe the weather in (b)(i) and reference to MEDC technology and resources was well used to explain impact minimisation in (c).
- 3. Production** This question generated a very narrow range of satisfactory performance from the candidature. Part (a) was universally well answered but this standard was not maintained into part (b). In (b)(i) physical factors were not always offered with markets and transport figuring in the answers given. Candidates often misread (b)(ii), with most neither offering irrigation, greenhousing etc. nor the explanation sought, so gaining few marks. Part (c) proved to be a good discriminator with (c)(i) producing responses from secondary to micro-electronics and (c)(ii) seeing genuine variation in response quality.
- 4. Development** As in June 2005 responses on development geography were disappointing. Candidates made a good start with parts (a)(i) and (iii) but performed badly in (a)(ii) and did not use the map, Figure 4. Surprisingly, indicators of local decline requested in (a)(iv) were not well known whereas valid reasons for regional growth requested in (b) were known. Part (c) proved too much of a challenge for all with irrelevant responses typical.
- 5. Migration** This tended to be the best answered Section A question, with no part causing general difficulty. Part (a) scored well for all candidates as did the explanation of the difference between push and pull factors. Counterurbanisation was understood as a process but often not well defined in (c)(i). Part (d) produced a good range of responses, with all offering causes and some going on to describe them.

- 6. Urban Environments** Some responses to question 6 were disappointing, with candidates experiencing difficulty in part (a). Some gave only one feature in (a)(i) and the differences requested in (a)(ii) were rarely explicit. Part (b) on CBDs was better answered though surprisingly not all knew what the acronym stood for. Answers to part (c) were let down by imprecision, with some valid factors offered but loose, vague development of them characterising the responses.

Section B

In Section B all candidates chose to answer Question 7, Fragile Environments. All made a good start to this 20-mark question. High scoring on part (a) continued into (b)(i) and (ii) with the role of overgrazing and overcropping in desertification being clearly understood and well explained. Part (b)(iii) saw a general dip in performance with not all candidates being able to identify and develop deforestation and climate change as other causes of desertification. Level 1 responses (1- 3 marks) typified part (c). Areas were correctly named but the effects offered tended to be vague and unspecific, with little more than a mention. Case study information was missing, as it was throughout the paper, but would have helped candidates score higher marks.

PAPER 2H

Introduction

Paper 2H attracted more candidates than Paper 1F. There was a reasonable spread of marks covering most of the grades accessible through this tier. A range of mark totals was also evident at individual question level. Unlike Paper 1F candidates opted for all three questions in the choice Section B. The great area for candidate improvement on the basis of these responses lies in the issue of candidates actually answering the question set.

Section A

- 1. Water** Most candidates failed to gain both marks in (a)(i); few went beyond a 1-mark response on healthy/safe to drink. Equally, there was a tendency for some candidates to write about the meaning of low quality water rather than identify specific factors lowering the quality. Part (b), however, was invariably well answered though the absence of examples often denied candidates access to Level 3 marks. Part (c) was also well answered. Water collection and delivery were normally both adequately addressed. In part (d) the term, regime was rarely picked upon with the effect that the question set tended not to be answered. Low marks were typical for (d).
- 2. Hazards** Most made a disappointing start, showing little knowledge and understanding of the source, track and spatial strength of Atlantic hurricanes in their answers in parts (a) and (b)(ii). Very few were able to develop the basic point of energy loss as the storm tracked inland. They did, however, tend to be familiar with the weather brought by these storms and their environmental impacts, and so scored well in (b)(i) and (c)(i). Responses to the final section ((c)(ii)) were pleasing with the role of development on impact minimisation being well understood. Candidates often missed accessing Level 3 marks by not including examples.
- 3. Production** A well answered question. Candidates tended to start well with

parts (a)(i) and (ii) though few scored both marks in (a)(iii). Part (b)(i) proved surprisingly problematic for some candidates; some offered human factors rather than physical and gaining the second explanatory mark in each case proved too much for some. Part (b)(ii), however, was always well done. The final section discriminated significantly with some candidates struggling to name a valid manufacturing type in (c)(i), and (c)(ii) producing a range of response qualities from mere lists of manufacturing types to sound accounts of recent industrialisation in the Pacific Rim.

4. **Development** Generally a weaker question, though a minority of candidates did achieve a respectable outcome. In part (a) it was in (iii) where candidates did best and had little difficulty with the task; (a)(i) responses were often limited to city names only and in (a)(ii) answers tended to go little beyond reference to shape. Part (b) was particularly well answered; decline indicators were clearly known and (b)(ii) generated some very interesting and quite profound reasoned accounts of regional growth in Africa and Asia. Disappointingly, not answering the question was typical of responses to (c); the key word 'how' was frequently ignored. Understanding of the concept of a growth pole was also commonly wanting.
5. **Migration** This tended to be the best answered question on the paper. All candidates showed awareness of the basic migration patterns in their responses to (a)(i), were able to offer valid reasons driving these patterns and were clearly comfortable with the counterurbanisation process (part (b)(i)). In (b)(ii), however, candidates rarely reached the Level 3 quality of response because of their difficulty in linking reasons to push and pull ideas and fitting their explanation into the framework created by the model. For a 6-mark finale question part the standard of (b)(iii) answers was very good. There was some repetition of previous answers but more important was the fact that both economic and political migration were well understood, and examples of explained flows were frequent.
6. **Urban Environments** This was also a well answered question. However, often candidates did not start as well as they did on previous Section A questions. Most candidates identified differences for (a)(i) but usually indirectly rather than overtly stating them. Equally, the reasons for these differences were generally stabbed at rather than being addressed and explained in a logical manner. Part (b) was much better done with almost all candidates correctly identifying an area and using the data to good effect. Part (c) was similarly well answered with most offering a sound account of rural-to-urban migration. The final part produced a variety of levels of response, though very few reached Level 3 because they did not explain the typical zones, but merely named and described them.

Section B

7. **Fragile Environments** This was a fairly popular option and one where candidates tended to score more highly than their average mark per question in Section A. Good starts were common on (a)(i) but partial definitions focusing on a cause of desertification were typical in (a)(ii). Candidates often did not understand part (b)(i) tended to confuse with the essence of the term 'fragility' rarely being captured by the candidates. (b)(ii), on the other hand, scored well, with candidates being able to follow in writing the diagram sequence but unfortunately, often repeating their answers in (b)(iii). Successful responses were frequent in parts (c) and (d), and these scored

respectably. The effects of desertification on the population of named areas were clearly known, and forest sustainability, especially rainforest, had been taught in the centres involved.

8. **Globalisation** This was most popular of the three optional questions though slightly less well scoring than question 7. Part (a)(i) saw valid ideas extracted from Figure 8 and mostly developed into a creditworthy explanation. Again, basic ideas had been grasped in (a)(ii) but the link into trade was frequently missing so candidates did not access the second mark available to each item in many cases. Global competition was normally correctly identified as the answer to (a)(iii). Tourism was generally well known and pleasingly understood. The attractions of the tropics for tourists were clearly communicated, African case studies showing understanding of the concept of sustainability appeared on most papers, and the negative impacts of mass tourism were often set in the context of a named resort.
9. **Human Welfare** Few candidates opted for this question, and those that did tended to score less well. Imprecise definitions were given to (a)(i) and few offered the data in response to (a)(ii), preferring instead to make vague statements lifted from Figure 9. (a)(iii) responses were similarly characterised by vague, imprecise comments which rarely constituted real evidence. (a)(iv) tended to be better done with some candidates offering good responses dealing with illiteracy and its consequences, though not referring to the spiral of decline idea, (a)(v) proved to be the best answered part of this question. The implications of HIV/Aids were very well understood. The responses to parts (b) and (c) were somewhat weaker, tending to be generalised proposals, occasionally reaching Level 2 in quality at best. In both cases the specifics, for example people living below the poverty line, were overlooked. Disappointingly, there were no references to appropriate technology in responses to (b).

PAPER 3

General comments

The option of a skills based paper as an alternative to coursework continued to be popular with both candidates and centres. As in the previous series of examinations, the paper supported those entered for Foundation Tier, whilst more able candidates were able to obtain some excellent marks. Candidates at both levels of entry were able to complete the paper in the allotted time of 1 hour and 15 minutes, and there was ample evidence that centres had prepared their candidates fully for the demands of Paper 3.

Questions 1 and 2

These resource based questions required candidates to use a number of geographical skills. Candidates tended to score higher marks for Question 1.

Question 1

Question 1 started by asking candidates to complete the annotations on a field sketch. This task proved to be straightforward and enabled the majority of candidates to obtain full marks. Candidates demonstrated accurate graph construction techniques in (b) and many were able to provide detailed comparisons

of two urban areas from material provided in additional completed graphs, as shown by the following extract:

'The Orchard Road has wide pavements while the East Coast Parkway has no pavements, the number of trees/plants is greater in Orchard Road than East Coast Parkway.'

Part (c) was, in general, more poorly answered with many candidates lifting material from the resources without explanation of how it supported or disproved the given conclusion. The following is an example of a good answer that enabled the candidate to be awarded level 3 in the mark scheme:

'The reason for my answer is that the East Coast Parkway has more modern buildings, trees/plants and is much noisier and busier than the Dunlop Street, which is in the inner city, it is the opposite of East Coast Parkway, it has old buildings which are two storeys high. It has no trees or plants, it is very quiet and not busy compared to the East Coast Parkway which is far from the CBD and the airport. The Orchard Road is more improved than the Dunlop Street but is not that much busier or noisier than the East Coast Parkway and you can see that from the pictures in Figure 1, this is why I agree with the student.'

Question 2

Candidates tended to score fewer marks on Question 2 than on Question 1 because they lacked map reading skills and some unfamiliarity with cross sections. Candidates were, however, able to complete the scatter graph accurately and comment on the relationships shown by the completed graph in part (c). However few candidates were able to draw detailed conclusions about the relationships presented by the graph and table, and a number offered explanations which did not meet the requirements of the question and so limited the marks that the candidate could obtain, for example:

'This shows that this area has a high rainfall throughout the year because there are a lot of woodlands and also river width and the velocity is high from sites A to H.'

Question 3

A number of centres had carefully prepared their candidates for this question by selecting a range of field studies and primary data collection techniques. As a result, candidates were able to identify some clear questions or issues that they had investigated and were able to outline the aim of their investigation. In (a)(iii), descriptions of the location of the field work were adequate but there were few responses which gave sufficient accurate detail. A typical, rather low scoring response with little detail would be

'The location of the fieldwork was in a village called -. The river flows through the centre of the village.'

Parts (b)(i) and (ii) produced a range of problems encountered during the data collection and showed that the candidates were able to give considerable thought about how to reduce these problems, Surprisingly, part (c) proved difficult for a number of candidates. There was some confusion over the term 'method of presentation', with candidates describing how they collected the data rather than the tables, graphs or other suitable presentation methods. Explanations of selection of presentation method were consequently limited with the majority of answers

emphasising the simplicity of the method, e.g. :

'We chose this method because it was very easy and fast.'

Suggestions for other methods of presentation for the data were also very brief and lacking in clarity, a typical response would be simply 'a graph', without mentioning type or trying to justify its selection.

PAPER 4 - COURSEWORK

Introduction

A number of candidates from both tiers were entered for the coursework option as the alternative to Paper 3.

Administration

There were few administrative errors on behalf of the centres and centres are again to be thanked for contributing to the moderation process. All work was submitted in simple lightweight folders which assisted with moderation. Much of the submitted work was accurately marked. However, there were instances of centres being overgenerous or inconsistent with some criteria, and this caused some adjustment in the candidates' marks.

Candidates' performance

Centres selected topics that were relevant to the specification, and, as previously, there was considerable evidence that centres had taken great care to design work that would be accessible to the candidates but that would also allow some individual selection of data collection methods.

Criterion 1 - Introduction and aims

All the submitted studies were introduced by clear aims, though few candidates were able to develop questions or hypotheses to extend their work. Some of the work included a carefully thought out sequence of data collection which allowed for individual work with investigations based on group work.

Criterion 2 - Data collection

Some of the submitted work had a strong emphasis on secondary data collection. Although this is perfectly acceptable, it limits the variety of methods used to collect information and the ability to fully justify these methods. Consequently, a number of pieces of work did not reach Level 3. Research using the internet must be accompanied by an acknowledgement of the source of data.

Criterion 3 - Data presentation

The submitted studies included a range of data presentation including some well constructed maps, digital photographs and a range of graphs. However, relatively few candidates used a wide enough range of techniques to reach Level 3, and the teacher- led nature of the submitted work limited the originality of the presentation methods from some centres. Centres are reminded that photographs and location

maps become much more valuable if annotated to emphasise the relevant features.

Criterion 4 - Analysis and Conclusions

All candidates were able to comment on their data but those who had relied on secondary sources tended to make somewhat superficial comments and were only able to reach Level 1 or the bottom of Level 2.

Most candidates were able to offer some concluding comments. In the better studies the candidates returned to their original question and were able to take an overview of the data collected. Most candidates were able to comment on the limitations of their studies and those who had relied on secondary data collection usually noticed that their work could be improved by some primary data methods.

Criterion 5 - Planning and Organisation

All the submitted studies were extremely well organised and the majority of candidates achieved either Level 2 or Level 3 for this criterion. Photographs and maps were integrated into the texts, and it was noticeable that a number of candidates were able to cross reference to this material.

It was pleasing to note that all the studies contained bibliographies and that sources of secondary data were acknowledged.

GEOGRAPHY 4370, GRADE BOUNDARIES

| Grade | | A* | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Lowest mark for award of grade | Option 1 (1F, 03) | - | - | - | 51 | 43 | 35 | 27 | 19 |
| | Option 1 (1F, 03) | - | - | - | 51 | 43 | 35 | 27 | 19 |
| | Option 1 (1F, 03) | 67 | 60 | 53 | 46 | 38 | 34 | - | - |
| | Option 1 (1F, 03) | 67 | 60 | 53 | 46 | 38 | 34 | - | - |

Note: Grade boundaries may vary from series to series and from subject to subject, depending on the demands of the question papers.