edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report
Summer 2007

IGCSE

IGCSE Geography (4370)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London WC1V 7BH

A PEARSON COMPANY

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on + 44 1204 770 696, or visit our website at www.edexcel-international.org.

Summer 2007

Contents

1.	Paper 1F Examiner Report	5
2.	Paper 2H Examiner Report	9
3.	Paper 03 Examiner Report	13
4.	Paper 04 Examiner Report	17
5.	Statistics	21

edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiner Report
Summer 2007

IGCSE

IGCSE Geography (4370) Paper 1F

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London WC1V 7BH

A PEARSON COMPANY

Unit 4370 Paper 1F

General Comments

The size of the candidature for this year's foundation paper rose broadly in line with the 60 per cent increase in the entry for 4370 viz-a-viz May 2006.
This year also saw a general improvement in the quality of the scripts. There were fewer very weak scripts. These candidates did tend to find the paper more accessible than their counterparts in 2006. These generally higher marks and improved quality was reflected in an increase in the proportion of scripts awarded the key grades.

Question-specific Comments

Section A

Question 1 : Water
Most candidates started well scoring both or at least one mark in part (a). (b)(i), however, posed some difficulties for many candidates who did not manage to go beyond the "lifting" of the annotations on Figure 1. Few referred to the river's size, source and direction of flow, used the rainfall distribution or outlined the plan's basic purpose. There was considerable overlap between (b)(i) and (b)(ii) with candidates frequently repeating points made in (b)(i) in (b)(ii). They rarely managed to see the distinction between the two tasks. (b)(iii) did differentiate between candidates; some did not identify the environmental effects as opposed to economic and social effects given on Figure 1. Part (c) proved to be the most challenging section of this question. Many seemed unprepared for the question's switch of direction with very few moving into the field of water conservation or prioritising supplies.

Question 2 : Hazards
Invariably the highest scoring question of the seven required. The whole of part (a) often attracted full marks with the majority of candidates being able to use Figure 2 effectively, knowing a volcano and the nature of active volcanoes. Equally, there were many sound answers to part (c) with most candidates using a combination of Figure 2 and their own knowledge/understanding to score well. Part (b) was the real differentiator in this question. The concept of short-term and long-term was not familiar to all, and in consequence, many answers were confused and lacked focus.

Question 3 : Production
Responses to this question on food production were frequently disappointing. The cartoon constituting Figure 3 often appeared to lack significance for the candidate who seemed unaware of the existence of overproduction of food in the European Union. Many gained little credit in (a)(i) and (ii), and very few had any knowledge of schemes such as set-aside or countryside stewardship as expected in (a)(iii). Part (b) was set as progression from European Union overproduction in (a); few appreciated this and referred to aspects of modern MEDC farming. Many answers were vague and contained no specific reference to European Union or MEDC farming developments. Part (c) tended to be better answered. Valid factors were often offered in (c)(i) and most candidates reached at least the top of Level 1 in (c)(ii). Most did name an LEDC and refer to generic factors boosting food production there.

Question 4 : Development
This proved to be another not strongly answered question. This has been the case with question 4 in most past examinations of this specification. Learning of the Development

Unit tends to be a weakness and candidates started reasonably well. Most knew Newly or Recently Industrialising Countries (or their named equivalent) in (a)(ii)/(iii), and were able to read Figure 4 correctly for(a)(i). Some read off the date for India correctly but were unable to do so for China. Part (b) was very disappointingly answered. Few candidates claimed maximum marks. The specification lists examples of the three types of development indicator. Responses of Level 1 quality were typical for parts (c) and (d). Few understood precisely the terms set in (c) or were able to refer to living standards, poverty, infrastructure or quality of life in (d).

Question 5 : Migration

In contrast to Question 4, this is a well-taught and learnt area of the specification. Although, this was not the best answered of Migration questions viz-a-viz previous examinations. The concepts of migration balance and asylum were not always fully understood. The distinction between immigration and asylum was frequently blurred in part (c) there were few higher level responses to this final part. Despite not all being clear about a migration balance, most did score reasonably well in (a)(iii) and (iv). Parts (a)(i) and (b) almost universally scored highly; immigration, emigration, forced migration and voluntary migration were well known to the candidates.

Question 6 : Urban Environments

The majority of candidates had success with this question. They started fairly well though the estimation for (a)(ii) and the term(s) sought in (b)(i) were often inappropriate. The causes and strategies for traffic congestion written about in (b)(ii) and (iii) were generally inappropriate and scored positively. Part (c)(i) normally resulted in full marks being awarded though most candidates failed to get beyond Level 1 in (c)(ii). Very few actually addressed the process of regeneration by referring to spending money or creating jobs. Tidying the place and attracting people was as far as the vast majority went in their answers.

Section B

Question 7 : Fragile Environments

This was significantly more popular than the two alternatives of Question 8 and 9. It also along with Question 9 scored highly. Many candidates had little difficulty responding in a creditworthy manner to parts (a)(i)-(iii). They were able to read the Figure 7 graph and describe its trend. The main sources of greenhouse gases were clearly identified by most in (b)(i) though (b)(ii) proved less straightforward. It differentiated well with only a few candidates being able to explain the warming process; most were only able to identify some steps in the process. Very few gained no credit for (b)(ii). Almost all candidates appreciated that global warming impacts on food supply and GDP even though the impacts suggested in (c) varied as did their rationale. Most candidates profited in part (c). The majority seemed to have been taught the Kyoto Protocol and a sizeable number of candidates dealt sufficiently with each of the three aspects of part (d). It was encouraging to see the number who were familiar with the purpose and/or evaluation of this key climate change management strategy.

Question 8 : Globalisation

Clearly the least popular of the three options in this section of the paper. Most opting for this question started well, and used Figure 8 to good effect and realised that Timberland is a trans-/multi-national. Global branding ((a)(iv)) was not well known and very few candidates scored both available marks. Few responses to (a)(v) were satisfactory with the idea of development affecting shopping habits rarely evident. Part (a)(vi) was generally better answered, especially section 1 on manufacturing. Costs were understood as a locational factor by most candidates. For a question finale, part (b) scored quite well with most candidates substituting trans-/multi-national company for

globalisation. Responses were, therefore, limited in scope but sufficiently valid for often a Level 2 mark.

Question 9 : Human Welfare

This question was both popular and high scoring. Almost all candidates gained full marks on the opening task in (a)(i) and correctly identified Sri Lanka as the LEDC. Infant mortality was well understood as a concept in (a)(iii) though rate was not addressed by all candidates for maximum marks. Part (a)(iv) was generally profitable for candidates though a range of quality and marks was evident. Most candidates identified at least one of the more welfare-biassed indicators. Part (b) tended to be well answered throughout with the literacy rate the most commonly identified indicator in (b)(iii). (b)(iv) differentiated very effectively with almost all candidates being at least able to break down HDI into its components for a Level 1 mark and some moving to higher levels by writing about GDP levels, government policy and spending priorities.

edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiner Feedback
Summer 2007

IGCSE

IGCSE Geography (4370) Paper 2H

Unit 4370 Paper 2H

General Comments

The rise in the candidature for this tier was slightly greater than that for entry to the specification as a whole. Both were significant in percentage terms. The paper generated a fair spread of marks and an overall standard of script broadly comparable to that of 2006. There was no general improvement as was the case on paper 1F. On tiered papers with a growing cohort the nature of the entry may be an explanation.
One overall feature of this year's paper was a very uneven mark profile. Most scripts showed a dip in performance in the middle of Section A – the Production and Development questions. The topics chosen for these two questions this time proved to be less student-friendly than those chosen for the 2006 paper.
It was also felt that there was an increase in the number of "gappy" scripts where candidates failed to offer an answer, and an increase in responses deemed NAQ (not answered the question).

Question-specific Comments

Section A

Question 1 : Water
A moderately well-answered question in general terms. Part (a) provided a gentle opener with most candidates being able to identify two valid features. (b)(i) scored reasonably well but most got their marks from direct quotation of the annotations on Figure 1. Too few candidates used the resource in its fullest extent. Rainfall data and river information were too rarely offered. (b)(ii) was generally answered satisfactorily though environmental impacts in the two areas of Spain labelled was sought for both marks. Part (c) differentiated well with the most able referring to water conservation and prioritisation of supply. It was pleasing to note that candidates identified the switch from quantity to quality with many offering good LEDC-based responses on poor water quality in (d). Mark levels were often encouraging for a question finale.

Question 2 : Hazards
Generally, the highest scoring question in section A, largely it is suspected reflecting the enthusiasm for this topic among candidates. Almost all candidates started very positively by understanding the nature of an active volcano in (a)(i) and by using Figure 2 very effectively to give clear reasons in (a)(ii) why volcanic areas are often populated. The standard of response to (b) was very high. Excellent diagrams, often for both constructive and destructive margins were common, and the process of formation was generally quite explicit. Part (c) was also well done; candidates were generally able to both extract and use information from Figure 2 and bring knowledge of their own to the question. Most candidates scored relatively well in (d) though a failure to draw distinction between short-term and long-term effects limited the numbers reaching a Level 3 mark award. The LEDC/MEDC contrast was well addressed by many candidates.

Question 3 : Production
This agricultural and food supply question generally generated depressed marks. Many candidates seemed hesitant about the issue of over-supply in the EU and MEDCs.
Most did gain some credit from (a)(i) and (ii) but too few were able to write about food mountains, wine lakes, waste etc. One centre were familiar with the issue and candidates wrote compellingly about the dumping of surpluses in LEDCs and its implications. The responses to (a)(iii) were very variable in quality; set-aside was not

known by candidates in many centres. Part (b) responses tended to lack focus on the EU. There were some good reasons offered by many candidates but they were often too MEDC-generic for full marks. Interestingly, part (c) with its LEDC focus was frequently better answered than earlier parts. (c)(ii) in particular, assessed a well-known topic. There was a range of quality but many responses had merit and included a variety of determinants, often referenced to named places.

Question 4 : Development

This has generally been a lower scoring question and so it was again. There was far from universal awareness of GDP and some candidates had very limited understanding of the measurement. For these candidates, parts (a)(iii), (a)(iv) and (c) were rather a challenge. There were candidates who were able to give a technically correct definition of the term, who knew of its shortcomings, and who were able to identify influencing factors, although some examples were rarely offered in (c). The stronger attempted parts were (a)(i) and (ii) where virtually every candidate knew one of the terms - NIC, RIC or Tiger economy. Part (b) tended to be moderately well answered; speculative but creditable stabs were common. Many were able to write about sectors, infrastructure, services, democracy and global influence.

Question 5 : Migration

Along with Question 2 – Hazards, this was the best answered question in Section A inspite of the fact that the terms, migration balance and asylum were unfamiliar to many. Scores were positive in part (a) with candidates gaining marks without directly using the term. Understanding of forced and voluntary migration was universally high with almost all candidates acquiring 3-4 marks. There was some uncertainty with some candidates as to the meaning of asylum saw them referring to pull migration factors only. This tended to limit their response to Level 1 quality. Some but not large numbers of candidates reached a Level 2 mark by applying their understanding to the UK and a less safe area. Part (d) was generally one of the best answered finales on the paper. Many interesting difficulties facing the authorities emerged from reading the scripts. Examples were frequently offered with the US-Mexican border a frequent location. These were well received by the examiners.

Question 6 : Urban Environments

Candidates usually achieved maximum marks in (a)(i) but many were too casual in arriving at an inaccurate estimation of the area of the CBD in (a)(ii). There were many decent responses to (b)(i) but a general tendency to refer to CBDs rather than "areas surrounding CBDs" and/or to not develop their answers into explanation. (b)(ii) was generally well answered; the schemes suggested were wide-ranging and often supported by examples studied. Vague Level 1 quality responses frequently taken directly from Figure 6 typified part (c)(i). Too few offered any notion of a regeneration process starting with jobs, visitors and spending. There were few high marks awarded for (c)(ii) but a lot of mark bunching in the middle of the mark range. De-industrialisation, the London Docklands and Sheffield's Lower Don Valley appeared on many stronger scripts.
LEDC examples were given in some scripts. Most candidates tended to lack focus on the three key terms used in the question.

Section B

Question 7 : Fragile Environments

This was clearly the most popular of the three optional questions in this section. The majority of candidates made strong starts with effective use made of Figure 7 in part (a). Part (b) was a little less well done than this; too many candidates misdirected their answer towards the greenhouse effect as a process rather than describe polluting activities that have strengthened it. Part (c) scored well; many well reasoned and valid impacts were identified. The Kyoto Protocol was pleasingly well known. Part (d) worked well as a question, differentiating between candidates but with a range of higher marks. The better answers described each of the three aspects of the protocol in turn as was hoped for by the setter. Nuclear power is generally a well understood topic and this final part scored very highly. Many candidates reached Level 2 and beyond by offering a balance of both advantages and disadvantages.

Question 8 : Globalisation

This was the least popular choice in this section though it seems to have been the preferred choice of teaching unit in some centres. Part (a)(i) brought mixed success. (a)(i)1 was generally well answered with many candidates offering supporting data from Figure 8 whereas (a)(i)2 was a greater challenge. The term, brand was not fully understood by many. The task did discriminate with most getting some reward. (a)(ii) was generally well answered. The reasons – costs, health and safety, market size and prosperity, transport advances .. - were usually known. The best responses were of a very high geographical and linguistic quality. (a)(iii), on the other hand, was rarely well answered. Few candidates had command of the reasons why firms grow; takeovers and mergers were as far as most went in their answers. Part (b) was generally interpreted as a task on the pros and cons of transnational companies. Reference to the globalisation process was indirect and implicit. Their points, however, were generally valid and creditworthy with many reaching a Level 2 standard of answer. Responses to the final part frequently lacked substance but were often on the right lines. Communications and the internet figured regularly and more than air transport.

Question 9 : Human Welfare

This proved to be not only a popular choice but also the highest scoring of the options in section B. The infant mortality rate was very often well enough known for full marks to be awarded in (a)(i). (a)(ii) too proved to be straightforward for almost all candidates. (a)(iii) created a great challenge with a range of marks being generated. Candidates normally identified the less materialistic indicators correctly but the aptness of the reasoning behind their choice did allow the examiners to discriminate. Maximum marks were rare in (b)(i) because very few answered to what extent there are intercontinental differences. Responses dealt with continent by continent and rarely took a global overview. Weaker candidates were able to use the world map (Figure 9b) to reasonable effect. Life expectancy was a well known term ((b)(ii)) and almost everyone achieved a score in (b)(iii). The literacy rate was a popular offering. (b)(iv) discriminated largely because only the more able provided actual reasons such as GDP level and government policy rather than description of the components of HDI.

Most candidates finished well. Part (c) was well answered by the standards of 9-mark finale questions. The main types of international development aid were generally known, and many candidates were able to provide examples of various sorts, including place to illustrate these types.

edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiner Report
Summer 2007

IGCSE

IGCSE Geography (4370) Paper 3

Unit 4370 Paper 3

General comments

As in previous series, approximately two thirds of the candidates were entered for Paper 3, a paper common to both tiers.
The paper proved accessible to those entered for the Foundation Tier but allowed the Higher Tier candidates to obtain high scores. Centres had, in general, prepared the candidates thoroughly for most aspects of the paper. However, candidates from a number of centres scored low marks for question 3 despite being competent with other aspects of the paper.

Question specific comments

Questions 1 and 2

These questions required the candidates to use both a range of resources and geographical skills. The majority of candidates achieved slightly higher scores for question 1.

1(a) this question was generally answered very well with candidates managing to use the field sketches successfully to identify where human activity had caused damage. Candidates showed a good awareness of erosion and the impact of human activity on the sites.
Nearly all candidates were able to identify that a sign put up asking visitors not to start fires. Some, however, misinterpreted the question and wrote what they thought could be done to reduce damage, rather than consider what was actually being carried out. The majority were able to evaluate effectiveness of the sign by identifying the burnt grass. This proved to be a very accessible section of the question for the majority of candidates.

For section b (i), nearly all candidates managed to interpret the data and draw the correct graph. Occasionally a candidate decided to mirror the graph shown to the other side, and failed to obtain full marks.
Section b (ii) was similar to b i) in that most candidates could transfer the data to the graph. The negative environmental scores caused problems in a number of cases, even though most candidates could correctly plot the distance from the coast line.

Section(c) was attempted with variable success. Some candidates produced superb answers about the environmental quality of the sand dunes but added nothing about the changes with distance, consequently limiting the amount of credit that could be given. A number of candidates wrote about how to improve the quality of the sand dunes, failing to answer the question. It was noticeable that those who highlighted the key words in the question managed to access the highest marks, as they focused on changing quality with increasing distance. Nearly all candidates who answered the question used figures, and those received the highest marks managed to use these in addition to an explanation of changes with increasing distance. The following extract from a level 3 answer demonstrates how a candidate used evidence from the resources to suggest reasons for the changing patterns:

'The area halfway to the bay has a score of two, which means there must be some positive features. This might be because in this area there is no place to sit and rest, so people do not tend to stay there and there for do not damage the site with litter. The areas where people actually sit and picnic or visit the beach are both nearer to seas and

have much higher pollution levels and lower environmental scores, (6 and 7 respectively).'

As in previous series, question 2 proved to be slightly more demanding and required more analysis of material than question 1. Despite this, the first sections proved to be very accessible, with the majority of candidates achieving high marks in sections (a) and (b).
A number of candidates missed 2c (i) possibly because they had not fully read the question as most of the other answers in section (c) were very good. The majority of those who attempted 2c(i)managed to get full marks, occasionally losing marks for incorrect line thickness, or, in a few cases not drawing the arrows to the correct country.

Candidates struggles to interpret the completed flow map beyond identifying countries from which migrants came. Very few managed to describe the spatial pattern of immigration which was the essence of the question. The most common answers included descriptions of numbers of immigrants coming from various countries on the map, or a statement that more were come from MEDCs.
A large number of candidates were able to agree or disagree with the conclusions given in 2(c), and provide some form of evidence. The stronger answers provided figures to support the comments, while few very good answers actually calculated percentages rather than just figures provided. Most candidates realized that there were actually more migrants from MEDCs, although there were larger number of people coming from nearby individual LEDCs. Very few candidates used the scale line to describe the variations in distance traveled. The following is a typical example of a level two answer:-

'I agree with the first conclusion because its so evident that a total of 29 immigrants were clearly looking for employment or a better quality of life yet only 16 were escaping war or racial problems. I nevertheless disagree with second statement because from the table, we find that the number of immigrants from short distance LEDCs is only 18 yet there are 22 immigrants from long distance MEDCs.'

Question 3

This question allows candidates to demonstrate the skills and knowledge obtained when carrying out their own field work investigations. Most centres ensured that the work was geographically relevant and organised so candidates were able to plan an investigation, collect and present data. For example, a candidate investigating the downstream changes in a river channel planned to collect the following:

'The data which I have planned to collect was the speed of the flow of the river, the distance between one end to the other end of the stream and the measurement for the cross section of the river. I needed to collect the speed of flow of the river to help me conclude which sides does the water flow the fastest. I also needed to measure the distance between one end to the other end to allow me to calculate the time taken for the floating object to reach the other end of the stream. I also needed measurements of the depth of the river so that I could calculate the cross section of the river.'

However, several centres appeared to have selected topics such as visits to observe factory processing, and the lack of primary data collection and the lack of a variety of techniques severely limited the candidate's responses. There are a number of suggestions for field work investigations in the Teacher's Guide, and centres should consider providing their candidates with experience of both physical geography field work, for example a river study, and human geography fieldwork, such as an urban or farm study.

While candidates had a good understanding of the equipment used, section 3(c), they were less confident about sampling methods or why those methods had been chosen in section 3 (d). Sampling techniques were frequently confused with taking samples, such as water samples for testing for pollutants.

Most candidates were able to justify their equipment or occasionally their sampling methods very well. Candidates identified how various types of equipment were the most suitable and explained how some equipment could be more accurate than other options. Many focused on the practicality of using certain type of equipment and sometimes the availability of equipment was discussed

e) (i) was attempted with a varying success. Many candidates drew simple graphs (scatter graphs or bar graphs) but few could achieve full marks as these were often unlabelled or untitled. Others drew sketches of how they obtained the data (particularly questionnaires), or maps of the areas they were working in, rather than a data presentation method However, a number of candidates who drew exceptional graphs, particularly those who displayed the cross section or discharge of a river.

The quality of the answers to e (ii) was very much dependent on the quality of the response to the previous question. Most candidates were able to justify their choice by stating their chosen method was simple to draw or easy to understand. Few candidates were able to expand their answers although some were able to explain how their choice could be used to compare data. Those who had not drawn a correct presentation method could not then explain their choice in the next section.

edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiner Report
Summer 2007

IGCSE

IGCSE Geography (4370) Paper 4

Unit 4370 Paper 4 Coursework

Introduction

The coursework option, paper 4, attracted an entry of approximately one third of the total candidates. There were entries from both the higher and foundation tiers candidates.

Administration

There were few administrative errors on behalf of the centre and centres are to be thanked for contributing to the moderation process.
The majority of work was submitted in simple light weight folders which again assisted with moderation.
Much of the submitted work was accurately marked. However, there were a number instances of centres being overgenerous or inconsistent with some criteria, and this resulted in adjustment of the candidates' marks.
Several centres helpfully annotated submitted work or provided separate comments clarifying their mark allocation.

General Comments

The choices of topic were all geographically relevant. However, some of the selected topics were not covered in the specification. Centres are encouraged to refer to the speciation or contact Edexcel if in doubt about the about the relevance of coursework.

Criterion 1 – Introduction and aims

It is essential that candidates have a clear aim for their study; in addition, candidates should be able to develop questions or hypotheses. The following extract illustrates sequence of questions that enabled the candidate to develop a relevant, focused study:-

- *I predict that Mombasa town will have tall buildings with an average of 4-6 floors. This is because the land is very expensive according to the bid rent theory, so it will be cheaper to build upwards.*
- *I predict that Mombassa town will have congestion of vehicles. This is because most vehicles tend to be in the CBD because this is where all the roads converge and the CBD's transport routes according to Hoyt.*
- *I predict Mombasa town will have congestion of people. This is because most people work in the CBD and it is also the busiest part of the town since there are shops, services and offices.*
- *I predict that Mombasa town will have most of its buildings as commercial/retail. This is because this is were most people are, so shops are built in the CBB so they can get more customers due to the sphere of influence.*
- *I predict that Mombassa town will have a higher rate of public transport, a lot of litter.*

The candidate then produced a plan of proposed data collection which related to the above questions, for example land use mapping to determine the number and location of commercial/retail buildings.
Most studies were clearly located using maps or aerial photographs, opportunities exist to annotate these to show data collection sites and other features.

Criterion 2 – Data collection

Most of the submitted work placed a strong emphasis on primary data collection. Candidates who had outlined plans in Criterion 1 were able to organise a clear sequence of data collection. The following extract is a section from a detailed account:-

River Gradient Measurements

Equipment required:-

- *ranging poles*
- *measuring tape*
- *clinometers*

Justifications

1. *To be able to compare the gradient of the river with distance downstream. Does it change?*
2. *To be able to test whether hypothesis is valid or not. Hypothesis 3 states 'As gradient decreases with distance downstream, river velocity should decrease as well.'*

The candidate then described exactly how the data had been collected, including reasons for selecting each piece of equipment. Problems encountered during data collection were summarised in a table, part of which is shown below:-

River gradient measurements – problems	*Solutions*
Trees and other obstructions, such as bends *The river gradient measurement was taken on the path by the river.*	*When taking the gradient measurement, try to find a 20m straight piece of river within the site range.* *Take the measurements inside the river in order to get the gradient of the river. The path by the river may have a slightly different gradient.*

Some candidates used methodology grids, which can be an excellent presentation method. However, care must be taken to ensure that such a grid does not limit the depth of the provided explanations, and therefore the marks which can be credited for the criterion.

Criterion 3- Data presentation

Candidates demonstrated some excellent data presentation techniques, and there were examples of exceptional competence with various ICT packer ages. A number of candidates included both field sketches and digital photographs that were clearly annotated to help explain the selection and location of sites, data collection methods and the problems encountered. Many candidates used a wide variety of techniques, and were therefore able to access Level 3. A number were awarded full marks for this criterion, usually those who included justifications for their choices of technique, and a sophisticated method unique to their study. For example, a candidate investigating the downstream changes of a river presented the varying channel characteristics as a series of located cross sections on a base map, with the following justification:-

'I used cross sections to clearly show the downstream changes of the river width and depth at each of the four sites, It is easy to see how these change between sites 1 and 4, and allows me to have a visual image of the variation in river channel size compared to distance downstream from the source.'

Criterion 4 – Analysis and Conclusions

As in previous series, the majority of candidates were able to comment on their data to some extent. Frequently, however, the analysis was limited and descriptive, and consequently did not reach the higher level for this criterion. In the following level 3 example, the candidate comments on the evidence from a pie chart constructed from data obtained whilst land use mapping:-

'In Mombasa CBD the most popular land use is commercial/retail (50%) which is much larger than any other of the land uses. There are very few residential areas or open spaces (4% and 2%). My pie chart(Figure 6a) therefore supports my original hypothesis that there will be a large amount of commercial and retail land use in the CBD but very little open space or residential areas due to the high cost of land. The high percentage shown in my chart supports both parts of the hypothesis.'

The majority of candidates were able to offer some concluding comments, the strongest of which considered the original aims and questions of the investigation.
Candidates were also able to comment on the limitations of their studies and to make valid suggestions for improvement. The majority tended to suggest that they might repeat their data collection or take a larger number of measurements. The evaluations that recognised changes at the planning, data collection and analytical stages would improve the validity of their study and of their conclusions were likely to reach level 3 for this criterion.

Criterion 5 – Planning and Organisation

All the submitted work was organised in a logical manner and the majority of candidates attained at least Level 2. The best studies included diagrams and graphs that were integrated into the text (as illustrated in the above example)

All candidates acknowledged sources of secondary data, including maps, books and websites.

As already stated, a number of centres made excellent use of ICT to enhance studies. Hand written annotations and labels were easy to read and that great care to ensure legibility. In general, there was an exceptionally high standard of presentation.

IGCSE Geography 4370 Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grading option 1: 03 Written Alternative
1F Written Paper

Grade	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	51	44	38	32	26

Grading Option 2: 04 Coursework
1F Written Paper

Grade	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	50	43	37	31	25

Grading Option 3: 03 Written Alternative
2H Written Paper

Grade	*	A	B	C	D	E
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	69	61	53	46	38	34

Grading Option 4: 04 Coursework
2H Written Paper

Grade	*	A	B	C	D	E
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	68	60	52	45	36	31

Grades per paper

Grade		Max. Mark	*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	**03**	60		46		36	30		18	
	04	60		44		33	27		15	
	1F	110				54			36	
	2H	150		86		64	53			

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Regional Offices at www.edexcel-international.org/sfc/schools/regional/

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel-international.org/quals
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on + 44 1204 770 696

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH