GCSE

Geography B

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **J085**

OCR Report to Centres

June 2013

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations

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 (Short Course)

Geography (J085)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Overview

General Comments

The Key Geographical Themes examination is based on two units of specification J385, namely *Rivers and Coasts* and *Economic Development*. Centres may enter candidates at either the foundation or higher tier of entry. Candidates from most centres were well-prepared for the examination, obeying the question paper rubric and using case studies which they had learned in class. Centres are reminded that the case studies on both higher and foundation papers are marked using levels criteria; to access the top level answers need to be developed, comprehensive in covering all parts of the question, and place-specific.

The varied nature of the assessments allowed all candidates to demonstrate their strengths and there were some excellent examples of high-calibre geography. Centres had obviously put a great amount of time and effort into preparing their candidates and they are to be commended on this.

Teachers are advised to study the reports of the various assessment components carefully as they give many pointers to how candidates may improve their chances of success. The reports are based on the comments of examiners and moderators who were responsible for judging the work of candidates.

A771 Geographical Enquiry

Administration

Administration by centres has improved with many centres submitting marks well in advance of the 15th May deadline. Only a few centres made errors on the MS1 forms and nearly all sent the CCS160 form promptly. The majority of centres completed assessment grids fully and included appropriate annotation of the form and candidates work indicating where credit was given. Only a few centres included their instruction sheets for candidates for the two components. This is to be recommended along with candidates indicating their word counts.

Moderation

The Enquiry involves centres selecting one Fieldwork Focus title from four and a choice of 18 titles for the Geographical Investigation. The Fieldwork Focus titles were all selected but the majority were Coasts, or Population and Settlements. The vast majority of centres split the title into several appropriate key questions and this provided a focus for primary data collection, analysis, evaluation and making substantiated conclusions. Most centres selected one title for their candidates to research in the Geographical Investigation. The favourites were Energy, the Olympics and World Heritage Sites. Some centres allowed a free choice or one from four titles.

The vast majority of candidates chose to write a research report; only a few power-point, booklet/poster or even an oral interview were seen. Some centres provided some sources for their candidates; the vast majority allowed candidates access to the internet for their research which was recorded in a diary. Most centres used ICT extensively in both their fieldwork and reports for research and presentation of the work. The standard of marking was much better this year as one would expect centres to have responded to the reports provided by moderators last June. It was obvious that centres had attended INSET and fully understood the requirements of controlled assessment. There were fewer adjustments in a downward direction and only a few in an upward direction. The reasons for these changes were many and are mentioned below.

The **Fieldwork Focus** on the whole was marked closely to match the assessment criteria. Centres that did not do this did not split the title into key questions, provide a methodology table, collect sufficient primary data or present it in a variety of graphs. Some also did not give sufficient detail and reasoning in their analysis and conclusions. There were some examples of excellent integrated use of maps and photographs to locate study areas. This set the scene and gave a sense of place. Some centres did refer well to theories such as the Bradshaw model and discussed the wider context of their study. There were many examples of candidates analysing their findings in depth. There were some excellent examples of students who had combined maps, photographs, graphs and their analysis on one page. They also made substantiated conclusions and realistic evaluations. Some, however, did show over-use of tables or textboxes to try and reduce the word count.

The **Geographical Investigation** was also marked more closely to match the assessment criteria. Some centres did encourage their candidates to write a thought shower to help them identify key questions and give their report a logical structure. The majority of centres continued to insist on a research diary and the best had candidates acknowledging sources and evaluating their validity. They also acknowledged images directly and linked them to their bibliography. Very few centres had candidates who failed to acknowledge their sources and made no mention of stakeholders. However, many did provide excellent tables or speech bubbles to show stakeholder views. They also analysed these views and tried to explain them. High level candidates made substantiated conclusions, looked to the future where appropriate, expressed their own opinions and had researched sources extensively.

In both assessments one common problem continues to be the word count which in some centres was significantly exceeded. This meant that their work lacked focus, precision and succinctness; centres need to ensure that students are aware of this failing. The over-use of tables and text boxes needs to be avoided.

Overall there continues to be an improvement in the quality of the work produced and it was very encouraging to see candidates enthusiastically take the opportunities offered and demonstrate high levels of ICT skills. They showed initiative, imagination and independence at a high level. Once again it was also encouraging to moderate complete pieces of work, even from weaker candidates, where they had attempted all elements of the assessment.

The future loss of the Geographical investigation and the increase in word limit to 2000 for the Fieldwork Focus needs noting by centres who also need to look at the new assessment grid. A major requirement will be the need to set out expectations and to collect more primary data in the field.

A772/01 Key Geographical Themes (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

Successful candidates for the 2013 examination:

- followed the rubric to read, select and answered their best three questions.
- understood exam specific command words, such as describe, explain, suggest.
- had a good grasp of geographical terms and Specification specific vocabulary
- showed accurate and detailed case study knowledge recall.
- adapted and applied their case study knowledge to the requirements of the question.
- had clear, legible handwriting, with good spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Substantial rubric error was noticed by many examiners this year. It appears that candidates chose to do additional questions within their allocated time or maybe were directed to do so if they finished early. Most common were candidates attempting Questions 1 and 2 and/or Questions 3 and 4. Some candidates crossed out the answers to a rubric error question that they did not want to be marked which was helpful although there should be no rubric errors anyway.

Previous Reports have covered the issue of rubric error and the best use of candidates' time in this examination. Changes to the examination format mean that rubric error will be impossible for the 2014 examination however there may still be an issue for centres regarding less able or less motivated candidates who find they have substantial amounts of time remaining after completing their answers.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were assessed specifically this year in a way that replaced the embedded quality of written communication criteria of previous years. Additional marks were awarded for SPAG for only the case study part of each question.
In preparing candidates for the 2014 examination centres need to be mindful of even more significant changes.

- There will be two compulsory questions, one to assess each Specification Theme.
- Each question will have a total of 30 marks, with an additional 3 for SPAG.
- Each case study sub-question will have a total mark of 9, with Level 3 marks ranging from 7-9.

Advice and suggestions for preparing candidates from the 2011 and 2012 Reports are equally as valid for the 2014 examination.

Candidates should be familiar with commonly used command words, such as describe and explain, and how they indicate the thinking required for a successful response. They should be encouraged to look for and underline command words during the examination. Short, sharp, focused answers should be given to the skills questions. Some candidates will write a full sentence answer when only a name or number is needed.

Candidates should be aware of the two types of four mark questions.

For open questions which do not require a specified number of responses, four basic ideas can achieve full marks. Three marks could be achieved for one idea that is developed with additional detail or clear explanation. In addition candidates can gain four marks for two developed responses and/or three marks for a well-developed response and a basic idea.

By contrast, for questions which specify two responses, each idea must be developed with detail to gain full marks. Candidates could highlight the word 'two' for such questions.

Candidates should be aware of the requirements of the nine mark case study question. A relevant example is needed, with correct, detailed information given for each section of the question. Accurate place-specific detail is needed to secure full marks such as additional place names linked to the example given and/or additional location information or data relevant to the example and the required content.

In addition to the nine mark case study question, there will always be a two mark knowledge recall question. This will usually involve the definition of a key geographical term, such as *adult literacy* in Question 4. Candidates can underline key geographical words in these and four mark questions. Specification Theme key word glossaries are useful for developing and reinforcing understanding of the meanings.

Most pertinent for the 2104 examination will be the wider coverage of a range of sub- themes for each compulsory question. Candidates will also need to revise all their case study examples within each Specification Theme. Time and thought will need to be given as to which example best suits the requirements of the case study question.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Rivers and Coasts

For the Short Course Examination Question 1 was almost three times as popular with candidates although the overall performance was very similar on both questions. However a marked difference was noted in case study responses. Coastal landforms were of a higher quality than the River landforms. Question 2(f) was the highest scoring case study question whereas Q1(f) was the second lowest.

1 Question 1 focused on river flooding and featured a map of the Zambezi River basin with information about flood impact and a photograph of the effects of flooding in rural Mozambique. The case study was an example of a river landform and how it changes over time. Most candidates were able to interpret the Zambezi River Basin map and information to score two or three marks for part (a). The incorrect answer of seven countries was given by 40% of candidates for (a)(i); presumably they did not include Tanzania in their calculations.

'River basin' is an example of Specification specific vocabulary which occurs three times in Theme 1a. However only a very small number of candidates was able to define this term correctly. More successful was the identification of a 'lake' as a store in the river basin system.

Question 1(c) was speculative and designed to stretch the more able candidates by requiring them to apply their knowledge and understanding of flood impact factors to an unfamiliar context. Many candidates explained some possible causes of flooding without focusing on the need to differentiate between the countries within the Zambezi river basin. Some made comparisons between LEDCs and MEDCs. Basic responses used the Resource to comment on the river network or the presence of large lakes. More able candidates were able to suggest and explain other physical factors such as relief and levels of rainfall. They also considered human factors such as population density and variations in flood defences.

Question 1(d) was well-answered by most candidates. Responses covered primary and secondary effects of flooding often given in the context on an LEDC. Destruction of homes and homelessness, impact on farming and food shortages were the most common ideas.

Question 1(e) saw confusion with coasts knowledge for some candidates. Concrete sea walls and wooden groynes were incorrectly given as methods to reduce river flooding. Successful answers included channel modification, levees and dams to control or restrict flood waters. Sandbags, more permanent barriers and houses on stilts were also given as methods to protect property. A few candidates mentioned afforestation, restricted floodplain development and early warning schemes as more holistic management methods.

The best case study answers used waterfalls. They included a detailed sketch or sketches showing a clear vertical drop and often valid detail such as a band of hard rock on top of softer rock. The best diagrams also had labelled key features such as a plunge pool and rock overhang. Coverage of processes was less convincing with basic ideas about erosion and the collapse of the overhang, leading to the retreat of the waterfall. Few candidates included detail about the actual processes of erosion, such as abrasion or the term undercutting.

Responses which focused on meanders were also successful. Although there was confusion about where the processes of erosion and deposition occur and the resulting features, such as a river cliff or point bar. Explanations of how meanders become ox- bow lakes were also weak.

Many candidates were not able to name a river valley and there was a dearth of place-specific detail. Examples which did achieve full marks had named landforms, such as High Force on the River Tees and/or detail about specific rock types such as Whinstone for High Force. Weaker responses had vague ideas about V-shaped valleys being eroded to make them deeper.

Just over a third of candidates attempting Question 1 failed to score any marks for the case study. Some declined to attempt the question, others gave coastal landforms as their example and others tried to apply their knowledge of the Boscastle flood.

2 Question 2 featured a map showing the possible impact of coastal erosion in Counties along the coastline of California and information about a proposed beach replenishment scheme at Surfers' Point in California. The case study was a coastal landform and how it changes over time.

Most candidates were able to interpret the California Coastline map and information to score all three marks for part (a).

Question 2(c) was speculative and designed to test the more able candidates. Some candidates were able to apply their knowledge and understanding of factors which affect coastal erosion rates to the context of some Californian Counties having more property at risk than others. Their responses covered ideas about the value of property linked to expensive beach houses and tourist developments such as hotels and other human factors such as variations in coastal defences. Physical factors were also considered such as differences in rock type and types of coastal landscape. Many candidates struggled to gain marks and wrote in very general terms about coastal erosion.

Over one third of candidates was unable to identify a coastal erosion process. The most common errors were linked to deposition or transport. Some candidates also gave landforms for their answers and some cited destructive and constructive waves. Abrasion and hydraulic action were the most common correct ideas.

A wide range of responses were noted for Question 2 (d). A few candidates recognised that the Surfers' Point scheme is an example of beach replenishment in the context of soft engineering. They then applied their knowledge to the example given with a clear focus on

the management of coastal erosion. The most able commented on the sustainability of beach replenishment. Some answers covered the increase in beach size being linked to tourism and increased business. Lower scoring answers focused on the re-location of the car park, being safer from flooding/erosion and missed the coastal management context.

Although fewer in number, the case study responses for Question 2(f) were of a higher quality than those given for river landforms with twice as many candidates gaining Level 3 marks. Most answers were focused on changes to a coastal headland caused by erosion. Cliff, cave, arch, stack and stump were the individual landform examples usually given as part of the classic sequence of change. Coverage of processes was generally more accurate, with comments on how the landform was created or changed and some detail about specific erosion processes, such as hydraulic action. Less successful were responses linked to deposition and transport such as spit formation. Labelled sketches were accurate but explanations of how longshore drift operates to create a spit were weaker. Weak Level 1 responses had very basic ideas about cliff erosion or beach formation. As with Question 1(f) there was a dearth of place-specific detail, although more candidates were able to name a coastal area and then the specific landform. Old Harry Rocks on the Dorset coast was the most common example given.

Section B: Economic Development

For the Short Course Examination Question 4 was slightly more popular than Question 3. However, performance on Question 4 was much higher and was the highest scoring question overall. Unlike the Full Course Examination, candidates fared better with the case study question out-scoring both Question 3(e) and Question 1(f). 13% of candidates achieved full marks with their case study responses for Question 4(f).

3 Question 3 used an OS map extract to show the location of Cambridge Science Park as an example of a quaternary economic activity. Questions followed about employment structure and MNCs operating in LEDCs. The case study was an example of an economic activity which had damaged the physical environment.

Ordnance Survey map reading skills continue to be a challenge for some Foundation candidates. Most candidates were able to identify the correct A road for question (a)(i) and the correct direction for (a)(iii) however only 43% of candidates was able to use the scale to give the correct area covered by Cambridge Science Park for part (ii).

Responses to Question 3(b) revealed a lack of understanding of this example of quaternary industry and its location factors. Some candidates thought that Cambridge Science park was a tourist attraction or linked to school visits, in spite of the guiding preamble to the question. Basic answers were linked to edge-of-city location and communications. Few candidates wrote about the links with Cambridge University for prestige, research and development.

Most candidates were able to give two correct examples of jobs in the tertiary sector for question (c)(i). Some candidates missed out on marks as they gave places of work rather than jobs. Question (c)(ii) was the lowest scoring four-mark question in the examination. Some candidates managed basic responses linked to changes in technology and migration of industry to LEDCs to explain the relative decline of the secondary sector, leading to more employment in the tertiary sector in MEDCs. Few made any connections with the provision of a range of service linked to being a more developed country. Incorrect ideas focused on higher pay, better conditions and higher qualifications needed for tertiary jobs.

Most candidates scored marks for question (d). The common responses were linked to cheaper labour costs and resources. Some also developed their ideas about fewer

restrictions and government incentives to attract MNCs to locate in LEDCs. Some candidates misread the question and explained good and/or bad points of MNC investment for LEDCs.

The case study did yield some interesting, contemporary examples of economic activities that have damaged the physical environment. Most centred around the operations of MNCs in LEDC locations and included: The Pearl River Delta in China; Coca Cola in India; forestry and mining in the Amazon; Shell in Nigeria; Nike in Vietnam (and other South East Asian countries) and BP in the Gulf of Mexico. Credible ideas about environmental damage covered the impact of pollution on water courses, vegetation, wildlife habitats and wildlife. Few responses had clear, relevant descriptions of the given economic activity beyond basic ideas about manufacturing and/or resource exploitation. One third of candidates who attempted Question 3 failed to attempt the case study or gain any marks.

4 Question 4 featured a line graph showing changes over time in the Human Development Index and a Water Aid poster showing the benefits of clean water in Nepal. Following questions about development measures and aid, the case study was an example of an economic activity in an LEDC and its location factors. Most candidates were able to read the line graph to score two marks for questions (a)(i) and (ii).The thinking required for part (iii) was more challenging with slightly fewer candidates gaining the third mark.

One third of candidates could not give a correct definition of adult literacy for question (b). Most were able to make the link with reading and writing. Fewer candidates secured the second mark by either defining the term ‘adult’ or stating the rate was given as a percentage.

Question (c) was well answered with most candidates stating that both measures would increase due to improved health and wealth. Some candidates gave developed reasons without clearly stating that the measure would increase. Some candidates misread the question and gave definitions of life expectancy and car ownership.

For question (d) some candidates misinterpreted the command word ‘explain’. They gave detailed descriptions of the uses of clean water shown in the resource instead of explaining the benefits. The most common correct ideas were linked to improved health, with some developed responses about water-borne diseases. Improved hygiene, less time spent collecting water and rising income due to increased crop yields were also given as benefits.

Most candidates showed some understanding of problems associated with MEDC aid to LEDCs in question (e). The most common responses were about dependency and debt linked to tied aid. Other ideas were about the mismatch between aid and people’s needs and the manipulation of aid by corrupt governments. Some candidates developed their responses well with valid ideas about the sustainability of aid.

Some candidates used a known aid project as their case study example. Water aid, Goat aid, Tree aid, Send a Cow and Computer aid were prevalent examples. These responses were given credit if they made a link to economic activity, for example the production of milk for sale. However the location factors given were weak. Examiners did note that some candidates did give more appropriate answers based on MNCs in LEDCs. The most common examples were Nike in Vietnam and China, Coca Cola in India and some interesting accounts of Apple/Foxconn in China. As with question 3(e) descriptions of the actual economic activity were very limited. Location factors were also weak with cheap labour costs being the most common idea given.

A772/02 Key Geographical Themes (Higher Tier)

General Comments

The paper allowed for 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 environmental management or hazard preparation.

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.

Question 2 was more popular than Question 1 and Question 4 was more popular than Question 3. There was limited 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.

Some candidates infringed the rubric requirement, usually by answering more than three questions. This examination was the first time that examiners commented on the number of candidates who answered two questions in one section and then crossed out one answer. This suggests that candidates need to read the questions carefully before deciding which question they prefer to answer. 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 described how their chosen economic activity affected people not the environment in Question 3. The introduction of 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 2014 examination, based on the revised specification.

- Answer both questions - there is no question choice.
- 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

Section A: Rivers and Coasts

1(a) Many candidates were unable to define the term 'river basin' accurately. Answers were often vague and often missed the key idea of drainage of a specific area. Where candidates did explain this basic idea, many did not develop it with any detail of key elements such as tributaries or watershed. A common confusion was with flood plain and candidates explaining how it was the area flooded by a river,

(b) This question was well-answered with most candidates interpreting the data on the map well. Many candidates scored full marks.

(c) The question differentiated well with some candidates making excellent suggestions about the varying impacts of flooding within the river basin. The best answers contained comparative statements about different factors. Common suggestions were variations in the number of rivers, presence of flood warnings and management systems, and numbers of people living on the flood plain. Weaker candidates showed misconceptions about the Zambezi basin which made some ideas irrelevant. They did not realise that all countries in the river basin are LEDCs and so made contrasts between situations in MEDCs and LEDCs. They referred to the Zambezi basin as one country where there were serious impacts rather than seeing the differences between countries within the river basin.

(d) This question was well-answered by most candidates who recognised potential problems of flooding in the area of Mozambique shown on the photograph. The two most commonly described effects were that farmland would be ruined or crops destroyed or livestock killed which could reduce the availability of food to eat or sell, and that houses would be destroyed leaving people homeless. Other ideas suggested were the possibility of disease through the floodwater lying on the land and difficulties to transport in the area. A small number of candidates wrongly focused their answers on ways to reduce the impact of flooding.

(e) Most candidates obeyed the instruction to describe one method, and different methods were used as the focus of answers. The most popular methods were levees, a dam, to deepen the river channel, and to plant trees. Many candidates developed their answer with more detail about how their chosen method would help to reduce the impact of flooding by controlling the river. Answers were generally weaker on considering the sustainability of the method. The most common suggestion was about cost with many candidates simply saying that their chosen method would be 'cheap to do'. There was little explanation of

how their method might be environmentally sustainable, for example afforestation, or socially sustainable, for example protecting villages situated on the flood plain.

(f) The most successful case studies often focused on a waterfall. Candidates were able to explain the formation process and how the feature might change further in the future. There were some well-drawn diagrams of waterfall formation, with the best answers containing details of rock type and height of the waterfall. The most common example used was High Force on the River Tees. Many answers gave good sequential explanations of the formation of a river feature but lacked any place-specific detail about the feature. This was particularly the case where candidates chose lowland river features such as a meander or ox-bow lake. Answers were generally better on explaining the change over time than on describing the landform. Descriptions were often best shown in the diagram or could be interpreted from the explanation, for example by reference to the steep-sided gorge or meander being cut off from the river by deposition. The most popular rivers chosen were the Tees, Clyde and Severn. Notable errors were that some candidates wrote about all landforms on their chosen river, starting with the source and finishing at the mouth. Occasionally candidates focused on flooding in their chosen river valley and methods of flood management. Some candidates mixed up erosion and deposition processes in meander formation.

2(a) Most candidates correctly named a process of coastal erosion, with hydraulic action being most common. They then described the method in sufficient detail to score the second mark. Some candidates incorrectly wrote about longshore drift or freeze-thaw weathering.

(b) Many candidates found the question to be challenging. They struggled to focus on distribution rather than just describing location and found the map difficult to interpret. The best answers identified the location of the two groups of Counties and gave examples of named Counties within each group. A number of mistakes were made in answering this question. Some candidates made errors in using compass directions, sometimes confusing east and west. Candidates just listed the Counties rather than identifying them as part of a group. Some answers were too weak to credit such as ‘they are located along the coast’. Candidates used poor or non-geographical terminology in their description, terms like ‘half way up’ or ‘bottom of the map’ were not accurate geographical answers. Some candidates misunderstood the question and suggested reasons for the location of the Counties rather than describing their distribution. Finally a number of candidates referred to countries rather than Counties which became a greater problem in their answer to the next section.

(c) Where candidates misinterpreted the map as showing countries not Counties of California they sometimes compounded this error by suggesting reasons that related to LEDCs and MEDCs, such as lack of funding for coastal protection. In contrast better candidates made sensible suggestions about differences in property values for different reasons, differences in geology or rock types found in different areas, or the importance of developments along the coast such as industry or tourism. Candidates were not expected to know the precise reasons for the differences in value of buildings at risk but to apply their understanding to an unfamiliar context.

(d) Answers varied in quality and relevance as candidates sometimes struggled to interpret the coastal management plan. The starting point to most successful answers was to state that the bike path and car parks had been moved further away from the sea. They continued by explaining how beach replenishment had increased the size of the beach and consequently it could absorb more of the wave energy. The answers then went on to explain how this affected sustainability in terms of cost, protection or enhancement of tourist facilities, and environmental protection or opportunities for new habitats. However, many candidates did not develop their ideas on sustainability and gave simplistic answers such as ‘the scheme was sustainable because it protected the coast’ or ‘increasing the

size of the beach was good for the environment'. The weakest answers merely described what was shown in the resource with no consideration of sustainability.

(e) Most candidates correctly described one method of coastal protection, with a sea wall, groynes, rip-raps and gabions being the most popular methods chosen. Many candidates explained how their chosen method would protect the coast either from the power of the waves or from the effects of longshore drift. A common mistake was made by candidates who stated that groynes would stop longshore drift, rather than limit its effects. A small number of candidates wrote about managed retreat which was not accepted as it does not protect the coast. Some candidates included details of how sustainable their chosen method was, which was not asked for in the question.

(f) There were many excellent case studies which focused on specific areas of coastline, most notably Dorset, Holderness and Flamborough Head. Candidates described named features such as the Old Harry Rocks and Lulworth Cove and drew detailed diagrams of these features, containing place-specific information such as rock types. Many answers gave good sequential explanations of the formation of a coastal feature but lacked any place-specific detail about the feature. This was particularly true where candidates explained the changes to a sequence of features leading to the formation of a stump. The best answers explained the process of formation and how the feature might change further in the future. The formation of depositional landforms, notably a spit, was generally not as well-explained, as there was more confusion and inaccuracy about how longshore drift helped to form the feature. Often these answers covered human management of the coast which was not required by the question. Occasionally candidates named inappropriate coastal areas for the features which they described and so could not achieve the highest level.

Section B: Economic Development

3(a) Candidates varied in their abilities to use the OS map extract. The best answers were accurate and precise in describing the location of the Science Park. They measured distances and used compass directions from specific features to locate the Park however many candidates did not show this level of expertise. Many answers referred to the Science Park being 'near to Cambridge' or 'next to open fields' or 'near houses' which were too vague to credit. Other weaknesses included not referring to the number of the road which has been identified. Examiners were puzzled to read answers that said the Science Park was next to the A470 as this road is not on the map extract. However, it is the example of a road number used in the key. Such a misunderstanding suggests that candidates have little experience of using OS map extracts. A number of candidates suggested explanations for the location of the Science Park which was not asked for in the question.

(b) Most candidates had some knowledge of what a quaternary industry is. They usually gained credit for reference to research and development of new products or by saying that such industries involved high technology practices. Relatively few candidates referred to information provision which is another key characteristic of quaternary industry.

(c) There were many good reasons suggested which showed that candidates had interpreted information on the OS map. The most popular suggested reasons were that the Science Park is near the university which can provide a regular source of highly skilled workers, and that it is well-located with major road links for movement of workers and goods. Weaker candidates gave answers such as 'it is near roads for good access'. A number of candidates explained why Science Parks generally are good places to set up business without any specific reference to Cambridge Science Park. Some candidates thought that the Science Park was an entertainment area similar to a theme park and so explained why it would be good for a day out.

(d) Many candidates found this to be a difficult question and possibly one they had not thought much about in class. Answers about similarity between the two sectors were more informed than those about difference. The most popular similarities which were considered were labour supply or workers, and transport links or access. Candidates recognised how both these factors would be important in the same way for different types of industry. Correct answers which identified differences often included some contrast between footloose quaternary industries and secondary industries which were tied to a specific factor such as a raw material or specialised site however such detailed answers were quite rare. Most answers were opposites such as 'secondary industries need raw materials but quaternary industries don't'.

(e) Most candidates were more knowledgeable and seemed more confident on this question which focused on multinational companies. The key factor which was emphasised by many candidates was the attraction of a labour supply. This idea was developed to refer to workers being cheaper, in large supply, skilled, willing to learn new skills, and would work for long hours. Better candidates also suggested other attractions such as lower taxes, government incentives and access to raw materials. The best answers also explained how MNCs would change location as such advantages became more attractive in other countries.

(f) A variety of case studies were offered from different countries. Popular case studies include the Pearl River Delta area of China, the Carajas mine in Brazil, a Coca Cola factory in India, a BP oil field in the Gulf of Mexico, quarrying in the Peak District and tourism in a variety of locations. Many of these case studies included place detail. Most detail usually covered the causes of the environmental damage or conflict. Weaker answers were generic in describing air or water pollution which could have referred to primary or secondary industry anywhere. Conflict management was usually less well-explained. For example in the Pearl River Delta which was the most popular case study there was little evidence that some candidates knew if any management measures had been introduced. Better candidates referred to local and national government plans and regulations to lessen air pollution or clean up water pollution. Weaker answers frequently included description of the economic activity and why it was located there. Answer by weaker candidates referred to pollution which was unspecified. These answers also contained irrelevant material about the effects of the economic activity on people rather than the natural environment.

4(a) Most candidates used the information on the graph to make comparisons between Nepal and the World. They compared change over time as well as noting differences in specific years. The best answers included accurate data interpreted from the graph. Weaker candidates did not make comparisons but described the two areas separately, and some included reference to South Asia which was not asked for in the question.

(b) Most candidates gave clear definitions of life expectancy. An omission by some candidates was a reference to 'average'.

(c) The quality of answer varied considerably. Some candidates took the approach of stating whether the indicator was high or low in countries at different levels of economic development e.g. 'the birth rate is generally higher in LEDCs', and then explained why this would be the case. Other candidates took a more open view that the birth rate varied between countries at different level of economic development because of factors such as access to contraception. The most commonly chosen indicators were birth rate and infant mortality. Candidates generally found more difficulty in explaining variation in car ownership and internet access, usually explaining the difference by reference to how rich the country or individuals in the country were. A common mistake was that candidates explained what the factor was, which was not required by the question.

(d) Candidates generally made good use of ideas shown in the Water Aid poster to suggest a number of benefits of access to clean water. Although weaker candidates just described what the poster showed most were able to explain how benefits such as clean water to drink and wash food and clothes would help people to have a healthier life, free from disease. The focus on disease became repetitive in some answers as it was linked to each picture in turn. The other principle benefits which candidates suggested were that the time saved by not having to collect water could be used more profitably, and that more or better crops could be grown reducing malnutrition.

(e) Many different ideas were used to explain why some aid may not be sustainable. The main reasons suggested were the possibility of debt in the receiving country, the aid given may be inappropriate to the needs of the receiving country, the aid is tied to a further agreement which may not benefit the receiving country, corrupt government officials may prevent aid getting to the people in most need, and some aid is only a short-term solution. Some candidates used a specific example of an aid project to show how it was not sustainable. Many candidates also commented on how aid may create dependency but some candidates could not explain the resulting problem. An error in the answer of weaker candidates was the opinion that aid would be unsustainable for MEDCs who could not afford to keep giving aid to LEDCs.

(f) A variety of different economic activities in a range of countries were used for this case study. Popular examples were Nike in Vietnam, Coca Cola in India, Dyson in Malaysia, tourism in Kenya and palm oil in Borneo. Where candidates chose a multinational company it was not always clear what the economic activity was. Such is the power of the MNC that it becomes the economic activity. The answer of Nike in Vietnam was accepted when examiners saw a reference to clothing manufacture or a factory in the answer. Generally candidates described the effects of the economic activity on local people better than how they explained why it was located there. The main location factors which were suggested were cheap and plentiful labour, relaxed health and safety laws, and access to raw materials. Positive and negative effects on local people were suggested, depending on the economic activity chosen. MNCs proved to be good examples for describing how they affect local people. A common error was that candidates wrote about effects on the economy or political regime of the whole country, especially in reference to MNCs. A small number of candidates wrote about all types of economic activity in a country rather than focusing on one particular example.

A significant number of candidates focused their example on an aid project. Answers which focused on an aid project, rather than emergency aid, were credited up to level 2, providing the example referred to factors influencing the location of the aid project and the effects of the aid project in the local area. Popular aid projects which met these criteria were Water Aid in Mali, Goat Aid in a named African country and various other projects established in LEDCs. Answers which focused on an aid project were usually more detailed about its effects on local people but many candidates could not explain in detail why the project was located there. Suggestions were simple such as ‘people are poor and need water’ or ‘the aid project helps local farmers to get more water’.

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