OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE

Geography B

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J385**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates, which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography B (J385)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content **Page**

B561/01 Sustainable Decision Making (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

This paper elicited a wide range of responses; however, very few candidates achieved over 30 marks. The majority of candidates seemed to be appropriately entered for Foundation Level, and there were less candidates seen who would have probably coped with the Higher Tier. The majority of candidates could provide answers to all the questions and there were few rubric errors. There were a high number of No Response (NR) answers on certain questions. And there were a number of candidates who attempted the first couple of questions and then left the remainder of their paper blank. Candidates often did not answer the question as required and lacked the detailed explanations required to access more than the basic marks in many cases.

Many of the errors candidates made related to a failure to correctly read the resource booklet, poor selection of examples and/or stakeholder, a failure to correctly evaluate what a question was actually asking or not knowing key geographical terms. For example, where the candidate was asked to describe a landform most described the process of its formation and so were restricted in the number of marks they could achieve. Generally though, candidates used the resource booklet effectively particularly for the one mark questions where they merely needed to take information directly from it.

The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar are still a major concern. Key terms are often incorrectly spelt, even though in many cases they are in the resource booklet. Very poor handwriting makes candidates work difficult to read and so difficult to mark. Candidates should be encouraged to ensure that their work is clear and legible. Candidates continue to write all around the page which makes marking much more difficult and they are often offered additional paper by invigilators, which is unnecessary as there is plenty of additional space incorporated into the question paper. Where additional pages are used, candidates need to be reminded to clearly label any extra work with the correct question numbers, as examiners are often left guessing which answer the candidate is referring to; Q8, Q9 etc. are often seen when the candidate should be referring to 5b, 5c etc.

With only one level marked question on this paper, few candidates failed to achieve marks on all sections of the paper. It is still crucial however; that the topic area covered by the DME is taught thoroughly, especially, as in this year's exam, that background knowledge is tested in earlier parts of the paper. This lack of contextual knowledge also stops candidates from being able to go beyond the most basic of development points and rarely able to link their thoughts to actual examples, beyond those given in the resource booklet, in the decision section of the paper.
As this paper is based on 'sustainability', this word is often used as a catch-all phrase. Students often respond with 'it is economically/socially/environmentally sustainable' and don't go on to say why or how. They must understand what these concepts mean and how they can affect different geographical ideas and people. There is no requirement to write a definition of sustainability at any point, and candidates who do so are just wasting valuable time.

Teachers need to consider the following points when preparing students for exams:

- Thorough teaching of the background geography of the topic area. It is not enough to expect the Resource Booklet to give the candidates enough information to be able to do well on this paper.
- Emphasis on including enough detail, explanation and development for the higher mark questions.

- When answering questions about sustainability students need to explain WHY creating jobs is sustainable, i.e. long lasting so people can plan financially for the future or WHY a groin is sustainable, i.e. often made of re-cycled material and simple and easy to repair by local builders, not requiring specialist contractors - and not just state what the term sustainability means.
- Making sure their handwriting is clear and legible.

Comments on individual questions

1 Most candidates achieved full marks on this question.

(a) Almost all candidates correctly identified 32% as the correct answer.

(b) The majority of candidates correctly identified Norway as the correct answer. The incorrect answer most often given was Denmark.

(c) Over 50% of candidates gained 2 marks, for commonly given answers such as 'loss of land', 'damage to houses', 'flooding', 'decrease in house prices' and 'cost of insurance'. Another 38% of candidates scored 1 mark.

2 Over 50% of candidates scored at least half marks on this question.

(a) Almost 50% of candidates were correctly able to identify Cliff – Arch – Stack for 2 marks. The most frequently given wrong answers were the substitution of Stump for Stack and Wave Cut Platform for Cliff. There were a disappointing number of candidates (almost 15%) who failed to score any marks on this question.

(b) This was a very poorly answered question as most candidates were unable to follow the command word to describe the landform they selected, instead describing the processes that formed it, for which they were able to achieve only one of the two marks available.

(c) There were a lot of No Responses (NR) or simple one word answers, with well over 50% of candidates failing to achieve any marks for this question. About a third of candidates were able to name a suitable erosional process, and a further 15% were able to correctly describe that process. A significant number of candidates offered answers based on weathering such as freeze-thaw, or discussed destructive waves.

3 The majority of candidates were able to score at least 2 marks on this question, mostly from sections 3(a)(i) and 3(a)(ii).

(a) (i) Around 75% of candidates were able to gain at least one mark on this question. Many candidates answered with sustainability ideas rather than why the method is good at reducing erosion. The most popular choice was B Sea Wall, where candidates were able to explain that they are 'long lasting', 'stop erosion' and had some understanding of the 'curved section causing wave reflection'. Rock Armour and Gabions were poorly understood in terms of the way they work.

(a) (ii) As so many candidates had chosen Sea Walls, over 75% were able to state 'expensive to build' as a disadvantage. Those who had chosen Gabions were able to give the 'cages rusting' as a disadvantage; however, Rock Armour was the least well understood.

(b) (i) A little over 50% of candidates failed to score any marks on this question. Where it was well answered the candidates focussed on Groynes and understood that they 'stopped long-shore drift', and 'built up the beach'. Revetments were less well understood, and Christmas Trees were almost universally misunderstood. Many candidates had clearly not been taught about the use of this method in Dune Stabilisation, instead discussing the 'planting' of the trees as an afforestation process, to intercept the waves and suck up the water, or to 'take up the force of the waves'.

(b) (ii) Almost 60% of candidates failed to score any marks on this question. A lot of very generic answers about 'cost' were seen, but these were not specific to repair and/or maintenance. Candidates still see the word 'sustainable' in the question and think if they say something is environmentally/socially or economically sustainable, that they will achieve some marks, without any explanation of why this is the case. The best answers to this question were able to discuss cost effectiveness and the recycling of the Christmas Trees.

4 A little over 50% of candidates scored at least half marks on this question. It allowed expression and encouraged a variety of responses.

(a) 82% of Candidates were able to score at least one mark on this question, with almost 40% scoring 2 or more. The best answers focussed on the Café Owner and the Owner of the Campsite, and showed an understanding of business continuity after the work had been carried out, or even an increase in business (for the café owner) during the work, with the construction workers frequenting the café. Those who chose the Construction Worker almost always only scored one mark for having a job, with the better answers understanding that this would be guaranteed for 2 years. Where candidates failed to score, either the stakeholder was poorly chosen or the answer did not relate to the chosen stakeholder.

(b) Around 75% of candidates were able to score at least one mark on this question with a little over 40% scoring 2 or more. The best answers focussed on the Beauminster Resident, where candidates could explain that they would be unhappy about having to pay increased taxes to pay for something that was not going to affect them, whilst preferring if this money had been spent in their local area. Candidates also scored well when they discussed the views of the Retired Resident, being unhappy about the disruption, increased noise, traffic congestion etc. due to the construction work, in the town where they had previously enjoyed peace and quiet. A number of candidates failed to score as they suggested that the sea wall would block the view of the sea from the campsite, clearly not understanding the location of the campsite in relation to the structure being put in place.

Those candidates that chose the Parents with young children or the Tourism Manager for either 4(a) or (b) often failed to score well as their answers tended not to be very specific.

5 As this paper had no pre-release material, this exam was a true test of a student's knowledge of the topic area. It was pleasing to see almost 50% of candidates' score at least half marks for the whole of Q5.

(a) The majority of candidates were able to attain at least level 2 with simplistic reasons given as to why their choice was the best idea, often taken from the Resources, but with appropriate links made to show simple development. Candidates tended to select Options 1 and 2 most frequently. Very few candidates understood that it would be the National Trust that would pay for the development, those who did tended to achieve higher marks. The best answers discussed the relative costs of protecting Mullion Cove verses the cost of the coastal defences.
It is imperative that candidates learn to interpret information from the resource book rather than just copy it, if they are going to attain L3 in this section.

Many candidates still refer to types of sustainability without fully explaining what they mean. It is not enough to say an option is economically sustainable with no further explanation. When a candidate failed to achieve on this question the candidate tended to give reasons for their rejected choices rather than positive aspects of their chosen option.

Option 1: Students who chose this option gave themselves more opportunity to develop their reasoning and generally scored better. The best answers understood that the breakwater would offer protection to the cove and the existing breakwater and that although the initial outlay was high, the maintenance costs would be lower over time.

Option 2: candidates who chose this option often limited their explanations and misunderstood the idea cost implications, often citing 2 x £2.8m for 100 years of protection, which was not discussed in the resource book.

Option 3: Was far less frequently chosen, but allowed the best candidates to analyse the cost/benefit of spending millions to protect a very small area verses the likely cost of damage to the village, which is someway inland.

(b) Most candidates were able to recognise 2 or 3 disadvantages of their chosen option. However, a significant number of candidates gave advantages of other options rather than disadvantages of their chosen option. As the question asked for disadvantages, development was not a requirement in the mark scheme as up to 3 separate disadvantages could be credited, however development points could be recognised. Nevertheless, lack of development of these ideas remains an issue.

Option 1: The disadvantages discussed were often based on cost, with the better answers discussing the distinction between the costs of the build against the on-going maintenance costs. Also it being visible, potentially deterring tourists thereby causing damage to the local economy.

Option 2: Cost was often discussed here too, although the best answers understood that if the damage became too great there would be a reversion to Option 3, whereby damage to the economy of the area would become an issue.

Option 3: Candidates recognised the potential cost of the damage to the houses and businesses of the Cove, and the loss of attraction, for tourists and as a site used for TV and films.

(c) This question was generally well answered with the majority of candidates able to give disadvantages of the other Options and many able to give simple development of at least one reason. The poorer answers clumped their reasons for rejection and the other Options together, rather than discussing them separately.

(d) 80% of candidates were able to score at least one mark on this question. Answers given often discussed both the rejected Options, rather than focussing on one and there was a lot of misinterpretation of the advantages of Options 2 and 3. The very best answers showed an understanding of the role of the National Trust.

B561/02 Sustainable Decision Making (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

This series the SDME questions were approachable, and well designed to differentiate well. For questions 2-4, level 3 responses were by no means uncommon. The “average” candidate managed to amass about 17-18 marks before embarking upon question 5. This is most encouraging. Full marks for the paper, though very rare, was certainly achievable.

Candidates had clearly been well prepared for the demands of the SDME by teachers, good use had been made of past papers and reports to centres. Nearly all candidates used the correct resource for each question, and many effectively used their own knowledge in support of their answers which was very good practice. Many used the optional diagram to answer Q2, and this often provided the description of their chosen feature, when it was annotated.

Almost all candidates understood each question and thus very few “No Response” (NR) were awarded and few candidates gave completely irrelevant or incorrect answers. However, a minority did not answer all elements of the question. For example, in Q2, missing the describe before the explain and in Q5 when a sizeable minority of candidates compared the options unnecessarily. Centres should note that in Q5, in particular, the demands of the task will not always exactly match past papers. Whilst the structure will remain similar, candidates should be prepared to carefully read and respond to the bullet points set.

The answer spaces provided were sufficient for most candidates with the large hand writers and verbose being the ones to require the additional pages; few candidates used an additional booklet, and in many cases this was used as an alternative to the pages at the back of the answer booklet. As is so often the case, the succinct responses regularly provided the best answers.

QWC was generally strong, though a number of candidates resorted to bullet points, in particular on Q2. Better responses were from students who planned their answer first or demonstrated a writing frame/plan. Others underlined command words or jotted ideas down. Most responses were clearly legible.

Whilst there was generally very good use of subject specific terminology, too many candidates used generic sustainability phrases parrot fashion, sometimes not placing them in correct context within a response, particularly in Q3 and 5.

There was a wide range of ability in answering questions 2-5 some candidates provided very long responses containing several different sound points. This did not enable responses to progress beyond L2 marks. Developed points, those which extend the detail via an example or by explaining consequences did progress through to L3 and L4. In any levels marked question two or three points (sound/ developed or well-developed) provides enough variety of points to achieve the top mark within a level.

Candidates seem to have had no problem finishing the paper in the time available. It appeared that any unanswered questions were down to lack of knowledge or understanding rather than running out of time.

Comments on individual questions

1. The majority of candidates gained the full 4 marks for this question. It was intended as a starter question to give candidates a good lead into the coastal management topic and to give them confidence. These aims have been achieved.

(a) A very accessible first question, there were very few errors here. Some students missed out the percentage symbol. However, the figure was accepted alone, which ensured they got the mark.

(b) Few wrong answers; a small minority read from wrong column. Leeway was given for small arithmetical errors in order to reward the geography. Correct comparison of the percentage figures was credited, as was "more people live within 5kms of the sea in the UK", as it provided an alternative correct answer.

(c) A wide range of answers gained credit these commonly included: homes destroyed, businesses lost, tourism decline, farmland lost, flooding, house value declining etc. Many candidates wrote in more detail than needed, which will have meant some time was lost. Very few candidates only wrote one answer or gave no response.

2. This question differentiated well with the whole range of marks seen. The question asked for description of a named feature that could be seen in the photograph. Many, including clearly able students, did not do this. Responses which lacked any description of the chosen feature were restricted from gaining full Level 3 marks. Therefore, 5 marks were made available for responses which contained only explanation of how a named feature was formed by coastal processes. Many candidates produced very good annotated diagrams, which were credited as description as well as explanation, as appropriate.

Almost all candidates correctly identified a feature, with stack, cave or arch being most common. There were few NRs, however some irrelevant responses.

There were good explanations of the appropriate named marine erosion processes of hydraulic action and corrosion (abrasion). There were also detailed responses explaining the impact of weathering processes. Although frequently the spelling of these technical terms was incorrect. Some students were a little confused as to what the processes actually did, they could name them but didn't show an understanding of the mechanics. Many showed a good understanding of the progression of features as a headland is eroded by marine processes, which was also credited.

Many responses were restricted to Level 2 (4 marks) because they failed to name a coastal process when clearly understanding the nature of hydraulic action, for example. Or named a process but failed to explain it.

The best responses identified and described a feature, then demonstrated detailed knowledge of processes. Some even explained first how headlands are formed, then the progression of features formed from crack to stump in detail, naming and explaining erosional or weathering processes involved in context.

Common mistakes were:

- Confusion between coastal processes e.g. sometimes freeze-thaw weathering was described for hydraulic action. Or transport types were named e.g. traction or longshore drift.
- Many responses missed out stages e.g. skipped from crack in the headland to stack.
- Some candidates displayed a lack of knowledge of these coastal features which limited marks e.g. naming a tombolo or spit as a feature.
- Incorrect spelling of terms or features e.g. hydraulic action or arch.

3. This question effectively discriminated between candidates. Few candidates remained in Level 1 and thus this question differentiated well between Level 2 and Level 3. The mark scheme allowed for access to Level 3 on this, 8 mark question more easily than in the past, when very good candidates were commonly restricted to top Level 2. A developed point made on either sustainability or how a defence works was enough to gain access to bottom Level 3.

The most common choices were the sea wall and the groyne. Although all options, in various combinations, were chosen by candidates. There was a distinction between hard and soft engineering in ABC versus DEF, however it was not essential that responses recognised this.

Almost all candidates selected a defence from each group correctly, very few chose two from the same group. Almost all wrote about two defence options, however there were a small number of NRs to this question, possibly due to candidates intending to return to it later and running out of time.

Many candidates were able to give a sound or excellent explanation of how their chosen defences worked but fewer were able to gain the same level of credit in explaining how their chosen defences were sustainable. There were some very good answers in relation to some choices; the understanding of groynes and their disruption to LSD and ability to build up a beach, which in itself is a defence, often stood out as the best answers.

Many candidates tried to bring in a broad range of reasons why their chosen defences were sustainable including points on social, economic and environmental sustainability. Here weaker candidates tended to bulk out their response with several sound points, rather than one or two developed point/s.

Common mistakes were:

- A large number of candidates selected defence E, but appeared to have a weak understanding of exactly how the scheme worked. Many candidates thought Christmas trees would soak up sea water and help prevent flooding.
- A minority discussed the negative impacts of their chosen sea defence.
- A very small minority compared sustainability of the 3 options in each group.
- Some candidates perhaps spent too long on this question to the detriment of question 5.

4. This question was generally answered very well by candidates. Again the question differentiated well, although as anticipated on this Higher Tier paper few were in Level 1. 4/6 and 5/6 were the most common marks, but many gained full credit.

Almost all candidates selected two people from the resource, as required, and were able to choose examples with differing views. There was no requirement for the opinions to be directly opposing. Candidates had to explain a feasible view and give reasons why the person might have it. The mark scheme moved away from requiring the mirror image type responses of previous years. Those giving only one view or two identical views were restricted to L2 3 marks.

It was pleasing to see most candidates select a particular person and develop their arguments, showing good understanding of the issues; this was particularly the case with the camp site owner and the retired resident. The vast majority of candidates were able to give sound reasons why the different stakeholders would have held their respective opinions. The strongest candidates were able to develop ideas and say how they would lead to future consequences linked to the person in the resource they had chosen.

Common mistakes were:

- Responses which provided reasons that were not applicable to the stakeholder and referred to general benefits e.g. to the local economy
- Responses which chose stakeholders that were not on the resource and thus gained no credit.

- Candidates mistakenly used the Green Monthly extract as a stakeholder.
- Candidates who were unsure what a tourism manager was. However, leniency was allowed in the marking to accept any feasible interpretation of the role.

5. This question differentiated well and utilised the whole mark range, although few responses were in Level 1. Level 3 was achieved regularly and Level 4 responses were more common than in past cycles, with some 15/16 and 16/16 examples seen by most examiners.

All three components of the question performed well, and the mark scheme asked examiners to award a "best fit" mark to show the most appropriate overall level achieved. Part 3 the alternative plan, was interesting this year and was a good opportunity for students to demonstrate their understanding of other coastal management methods. Here, examiners commented on the exciting and stimulating variety of alternatives suggested, some probably not feasible in reality. The mark scheme did not restrict candidates in terms of their plan needing to be realistic from an engineering or financial perspective, examiners were looking for ideas and justification of their sustainability. Candidates drew well on their own case study knowledge. Alternative options ranged from rebuilding bigger harbour walls, to using offshore reefs or soft engineering strategies. Many used ideas from the resource book with a good understanding of sustainability shown.

Overall, the majority of candidates understood the concept of sustainability and developed points linked to environmental, social and economic sustainability. In a change from previous exam series, the mark scheme allowed credit for implied ideas of sustainability within a response. Therefore, it was not necessary for candidates to repeat the phrases "this is economically sustainable" etc in order to get credit for their points.

Most candidates answered each section of the question. Many of the strongest candidates were able to reach full marks on this question by effectively developing just a single point for each of the three sections. However, there was still a number of students who followed a drill that must have been set by centres based on past questions. This meant a sizeable minority of students had written irrelevant sections, sometimes a page or longer, which gained little or no extra credit. Centres must be reminded that Q5 does not follow the exact same pattern each year and thus prepared, formulaic answers struggle to move into Level 3. This year weaker candidates too often offered a long list of explanations as to why their chosen option was/was not sustainable but not did not develop any one reason to a sufficient standard to be credited at the higher levels.

Where candidates missed out one part of the task set their response was judged using a best fit approach, while taking into account that a sizeable chunk of answer was missing.
There were very few NRs and few candidates who appeared to have run out of time. Many candidates filled the 3 pages allowed and some went into the additional space, showing a high level of ability to explain their developed ideas.

Common mistakes were:

- Responses which compared their chosen option to the others. Often in this case candidates said their option was better than option X because... and then focused on the negatives of the other option, hence were unable to pick up marks for why their chosen option was sustainable.
- Responses which included reasons for the rejection of other options, which the question did not invite.
- Responses that considered various elements of sustainability providing simple points rather than focusing on an idea and developing more detail. Almost all candidates reached Level 2, many developed lots of points to a simple level, when further development of fewer points would have scored more highly.

- A minority of candidates used one of the other options provided as their alternative option. (Quite a few did, however, adapt one of the given options which was credited equally with an alternative of their own invention, this helped all students access full marks.)

B562 and A771/02 Geographical Enquiry

General Comments:

In this ninth and penultimate session for entry for this specification for controlled assessment for B562 and A771 there has been a combined entry of nearly centres 500 and over 30000 candidates.

Administration
Administration by centres continues to be good with many centre's submitting their marks well in advance of the 15th of May deadline. There were only a few MS1 errors and nearly all centres sent their CCS160 forms promptly and many included the GCW304 form for individual candidates. Most centres completed assessment grids fully and included appropriate teacher comments on forms and indicated where credit was given. A few centres are point marking and not assessing holistically. This should not be done as assessment criteria do not carry equal weighting.

Moderation
The enquiry involves centres selecting one Fieldwork Focus title from four. The Fieldwork Focus titles were all selected but, the majority were Coasts, with Rivers then Settlements and Economic having significant numbers. It is expected that centres "contextualise" the title to match their study area. The vast majority of centres did this well. Those who did not had studies which undertook a report structure and not a route to enquiry with a clear focus.

Centres did break down their title into 3 or 4 key questions or hypotheses, justified them and gave reasoned expectations. Some centres however, did not define sustainability and missed the opportunity to have questions relating to economic, environmental and social sustainability. Many made references to models, e.g. Egan Wheel and how their study had relevance in the UK and wider afield. Those centres that did not do the above did suffer from a lack of a clear focus for their candidates. Most centres located their study area in a series of maps at different scales with photographs and aerial photographs. However, some candidates did not annotate or even refer to them in their written work. This is needed to give a sense of place and the character of the study area. There is no need to give risk assessments and to define terms as this reduces the word count unnecessarily.

The vast majority of centres continue to provide a methodology table linked to their key questions with details of their methods and a justification for them. Most candidates suggested mainly primary data techniques from fieldwork with some supporting secondary sources. Questionnaires were commonly used, but some were too simplistic with yes/no answers only. Some candidates suggested a wide range of techniques, but only carried out a few of those mentioned. Most centres provided raw data tables and some candidates, included them next to their graphs and analysis, a method to be encouraged. Most candidates presented their work in a variety of forms with graphs, maps, sketches, photographs well annotated. Some combined these with their analysis for each site they studied in an effective way. Thankfully most candidates drew proportional symbols and not just one type of bar or pie chart. Some candidates successfully used statistical techniques such as Spearman rank to help analyse their data.

The analysis of their data was done well by candidates who had identified key questions and identified patterns with reference to data and suggested reasons. Some candidates did this in far too much detail and exceeded the word limit as a consequence. Most centres had candidates returning to their key questions and used their analysis to give substantiated conclusions. Those who did not lacked focus and their conclusions tended to be general. Many candidates included the evaluation of their methods in their methodology table. In general candidates gave critical evaluations and suggested realistic solutions to improve and extend their enquiry. Many suggested who might be interested in their findings.

It was encouraging to see fewer candidates exceeding the prescribed 2000 word limit and centres recognising this in their marking. It is important to mention again that the use of tables and text boxes should be restricted to the methodology table and annotations.

Overall there continues to be an improvement in the quality of work produced and the use of ICT to give a sense of place for their study area. There were many candidates who showed initiative, imagination and independence at a high level.

The vast majority of centres marked accurately and some responded very well to the advice given from their moderator in previous reports. Once again those that were adjusted were because they did not have a clear focus with key questions, had not given expectations and had collected insufficient primary data. Some centres also did not have sufficient variety in their graphs.

It is important that centres read their moderators report and act upon advice given. It is also advisable to look at the OCR web site which has examples of work.

B563/01 Key Geographical Themes (Foundation Tier)

General Comments:

With one exception, all the Examiners and Team Leaders agreed that the June 2016 examination was appropriate for candidates entered at Foundation level. This was neatly expressed by an experienced Team Leader: *'It was in my view appropriate for the target audience with opportunities from the whole grade C-G range to be rewarded.'*

Most candidates seemed to be entered at the correct level, with a few Examiners commenting that some may have been better suited by the challenge of the Higher paper.

There was a noticeable dip in performance from Question 1 to Question 3. This covered the overall total mark, the case study mark and the mark for spelling, punctuation and grammar. This dip could be due to issues of timing or exam fatigue for Foundation candidates. It may also be due to the case study selection leading to lower marks with Question 3. There is little evidence that candidates do not have sufficient time for this examination, they could perhaps be better prepared to make the most of the time they have to raise performance.

Although optionality and question choice ended in 2013, candidates can still choose which Question to tackle first. They should be encouraged to read all the questions, study the resources and consider their case study choices before starting to write their first answer.

Some candidates made good use of the Resources to guide them through the content transitions within questions. For four mark questions they used the Resources to trigger and select appropriate knowledge and understanding to focus on relevant and concise responses. A good example of this was the effective use of Fig. 4, the photograph of a squatter settlement, to answer Questions 1(d) and 1(e). Weaker candidates did not recognise this. An experienced Team Leader noted: *'Often candidates did not grasp or follow instructions and they responded as if the question was a direct continuation of the previous question.'*

There are examples of sub questions which did follow a logical sequence. For example: Questions 1(a) (b) (c) linked to the population pyramids in Fig. 3; Questions 1(d) and (e) mentioned above; Questions 2(a) (b) (c) (d) linked to drought and Questions 3(a) (b) (c) covering employment structure and economic development. However examples of where candidates did not notice a change in focus included: Using Fig. 4 to tackle Questions 1(f)(i) and (ii) about land use zones, thereby ignoring Fig. 5, a land use zone model for an LEDC city. Using Fig 10, a photograph of a plantation worker, to comment on the location factors for secondary industry for Q2(d). Using Fig. 12, USA aid to the Philippines to answer Question 1(f) about general problems for LEDCs caused by aid from MEDCs.

To prepare candidates for the 2017 examination, Centres could use the Resources as a card sort activity. Candidates could group them into themes, types of question and mark tariff. Learning could focus on how the Resources support progress through the examination by noting the content changes within each question.

Centres should also maximise the content coverage afforded by their case study revision menu. For example, the choice of international migration for Question 1(g) affected candidates' marks. Those who selected Poland-UK had less to offer for the migration management section, compared to those who chose to write about Mexico-USA. This was also noted for Question 2(g) where many candidates were unable to match the correct ideas about plate tectonics to their given earthquake of volcano example. Question 3(g) did yield encouraging contemporary

examples of named economic activities and their impact upon the physical environment. However concomitant ideas about environmental impact management were weak by comparison. Candidates should also be aware that Examiners use the internet to check the accuracy of any data given as part of their response. For the 2016 examination this was particularly true for data for Poland and Mexico for the migration case study and information about casualties and damage costs for the tectonic hazard case study.

Candidates should be made aware that the second section of each case study is always the more challenging. It usually involves the explanation of causes or comments about management. This serves as a good performance discriminator for the more able candidates who are targeted to achieve a grade C.

The most disappointing aspect of case study performance continues to be the failure of some candidates to select a relevant example or to attempt these questions. The case study questions, along with the SPaG marks, account for 36 out of the total mark of 99. This range of marks covers four grade boundaries. Over a quarter of candidates failed to attempt Question 3(g) whilst others offered completely erroneous examples such as natural hazards or aid projects.

Examiners noted the encouraging highlighting of key words within questions by some candidates. However some candidates did this with little thought or focus by underlining almost every word.

This should be smarter and practiced as part of exam preparation. Candidates could be given a limit regarding how many words they could underline for a given set of questions. Success criteria could focus on command words, if two responses are needed, if a Resource is used, and for case studies, the place/scale needed and the content focus.

Candidates should also be aware of the two types of four mark question. Where candidates are asked for two ideas each must be explained to secure four marks. Examiners use a tick to annotate a relevant idea and 'DEV' to show that this has been explained or developed. Candidates who give more than two ideas without any credible development can only gain two marks. However if two ideas are not specified by the question, four basic valid ideas can secure full marks. Question 1(d) and 1(e) exemplify this. Candidates could use other past papers (2014 and 2015) to identify and respond to the different four mark question types.

Centres should also consider the management of candidates during the examination. Some Examiners commented on separate extension booklets being used rather than the four additional pages provided in the question-answer booklet. Some examiners struggled to decipher the handwriting of a few candidates. An experienced Examiner noted: '*The growth of very poor handwriting becomes more noticeable year on year and it does make marking more challenging'.* Centres should consider if such candidates could be supported by use of a scribe or a laptop to word process their answers. Centres should also ensure that the accompanying paper work is fully completed for the use of a scribe or word processor. This is important in enabling Examiners and Team Leaders to award the correct mark for spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1:

Question 1 assessed the Population and Settlement Theme of the Specification. This was the highest scoring question overall with the most successfully answered case study question. The Resources were a set of population pyramids for Japan, a photograph of a squatter settlement in Nairobi and a diagram showing land use zones in an LEDC city.

The skills questions in part (a) required candidates to read from the population pyramids. Parts i) and iii) were correctly answered by nearly all candidates, however, nearly a third gave the incorrect answer of 2005 for part ii).

Interpretation of what the pyramids revealed about changing birth and death rates was a more challenging part (b). Most were correct for part (i) by selecting decrease for birth rate. About one selected 'stay the same' or 'increase' as incorrect responses for death rate. A popular misconception could be that the wider pyramid top in 2050 shows more people dying.

An explanation of these changes was needed for part (c). The question was split into two marks for birth rate and two for death rate. These marks could be gained with either a relevant idea explained or two valid ideas for each rate. Death rate changes were commonly linked to improvements in health care and medicine, with some answers about improved lifestyle and better geriatric care. Contraception and family planning featured strongly for birth rate. Reference to a one child policy was a common error. Smart highlighting of the end of the question 'in an MEDC such as Japan' could have prevented this.

Part (d) marked a content change from population to settlement and was supported by a familiar looking photograph of an LEDC squatter settlement. This was the highest scoring four mark question for the whole paper. One Examiner remarked: *'Candidates seemed to understand what they were seeing and the back story.'* Some candidates listed four valid problems whilst others chose two and developed them with detail. Comments about poor health linked to overcrowding, sanitation and water supply were most common, along with poor quality housing and lack of access to basic services.

For part (e) many candidates made a logical step to describe and explain how the quality of life could be improved via direct reference to the problems they had described in part (d). To gain full marks each idea needed a valid explanation. Such as a clean water supply leading to improved health. Most credited responses seemed to be linked to careful consideration of Fig. 4 rather than the recall of learned examples such as self-help housing improvement schemes and the like. Over half the candidates were unable to offer credible explanations to achieve three or four marks. This included those who offered list of ideas without explanation. Smart highlighting of the word 'two' would have helped.

Part (f) was the least well answered question in the whole exam. Non scoring responses continued to make reference to Fig. 4. Others ignored the precise instructions with each question and commented on how the land uses might be different, such as more industry in an MEDC city or bigger houses of part (i). The most common correct answer was that MEDC cities would not have any squatter settlements. Some said 'fewer' squatter settlements, a subtle difference, but an incorrect idea. For part (ii) the common correct idea was the CBD being located in the centre or middle. These candidates had noticed the key word 'location' in the question. This was intended as a challenging question as it involved a geographical model and higher level comparison thinking.

Nearly all candidates attempted the migration case study part (g). This was the highest scoring case study question with the majority achieving Level 2, four or five marks. This was mainly due to the example chosen. Most common was from Poland to the UK. These responses had few valid ideas regarding the management of migration. Incorrect ideas about work permits, visas, restrictions, quotas, and repatriation showed an ignorance of the free movement of people and labour within the EU at the time of the 2016 examination. Basic push and pull factors linked to employment, wages, better services and sending money home were credited in the first section. The second most common example was for Mexico to the USA. Similar push and pull factors were noted but with some credible ideas about border controls for the management section. These candidates gained the top of Level 2, six marks. About fifteen percent of candidates were able to gain level three by offering developed ideas about management, some with accurate place specific detail such as relevant data or phrases such as 'the tortilla wall' or places such as

the Sonora desert. A few candidates offered credible coverage of migration from Syria into a European country such as Greece or Germany with clear ideas about conflict and seeking safety or asylum.

Incorrect place and scale selection limited some candidates to sub Level 1 marks. Continents such as Europe and Africa were given instead of named countries. At the other end of the scale named settlements were given such as London, Peterborough and Stoke. Smart highlighting of 'named country' would have helped.

As with any migration case study question some responses were mired in misconception and prejudice. One Examiner noted that the responses *'showed more about received opinion than acquired knowledge'*. Geography teachers are well placed to address these challenges in the classroom. One Examiner noticed very few anti-immigrant comments and noted that *'perhaps geography teachers are doing a good job here.'*

Question 2:

Question 2 assessed the Natural Hazards Theme of the Specification. This was the second highest scoring question overall with the second most successfully answered case study question. The Resources were two world maps showing information about drought, four images of drought management methods in MEDCs and a photograph of a tropical storm shelter in Bangladesh.

For part (a) candidates were required to select information from the two maps. Nearly all candidates showed that they were able to do this. It was encouraging to note that most candidates simply provided the correct answers: 'low risk'; 'Africa' and 'Asia'. However there are still those who waste time by embedding the answer within an unnecessary sentence.

Part (b) was the least successfully answered four mark question for the whole examination. Just over a third of candidates failed to answer or score any marks. They tended to write about hazards or differences in development in general terms without any reference to drought. Others provided inaccurate statements about LEDCs having no clean water, no reservoirs or no shops selling bottled water. Credible responses focused on the use of water for subsistence and commercial farming and the impact that drought would have on food supply, business and people's health. Others also commented on problems with access to clean, safe water in LEDCs and how this is exacerbated during drought conditions. Some candidates secured marks by writing clearly about how MEDCs were better able to manage the impact of drought. Maybe they sneaked a look at the next Resource Fig. 7 for inspiration. Smart highlighting of the words 'impact' and 'drought' could have helped focus the less relevant responses.

A very small number of candidates gained two marks for part (c), with three quarters achieving one mark. This may have been due to lucky guessing rather that knowledge recall. The multiple-choice selection replaced an earlier draft question asking candidates to explain the cause of severe drought. The latter was rejected as too challenging for most Foundation candidates. The 'higher temperature' distractor was included to offer some challenge.

For part (d) four different types of images showing different MEDC drought management methods were shown in Fig. 7, with the deliberate omission of titles or text from three of them. Candidates were thus able to gain two marks for identifying two of the methods with simple terms such as: 'store water'; 'waste less water' 'map areas of drought'. The third and fourth marks were for explaining how the chosen methods would reduce the impact. Just over one quarter of candidates were able to do this. Most with basic, but credible ideas, such as 'save water for the future' or 'help areas most at risk'. Some candidates did not recognise Method 3 as a water storage reservoir and dam, they wrote incorrectly about HEP generation or flood control.

Part (e) marked the transition from drought to tropical storms. However some candidates continued to write about drought, whilst others focused on other hazards such as earthquakes or hazards in general. Smart highlighting of key words such as 'weather conditions' and 'tropical storms' would have helped. Some candidates recognised tropical storm but missed weather conditions to write about the climatic conditions needed for the formation of a tropical storm. Others wrote about hurricanes and tornadoes without any reference to hazardous weather conditions. Just under one quarter of candidates did respond with relevant ideas about strong winds and heavy rainfall causing destruction and flooding to secure full marks.

A familiar looking photograph of a tropical storm shelter was used for part (f). Some candidates gained only one mark for a general comment about keeping people safe or reducing deaths. Others made good use of the Resource to link their ideas to specific design features. Common ideas made reference to the concrete structure being able to withstand strong winds and the raised structure providing some protection from flooding. Others also applied detailed knowledge about shelters being centres for food, water, education as well as a safe haven. Some even commented on the cyclone warning flag atop the shelter.

Part (g) saw a second shift in content to tectonic hazards in an LEDC context. A correct type of tectonic hazard and a coherently linked LEDC place were needed to access the marks. One quarter of candidates either failed to attempt this question or scored zero marks. Just under another quarter recorded bottom of or mid-Level 1 marks of one or two. These were candidates who gave a climatic hazard with an LEDC place or a tectonic hazard for an MEDC place. Smart highlighting again could have prevented these inappropriate case study choices. Correct choices featured earthquakes more than volcanic eruptions with Haiti being the most common. Pakistan, Kashmir and Sichuan also featured strongly with a few mentions of Nepal. The most common volcanoes were Nevado del Ruiz, Montserrat and Pinatubo. The familiar impact section was successfully covered by most with references to death, injury, destruction or secondary effects such as disease and the need for aid. However a smaller number were also able to match a plate tectonics idea to their chosen example, with fewer still able to explain these ideas clearly. There were common misconceptions of plates hitting each other or going over the top of another plate.

As with data provided for the migration case study Examiners are rigorous in their checking of data given for impact. This does enable accurate answers to be given credit for place specific detail (PLC) to gain full marks. Some candidates also supplied the correct names for the plates linked to their example. One Examiner was impressed by a reference to the Longmenshan fault linked to the Sichuan earthquake.

Question 3:

Question 3 assessed the Economic Development Theme of the Specification. This was the lowest scoring question overall with the least successfully answered case study question. This may have been due to timing or exam fatigue. The Resources were pie charts showing employment structure for three contrasting countries, a photograph of plantation workers in an LEDC and an information graphic about aid from the USA to the Philippines after a natural disaster (Typhoon Haiyan).

Nearly all candidates were able to read the pie charts for part (a) (i) and (ii), however less were successful with part (iii) with nearly a quarter of candidates choosing the incorrect answer of 48%.

Part (b) was very challenging, asking candidates to link differences in employment structure to difference in economic development. Three quarters of candidates secured one or two marks for giving relevant evidence, such as a high primary sector for Tanzania. However few were able to link this to a valid, coherent explanation. Basic ideas about reliance on agriculture for subsistence or exports enabled some to gain a further mark.

For part (c) over half of candidates correctly identified primary as the correct sector with a basic idea about farming or raw materials for the second mark. Incorrect ideas about manual labour or low wages limited some to only one mark for primary.

Part (d) marked a shift to secondary industry and required candidates to use their knowledge to describe and explain two relevant location factors. Simple ideas about transport links, access to resources, workers and markets gained credit. However a quarter of candidates continued to write about primary industry or differences in development thus failing to score any marks. One fifth of candidates did not attempt this question, the second highest omission rate for the whole examination. Smart highlighting of secondary industry may have helped these candidates.

Part (e) marked a transition to aid. Successful answers made good use of the Resource. They were able to link the elements shown to specific needs after a natural disaster. The importance of clean water for health, food supply and hunger, the need for safe shelter for the homeless and hygiene kits to treat the injured and prevent infection were all clearly covered. Some candidates gained only one mark for a general statement about helping people to get back on their feet or similar. Candidates who ignored the command word 'explain' often failed to score as they merely copied a list items of aid from Fig. 12.

For part (f) candidates were required to recall their knowledge of problems for LEDCs caused by aid from MEDCs. Nearly three quarters scored marks, with one fifth being able to explain two problems clearly. Dependency and debt were the most common, with some ideas about corruption and inappropriate aid also featuring. The other candidates either omitted this question or continued to focus on Fig. 12 and comment on the aid shown in the Resource.

Part (g) marked another transition within the coverage of the diverse Economic Development theme. Candidates needed an example of an economic activity which has damaged the physical environment with some ideas about the management of this. This yielded the highest omission rate for the whole examination, with nearly a third of candidates declining the question. Nearly half of all candidates did not achieve any marks. An experienced Team Leader commented: *'This question felt like a dumping ground for any case study the candidate knew but had not been able to use elsewhere.'* These candidates chose natural hazards or aid projects for their economic activity example and could not achieve any marks. Sadly some wrote an answer filling the whole page.

Some tried to adapt an MNC-LEDC case study such as Nike in Vietnam but focused on the impact on the economy or people and struggled to link their example to the environment. More successful were those who considered the impact of Coca Cola in India with relevant ideas about water depletion and contamination. Others received one or two marks for the impact on tropical rainforests but they believed that deforestation was a valid economic activity. Some tried to link ideas about environmental damage to the development of shopping centres like Meadowhall and Bluewater, ignoring the fact that these were originally brownfield sites.

However there were some encouraging, contemporary examples given. Pollution in the Pearl River Delta was common along with palm oil production in Indonesia or Malaysia. Other credible examples included tourism in Kenya, floriculture in Kenya, the Deepwater Horizon oil spill and the decimation of the Aral Sea by cotton production in the old USSR. These responses gave coherently linked ideas about damage to the air, soil and water quality, or the destruction of rainforest and wildlife habitats. Impacts on human health or spoiling the enjoyment of the natural landscape were also credited. The more challenging management section was tackled with less confidence and clarity. Most were hypothetical responses about fines for companies causing pollution or habitat protection schemes with very little clear, correct detail.

B563/02 Key Geographical Themes (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

The paper allowed widespread differentiation. There were many excellent answers in which candidates demonstrated a thorough grasp of geographical principles and a detailed knowledge of place specific case studies to support their argument. However, it was suggested by examiners that some centres might be entering candidates for the higher tier who may be better suited to the foundation paper. A strong characteristic of weaker candidates is vagueness in many of their answers, especially where case study knowledge is required. If candidates are to reach level 3 in case study sections there is a requirement that their answer is place specific in addition to being comprehensive. A good way to test this requirement is for candidates to read their answer and 'cover up' the name of the case study. A suitable answer about a particular place or event will be recognisable through the detailed references being made.

Where case studies were on familiar topics candidates scored well. Most candidates selected appropriate case studies which they had learned in detail. This included some weaker candidates for whom the case studies were the best answers. For some candidates the challenge was to select the appropriate detail to use in answering the specific question. Weaker candidates sometimes decided to write all they knew about the case study, whether it was relevant or not. Relevant place detail is often the main differentiating factor between Level 2 and Level 3 case studies. Although there are a limited number of case study topics the focus of each case study will vary from year to year. It is worth noting that some case study examples may be better than others to answer questions with a different focus, for example where there is a focus on conflict or management.

Examiners felt that some weaker candidates did not understand what was required in some questions because they did not take notice of key commands such as ''Describe the relationship between … (Question 2a) and 'Describe two major differences between ….' (Question 3aii). Some candidates wrote case study answers which they had learned which did not always match the question asked. This was seen in the case studies for questions 1, where they wrote about the effects of migration, and question 3, where they wrote about the effects of an economic activity on people.

There was no OS map included in this examination but future candidates must not assume that it has been lost for ever. Centres should continue to give their candidates the opportunity to revise and apply basic map interpretation skills which they have learned. There are opportunities in each question for candidates to develop answers, and in some questions they are instructed to do so. Candidates need to consider how they might do this when the opportunities arise.

There was little evidence that candidates had evaluated questions before starting to answer them or made rough plans for their answers. Candidates are advised to read through the whole paper before they begin their answers in order to pick out their best-known topics to start with. Also they should plan their answer in order to check relevance to the question before it is too late.

Time management was not a major issue for most candidates who completed all their answers. However, there was some evidence of more non-responses for the final case study question which may indicate that some candidates ran out of time. Some candidates lost marks by misreading or misinterpreting sections and consequently writing irrelevant answers. For example, they chose a climatic rather than a tectonic hazard in their case study for question 2.

The award of marks for SPaG was not a major issue as most candidates were able to meet the high performance criteria in their case study answer. Where candidates omitted a case study or wrote very little their SPaG mark reflected this.

Although the examination system is perpetual it must be remembered that in each year the examination is a unique experience for that group of candidates. Consequently the following advice may be useful to candidates about to embark on their final preparation for their 2017 examination, based on the specification.

- Read each question carefully;
- Pay particular attention to key words which are often emboldened, also 'command' words and words which set the context or scale of the answer;
- Be prepared for changes of topic within the general question focus;
- Do not repeat the same answer in different sections - such answers do not gain double credit;
- Be precise when using information from maps, graphs and diagrams;
- Relate questions to examples and identify appropriate case studies which have been learned;
- Learn the details of case studies to give them authenticity;
- Use the number of marks available for a section as a guide to the number of points needed;
- Develop ideas and extend answers in order to increase the marks which can be awarded;
- Re-read and check the answers if there is time at the end of the examination;

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1

(a)(i) The first question was generally well answered. The best answers concentrated on increase and decrease in the population of the three age groups. Categories 0-14 and 65 and over required simpler responses than the 15-64 age group. This middle age group proved to be more discriminatory. Although many candidates recognised the difference between the older and younger age bands, many were too imprecise or inaccurate in their description. Only the better candidates commented on the idea of little overall change or the increase above 40 years or decrease below 40 years. Candidates made a number of errors in attempting to describe the differences. They wrote about birth rate and life expectancy, they described the shape of the pyramid, they used statistics from one bar only, they wrote about changes in the sex ratio.

(a)(ii) Almost all candidates described the changes simply. Some candidates also gave an explanation of the changes which was not required.

(b) The question was a good discriminator. The most popular reason which was suggested related to improved healthcare, but other common suggestions referred to improvements in diet, provision of care homes for elderly people, and improved sanitation. Better candidates were able to develop their ideas.

(c)(i) Candidates' answers were in two main groups, explanations of push and pull factors for migration to the squatter settlement and reasons why people remained in the squatter settlement. Push and pull factors concentrated on employment, education for children and farming difficulties. Reasons for staying in the squatter settlement included high cost or shortage of accommodation elsewhere in the city, poverty of the residents and community spirit. Most candidates identified reasons but discrimination came with the degree to which they were developed. Common errors included descriptions of conditions in the squatter settlement and explanation of why life was difficult in the squatter settlement.

(c)(ii) Descriptions needed to refer to physical improvements to the area rather than to benefits to the quality of life of the individual. There were excellent descriptions of site and service schemes, self-help schemes and provision of basic houses. Many answers focussed on 'build better houses by…' or 'improve sanitation by ….' Weaker candidates made the error of developing how the improvement could help individuals rather than developing what the improvement would include. Some candidates suggested more than one improvement but failed to develop one of their ideas. The main difficulty suggested was cost, i.e. that improvements would be expensive and it would not be possible to afford them. Weaker candidates made no reference to who would not be able to afford them or suggested that it was the residents themselves who could not afford them. The best answers explained that it would be an economic burden to the city or national government. Weak candidates did not suggest improvements other than vague ideas such as 'clean up the streets'.

(d) This was a difficult question. Many candidates made an error of either failing to focus on pattern or location of land use zones, or did not compare land use in the two types of city. The main way that candidates scored marks was by stating that there would be no squatter settlement in an MEDC city, and by comparing the location of high quality or low quality housing. Some candidates also made the observation that the CBD would be located in the centre of both models. Common errors were that candidates tried to explain why the differences exist, and focussed on the size of land use zones rather than their location.

(e) Candidates identified a number of case study examples. The most popular were from Poland to the UK and from Mexico to USA. Other migration routes named were from Ghana to Italy and from Syria to the UK. There were many detailed case studies which contained place detail. The Poland to UK example gave much scope for detailed reasons for migration but candidates found more difficulty in describing how the migration has been managed. Free movement rules within the EU make it difficult to develop management strategies. There was much speculation about what the UK government could do to manage migration. The best candidates wrote about what the Polish government is doing to reduce emigration and encourage young males to return to the country. Many answers showed a misunderstanding of border controls and incorrect ideas such as a points based immigration policy. Weak candidates showed little understanding by describing Poland as an LEDC with no electricity and no water supply. The Mexico to USA example gave more opportunity to describe management methods with details about border patrols, crossing points, the 'tortilla' curtain and the establishment of factories on the Mexican side of the border. Many causes of migration were a list of factors with statistics on unemployment rates, literacy rates and wage levels. A common error made by some candidates was to focus on the impacts of migration for both origin and destination countries. Some candidates included statistics which were out-of-date.

Question 2

(a) The question discriminated well. To describe the relationship candidates needed to compare information from both maps. An error of weaker candidates was to only include information from one map, either the number of droughts or the level of risk. Good answers included a general statement about the relationship, followed by information from the maps which referred to individual continents. Africa and Asia and either Australia or Europe were most often chosen. Errors made by candidates included focussing on the differences between LEDC and MEDC areas, giving examples of individual countries, and trying to explain the relationship shown in the maps rather than describing it.

(b) The most common activities suggested were over-cultivation, overgrazing, irrigation and deforestation. Differentiation came in the extent to which these ideas were developed. For example a good answer would state 'over-cultivation results in the soil drying out so nothing will grow, so people who rely on the crops will have no food'. Weaker candidates listed a number of causes but did not develop the ideas. Many answers referred to water usage. Whilst weaker candidates referred to 'using water' better candidates wrote about wasting water or excessive use of water. Errors made by candidates included irrelevant answers about wasting water in

MEDCs, for example washing the car and watering the lawn, and focussing on the impact of drought or crop failure rather than the causes of it.

(c) The question was the most poorly answered on the paper. Most candidates showed a lack of knowledge of what conditions cause drought. Candidates referred to a lack of rainfall or high temperatures but failed to gain credit because they did not qualify the statement by referring to it occurring over a long period of time. Few candidates mentioned features such as the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) or the failure of seasonal rains like the monsoon. Some candidates mentioned El Niño or La Niña but it was rare to see an answer which showed understanding of the processes. Few answers included any locational detail to support the description of specific climate events like El Niño. An error made by some candidates was to explain what the impacts of drought were, such as 'crop failure which leads to starvation'.

(d) Many candidates scored two marks for describing two methods. Fewer were successful in explaining how sustainable they were. The main methods identified were saving or storing or not wasting water and predicting future droughts. Candidates often just stated that the method was sustainable but did not explain why. Rather they gave a general explanation of sustainability. The best answers related to cost or longevity of the method described. A few candidates mixed up local and national methods and so gained no credit for inappropriate descriptions. Occasionally candidates misinterpreted the question and attempted to compare the sustainability of the two local methods and two national methods.

(e) Many candidates identified two features of weather, usually heavy rain and strong winds. Weak answers were characterised by responses such as 'windy' and 'rainy'. A common error was to describe conditions needed for tropical storms to form such as high sea temperatures. Other unacceptable answers were hot weather, storm surges and low pressure.

(f) The question was well answered by most candidates who made good use of the photograph of the storm shelter. Many identified the raised platform, or it being on stilts, and how it would protect people from flooding, and the building made of concrete or a strong material which would withstand the high winds of the storm. Less commonly candidates identified the large size and its ability to hold a lot of people, and shutters or covered windows to protect people from flying debris.

(g) There were a number of popular case study examples, especially Haiti. Other choices included Kashmir, Sichuan, Nepal, Nevado del Ruiz, Montserrat and Pinatubo. Occasionally candidates made the error of choosing an event in an MEDC, usually Japan, or a climatic hazard such as Nargis or Katrina. Good candidates gave a wide range of developed points which focused on the correct plate boundary and plate movement with detailed effects on people, well supported by place specific detail. Unfortunately weaker candidates frequently gave incorrect plates and types of boundary and muddled facts and figures from several different tectonic events. A common error was to focus on response to the hazard rather than causes of it. Weaker answers were typified by lack of developed ideas. Candidates made the simple point of destroyed or collapsed buildings, but did not develop the idea by saying that this resulted in many people being homeless or at the mercy of weather elements.

Question 3

(a)(i) Nearly all candidates identified Sri Lanka as having the most even employment structure.

(a)(ii) Most candidates made two correct comparisons although some candidates gave two simple statements and allowed the examiner to make the contrast, i.e. Tanzania is mostly primary employment, Germany is mostly tertiary employment. This scored one mark. Careless errors were made when candidates referred to Africa not Tanzania, and focussed on Sri Lanka not Tanzania.

(a)(iii) Many candidates gave one reason relating to Tanzania and one reason relating to Germany. Most began their explanation by stating that Tanzania is an LEDC and Germany is an MEDC. Understanding this key feature about the employment structure of each country gained them two marks. The development of these basic ideas gave differentiation. Candidates were generally more successful in an explanation of why Germany is dominated by tertiary and to a less extent by secondary employment. Acceptable ideas referred to a higher level of education, greater demand for services due to disposable income, importing food or raw materials to be used in manufacturing, and mechanisation of farming so less employed in the primary sector. Candidates found more difficulty in explaining why Tanzania is dominated by the primary sector. The most common reasons were that many people farm to feed their family, and farming is still labour intensive. Statements such as 'Tanzania has more farmland' and 'There is more farming in Tanzania because the climate is better suited and there is more space' were not accepted.

(b) Most candidates recognised that the person in the photograph was involved in research. Other ideas which gained credit were linked to high level of technology or an educated or skilled workforce. Some candidates referred to development but did not qualify it by stating what was being developed.

(c) Many candidates showed a good understanding of factors affecting industrial location. A variety of factors were referred to including raw materials, market, labour, government incentives and accessibility. Also candidates used ideas which particularly referred to MNCs in LEDCs such as cheap labour and lax pollution laws. A common error was that candidates wrote about 'transport' rather than specifying one particular type of transport which might attract a secondary industry. Whilst many candidates wrote about the benefit of a large workforce, more sophisticated answers referenced a skilled workforce which is more pertinent in many modern industries. Some candidates misinterpreted the question and wrote about how secondary industry would affect an area, such as creating more jobs.

(d) This question was a good discriminator and there was a large variation in the quality of answer. Weak candidates merely copied information from the diagram for which they gained no credit. Candidates should be aware that they must use the ideas and develop them to gain credit. In this case it was necessary to explain how the details shown would benefit people in the aftermath of a natural disaster. For example, hygiene kits would help to improve sanitation and reduce the risk of disease breaking out. Some candidates did not focus on the emergency response nature of the aid examples and wrote about non-emergency aid such as developing irrigation. Other weak answers focussed on how aid would help people to get back on their feet, but with no specific examples of how this would be done.

(e) Many ideas about the non-sustainability of aid were suggested. The more common responses were about dependency on aid, tied or conditional aid, the short-term nature of aid and its subsequent problems, and the problem of corrupt government officials in the country receiving aid. Two ideas which were not accepted were that aid is expensive for the donor country and it would take a long time to raise the necessary funds, and the environmental impact of transporting aid materials.

(f) The third case study was generally answered less well than the other two. A variety of economic activities were used as the focus, with manufacturing in the Pearl River delta the most common. Other popular examples included cotton farming near the Aral Sea, flower growing in Kenya, palm oil production in Borneo, the Coca Cola bottling plant in India, tourism in Kenya, mining and lumbering in the Amazon and quarrying in the UK. All these examples were appropriate to explain conflict and management with the environment. Some candidates chose examples with an incorrect focus on social and economic impacts such as Nike in Vietnam and Apple in China. Even though they sometimes tried to adapt the example to environmental conflict there was little to focus on other than vague climate change references. As in previous years there are more irrelevant answers to this case study than the others because of poor choice of example. Answers which focussed on aid projects, housing projects, shopping centres,

and sustainable urban developments were largely irrelevant because there was no link to economic activity. The many appropriate comprehensive case studies contained detailed effects of particular economic activities on the environment and what steps had been taken to manage or reduce these effects. Answers which focussed on ecosystems, wildlife, vegetation, air and water had plenty of scope for development of effects with place detail which was specific to the example chosen. Sustainable management was often described in more general terms. The best answers used statistics, e.g. the cost of cleaning up effected environments in the Pearl River area, or specific examples such as organisations in charge of monitoring deforestation in the rainforests where oil plantations had been established.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553