edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report Summer 2009

GCSE

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 GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, 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/

Summer 2009

Contents

Unit 4370 Paper 1F

General comments

This year saw the largest candidature since the qualification became available in 2005 and equally pleasing was the significant increase in the mean mark compared to 2008. The general absence of unanswered items on the paper was very noticeable; most candidates submitted a largely complete script. The profile of their marks between questions was strikingly more even than in previous years though the broad tendency for lower scoring questions 3 and 4 remains. Part but only part of the improvement may be attributed to our efforts to increase the accessibility of this foundation tier paper, especially its mid-question items, often in part (b).

The paper did generate a good spread of marks with the opportunity to demonstrate C grade qualities, particularly in the ultimate items being taken by some candidates. In Section B as in previous years, the Fragile Environments question (question 7) proved to be the overwhelmingly popular choice.

Question-specific Comments

Section A

Question 1 : Water

This tended to provide a solid start for most candidates for whom water quality and flooding seemed to be familiar topics. Items (b)(ii) and (iii) produced differentiation by outcome with explanation and a long list of distinctive causes respectively being offered only by the better candidates. The three opening items proved fruitful for most candidates. Item (c), the overlap part with the higher tier paper generated as was expected a range of responses but relatively few reached Level 2 by being able to explain relevant hydrological processes. Many named a valid example and most were able to list pertinent factors such as heavy rainfall and tarmac surfaces but not able to go beyond stating.

Question 2 : Hazards

Most candidates scored reasonably well on this tropical storm question. Most knew the term, hurricane ((a)(ii)) and were very familiar with two valid weather characteristics ((a)(iv)). Items (a)(ii) and (iii) proved a little more challenging; the word "islands" resulted in some candidates identifying more than the US Virgin Islands in (a)(ii), and not all impacts stated in (a)(iii) were clearly economic. Item (b) proved to be a strong differentiator with most gaining some credit and a smaller number outlining the mechanism by which heavy rainfall and strong winds lead to landslides and tidal waves respectively. Item (c) was generally well answered with most candidates knowing two valid management strategies.

Question 3 : Production

This was often candidate's lowest scoring question. Almost all were able to place economic and environmental in the correct box for (a)(i) but relatively few had any thing but minimal success in (ii) when it came to naming from their own knowledge examples of factors. Equally disappointing was their general inability to either name a valid farming type and/or offer an explained link between it and the two specified influences. Items (b) and (c) tended to be better answered with the majority of candidates being able to identify MEDC/LEDC farming differences and refer to alternative land uses and/or food surpluses in Europe in item (c).

Question 4 : Development

This tended not to be a high scoring question but did tend to score better than has become usual for the Development question. The most able candidates only differentiated their answers to (a)(i) and (a)(ii) by realising that development difficulties were not actually synonymous with LEDC evidence. In (a)(iii) few were able to explain the process for 2 marks though many gained an initial mark for indicating a tentative link. Item (b) tended to produce a mass of Level 1 quality responses with relevant factors often being listed rather than developed and at best, loosely related to the named country.

Question 5 : Migration

This year's migration lived up to tradition and was again the highest scoring question on most candidate's script. The majority of candidates handled the opening data-response items comfortably and pleasingly were familiar with the terms, immigration and migration balance. The push-and-pull model was as usual well known, and candidates generally had little difficulty in demonstrating good understanding of the causes of Western European immigration.

Question 6 : Urban Environments

This question tended to be answered at a respectable standard and was usually one of candidate's better answers. Mega-cities and shanty towns appear to have been well taught. There was a general awareness in the scripts of population pressures and their associated problems in urban areas of LEDCs (items (a)(ii) and (b)(i)), and of the advantages brought by the population growth (item (b)(ii)). Shanty town improvement schemes were often known and in some cases, well referenced to a named community within a city. Many candidates attained at least, the top of Level 1 mark.

Section B

Question 7 : Fragile Environments

This was the overwhelmingly popular choice of most candidates. It was also often very well answered and produced high mark totals. Global warming and climate change had clearly been well covered by the candidates. Parts (a)(iii) and (iv) did differentiate with some candidates not coming up with sufficiently distinctive factors in (a)(iii) and not developing their understanding of a greenhouse gas in (a)(iv) for maximum marks. The 1-mark items were invariably answered correctly. Item (c) was generally the worst answered part of the question with full explanation of the greenhouse effect process rare. Most candidates referred to the Kyoto Protocol in item (d) with the degree of description of its workings varying. The most able candidates also made reference to transport and renewable energy initiatives with some including some place geography.

Question 8 : Globalisation

Those candidates opting for this question on NICs (newly industrialising countries) especially China, TNCs (transnational companies) and LEDCS (less economically developed countries), especially African tended to score positively if not as well as those opting for question 7. There was sound use of Figure 8a's data in items (a)(i) to (a)(iii). Equally, most candidates whilst not reaching maximum marks seemed to understand the basic rationales behind NICs trading with LEDCs ((a)(iv)) and TNCs locating plants in LEDCs ((b)(ii)). The final question part ((b)(iii)) tended to be done only modestly well. Most could name a TNC but few could provide the sort of case study detail of its global operations sought.

Question 9 : Human Welfare

A small percentage of the candidature opted for this question and did generally find it challenging. Not all candidates achieved maximum or near-maximum marks in (a)(i) and there few full and accurate definitions of environmental sustainability provided in (a)(ii) though most did gain some credit in these two opening parts. Item (a)(iii) did tend to be reasonably well answered though few responses to (a)(iv) went beyond Level 1 quality. Case study-type detail related to a named UN aid agency was generally missing from the scripts. Item (b)(ii) proved to be very challenging; hardly any candidate was able to link aid to narrowing the development gap by raising living standards in LEDCs. The concept of global differences seemed to be not appreciated.

Unit 4370 Paper 2H

General comments

There was a significant increase in the number of candidates this year and a rise in the average total mark for the paper. There were many very sound scripts and a general improvement in the standard of performance. Two features of this overall advance were:

- more top grade quality scripts
- more scripts with a fairly even mark profile

Fewer scripts had unanswered items or very badly answered items than in previous years.

Question-specific Comments

Section A

Question 1 : Water

A generally well answered question with most candidates making a positive start with item (a)(i) though not all identified both changes in quality downstream. There was a range of creditable responses from scientific to more generic in (a)(ii) and most candidates were comfortable with the concepts of drainage basin and watershed. Item (a)(v) was generally well answered with most candidates recognising the influences on water quality from both urban landscapes and farming though the urban input into answers was generally less. Items (b) and (c) performed reasonably well though answers did tend to lack real process explanation. The best candidates did use hydrological terms and did provide examples of events on particular rivers such as the role of Himalayan deforestation or the monsoon on Ganges or Bangladeshi flooding and the flood mitigation schemes along the Mississippi.

Question 2 : Hazards

A further successful question with many candidates attaining encouragingly high scores. Item (a)(i) was largely well answered with most candidates developing their responses into a second mark by referring to jobs, costs and similar economic ideas. At times part (a)(ii) seemed to generate some confusion as candidates described the breeding conditions needed for a tropical storm rather than the weather associated with their passage. Consequently, the vast majority of candidates were on the right track when it came to accounting for the storm's weakening in part (a)(iii). Few candidates struggled to achieve good marks in item (b) recognising a range of ways from forecasting and evacuation to damage-limitation measures of reducing storm impact. Item (c) was an effective differentiator with the more able candidates discussing social reasons for staying put in storm-prone areas and the less able answers listing without development fairly peripheral influences such as nice weather and beaches.

Question 3 : Production

In the main, this was not very well done question; it seems that agricultural practices and processes are not always well known and understood. The political and social factors second example was invariably incorrect in (a)(i) and poor choices of farming type in (a)(ii), for example, commercial farming or subsistence farming handicapped many candidates. Item (a)(ii) with its 6 marks available was rarely well answered. Most candidates, however, were able to provide a number of reasons why farmland in MEDCs is no longer used for food production; some focussed on sector change, some

on EU policies such as set-aside, others on economic alternatives. There was generally a good level of response to item (c). Some of the better answers included reference to HYV varieties of seed, especially in India though confusion of green revolution and GM crops was apparent in some answers.

Question 4 : Development

This was better answered than many previous question 4s. The term, literacy rate was generally known though a common failure was not to explicitly link low literacy to the holding back of economic development whilst recognising its general restraining effect ((a)(ii)). Item (a)(iii) was generally well answered though there was a tendency to repeat low literacy rate. Again, explicit linking of environmental difficulties to the holding back of development was rare in (a)(iv). The failure to address development and national development was again evident in many of the item (b) answers. There were relatively few well developed answers. Item (c) was a little better one with most candidates knowing and being able to describe the Brandt line, including examples and anomalies. Changes to this development divide were typically sketchy but there was some evidence that the idea of dynamism was understood. Unfortunately, there were candidates who discussed a national north-south divide.

Question 5 : Migration

This was typically as in previous years candidate's highest scoring question. The vast majority of candidates were able to correctly interpret Figure 5 and identify two trends and include statistical evidence in item (a)(i). Maximum marks for this item was common. The terms, immigration and migration balance were generally known to the candidates. Item (b) was another well answered part. Most candidates successfully highlighted the element of choice in their definitions of forced and voluntary migration, mentioned whether it was primarily a push or pull influence, and gave appropriate push and pull factors as examples for each. On item (c) only a few more able candidates discussed both the origin areas and the Western European destination. Most candidates generally concentrated on the attractions of the destination area in isolation. There were some excellent case-study type responses to item (d) with details about Turks to Germany and Mexicans to the USA frequent. Most candidates provided some discussion of the effects of the migration on both origin and destination areas.

Question 6 : Urban Environments

On the whole, a reasonably well answered question with evidence that mega-cities and shanty towns had been well taught. Candidates generally handled the data-response task that were (a) well. Item (b) produced a lot of Level 1 quality work, including reference to self-help schemes. Those going beyond this level named actual shanty towns, provided some case study material and linked the improvements to quality of life. In too many answers quality of life was not developed. Item (c) was generally well answered but the final item proved to be rather challenging. There were some non-responses and many responses in which the concept of urban manager seemed to pose problems. Few candidates went beyond listing cost, space, infrastructure and population.

Section B

Question 7 : Fragile Environments

The majority of candidates chose this option and did it pleasingly well. Items (a)(i) and (ii) seemed to cause few problems though some candidates did offer factors in (a)(ii) that lacked sufficient distinctiveness. Most candidates named a greenhouse gas in (a)(iii) and recognised that it either trapped heat or was part of the greenhouse effect. The majority of candidates received full marks here yet failed to do so in (b)(i) where it was common to read too much into the thermometer diagram but not the simple truth that the warmest years tended to be the more recent ones. There were many good answers to (b)(ii) with process explanation present. Most candidates recognised a link between the rise in greenhouse gases and the rise in temperatures but the confusions with the ozone layer remain in many candidate minds. A lot of candidates showed in (c) good understanding of the international agreements which address the issue of greenhouse gases, most notably the Kyoto protocol. Item (d) was also generally well answered with candidates showing a strong awareness of the potential consequences of the rise of greenhouse gases. There were extreme views but also sophisticated answers balancing advantages and disadvantages. Flooding and rising sea levels were a common theme.

Question 8 : Globalisation

Part (a) provided a positive start for most candidates though the wording of (a)(iii) did cause some problems. Many did appreciate that Chinese exports are African imports and vice-versa. There were some reasonable answers to (b)(i) with a wide range of creditable benefits offered. Most candidates seemed to recognise the exploitative nature of TNC's relationship with LEDCs and many good answers addressed the dangers of TNC power. Most candidates were able to successfully name a TNC for item (c) and to indicate that its headquarters were often located in an MEDC while production was often carried out at multiple locations in LEDCs. Few discussed markets and R & D. The final item produced decent scores because most candidates could write about migrating workers, aeroplanes and the internet and their parts in integrating the world.

Question 9 : Human Welfare

This question was of similar popularity to question 8 but scored less well largely because the opening and closing items posed more problems for candidates. Not all candidates achieved maximum marks in (a)(i) and defining environmental sustainability well enough for 2 marks was achieved only by the better candidates. Most candidates, however, did recognise the importance of focusing on the needs of women and children in (a)(iii). There was also a very positive response to item (a)(iv) with the majority of candidates able to successfully justify their choice of goal and why it was the most important. Item (b)(i) was associated with many generic answers lacking specificity and development. Some candidates did describe in (b)(ii) how international aid can reduce global differences but the typical response made no reference to the development gap, specific NGOs or the impact of their aid. Item (b)(iii) was often quite well answered with references to the global economic crisis, uncooperative governments and limited time. There were too few responses showing good understanding of the problems associated with achieving the goals.

Unit 4370 Paper 03

General comments

There was an appreciable increase in the numbers opting for Paper 3 .The paper, which was common to both tiers, proved again to be general accessible to Foundation Tier candidates whilst allowing Higher Tier candidates to obtain marks at a higher level.

A larger majority of centres had prepared their candidates thoroughly for this paper and for question 3 in particular. However, a significant number of candidates once again scored appreciably lower marks for question 3 having displayed competence with questions 1 and 2. It was evident from the responses that these candidates had none or very limited experience of field work.

Question Specific Comments

Question 1

This question, in common with question 2, required the candidates to show competence with a range of resources and geographical skills.

1(a) This question, based on a divided bar graph, enabled nearly all the candidates to make a confident start to the paper. The majority of candidates were able to complete the second divided bar graph in section b (i) and to describe the changes in the use of renewable recourses and coal in b (ii). Some candidates, however, gave rather simplistic statements such as 'less coal is used' and therefore could not be awarded full marks in b (ii) where the candidates which required to use evidence from the graph to support their answers. This can be illustrated by an extract from a high scoring answer; 'In 1990 the use of coal was 65% and in 2006 the use of coal for generating electricity reduced to 35%.'

Question 1c resulted, surprisingly, in a range of answers. Some candidates were able to use the scale line to measure the length of the proposed barrage, but in general this appeared to be a skill unfamiliar to many. Similarly, the position of the actual barrage in relation to Weston-super-Mare, which required the candidates to use compass points, resulted in answers ranging from north to east. It is clear that some candidates would benefit from additional practice with basic skills.

Responses to (d) showed considerable variation, lower level answers consisting of material copied from Figure 1(e) with out additional development, whilst the best answers were produced by candidates using the information from a range of resources; 'We are also told in Figure 1(d) that ports such as Bristol and Cardiff might become silted up. This is a disadvantage because ports provide a link to trading and employment so if they become silted up and can not be used; many locals will loss their jobs.'

In 1d (ii), most candidates were able to suggest ways to extend the fieldwork, but these usually consisted of 'asking more people.' It was relatively unusual for a candidate to extend their comments to explain how their chosen techniques as illustrated by this very good answer; ' They could visit other towns in the area such as Cardiff and ask a similar questionnaire here They would then know if the opposition to the barrage was just from Weston- super-Mare or more widely based.'

Question 2

Section 2(a) was well answered by the majority of candidates but areas within the question caused some problems for those who appeared to have limited experience in obtaining information from photographs and sketch maps. This was especially evident in 2(a) (ii) where candidates were required to use both resources to identify land uses. Question 2(a)(iii) was generally well answered, with some detailed annotations such as; 'Spacious gardens between the houses planted with trees and other plants.' Some, however, did not attempt the question and this would suggest that candidates would benefit from learning how to annotate sketches and photographs

There were some excellent answers to 2(a) (iv) where the identification of spatial variations in housing and land use was required, however many did not consider this element and restricted their answers to one of the areas along the transect, or did not provide clear locations, consequently reducing the marks which could be awarded; 'In A the some land is used for building and a café is built and some is left for pedestrians to walk on.'

Construction of the graph, 2(b)(i), and calculating the projected population for the Herrliberg caused few problems to the majority of candidates although some constructed a histogram for 2(b)(i). This is method should only be used if the data is continuous, and the non-discrete data given is a clear indication that a line graph should be drawn.

Most candidates were able to suggest some valid reasons for movement into the Herrliberg region although the factors were frequently copies of the information given in Figure 2(e), as shown by this middle band extract 'The student might have concluded that people moved to Herrliberg mainly due to its cheaper taxes than Zurich (10 out of 25 people) said this hence most of the people were from Zurich (11 out of 25 people).' Those who developed their answers to include information given in Figure 2(b) or made deductions from Figure 2(a) normally reached the higher level.

Question 3

There were some excellent answers to question 3 and it was felt that the standard of responses to this question had significantly improved. Centres are to be congratulated for the quality of many of the answers. This was only the case however, where candidates had carried out investigations involving geographically relevant topics.

Some of the most successful answers related to river investigations, coastal processes or delimiting the CBD (central business district) of a local urban area. In particular there were several very good answers based around fieldwork on the Nairobi River and the CBD of Worcester which were detailed and showed good understanding of the whole fieldwork process. There were still, however, a significant number of answers which did not have a geographical focus such as 'the shopping behaviour of humans', and multiple answers which focused on what people bought at a shopping mall.

The majority of candidates were able to identify at least one aim, and frequently give two well developed ideas for their investigation, although the geographical focus was sometimes lacking. Clear detailed aims enabled the candidates to focus on the work they had carried out, and theses candidates usually scored highly for Question 3; 'Aim 1. To find the factors that influences the velocity of the river, the size of the channel and its depth. Aim 2. To find the velocity of the river on the inside and the outside of a meander.'

Those who selected non-geographical topics, as mentioned above, did not receive any credit as their aims where not appropriate.
The majority of candidates were able to identify the data required to achieve their aims, many explained this data in more detail than the command word 'list' indicated was necessary and a number of candidates described data that was unrelated to that outlined in 3a.

Question b (ii) enabled the majority of candidates to achieve a high mark, and some very detailed and well structured descriptions of data collection were provided. The following extract is taken from a high level answer; 'We threw the orange peel into the river and started the stop watch, as it reached the finishing line we stopped the watch and took down the time in seconds. We did this for the right bank, left bank and mid stream.'

Candidates were, in general, able to explain how they ensured that their data collection was accurate, although this was frequently limited to statements such as; 'We did this three times.' Fewer attempted to explain how they ensure that the data was representative as they had not considered this aspect during their planning or data collection. It was unusual to see a response of the quality of the following; 'The velocity experiment was carried out several times at regular intervals and the average taken to make the results reliable and accurate. Samples were taken at regular intervals of 500m (stratified sampling) to make the results representative of the whole area. Some of the data collected first hand was opinionated as some answered to their benefit and some intended to mislead.

Not everybody was willing to answer hence the results were unreliable and not representative of the whole area. We carried out the fieldwork at various stages and at certain locations which would not represent the whole area necessarily.'
Some candidates misread the question and described how they represented their collected data as graphs and diagrams.

Question 3(c) produced a varied response. There were many candidates who simply wrote one word answers, 'line graph, pie chart,' and did not clarify or develop. A significant number of candidates were able to successfully describe their data presentation methods. Some managed to do this successfully without sketching an example, although many of the higher scoring answers provided examples of the methods described.

A high level response involved the candidate sketching a bar graph and a pie chart (which were annotated) and adding the following explanation: 'Bar graph to represent the velocity of the river at various intervals and also to show the purity levels at each stage of the river. This method clearly indicates small changes that occur in the values hence enabling clear evaluation of the data. Pie charts are used to group opinionated data collected by questionnaires and to easily organise data. They can be used to show the consumption of the water and the uses of it and also to show the majority of the factors and therefore allowing these to be compared in a visual way. Although it is necessary to convert the data into degree measurements, this can be simply carried out with the use of a calculator.'

Unit 4370 Paper 04

Introduction

The coursework option, paper 4, attracted an increased number of centres. As in previous series, there were entries from both the higher and foundation tier candidates. Approximately one sixth of the total candidates for IGCSE geography were entered for the coursework option.

Administration

There were relatively few administrative errors on behalf of the centres submitting coursework and all the work arrived by the specified date. There were a few instances where the centres omitted the highest and lowest scoring piece of work from their sample, and it should be noted that these are required in addition to those indicated on the OPTEMS. All centres are to be thanked for submitting the work in simple light weight folders and without the use of plastic wallets. In general, much of the submitted work was accurately marked. However, there were some instances of centres being overgenerous with a number of criteria, and this resulted in adjustment of their candidates' marks. Some very detailed work, involving a range of primary data collection techniques, was marked rather harshly, again resulting in some mark adjustment at moderation. Several centres most helpfully annotated submitted work or provided separate comments clarifying their mark allocation. These comments greatly assist the moderation process.

General Comments

The choices of topic were usually geographically relevant and related to the specification. In some cases the centres allowed their candidates to select their own topics for investigation. Although this allows candidates to investigate an individual field of interest, it is essential that this is related to the specification. Other centres investigated subjects with very little geographical relevance such as wild life in a national park. Coursework of this nature is not suitable and these centres are strongly urged to contact Edexcel for clarification of the relevance of coursework topics.

Criterion 1 – Introduction and Aims

It was pleasing to note that most candidates stated one or more clear aim for their investigation in addition to posing questions or hypotheses. The following extract illustrates a clear line of questioning that enabled the candidate to develop a logical sequence of investigation:

The main aim of this coursework is to examine why the various features of the river change so drastically. These will be examined after we have taken:

- river depth measurements
- river velocity measurements
- river bed load size measurements
- river bed load degree of angularity
- slope angle measurements.

The candidate was then able to suggest a number of hypotheses which were well linked to geographical theory, in this case the Bradshaw model. The majority of submitted studies were located using maps and/or aerial photographs. Opportunities exist, in some instances, to use these more effectively, for example by adding labels or annotations to show and the data collection sites.

Criterion 2 – Data Collection

The best submitted coursework had, in common with previous years, a strong emphasis on primary data collection. Unfortunately there are still centres that regard coursework as a 'project' and encourage their candidates to collect all their information form secondary resources. This limits the marks that can be warded for this criterion.

Those candidates who had outlined aims and developed a sequence of data collection in criterion one usually gained the highest marks for this section. In the following extract one candidate explains their reasons for using an environmental survey by stating; 'If the streets and sidewalks are littered then people tend to stay away from such areas. This could lead to a down turn in tourism.'

A small number of centres used an extremely large number of data techniques with the result that the candidates became over-burdened with data presentation methods and found it difficult to draw all their extensive information tighter in the conclusions. Three data collection methods that involve obtaining raw data or statistics will usually prove more than adequate.

Criterion 3 - Data presentation

There were some outstanding data presentation sections where candidates demonstrated originality and great competence when using ICT. Of particular note were some superbly annotated sketch maps and field sketches. In addition, some candidates made outstanding use of ICT as part of a series of overlays to locate building types and to display the results of quality of life surveys.

Although some candidates were justifiably awarded full marks for this criterion, scope remains for many centres to encourage the use of more original methods and the justification of choice of technique.

Studies containing basic data presentation methods such as bar charts, pie charts and photographs without some form of labelling or annotations should not be awarded higher than level one for this criterion. Some centres are still giving their candidates very high levels for what are, essentially, basic methods copied from the internet.

Criterion 4 – Analysis and Conclusions

The majority of candidates were able give some analysis of their data, although this generally tended to be descriptive rather than analytical. The better work integrated the data presentation within the analysis and conclusion sections. for example, a candidate constructed a bar graph to show the services available along an urban transect, and stated the following below the graph; 'The graph shows that in general as distance form the CBD increases the availability of amenities decreases. This is more true for the northern transect, where it is clear that there are far less amenities than in the CBD. Again as regards to figure 6, there seems to be an area of heightened development towards the south of the city, fitting in with the nuclei model.'

Nearly all candidates included some concluding comments, the best of which considered the original aims or questions of their investigation. For example; 'In conclusion, the data collected shows my hypothesis is only partly true. The city of Houston conforms to the nuclei theory of urban land use, although it does not seem to fit as well with the sector and concentric models.'

Most candidates were to discuss the limitations of their studies. They normally mentioned the data collection processes with valid suggestions for improvement. This was normal restricted to suggestions of repeating their data collection time or taking a greater number or range of measurements. However, this year there were some outstanding evaluations that recognised changes at the planning, data collection and analysis stages would improve their conclusions and the validity of their coursework.

Criterion 5 – Planning and Organisation

All the submitted work showed at least evidence of organization. Many obtained level two for this criterion, with a number gaining full marks. The most effective studies ensured that diagrams. photographs, maps and graphs were fully integrated into the text. Many candidates acknowledged the sources of secondary data.

All of the candidates made some effective use of ICT to enhance studies.

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
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Summer 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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