

Principal Examiner Feedback November 2009

GCSE

iGCSE Geography (4370) Paper 04

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.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to our Subject Advisor for Geography at Edexcel on 020 7190 4165.

(If you are calling from outside the UK please dial + 44 1204 770 696 and state that you would like to speak to the Geography subject specialist).

November 2009

Publication Code: UG022351

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2009

Unit 4370 Paper 04 Coursework

Introduction

The coursework option, paper 4, attracted an entry of approximately one quarter of the total candidates. Entries were received from both higher and foundation tier candidates.

Administration

There were few administrative errors on behalf of the centres, who are to be thanked for greatly assisting the moderation process.

The majority of work was submitted in simple light weight folders which again assisted with moderation.

As in the past, many aspects of the submitted work were accurately marked. However, there were some instances of centres being over-generous and this resulted in adjustment of their candidates' marks.

A number of centres most helpfully provided detailed annotations to the submitted work or provided separate comments which helped to clarify the reasons for the mark allocation.

General Comments

The choice of topics was both geographically relevant and related to the specification. However, the topics selected by some centres proved very demanding in terms of the amount of data required and were over challenging in their demands. Centres should also consider the personal safety of their candidates when selecting topics for investigations.

Criterion 1 - Introduction and aims

All candidates stated one or more clear aims for their investigation, a pleasing improvement on some of the less focused studies submitted in previous series. A number of candidates also posed questions or hypotheses which allowed them to develop their investigations. The following extract illustrates a clear line of questioning used by one candidate:

To identify the causes of uneven group concentration of Asians in the Parklands area.

To investigate why ethnic concentrations are growing in size.

Unfortunately, the candidate did not then take the opportunity to develop a sequence for their investigation, which limited the marks which could be awarded for this criterion.

The majority of submitted studies were clearly located using maps and/or aerial photographs. As in the past, opportunities exist to use these more effectively, for example by the addition of annotations to show and describe data collection sites.

Criterion 2 - Data collection

All of the submitted work placed a strong emphasis on primary data collection. Candidates who had outlined plans and had developed a sequence of data collection as part of Criterion 1 usually gained higher marks for this section. In instances where secondary recourses were used, such as Yellow Pages, candidates were able to justify their reasons for including the resulting information.

Very few candidates used sampling techniques when collecting their data. There were some examples of candidates being aware of sampling strategies, for example:

I will use random sampling in the Diamond Plaza.

Although this candidate was clearly aware of the concept of sampling they failed to explain how it benefited the study; an explanation of the lack of bias due to the use of sampling techniques would have assisted the candidate when evaluating the validity of their conclusions (criterion 4).

Some candidates used a very limited range of one or two data collection techniques (interviews and questionnaires) which consequently provided a somewhat limited amount of data. Where a limited number of data collection techniques were described the marks for this criterion were adjusted accordingly.

Criterion 3- Data presentation

As previously, some candidates demonstrated proficiency with a range of data presentation techniques, and many showed competence with various ICT packages. Candidates included both field sketches and/or photographs that were clearly annotated to explain the selection and location of sites in addition to the main relevant factors illustrated.

However, centres are requested to note that studies containing basic data presentation methods such as bar charts, pie charts and photographs which are simply labelled and without some detailed annotations should not be awarded higher than level one/level two for this criterion.

Criterion 4 - Analysis and Conclusions.

All the candidates were able to offer some concluding comments, the best of which considered the original aims and questions of the investigation. Frequently, however, the analysis was limited to descriptive comments, and therefore did not reach the highest level for this criterion. Where the centres awarded high levels for brief outlines of the data and did not provide detailed conclusions, the marks were adjusted.

it was evident that the candidates recognised that the submitted work presented limitations, and most were able to suggest some methods of improvement:

To improve this project I could have spent longer on the fieldtrips collecting more information. And I could have looked at more secondary evidence. It was difficult to find the secondary data that was in English though.

Comments such as that given on page four would be greatly improved if the candidate had considered how the extra data suggested might support the validity of the conclusions previously made.

Criterion 5 - Planning and Organisation

All the submitted work was well organised, and the majority of candidates attained at least Level 2 for this criterion. The most effective studies included diagrams and graphs that were integrated into the text, even if this was sometimes a brief mention:

The point of practicing culture and religion was proved by photograph 1

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

All of the centres made effective use of ICT to enhance studies. Hand written annotations and labels, although only rarely seen, were easy to read. Over all, the submitted work was extremely well presented.

IGCSE Geography 4370 Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grading option 1: 03 Written Alternative
1F Written Paper

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	100	52	45	38	31	24

Grading Option 2: 04 Coursework
1F Written Paper

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	100	51	44	37	30	23

Grading Option 3: 03 Written Alternative
2H Written Paper

Grade	Max. Mark	*	A	B	C	D	E
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	100	70	62	54	46	38	34

Grading Option 4: 04 Coursework
2H Written Paper

Grade	Max. Mark	*	A	B	C	D	E
Overall Subject Grade Boundaries	100	69	61	53	45	37	33

Further copies of this publication are available from
International Regional Offices at www.edexcel.com/international

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

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