OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE

Geography B

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J385**

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

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, but there were still some candidates seen who would have probably coped very well with the Higher Tier. The majority of candidates could provide answers to all the questions and there were few rubric errors. The number of No Response (NR) answers seemed to be higher than in previous years. Candidates often did not answer questions as required and lacked the detailed explanations necessary to access marks in many cases.

Many of the errors candidates made related to misreading of words within questions or misunderstanding of questions or not knowing key geographical terms. The importance of reading the question properly, for example, where a question asked about 'change' - a one word answer is obviously not going to be sufficient demonstrate this concept. Candidates did not use 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 continue to be of concern. Key terms are often incorrectly spelt, even though in many cases they are in the resource booklet. Poor handwriting makes some 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 as instructed on the question paper.

With only one level marked question on this paper, few candidates failed to achieve marks on all sections of the paper. It is still advisable however, that the topic area covered by the DME is taught thoroughly as candidates often fail to go beyond the most basic development points and rarely link their thoughts to actual examples, beyond those given in the resource booklet. This lack of background knowledge holds candidates back and stops them achieving the highest levels 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. They must understand what these concepts mean and how they can affect different parties. Centres need to consider the following points when preparing candidates for exams:

- Emphasis on including enough detail for the four- mark questions.
- When answering questions about sustainability candidates need to explain WHY creating jobs is sustainable, i.e. long lasting so people can plan financially for the future and not just state what sustainability is.

Comments on individual questions

1. Most candidates achieved full marks on this question.

(a) The vast majority of candidates correctly identified country C as the correct answer. Those who did not often said country E.

(b) The majority of candidates correctly identified fishing (in the Ganges) as the activity in the primary sector

(c) The majority of candidates were able to identify the percentage of tertiary employment in Country A as 75%

(d) A smaller number of candidates correctly identified catering (or catering jobs, for example, chef) as the correct answer. Often those who failed to gain credit here gave the answer of car manufacturing in Beijing – showing a lack of understanding of the key concept of industry sectors

2. Almost half of all candidates failed to achieve any marks on this question

(a) Many candidates failed to interpret correctly the question, in which they were clearly asked to suggest an economic change from Resource 3. Often the candidates just gave observational changes with regards to the resource, rather than referring to an economic change. Those who got this right referred mainly to the shipyards or leisure cruises, and some mentioned fewer factories and more offices. The most common misconceptions were the addition of a bridge, a wider or smaller river and the addition of houses.

(b) This was a very poorly-answered question as most candidates failed to recognise that only the table gave data for the time range indicated in the question. For those who did realise this, many failed to state that there were 'less miners' – just lifting figures from the table instead.

(c) Generally, if candidates correctly answered 2(b) they then went on to get this question right. The majority of correct answers explained the decreased need for workers in the mining industry; for example, decline in resources, outsourcing and increase in machinery. Not many candidates referred to the building of new offices to attract new companies and create new jobs. However, generally this was not a well-answered question (especially where previous, connected questions were not answered correctly).

3. The majority of candidates were able to score at least two marks on this question, mostly from parts a and b

(a) Almost 90% of candidates were able to interpret the graph correctly and give the answer of 10%

(b) Over 90% of candidates were able to state correctly that most people worked in the tertiary sector.

(c) This was not generally well-answered with the majority of candidates choosing to explain why the primary and secondary sectors had declined rather than why tertiary increased. The best answers focussed on the change in education and the health service in the UK since 1800 and so were able to explain the need for more teachers/doctors, for example.

4. This question was generally well-understood and answered. The most common correct responses included ease of access, trade suppliers and being near to university. Common errors involved mentioning vicinity to the city centre without explaining why this would be a benefit. The majority of candidates were able to achieve at least two marks on this question.

5. This question was generally well-answered by candidates, with the majority scoring at least four marks having identified correctly both valid stakeholders and a simple reason for their view.

(a) A large majority of candidates scored at least two marks. The most frequent answer was based on unemployed people and their ability to find work.

(b) This question saw a high percentage of candidates score full marks, with the majority of them focussing on the local environmentalist, the destruction of Greenfield sites and the loss of habitats.

6. As this paper had no pre-release material, this exam was a true test of a candidates' knowledge of the topic area. It was a little disappointing to see a general lack of use of exemplar material from sites studies by candidates. Only a quarter of candidates were able to score at least half-marks on this section of the paper.

(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. Candidates selected all the options with an almost equal spread. Very few candidates were particularly site-specific, tending to focus on more generic answers that would be achieved at any of the sites; for example, the creation of jobs and the multiplier effect. By being non-specific they were limited to level 2.

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 generally mentioned the same points used in question 4 for this answer but in a way that these points were beneficial for the local area also. Many mentioned existing businesses being a benefit.

Option 2: This answer was supported by 'clean slate' ideas as nothing was there so it would be easy to build anything. Some candidates misinterpreted the question and thought the farm would stay there and went on to say why this would be beneficial; for example, local produce and farm shops.

Option 3: This was well-answered mentioning the need for a brownfield site to look more attractive and that it would be more environmentally friendly as it wouldn't use greenfield land.

(b) Most candidates were able to recognise one or two 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 three separate disadvantages could be credited; however a development of one point could be recognised.

General arguments such as 'cause pollution' and 'global warming' are still frequently seen as answers, although some credit can be given for these if the specific pollution type is discussed. It would be far more beneficial for candidates to be more specific with regards to the issue at hand for the options given.

Option 1: Candidates often focus on greenfield site issues, overcrowding and increased traffic.

Option 2: Candidates most frequently discussed the fact that the site was currently used for arable farming, but then went on to mention that the farmer would lose his job, or that his cows would have nowhere to live, without considering the fact that the farmer would probably be very well paid for the land

Option 3: Candidates often recognised the issues that would be caused for existing companies whilst the redevelopment was taking place, along with the issues caused by the freight lorries already travelling along the road that leads to the site. This was often the most well-answered option.

(c) This question was not generally well-answered as candidates were often unable to develop their explanation as to why they rejected the other options. It was often seen that the candidate would continue to focus on why their chosen option was better.

(d) Very few candidates scored more than a single mark here, although the question often elicited the longest responses. The vast majority of candidates continued to reiterate why their chosen option would be the best for the area, often repeating points they had made in 6a. Candidates often defined sustainability, but very few could explain the need for sustainability. The most frequently credited point was when a candidate gave some indication that the development had to last a long time / last into the future.

B561/02 Sustainable Decision Making (Higher Tier)

General Comments:

There was evidence of good preparation for the examination and candidates of all abilities were able to access the resources with good use being made of them for all of the questions. The rubric was followed with few errors. The full range of marks was seen. There were few instances where candidates failed to answer a question. There was little evidence that candidates were short of time with almost all completing the paper. The majority of candidates responded to all three bullet points in Question 5. Candidates should be reminded that developing one or two ideas will gain more credit than stating a range of ideas on level response questions such as questions 2, 3 and 4. There was evidence that some candidates were able to use their own knowledge to gain credit particularly in question 5.

The standard of written work was good overall and acceptable for the weaker candidates. Candidates need to be encouraged to use paragraphs in their answers. Most candidates showed a good understanding of the subject matter and were able to use geographical terminology, such as sustainability, brownfield and biodiversity with understanding. Examples of this were seen in the answers to question 5. Candidates need to be reminded of the need to read questions carefully so they understand their individual demands. This was particularly relevant for question 2 and 3. Candidates need to be aware that they will not be given double credit for using the same idea but in a different part of the question. This was most evident in Question 5. Candidates need to be reminded that the demands of question 5 do vary between examination sessions and that there is no general format that they can follow to answer it. Candidates need to be specific about the type of pollution to which they are referring.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1(a).The question asked for two pieces of evidence to show that country A was the most developed. The mark scheme allowed for candidates to use either correct data for example, 75% in tertiary, or terminology such as “Country A has the most employed in the tertiary industry”. The majority of candidates were credited with full marks for this question.

Question No. 1(b). The mark scheme allowed credit for candidates who chose an example of an economic activity from the secondary and tertiary sectors or answered that secondary was a manufacturing and tertiary a service activity. The most common answers were ‘Manufacturing in Beijing’ and ‘Catering in New York’ both of which were taken from the resource. A minority of candidates used their own examples so showing an understanding of economic sectors. The majority of candidates were credited with full marks for this question.

Question No. 2. The question required candidates to describe and explain changes in economic activities. The majority of candidates used the resource material to base their answer on and the mark scheme allowed credit for this and for other examples. The highest scoring answers were those where the candidate recognised that there had been a decline in the numbers employed in mining, as shown in the resource, and then went on to give an explanation. The most common answers looked at increasing mechanisation in mines, lack of resources and it being cheaper to import coal from abroad as being the causes of mine closures. A relatively small minority of candidates developed these ideas well to level 3. An example of such a response was ‘mines have closed down because there has been a decrease in natural resources and they are harder to reach so it is not financially viable to dig deeper for low levels of resource’. The majority of candidates gave a description of the change and one sound reason for it and so were credited at the bottom of level 2. There was a number of candidates who focussed their answer on describing the changes and the mark scheme limited them to level 1 for this. There were very few good reasons for the opening of ‘The Works’. There were a few candidates that thought Marine Colliery was a shipyard.

Question No. 3. The question required candidates to describe and suggest reasons for changes in UK employment in the tertiary sector from 1800 onwards. The majority of candidates were able to give a detailed description of the graph referring to primary, secondary, tertiary and quaternary in their answers. Many gave excellent accounts as to the changes in general but failed to apply their answers to the demand of the question, which had tertiary as the focus and so were credited at either level 1 or low level 2. The highest scoring answers referred to ideas such as the development of the economy leading to free education for all so the demand for teachers increased.

Question No.4. The majority of the candidates referred to the stakeholders given in the resource in their answers. The mark scheme did allow for those implying rather than stating named stakeholders to gain equal credit. The majority of candidates scored five or six out of eight marks for this question. Many showed a good understanding of the position of the different stakeholders and the best answers concentrated on a limited number. Examples of ideas from higher scoring responses included that 'an unemployed man would be in favour of the development as they could get a job, get a regular income and be able to improve their standard of living'. The question asked for stakeholders so as long as there was more than one chosen, and with differing ideas, candidates could gain full marks. Those that referenced all the stakeholders gave a limited response for each so were credited at level 1. Candidates that used the same idea for different stakeholders such as the new company owner and the business owner were not given double credit. A few candidates explained the sustainability or positive and negatives of Matford Park so gained no credit. The least-understood stakeholder was the planning official. The better understood stakeholders were the unemployed person, environmentalist and the mobile food outlet owner.

Question No. 5. The majority of candidates covered all three bullet points for this question. Candidates chose all three options with one and three being the clear favourites. Many candidates gave detailed responses to the first bullet point but were not always able to sustain the quality of their answer for the next two. The section asking for disadvantages of their chosen option was often the least well-answered. Good use was made of the different elements of sustainability to explain their ideas. The highest scoring candidates were able to link their reasons and show a high-level of understanding. An example of this was 'there will be a variety of businesses from the secondary, tertiary and quaternary sectors so there will be jobs at all levels of skilled workers. For example low skill level shop assistants for the cash and carry and delivery drivers for the distribution centres, but skilled engineers needed for companies like Volvo. This means more people will become employed…'. The lowest scoring candidates gave a list of ideas with little or no development, so were credited at level 1 or bottom of level 2. There were many generic answers where candidates referred to benefits to the economy, problems for the environment and job creation, which could have applied to any of the three options. Candidates need to include place-specific information in their answers. In many answers the only time that some identity was given was when they referred to nearby docks or A361. Some candidates followed the format of previous papers and gave the advantages and disadvantages of each of the options, which this question did not demand. A common misinterpretation was the linking of the redevelopment of the Broadmeadow site with decline of tourism in Teignmouth.

B562 and A771/02 Geographical Enquiry

General Comments:

In this eighth session for entry for this specification for controlled assessment for B562 and A771 there has been a combined entry of nearly 550 centres and 30,000 candidates. This is the second session where the Geographical Enquiry is composed of one component, that of the Fieldwork Focus.

Administration

Administration by centres continues to improve with many centres submitting their marks well in advance of the 15th of May deadline. Once again only a few centres made errors on the MS1 forms and nearly all sent the CCS160 form promptly. Only half the centres submitted the GCW347 form from candidates detailing their group work. The majority of centres completed assessment grids fully and included appropriate annotation of the form and candidates' work indicating where credit was given. An increasing number of centres included their instruction sheet for candidates and data recording sheets. This is to be recommended along with candidates indicating their word count.

Moderation

Significantly fewer centres were adjusted this year. This was due to centres taking note of the advice given to them by moderators last year. They collected more primary data, had 3 or 4 key questions, expected outcomes and followed the route to enquiry.

Centres chose all four titles, but rivers and coasts were the most popular. Successful investigations broke down the title into three or four key questions. The Bradshaw and urban models allowed this to be done relatively easily. The coastal geology title needed more reference to geology than processes and human intervention. Many candidates included background to the theories, topic and the study area. However, some did not include maps showing the sites where measurements were undertaken. Some centres unnecessarily included risk assessments, definition of terms and processes. These should have been applied to their study sites.

Most centres used methodology tables successfully. They suggested a wide range of appropriate techniques, predominantly primary. However, some centres did not carry out all these techniques, present or analyse them. Some centres used satellite images and maps very effectively and integrated them with graphs. Some graphs selected by candidates were inappropriate. A few centres chose to use statistical techniques such as Spearman rank very effectively.

Most centres analysed comprehensively with reasoning and often did this next to the maps and graphs. It was encouraging to see candidates return to their key questions in their conclusions. This allowed them to use their analysis to give substantiated conclusions. Evaluations were also well-structured, with some centres mentioning limitations and solutions on their methodology tables. Good centres suggested realistic ways to improve and extend their studies.

A few centres still use text boxes and tables too often. It is only appropriate in annotating photographs or graphs and for the Methodology table. In a few centres this led to candidates exceeding the word limit. Exceeding the word count needs to considered in the future and where candidates have done so centres need to acknowledge this in their mark sheet annotation.

Overall this year has been successful with centres in the main responding to advice given by moderators last year. There were some very high quality enquiries, which reflect well upon the quality of teaching and hard work of candidates.

It is important that centres read their moderators' reports and act upon the advice given. It is also advisable to look at the OCR web site, which will soon have examples of good practice from this year.

B563/01 Key Geographical Themes (Foundation Tier)

General Comments.

Examiners were unanimous in their opinion that the June 2015 examination was appropriate for candidates at Foundation level. A few examiner feedback reports suggested that the most able candidates may have been better suited to the challenges of the Higher level examination. It was also noted that there were fewer 'no response' answers from candidates, although there are still those who fail to attempt the case study sub-questions. The case study sub-questions, along with the mark for spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPAG), carry 36 marks out of the total of 99 marks available for the examination. It is a source of disappointment that these candidates are either unwilling or unable to tackle the case study element of the examination.

June 2015 saw the second examination for specification B with three compulsory questions. Each question can encompass the full range of key ideas and content of the specification theme being assessed. In general most candidates were able to manage the shift in focus from one part of a theme to another: from rivers to coasts in Question 1; from settlement to population in Question 2; and from tectonic to climatic hazards in Question 3. Each transition was supported by an appropriate resource: Fig. 2 for Question 1; Fig 7 for Question 2 and Fig.9 for Question 3. Centres should focus on these transitions and how they are supported by appropriate resources, in their preparations for the 2016 examination. The shift in focus also provides a sign-post as to the possible content of the final case study sub-question.

In preparing candidates for the 2016 examination centres should also take account of an apparent decline in performance for Question 3. Although optionality and question choice ended with the 2013 examination, candidates can still choose which question to answer first. For the 2015 examination it may have been a sound tactic for candidates to answer Question 3 first, if Natural Hazards was a strong theme for them. Question choice and selection criteria should still be an important part of preparation for future examination or practised with mock examinations.

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. Centres should consider whether these candidates could be supported by use of a scribe or a laptop to word process their answers. Furthermore, centres should ensure that the accompanying paper work is fully completed when a scribe or word processor is used. This is important in enabling examiners to award the correct mark for spelling, punctuation and grammar.

As with all previous examinations, there were aspects that candidates found challenging.

Compared to the 2014 examination, less use was made of an Ordnance Survey map extract for 2015. Examiners noted a range of competence for Questions 2aii) and iii) and the use of OS map evidence to support ideas for Question 2b). Centres should make use of Ordnance Survey maps when covering U.K. based elements of the specification themes and set a variety of map reading and interpretation tasks.

It was encouraging to note that some candidates had underlined key words and/or command words. This practice can slow candidates down and get them to consider the question requirements and the exact knowledge, understanding and type of response needed.

Candidates should be familiar with common examination command words through their normal learning repertoire. In particular learning could focus on the difference between 'describe' and 'explain' so that candidates focus their thinking on the relevant elements of knowledge and understanding required. This is most relevant for the case study questions where the final section usually requires a more sophisticated, evaluation or commentary as opposed to lower level description.

Candidates should also know the meaning of specification-specific vocabulary or key words in order to unlock the specific knowledge required to gain marks.

Areas that caused difficulty for some candidates with the 2015 Examination were:

Question 1:
Stores and transfers for river flooding, correct technical terms for flood reduction methods, coastal erosion processes and coastal management methods.

Question 2:
Types of housing (terraced), urban regeneration, terms associated with changes in retail provision, such as threshold population and the 'donut effect.'

Question 3:
Deadly features of a volcanic eruption and techniques and technology associated with the prediction of volcanic eruptions.

The annotation 'DEV' should be a key part of examination practice and the marking and review of practice or mock examinations. Examiners use this annotation to indicate the development of a basic, valid idea. This could involve further descriptive detail or additional ideas for example for coastal management methods in Question 1g). 'DEV' is also needed when the question requires an explanation such as in Question 2c), where two reasons explained were needed for the location of the new shopping area.

Awareness of 'DEV' should be linked to the two types of four-mark question. Those that require two parts to the answer are more challenging in that the response needs development in terms of detail or further explanation. On other questions, four marks can be secured with four basic, valid ideas, almost in list form, Questions 1e) and 3g) are good examples of the latter.

As with all previous examinations the case study question is the key to success. Each question is split into three parts to support candidates in constructing their answers. The entire response is levels marked holistically and candidates who write valid content in the wrong section are fully credited. A valid named example is needed to progress beyond Level 1, and with on-line marking examiners make frequent use of the internet to check the validity of familiar and unfamiliar examples. This was done to ensure that coastal management methods matched given place examples for Question 1g). Data given to support ideas about China's one child policy for Question 2g) and valid LEDC climatic hazards for Question 3h) were also carefully checked.

Question 1

Question 1 assessed the rivers and coasts theme of the Specification. This was the second highest scoring question overall with the second most successfully answered case study sub-question. The resources were a flood hydrograph linked to two river valley landscape block diagrams, and two photographs showing evidence of coastal erosion at Skipsea at two different times.

The skills question in part (a) required candidates to read the flood hydrograph and extract number data for three marks. Just over three-quarters of candidates were able to do this for full marks.

Candidates were then required to apply their knowledge of the causes of flooding to the two block diagrams for part (b). Three-quarters of candidates were able to do this. However, only one third were able to explain their ideas or provide detailed understanding of stores and transfers. The most common, basic responses were that the river channel had been straightened or that trees had been removed. Weak explanations referred to the speed of the river's flow or that the trees could no longer soak up or absorb the water. Better answers used correct terms like interception storage or referred to the impermeability of the urban landscape. Higher scoring explanations also made reference to the reduction in lag time and increased surface run-off into the river channel. Some candidates made incorrect inferences about changes to the angle of the valley slopes or the layer of soil. One quarter of candidates failed to score any marks for part (b). This was similar for part (c). This was partly due to a misreading of the question, which states 'other' causes of flooding. These candidates repeated their answers given for part (b) thereby failing to gain any marks. Some candidates gave definitions of flooding whilst the most common, basic response was heavy rainfall. Only a minority of candidates were able to explain relevant ideas with any detail or confidence.

Basic ideas involving barriers and wider/deeper channels were given for part (d). There was a lack of technical vocabulary such as levees or dredging in the lower scoring answers. Few candidates showed an understanding of wider drainage basin management ideas and those who mentioned afforestation spoke again in vague terms about trees soaking up water. Some candidates made explicit reference to coastal management methods such as concrete sea walls and groynes.

Part (e) signalled a shift to coasts and was well-answered. Most responses focused on the potential loss of housing due to erosion and linked this to stress, insurance costs, inability to sell property and having to relocate. The loss of transport routes and inconvenience for journeys to work was also a common answer. Less frequent were ideas about the impact on tourism and other economic activities. Some candidates made comments about death and injury believing that residents would remain at home until their property succumbed to cliff erosion.

For part (f) candidates had to match three key words to definitions of coastal erosion processes. Just over 40% secured full marks, whilst one fifth did not gain any marks at all.

A wide range of English coastal places were given for the case study part (g). The Holderness coast was the most common area selected, followed by Norfolk, Dorset and the South West. Some candidates gave clear place-specific examples such as Mappleton, Happisburgh and Dawlish. Weaker answers gave a valid coastal place with general, list-like, ideas about coastal management methods. Examiners checked that these methods were valid for the given place example. Sea walls and groynes were the most common methods given, with fewer accounts of soft engineering examples or managed retreat. Better responses offered detail about materials, locations or how these methods operated to reduce or prevent coastal erosion. Detailed comments about the sustainability of valid methods were rare. Most candidates were able to offer vague ideas about success, costs or durability of given methods. Other candidates made general comments about sustainability without any valid evidence to support them. A few candidates described river flood management schemes, most notably for Boscastle, whilst others focused on landforms with Old Harry making an occasional appearance.

Question 2

Question 2 assessed the population and settlement theme of the specification and was marginally the highest scoring question compared with Question 1. This was largely due to the valid opportunity for candidates to show their knowledge of China's one child policy. This made part (g) overwhelmingly the most successfully answered case study. The resources were three photographs of urban landscapes in and around Oldham linked to an Ordnance Survey map extract. Population pyramids for the U.K. and Uganda supported the transition from settlement to population within the question.

For part (a) i) very few candidates gave the word *terraced*. A range of alternatives was accepted such as 'attached' or 'joined together'. Three-quarters of candidates gave the correct grid reference for these houses for a) ii). For a) iii), only half could find the correct number of the A road in grid square 9507. Some incorrect answers were place names such as 'Moorside' which implies a misreading of the question.

Only basic ideas were given for part (b), with building new houses or alternative land uses, such as shops being the most common. Very few candidates recognised or commented on the wider context of inner city regeneration. This was similar for part (c) and (d), which focused on changes in retail provision. Most candidates scored marks for giving reasons to explain the location of the new shopping area, with references to transport routes and space being the most common. Better, developed responses made reference to access for customers and deliveries as opposed to visitors noticing the shopping area as they drove past. Very few candidates recognised the wider context of an edge of town retail development linked to specific site characteristics and access to threshold population. With part (d) most candidates commented on the loss of trade or custom for shops and services within Oldham's CBD. Some candidates wasted time by explaining the attractions of the new shopping area for customers instead of developing their ideas about the impact on the CBD. Few commented on the decline in customers leading to possible closure of shops and job losses. Very few commented on how the types of shops and services within the CBD might change and there was a scarcity of key terms such as the 'donut effect' in responses.

Over 90% of candidates were able to compare the two population pyramids to give the correct answers to parts (e) i) and ii). A similar proportion also scored marks for suggesting why the two countries would have different life expectancies for part (f). The most common were ideas about health care linked to services, provision, access and survival rates. Some candidates linked their responses to differences in economic development and made reference to contrasts in living conditions and quality of life.

China's one child policy was the overwhelming response to the case study part (g). Over 80% of candidates were able to give developed Level 2 or Level 3 responses. Many had accurate knowledge of how the policy operates via rewards and fines. There was also detailed coverage of some of the consequences of the policy, although some accounts of female infanticide were rather dramatic in style. Less secure were those candidates who offered data to support their ideas. Examiners checked data references to changes in birth rate, fertility rate and rates of population growth. The most common misconception was that the policy had led to a decline in China's total population. This significant error meant that candidates could not gain the top mark for the level their response had reached. However 17% of candidates did achieve full marks for developed ideas with correct place specific detail. Other successful case studies were Thailand with correct ideas about 'cabbages and condoms'; and Gambia with accounts of the impact of family planning policies on attitudes and fertility rates. There were also a few well-supported examples of pro-natal policies for France, Germany and Japan. Some candidates offered weak ideas about family planning in the U.K. or muddled accounts of migration case studies linked to immigration controls.

Question 3

Question 3 assessed the Natural Hazards Theme of the Specification and was the lowest scoring of the three questions. Part (h) was also the least successfully answered case study question. Examiners speculated that this might be due to a lack of knowledge for a valid LEDC climatic hazard. The resources were a data table of selected volcanic eruptions, a world plate tectonics map and a satellite image of a tropical storm over Japan. The latter resource supported the transition from tectonic hazards to climatic hazards.

Almost all candidates read the data table successfully to select 33,000 as the number of deaths caused by the Mount Pelee volcano for part (a) i). However, just over 60% were able to identify that Indonesia has the highest number of the so-called deadliest volcanoes. Martinique was a common incorrect answer, suggesting a misreading of question (a) ii). A larger proportion of candidates were able to use the map to name the Nazca plate as moving towards the South American plate for part (b). The Caribbean plate was a common incorrect response.

Producing an annotated diagram to show how one type of plate movement can cause a volcanic eruption for part (c), proved to one of the most challenging questions in the exam. Over a third of candidates either scored zero marks or failed to respond at all. Of the former this was usually due to selecting an incorrect type of plate boundary, such as a collision zone or conservative margin. As with a similar question in the 2011 examination, these candidates believed that plates crashing together forces magma/lava to shoot up to cause an eruption.

Candidates who selected subduction zones or diverging plate boundaries secured two marks for the correct type, and showing the plate movement with arrows. Only a minority of candidates were able to explain or show the formation of magma and magma rising to cause the eruption.

For part (d) over 60% of candidates were able to state two deadly features of a volcanic eruption. Lava and ash were the most common with volcanic gases a close third. Some candidates showed good knowledge of key words such as pyroclastic flow and lahars. Some candidates did not understand the command word ‘state’ or take into account the limited space for an answer. They wrote longer descriptions of how their chosen features were deadly. This did not gain them any additional marks.

Methods given to predict volcanic eruptions were mostly incorrect or vague. Just over a third of candidates did not score any marks. Most scoring answers made references to measuring earth tremors, ground deformation and temperature changes without any clear development about either the techniques or technology used, or how the data could be used to predict an eruption. A common misconception was that animal behaviour could be studied as a method for predicting volcanic eruptions.

Once again just over one-third of candidates did not score any marks for part (f). A common incorrect answer was that areas of volcanic activity were cheap places to live because of the dangers. Other candidates missed the key word ‘benefits’ to write about poverty and lack of choice over where people could live. Correct ideas included references to volcanic soils and tourism, with many candidates able to develop their ideas by explaining how this contributed to economic development. Fewer candidates included geo-thermal heat and valuable mineral deposits in their responses. However, this was the highest scoring four-mark question focused on volcanoes.

Part (g) was the highest scoring four-mark question for Question 3. Nearly half the candidates were able to list or describe possible impacts on human life, property, transport and economic activities to score either three or four marks. Some candidates scored fewer marks by failing to recognise the Japan/MEDC context and wrote about thousands being killed or the need for international relief aid. A few candidates misread the question and described the weather conditions associated with a tropical storm, without any reference to possible impacts.

Part (h) was the least successfully answered case study for the 2015 examination. A quarter of candidates either scored zero or failed to attempt an answer. Just under one-fifth gained one mark for a valid named LEDC. Most of these responses covered the 2010 Haiti earthquake even though the words 'such as a drought or tropical storm' were included at the start of the question. Another common error was to select a correct climatic hazard but for an MEDC place. Hurricane Katrina was the most common with some vague responses about drought in Australia from some candidates. It was agreed to award a maximum of mid Level 2 five marks, if an MEDC climatic hazard had valid ideas about impact reduction methods and their success. Cyclone Nargis in Burma/Myanmar was the most common correct case study example. Some of these answers focused on the lack of warning, preparation and the blocking of aid by the military government to score well. Other candidates described incorrect ideas about evacuations, shelter and immediate relief aid for Cyclone Nargis.

Candidates who selected Bangladesh or Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines tended to produce the best responses with valid ideas about warnings, preparations and shelter. They were also able to comment on the success of these methods within the LEDC context. LEDC drought examples focused on sub-Saharan or East African countries. They were often vague but some did provide valid methods linked to aid projects, such as the operation of Water Aid in countries like Mali. When preparing candidates for future examinations centres need to consider a wide range of case studies that meet all the requirements of the content for the Natural Hazards theme.

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 impact reduction.

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 'Give two pieces of evidence from the photograph … (Question 2bii) and 'Explain how two other factors ….' (Question 1bii). Some candidates wrote case study answers that they had learned, which did not always match the question asked. This was seen in the case studies for questions 1 and 3 where they commented on economic, social and environmental sustainability when they were asked about conflicts and success.

Particular areas of examination technique, which candidates must practice are as follows. Centres should give their candidates the opportunity to revise and apply basic map interpretation skills that 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 candidates who completed all their answers. Some candidates lost marks by misreading or misinterpreting sections and consequently writing irrelevant answers. For example, they chose a tectonic rather than a climatic hazard in their case study for question 3.

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 2016 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 The first question was generally well-answered. Most candidates used comparative statements to identify differences in peak discharge and quoted accurate data from the hydrographs. Most answers include the required units (cumecs). More candidates identified the higher peak discharge than the shorter time lag in 2010. Weaker candidates included details about rainfall and base flow, which were not asked for in the question.

bi The most common suggestions for greater risk of flooding in 2010 focussed on deforestation and permeability. Strong candidates developed these ideas well. Many candidates showed good understanding of the principles of hydrology with appropriate use of terms such as impermeable, infiltration, interception and run-off. Some candidates mistakenly thought that straightening the river channel would result in flooding in that place, and others suggested that a steeper slope would increase the risk, but the slope has the same gradient in both years. Candidates who focussed their answer on why there was less flooding in 1980 did gain credit for their ideas; for example, there were more trees so more interception; but a better approach was to overtly state how the area changed between 1980 and 2010, such as the trees have been removed leading to less interception.

bii Many other possible factors could cause river flooding. The most popular suggestions made by candidates were heavy rainfall, steep valley sides and impermeable surfaces. Weaker candidates repeated the same development idea, such as increased run-off, for both factors. Occasionally candidates made the mistake or repeating the same factors they had explained in the previous section. Deforestation and permeability were accepted if the candidate had not previously identified them in section bi.

c This was the best-answered section in question 1. Many different methods were suggested from afforestation, building levees or embankments, dredging to prevent the river overflowing to using sandbags and building houses above flood level to manage the result of flooding. Some candidates failed to develop their methods by explaining how they worked. Other candidates used the same explanation for both methods, for example

building levees and deepening the river channel by dredging would both increase the channel capacity. Less popular, but often well-explained ideas involved flood plain zoning and management of the floodplain.

di Candidates were not hindered by the change of focus of the question from river hydrology to coastal erosion. The photographs were used as stimulus material but candidates suggested a variety of impacts of erosion on coastal communities. Good answers focussed on the dangers to property and the impact this would have on residents and the local community. Candidates were well aware of the financial and social implications of the loss of houses and farmland and the possible effects on tourism. Weaker candidates failed to gain credit for vague statements such as 'infrastructure is lost, and 'land is lost'. Some candidates wrote about 'many deaths and injuries, and the whole community will be homeless'. This showed a lack of understanding of the situation on coastlines in the U.K. Another error was to concentrate initially on the erosion of the cliff and how it might have happened before going on to consider the effects on the community. A minority of candidates also made the mistake of describing possible impacts on the natural environment, such as wildlife habitats.

dii Despite a few candidates explaining what a constructive plate boundary is, this question was generally well-answered. Usually candidates referred to deposition and either identified a feature of a constructive coastline or explained how constructive waves create this type of coastline. Many candidates used the correct terminology such as swash and backwash and features such as a spit or beach.

e Most candidates named an appropriate area of coastline such as the Holderness coast or the Jurassic coast or a named location such as Lyme Regis or Mappleton. Occasionally weaker candidates named an area such as the Devon coast or the Yorkshire coast, which usually led onto vague, non-specific answers. There were many popular examples named including Poole Bay, Spurn Point, Swanage, Pevensey Bay and Hengistbury Head. Some candidates had studied their chosen location as part of the fieldwork. The best answers described different methods used to manage erosion and described the resulting conflicts of each method. The Holderness coast provided the basis for many excellent answers because of the variety of management methods used and the different conflicts that have resulted. Other examples proved to be more difficult to gain full credit because the management methods and subsequent conflicts were similar, such as beach re-profiling, recycling and replenishment. Weaker answers were characterised by management techniques, which did not relate to the named area of coastline. Also the techniques being named, such as gabions, but not described, or being described in simple terms such as 'stones in a wire cage'. Some candidates failed to develop the idea of conflict and instead wrote about the success or sustainability of the management techniques. Where conflicts were identified the most common ones were focussed on expense and spoiled appearance or eyesore. Often the same conflicts were repeated for different techniques and different locations. The main weakness of many candidates' answers was the failure to develop the place details. Descriptions of management techniques and conflicts were detailed but largely generic and could have applied to most coastlines suffering erosion. The best answers were identified by specific place details such as named locations on the coastline, details of cost and scale of the methods used.

Question 2

ai Some candidates had difficulty with identifying the CBD on the OS map extract. They did not see the evidence of the town hall or the bus stations to help them to locate an appropriate grid square. It was disappointing that a significant proportion of candidates did not seem to understand the type of area they should be looking for on the map, as there were wildly inappropriate grid squares suggested. Occasionally candidates gave a six-figure grid reference which was not accepted as the CBD is not a specific location.

aii Candidates often find photograph interpretation a challenging task and this question illustrated the typical difficulties found. A significant number of candidates made the mistake of looking at the OS map for evidence, ignoring the instruction in the question. Other candidates concentrated on what cannot be seen in the photograph, such as shops or busy main road, which gained no credit. A small minority of candidates looked at the photograph of the inner city area in error. When candidates did look at the correct photograph some of them failed to describe what they could see and wrote about woodland or open space. Despite the numerous ways that candidates found to score no credit, there were many answers that included appropriate evidence. The most obvious point to include was the type of houses but many candidates also identified the cul-de-sac or winding road and gardens of the houses.

b The question was one that invited a range of different responses on the topic of urban redevelopment. Most candidates focussed their answer from the point of view of residents who would live in a housing area like the one shown in the photograph. A common theme of many answers was that the residents would be forced to move out of their houses with various negative consequences that such a move would entail, such as further distance to travel to work in the town centre or the increased cost of new housing. Many candidates suggested that the housing shown in the photograph was typically more affordable housing that would not be available elsewhere in the area. Better candidates were able to suggest more wide-ranging difficulties such as noise and disturbance during redevelopment, breakdown of close-knit communities and loss of urban heritage. A small number of candidates also recognised the possibility that refurbishment of the existing building may be a cheaper or more acceptable alternative. Weaker candidates merely suggested that the residents would not want to move or presumed that the residents would become homeless.

c This was the best-answered section in question 2. Most candidates identified the location of the new shopping centre on the O.S. map extract and realised that it was next to the motorway junction and on the edge of the built-up area. The most popular explanations for its location were based on accessibility, cheaper or available land and a large local population. Differentiation occurred through the degree to which candidates developed these ideas. Weaker answers were typified by suggestions such as ‘the shops are easy to get to’ or ‘there are lots of houses’. Some candidates continue to be confused by the examples of road numbers given in the map key. As in previous years candidates stated that the motorway shown on the map was the M1 and the main road was the A493. In this question candidates were not penalised for the error but it does reveal the lack of understanding by some candidates of Ordance Survey maps.

d This was a challenging question in which many candidates scored half-marks but relatively few managed to score full-marks. Most candidates scored their marks by explaining that the CBD would lose customers to the new shopping area, which could result in the closure of some shops. A common variation on this suggestion was that shops would be re-located from the CBD to the new shopping area with the same impact on the CBD. Only the best candidates further developed this idea that the CBD generally would become more run-down and unappealing to customers. Many candidates suggested that the loss of customers would impact on businesses, which would lose money, or workers who would become unemployed. These suggestions were not accepted as being effects on the CBD. In common with other questions weaker answers were characterised by sweeping statements such as ‘the CBD of Oldham will close down’. A significant proportion of candidates made the error of focussing their answer on possible advantages of the new shopping area such as more space for parking and larger shops. Few candidates considered that there might be positive effects on the CBD, such as less traffic congestion, or that the CBD would be improved in some ways to compete with the new shopping area.

ei Candidates again coped well with the change in question focus. Most candidates realised that they had to interpret the information in the population pyramids rather than trying to extract data from them. Most candidates scored both the available marks through simple comparative statements, although weaker answers lacked the required comparison. A minority of candidates wasted time by explaining why there were differences in birth rate and life expectancy, whilst others misunderstood or misread the question and defined the two terms.

eii This was a challenging question and differentiated well between candidates of different ability. The better candidates suggested how the dependent population would be supported in the two countries and made comparisons between the types of support offered. Most scored better on ideas about support in the U.K. and were able to score three marks for a focus on one country. Comparison was not required to gain credit but the suggested methods of support had to be different between the two countries. Candidates usually identified greater government support in the U.K and greater family support in Uganda. Many recognised that children especially in the LEDC would be working to support themselves and their family from an early age. Credit was also gained by development of how government support was given in the U.K., both financial and care services. Some candidates did not gain credit for these suggestions because they were too vague, for example suggesting benefits rather than child benefits or pension. Unfortunately some candidates misunderstood the question and focussed on the composition of the dependent population in the two countries and stated that the U.K. has an ageing population whilst Uganda has a youthful population. Consequently they did not address the issue of support for these sections of the population. Other candidates focussed on the issues that come from dependent populations rather than the support offered to them. Some answers were vague such as 'the large ageing population in the U.K is supported by the working population'.

f The overwhelming choice of country for this case study was China. Other countries that were used included India, specifically Kerala, Thailand and Bangladesh. The main strategy identified in China was the one child policy but better answers also included the 'later, longer fewer' policy. Details of the one child policy varied between candidates, some merely mentioned that it had been imposed whilst others went into detail about the incentives and penalties. Most candidates understood the requirement of the question to consider the sustainability of the strategy and this led to good place-specific information such as consideration of the '4-2-1' family situation, 'little emperors', the unbalanced male-female ratio and issues such as sterilisation and forced abortion. Better candidates discussed sustainability issues such as an ageing population, gender imbalance and urban-rural differences. Weaker candidates tended to list ideas about impacts and sustainability rather than explain them. A common misconception was that the policy had led to a decline of population in China rather than stating that the rate of population increase had slowed down. The other examples of population management often had less detail both of the attempts and issues of sustainability. In Thailand the specific details focussed on the 'cabbages and condoms' scheme where candidates addressed the benefits of the policy. In Kerala answers focussed on education, which did help to control population growth but was introduced to improve the level of development. Very few answers focussed on pro-natal policies but there were case studies about Singapore and France. Only a small minority of weak candidates wrote about migration management strategies.

Question 3

a Distribution is a challenging concept for many candidates. Weaker candidates tend to list locations rather than look for patterns. Therefore this question differentiated between candidates. Most candidates recognised the link between volcanoes and plate boundaries and many recognised that they were on destructive boundaries. Although candidates saw that the volcanoes were clustered or grouped they did not gain credit until they stated that there were two clusters or groups. Weak answers stated that the volcanoes were located on the equator, on land or simply where plates meet. Candidates also tend to write that volcanoes are located on the edge of plate boundaries, which is tautology as a plate boundary is the edge of a plate.

b This question was well-answered and many candidates scored two marks. The correct answers focussed on the unpredictable and often violent nature of such volcanic eruptions or the laissez-faire attitude of residents towards the possibility of another eruption. Some candidates also realised that such volcanoes are unlikely to be monitored and therefore no warnings will be given.

c Candidates found the requirement to draw a diagram and annotate it quite challenging. The nature of destructive plate boundaries is well understood by many candidates who will have seen appropriate diagrams in textbooks. Nevertheless some candidates found this new task rather daunting. Attempts varied from well-drawn diagrams which had clear annotations linked with arrows to specific points of the diagram, to very simple sketches, which were unrecognisable as a plate boundary and had no labels. Occasionally candidates drew a cross-section of a volcano instead of the plate boundary. Weak candidates sometimes made the mistake of drawing a constructive or conservative plate boundary. Marks were awarded for the detail of the annotations rather than the quality of the diagram. Consequently there were a few excellent diagrams that gained little credit due to them having little annotation. Conversely some untidy sketches scored well due to detailed annotations linked to the diagram. The best annotations were short phrases or sentences that identified the plates and explained the processes taking place. Usually marks were gained for identifying the direction of plate movement (by labelling the converging arrows), the oceanic and continental plates, and the subduction zone or describing the subduction process.

d This was another challenging question for some candidates, although there were many detailed, informed answers. Generally candidates could describe the various warning signs, which could be measured such as tremors, bulges in the ground surface and emission of gases. However, they were less able to describe how they were measured by reference to monitoring techniques or equipment, such as tiltmeters or seismometers. Relatively few candidates referred to the equipment by name but some candidates did refer to GPS systems and monitoring satellites. Weaker candidates suggested that steam, ash and smoke were indicators of possible eruption, with simplistic monitoring techniques such as ‘look out for smoke’ or ‘look at the volcano to see if it is steaming’ or ‘see if there is any movement of magma’.

e Candidates answered the question well. Many stated the possible benefit of fertile soil for farming, mining, tourism and geothermal energy. Often candidates failed to score the development mark through vague answers such as ‘fertile soil helps crops to grow’ or ‘fertile soils are good for farming’ or ‘tourism increases jobs’. To gain credit a developed answer needed to state ‘soils are fertile which improves yields’ or ‘enables farmers to grow more crops which they can sell for profit’. One common misunderstanding was that housing near a volcano is cheap because no-one wants to live there.

f Most candidates scored three or four marks on this question. The only significant problem found in candidates' answers was the failure to distinguish between primary and secondary effects. Nevertheless most candidates overcame this because they suggested more problems of each type than were required. Flooding by itself was not credited without some reference to what was flooded, such as farmland, crops or villages.

g Some candidates found the focus of the case study quite challenging but many suggested acceptable methods to reduce the impact of the hazard. More candidates chose the hazard of a cyclone rather than drought, but the latter often gave more methods to deal with the hazard. The most common case study of a cyclone was Nargis but other popular ones were Haiyan and Sidr. Drought case studies usually focussed on Ethiopia or Kenya. Some weaker candidates did not name the LEDC affected but wrote about the Sahel or even Africa. A small, but significant minority of candidates misread the question and either chose their example from an MEDC (such as Katrina or drought in Australia) or wrote about a tectonic hazard. In the latter case no credit was given as the answer was irrelevant. Cyclone Nargis was discussed by many candidates but much of what some candidates wrote was very general and could have applied to any tropical storm so restricting their credit for place detail. In common with other case studies many candidates wrote about the impacts of the cyclone before going on to describe impact reduction. The best answers about Nargis focussed on the influence of the military regime keeping aid out of the country for a period of time, which led to rural areas not receiving adequate supplies. Also candidates explained how aid agencies had difficulty gaining access to the areas that needed help. Weaker candidates tended to include all the management measures they knew whether they were relevant to their named example or not. These included suggestions such as strengthening levees, issuing warnings, implementing evacuation plans and boarding up windows. Some candidates focussed on Bangladesh where it was difficult to tell if the measures were a response to cyclones or river flooding caused by excessive rain and snowmelt.

Drought case studies focussed on aid measures taken to relieve the situation. These were often described in detail along with an assessment of how successful they have been. Some candidates considered the long-term management of drought in Africa in detail. As with the cyclone examples many candidates focussed too much on the causes or effects of the drought rather than how to reduce its impact. Some candidates described methods that were generic and could have applied anywhere, such as bunds, wells and drought-resistant crops. Also there were inappropriate measures suggested such as hosepipe bans. Many candidates gave good descriptions of appropriate drought protection methods, although they found it difficult to assess their success and few included much place detail.

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