GEOGRAPHY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-11	12-24	25-32	33-44	45-56	57-68	69-100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-11	12-22	23-32	33-43	44-55	56-67	68-100

This session went smoothly and feedback from centres via G2 forms was very positive. There were some very good scripts written in response to both papers.

It was pleasing to see that almost all centres are now following many recommendations made in previous reports. In general, candidates are being much better prepared for the examinations and are more careful in responding appropriately to particular command terms. Particularly notable this session was the large number of well-drawn annotated maps and diagrams, although some continue to be weak. Almost all candidates are now providing useful details of the case studies and examples they use to support their responses.

One recommendation overall to teachers is to advise candidates to try to respond to questions by starting with the question they feel to be their strongest rather than answering questions in the same order as the examination paper, which may not seem the most logical. This advice is given because it was apparent that a number of candidates had not performed as well as they might have done, probably because in part they had not left sufficient time to complete a question that they seemed well prepared to answer.

Finally it should be noted that after careful comparison of scripts from this session and previous sessions it was evident that Paper 2 was slightly more difficult on which to achieve high marks than first appeared to many candidates and centres. In consideration of this, the mark boundary separating Grades 6 and 7 was lowered by a single mark. This should not be interpreted as any kind of trend. It is anticipated that next May this mark boundary will return to its previous position.

Higher level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-3	4-7	8-11	12-15	16-19	20-23	24-30

Range and suitability of work

The quality of work produced continues to improve and most centres have adapted very well to the 2500 word limit. Presenting one, rather than two pieces of work has also appeared to help centres find

and focus on a suitable topic. The next step forward appears to be to try and make their investigation more relevant to their location. Many centres choose a river, coast or CBD study as their topic and centres should appreciate that top marks are reserved for those students who not only demonstrate excellent geographical skills but who also apply them to an original theme found in their local environment. It is also pertinent to discourage students from using the personal style of 'I', 'you' or 'we' and to encourage them to adopt a formal impersonal reporting style.

Most centres understand the hypothesis driven criteria laid down in the IB syllabus and prepare their students very well to complete this part of the course. The weakest centres continue to give students a general subject for study and fail to train them how to collect primary data that can be effectively analysed.

A few centres continue to over-mark. This tendency can only be overcome by individual teachers becoming thoroughly conversant with the requirements of the IA component of the syllabus. All teachers, where possible, should attend workshops in their area and use the online curriculum centre for guidance and resources.

Candidate Performance by Criteria

A - Aims and hypotheses

Schools are mainly following a format of one clearly stated aim, followed and supported by two or more hypotheses. This approach works very well and is followed by group work where a common set of data is collected. Some candidates devised their own hypotheses that showed individuality and initiative, and some centres had a number of hypotheses from which students were able to choose. The choice of good, well-founded hypotheses, relevant to a 'living' issue in the local environment remains the vital first step in a good piece of fieldwork. Weaker students continue to need strong guidance at this stage of the process as they can loose direction very quickly.

Most candidates gave some introductory background to the study area to set the scene. Stronger candidates were able to present a clear rationale for the choice of study area and its connections to theory.

B - Methods of data collection

This is the area that can suffer the most if students feel threatened by the word limit. It is in fact, an ideal place to employ a range of techniques for explaining methods of data collection such as annotated photographs, diagrams, plans, maps. If a questionnaire is used, it is important to pilot the individual questions to ensure that the correct types of responses are being generated; quantitative data from closed questions is preferable to qualitative information that comes from opinion-based questions. Many candidates adequately describe techniques of data collection, but without justification. The choice of sites, the timing of surveys, the size of sample, the sampling process, the equipment used and the techniques employed need to be explained.

The amount of data collected was adequate in most cases, although some of this data was never processed or analysed. This suggests that some weaker candidates did not fully understand the purpose of its collection.

C - Data presentation and processing

Some candidates achieved maximum marks on this criterion and it was most encouraging to see a wide variety of techniques used. Annotated graphs, maps, photos and questionnaires were all useful techniques of representing data and indicating trends, anomalies or points of interest. In some cases candidates combined graphs, maps and photos on one page, which was a very effective way of showing changes, patterns or interrelationships. On the whole, maps were disappointing. Many were either crudely drawn or downloaded without being personalized. Unnecessary national maps were

included at the expense of large-scale local ones. The most effective illustrations were those that showed the data on a map in the form of proportional symbols. Graphs had some limitations where candidates used line graphs for non-continuous data or they presented a sequence of one graph per page making comparison difficult.
All candidates made an attempt to process their data and many used Spearman's Rank. However, only a few candidates really understood the meaning of the resultant coefficient and its significance.

D - Interpretation and analysis

The most successful candidates are aware of the heavy weighting of this criterion and the need to go beyond simple description. They organised their analysis so it was closely linked to each hypothesis. This section thoroughly assesses whether the candidates understand the work submitted and whether they are able to analyse and extend their understanding of the topic or whether they have only satisfactorily completed the exercise presented to them by their teacher. Successful analysis will be focused, geographically and theoretically sound. Less successful candidates present descriptive accounts of their data stating the obvious without any further efforts to interpret the patterns or trends observed in their collected data.

E - Conclusion and evaluation

This continues to be the most testing part of the assessment. At best, candidates relate the outcome of their research to the original aim and, in the evaluation identify specific techniques that could be improved. For some candidates the rejection of hypotheses was a problem and led them to blame their friends, the equipment or the weather.

Recommendations for the future teaching of candidates

- Keep the introduction focused with a lucid aim and hypotheses and a clear, concise link with associated theory.
- Apply the BOLTS system (border, orientation, legend, title, scale) to any map used to ensure that they are correctly presented.
- Choose appropriate maps throughout the piece of work.
- Justify the choice of methods of data collection in addition to describing them.
- Annotate graphs, maps, photos and questionnaires to identify special trends, patterns, anomalies and features.
- Ensure that they go beyond description of their data and analyse it thoroughly drawing in theory and background knowledge.
- Consider carefully the content of their conclusion and make realistic recommendations in the evaluation that suggest practical ways of improving the techniques used, the location and timing of surveys.

Recommendations for teachers

- Undertake a pilot survey for questionnaires and new pieces of fieldwork.
- Ensure that the students' hypotheses are viable.
- Become familiar with the markscheme before marking the student work.
- Annotate the reports or include a summary of reasons for the marks awarded.
- Discourage students from using the personal style of 'I', 'you' or 'we' and encourage them to adopt a formal impersonal reporting style.

Standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-3	4-6	7-11	12-15	16-19	20-23	24-30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

There appears to be a gradual improvement in the component. The reduction of the word limit has been an important change, as most schools understand the requirements and this is reflected in the candidates' performance. There is, as a result, more concise and consistent work and fewer descriptive reports. Nevertheless, there were clearly a number of investigations that exceeded the 1500 word limit and these were penalized.
The topics of investigations were generally appropriate to the core and optional themes and showed, as usual, some regional differences. All were more successful when the approach was less descriptive.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A- Hypotheses or research question

In many cases there has been an improvement in the statement of hypotheses and theoretical background, which has been a weakness in previous sessions. Nevertheless the quality of the hypotheses continues to be a problem because the hypothesis, while it is not itself assessed, has a tremendous impact on the resulting work if the quality is inappropriate.
The lack of a spatial component continues to be a problem as it is evident that some samples have very little geographical perspective. But there was an improvement in the quality of the maps and photographs included, and many were labelled, which helps candidates save words and keeps them within the word limit.

Criterion B – methods of data collection

The lack of proper data was the main weakness for this criterion and although the number of samples without proper data was found to be decreasing compared to previous sessions data must be carefully considered as it has an important impact on the outcome. Investigations were generally adequate and the fieldwork reports more so than the research assignments. The latter's dependence on secondary data led in some instances simply to the downloading of data from the Internet without any attempt to interpret the data or even to attribute the source.

Criterion C – data presentation and processing

Again, candidates must be aware of the need for a variety in the methods of data processing and presentation otherwise the tendency is to produce very limited and repetitive types of graphs with few statistics. As in criterion C, there was a difference between fieldwork reports and research assignments. Most of the former endeavoured to go beyond descriptive calculations and to work inferentially by manipulating and interpreting data. There were some very good applications of Spearman's Rank, which seems to be one of the most popular statistical methods. Among the research assignments there was a tendency to download data from the Internet simply as a means of illustrating what had been written. While mapwork skills were varied and well displayed, the ability to download maps in colour, high quality, and fine detail presents still a challenge.

Criterion D – interpretation and analysis

In some cases, depth of analysis was lacking and this was particularly the case if the investigations were too broad to be covered in 1500 words. This problem relates to the formulation of the

hypotheses and the quality of the interpretation and analysis of data depends on the quality of the data. In-depth interpretation and analysis were stronger in the fieldwork reports than in the research assignments.

Criterion E – conclusion and evaluation

The evaluation by candidates tends to be the same each session. Conclusions range from the non-existent to the simplistic to the tightly relevant.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Encourage a strongly spatial component for investigations so that they are geographical in nature.
- Include an appropriate amount of proper data, secondary or primary.
- Stress the importance of "processing" data; that is, transforming the data into other means of presentation such as maps, tables, and graphs.
- Use a sketch-map (preferably not computer-derived) to show the location where the study is carried out, with annotations to justify the choice of topic and location.
- Ensure that methods of data collection are appropriate for the research question.
- Encourage candidates to use the data appropriately in their analysis and relate the data to the research question.
- Use tabular presentation in the sections relating to criterion B and possibly parts of criterion A to help candidates to reduce words in line with the word limit.

Further comments for teachers

- Annotate the reports and include notes to justify marks allocation.
- Ensure that the study involves the collection of sufficient quantitative data.
- Adhere to the M05 requirements for one piece of work only, with the 1500 word limit.

Higher and standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-5	6-10	11-14	15-20	21-26	27-32	33-50

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-5	6-10	11-14	15-20	21-26	27-32	33-50

General comments

There were a smaller number than usual of the G2 forms (teachers' comments on the written examination) returned by teachers but the comments showed (by a slight majority) that they felt that the examination paper was a little more difficult than last year, and that the population section in the core had received inadequate attention in the questions set. It is worth mentioning in response that the intention of the examination is to cover all aspects of the syllabus over the lifetime of the course and that all elements cannot be guaranteed to be included in each session. The absence of a population-based question is the result of this approach.

Despite this concern, the majority of respondents were satisfied with the syllabus coverage, the clarity of wording and the quality of presentation of the paper.

The mean grade obtained was in line with previous sessions, although there were slightly fewer grades 7 and 6.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

The smaller proportion of candidates attempting question 3 could possibly indicate that this was an area of the course with which many of the candidates felt less comfortable and that it had been less well covered in teaching.

Examples and case studies were often superficial and inaccurate or incorrect. A surprising number were badly out-of-date with for example, data quoted dating from the early 1990s or descriptions given of Ethiopia in the period under the rule of Mengistu.

Misreading or ignoring command terms still cost candidates many marks, although less so than in the past. The practice of breaking the mark allocation into two components when the question contained two command terms seemed to help candidates.

Descriptions of trends and patterns in graphs remain a weakness and candidates are advised always to attempt to describe the general trend or pattern (with some quantification), before noting deviations.

Maps and diagrams were seldom presented and, where they were, remained of poor quality and too small.

The areas of the programme in which the candidates appear well prepared

Greater attention seems to have been paid to the relationship between marks and time, as few candidates seemed unable to complete the paper in the allocated time and there were few over-long responses.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1 – relationship between GDP per person and under 5 mortality

This was the second most popular question, attempted by 82% of the candidates and which achieved the highest average mark (13/25). The type of diagram was obviously new to many candidates, but few were unable to interpret it.

(a) Description of changes in the relationships in countries A and C – although almost all candidates

could describe the changes in the GNP and mortality rates, fewer attempted to comment on the relationships between the two sets of data.

(b) Description and explanation of trends for country B – while the initial relationship was described, few candidates noted or explained the obvious flattening of the curve at higher GNPs. Explanations for the relationship were generally sound.

(c) Measures of mortality as indicators of development – some excellent answers were produced, with the strengths and weaknesses of several different mortality rates considered. Weaker candidates focused only on the under 5-mortality rate (frequently misquoted as infant mortality rate).

(d) External factors affecting economic development – this question proved an excellent discriminator: the strongest candidates gave detailed case studies of countries with a range of factors considered, both positive and negative, while the weaker candidates tended to present superficial analyses, generally based on inappropriate examples (climate, endemic diseases, political instability) and faulty knowledge.

Question 2 – availability of food in MEDCs and LEDCs

This was the most popular question, attempted by over 90% of the candidates, although it also had the lowest average score (11/25).

(a) Trends on food availability – a straightforward question, but a surprising number of candidates failed to score full marks for it because of the absence of any quantification or a recognition of the trends, or of a failure to comment on overall and comparative values.

(b) The problem of malnutrition – the strongest responses were based on a recognition of the minimum recommended daily calorific intake and covered both over-consumption in the MEDCs and persistent malnutrition in the LEDCs, despite the increasing availability of food. Weaker candidates spent a great deal of time on analysing the comparative values of the components of food supply.

(c) Decrease in food production per person – few really good responses were presented, mainly because candidates failed to recognize the most important factor of all, namely that population growth outstrips food production in many areas. Another common failing was to equate a reduction in labour force with a reduction in food production. The better responses provided a range of factors drawn from different areas of the world.

(d) "Food aid benefits rich countries as much as poor countries" – this was another question that clearly discriminated the strong candidates from the weaker ones. Strong responses provided good arguments based on the advantages and disadvantages of food aid to both MEDCs and LEDCs and then attempted an evaluation. Facts, in these responses, were accurate and pertinent. Weaker candidates tended either to discuss food aid in LEDCs only, or to focus on the assistance provided in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina (which is hardly relevant). A surprising number of responses were based on the erroneous assumption that countries pay for food aid.

Question 3 – resource types from production to consumption

Only 27% of the candidates chose this question, being by far the least popular one but which had the average mark (12/25) and lay between those achieved in the other two questions. It is possible that the lack of popularity of this question was a consequence of the diagram not being understood (or possibly from a lack of knowledge of a topic that comes at the end of the course content).

(a) Examples of resource types A and B – the majority of candidates had no difficulty in identifying them as renewable and non-renewable resources, although, having correctly identified resource type B as non-renewable, some strange examples were given.

(b) (i) Recycling at the consumption stage – some interesting examples were quoted and full marks were awarded even when the resource was not renewable (such as the recycling of aluminium cans).

(b) (ii) Conservation at the processing stage – this question posed a problem for many candidates with few being able to identify an example where the introduction of advanced technology at the production stage has reduced waste.

(c) Changes in the global consumption patterns of a given resource – it came as a surprise that this question produced such poor results as similar questions have been set in the past. Descriptions of the patterns and explanations for them were usually superficial or inaccurate, for example, claims that the consumption of oil has not decreased in any region. Many candidates gave lengthy but irrelevant discourses of what would happen in the future, especially when covering a fossil fuel.

(d) Sustainable development policy – some really excellent, well-organized and focused answers were presented. The examples of policies considered ranged widely in scale, from local recycling schemes to national initiatives. However, it was also obvious that many candidates had no knowledge of such schemes and attempted to hide this by producing rambling responses on what could be achieved by the introduction of sustainable development policies.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Recommendations fall into two groups.

Preparation for the examination

- Case studies should be up-to-date and contain facts and figures that can be used to justify broad generalizations.
- Candidates should learn to identify the general trends and patterns in graphs, e.g. using terms like “an overall increase”, “a negative / positive correlation”, “rising steadily and then slowing down”, and always give some quantification.
- Sketch maps and diagrams should be large and contain mainly relevant information. A well-annotated map can save time.
- Extended writing, such as that required by the last sub-questions (part (d)) should be organized and logically developed, all of which requires a little planning.

Examination technique

- Questions should be carefully read (and understood) before attempting to answer them.
- Special attention should be paid to command terms: such as describe, explain, evaluate.
- The mark allocation should be regarded as an indication of the length of time to be spent on the question.
- Accurate geographical terminology not only improves the quality of the response but also can save time.

Higher and standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-10	11-21	22-26	27-35	36-43	44-52	53-80

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-5	6-10	11-13	14-17	18-22	23-26	27-40

The areas of the programme which proved difficult for candidates

Question choice was usually pre-determined by the topics that had been taught rather than freely chosen in the exam. Lithosphere, settlement and globalization were the most popular topics and geographical regions and productive activities attracted only a small minority of candidates. Although structured questions were more popular than the essays, the mean marks for both question type were similar. They appeared to allow good candidates to enter into detailed discussion and the opportunity to develop ideas fully and present an argument. At the lower end, essays attract very generalized and weak responses from candidates with opinions, but limited knowledge and skills.

Other difficulties included lack of detailed knowledge of physical processes and terminology. Map skills were also poor and annotated sketches misunderstood.

The level of knowledge, understanding and skills demonstrated

Since the start of this programme three years ago, knowledge of case studies has improved significantly and many candidates spontaneously included them in their answers. At best, a range of case studies was revised and skilfully applied to fit the requirements of the questions. Deficient case study knowledge inevitably resulted in a mismatch where the case study did not support the answer.

The strengths and weaknesses of candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1

(a) This was a relatively unpopular question typified by very long descriptive responses taking a source to mouth approach. Only a few candidates fully addressed the question by acknowledging that both erosion and deposition influenced fluvial landforms to varying degrees.

(b) This was also a relatively unpopular question.

(i) Many candidates correctly defined flash flooding, although some referred to river levels in general rather than to discharge.

(ii) Many candidates were unable to identify factor A, either repeating intensity or citing a factor that was not related to precipitation. Factor B was usually correctly identified.

(iii) Human influences were usually well covered with two types adequately described with the emphasis on urbanization. Responses that focused on channel manipulation were irrelevant.

(iv) Water management strategies were often limited to flood control and the broader issues of matching supply with demand or conservation were seldom mentioned.

Question 2

(a) This was a popular question attempted by many candidates who often wrote at great length sometimes disregarding the focus of the question. More discerning candidates recognized that the emphasis was on erosion rather than deposition. Although candidates could adequately describe the part played by humans in influencing erosion both deliberately and inadvertently, their knowledge of background physical geography such as geology, coastal configuration and marine factors was very weak.

(b) This was a very popular question.
Most candidates answered parts (i) and (ii) correctly. However, explanation in part (iii) was weak with very few answers referring to constructive and destructive waves. Many candidates in (vi) failed to cite low-lying coastlines and the whole of the Holderness coastline was often used as a case study, without recognition of its topography, which is varied and has many cliffs.

Question 3

(a) This was the least popular question on the examination paper, but there were some outstandingly good responses showing a sophisticated level of understanding and evaluative skills.

(b) This question was attempted by only a few candidates most of whom coped well with parts (i) and (iii), but found difficulty in explaining the pattern shown in diagram A, part (ii), where few mentioned evapotranspiration. In part (iv) although candidates had knowledge of the issue of water scarcity in one country, few showed any understanding of the international conflicts arising from shared water resources. Very few offered any resolution to the problem.

Question 4

Traditionally, this is a popular topic but this year candidates were challenged by both questions, which required specific knowledge of physical processes and features.

(a) Relatively few responses recognized the relationships between volcanic location, volcanic form, eruptive activity and the hazardous nature of the materials produced. Typically, responses simply contrasted the eruptions of Mt St Helens in 1980 and Pinatubo 1991, mentioning the type of hazard and level of human impact. These responses were well rehearsed, but only partially relevant.

(b) This was a very popular question attempted by the majority of candidates.

In part (i) most candidates were able to define mass movement accurately, but in part (ii) there were many errors; “A” was seldom identified as soil creep and “B” was often classified as a landslide instead of a slump.

(iii) Although a few candidates were able to describe and illustrate the process of soil creep, many described a generalized shift of soil down the slope. Some were unable to distinguish between human and physical effects.

(iv) Many responses were generalized and non-specific to slumping. The distinction between human and physical factors and their relative importance was also problematic for some candidates.

Question 5

(a) Very few candidates attempted this question. Their chosen ecosystem, such as the Amazon rainforest, was often too large. Responses were typically descriptive rather than discursive and arguments were weak and unsupported.

(b) This was an unpopular question
In part (i) many responses recognized the interrelationships between living and non-living components, although few mentioned nutrient exchanges. In (ii), components "A" and "B" were usually identified correctly, and in (iii), there were some excellent diagrammatic representations of Gersmehl's nutrient stores and transfers (usually in the topical rainforest). Alternative diagrams representing the cycling of individual nutrients such as carbon received limited credit, and food chains and webs were unacceptable.

Question 6

(a) This was a moderately popular question.
The weaker responses were unable to distinguish adequately between acid rain, ozone depletion and global warming (the latter not required in the question). Scientific knowledge was weak and very few were able to relate particular international meetings or treaties to particular problems.

(b) This was a moderately popular question.
Very few candidates had any difficulties in the first two parts of this question, but part (iii) was managed poorly. Only a few were able to describe and explain the conditions associated with the passage of hurricane beyond a brief mention of rainfall and strong winds coming and going overhead. Some candidates resorted to describing the general origin of hurricanes and their associated hazards.

(iv) A significant number of responses contained factual, recent and case studies, but little evaluation. The approach adopted by most candidates was to describe two hurricanes; one disastrous event in an unprepared LEDC and the other in a well prepared MEDC. A few excellent answers recognized that the response to a specific hurricane event may not follow this conventional divide, but may vary within one nation, citing Hurricane Katrina in 2005 as an example.

Question 7

(a) Very few candidates attempted this question. However, their answers were generally good showing a sound holistic grasp of contemporary geographical issues in their own region.

(b) This was a very unpopular question.
In parts (i) and (ii) responses showed an appreciation of cartographic techniques and their implications. However, in part (iii) very few presented a well-drawn and annotated map. More often they appeared as labelled rough sketches.
In part (iv) responses were much better and most candidates were able to distinguish between single and multi-feature regions.

Question 8

(a) Very few candidates attempted this question and those who did seldom focused on the CBD alone. There was also an over-reliance on urban models covering the whole urban area. Although some knowledge of retailing was evident, there was little appreciation of the full range of services found in the CBD or the factors that determined their location. Maps were usually inaccurate and lacking specific detail and place names.

(b) This was the most popular question.

(i) The majority inaccurately defined a primate city as the largest, or the capital city and very few appreciated the concept of primacy.

(ii) Some candidates produced imaginative and valid reasons why the data might be unreliable. Occasionally, the term "national ", which appeared on the graph, was interpreted wrongly to mean non-immigrant population.

(iii) Description of the graph was sound with many recognizing a decline in primacy over time, even though the time intervals shown on the graph varied. Explanation was usually focused on declining populations in the major city due to congestion and other problems associated with over-urbanization. Very few related the general decline in primacy to the development of an urban hierarchy associated with national economic growth.

(iv) The question was sometimes misunderstood but there were a few very well exemplified responses. Counter-urbanization was confused with suburbanization, costs were discussed as well as benefits and rural settlements were not clearly identified. Altogether, responses were unimpressive.

Question 9

(a)Very few candidates attempted this question, but results were pleasing. The best responses defined agribusiness, its spatial expansion and its range of impacts affecting both the MEDC and LEDC. Only a few addressed both sides of the argument, recognizing the impressive increases in food production resulting from agribusiness. Weaker responses were unable to distinguish agribusiness from agriculture and the focus was on eutrophication and the Green Revolution of the1970s and 1980s.

(b) Most of the candidates who had clearly prepared for this topic attempted this question. Parts (i) and (ii) were correctly interpreted but in part (iii) sustainability was often considered from a commercial perspective and environmental factors largely ignored. Examples were often missing or poor.

Question 10

(a) This question was relatively unpopular.
Many accurately defined globalization and explained the processes and outcomes of cultural diffusion. These were expressed normally as the cultural homogenization of food, dress and language. Very few essays addressed the issue of physical diversity. Although some attempted to consider the opposite viewpoint that diversity was increasing, conclusions were very often weak and unsupported by evidence.

(b) This was one of the most popular questions.

(i) Very few candidates fully appreciated the demands of this question. Errors arose over the interpretation of the words "destination" and "different impact". The best answers referred specifically to the data as given in the table and the photographs, picking out six contrasting and visible impacts. Implied, distant or imagined impacts were unacceptable.

(ii) Many candidates appeared to have rehearsed the reasons for the growth of tourism on a global scale, but only some were able to present a good range of reasons for the growth of remote tourism that relate principally to improved accessibility and tourist provision at destinations in LEDCs.

(iii) A range of strategies was allowed, provided that they aimed to conserve a named tourist destination. Conservation was not restricted to the environment and the protection of local communities and the economy were equally acceptable. Although the majority of responses focused on relevant ecotourism strategies, few were adequately evaluated.

Question 11

Parts (a) and (b) usually produced correct answers, but this was not true of part (c) where the majority of errors related to inaccurate grid referencing.

(d) Many candidates failed to correctly identify the "edge of the urban area" and focused instead on horticultural and agriculture activities in the rural hinterland of Loxton.

(e) Many responses were very disappointing and the result of lack of practice and possibly lack of time. Sketch maps were often uninformative with missing features such as a title, key and scale. Regions were indistinct due to lack of clear boundaries and colour. Very few candidates adequately annotated their maps, although some presented annotations as notes beneath a key for which they received limited credit.

Further Comments

After six previous Paper 2 examinations, teachers and candidates are becoming more familiar with its requirements. There is clear evidence of a general improvement in factual knowledge and case studies. However, poor handwriting continues to be a problem and some candidates are unable to apply their knowledge to the question due to weaknesses in examination technique. These weaknesses include misunderstanding command terms, lack of planning for essays, poor sketching and map drawing skills and time mismanagement. They might be rectified by careful scrutiny of past exam papers and unseen questions practiced under timed conditions. Revision of terminology and command terms is also essential.

Recommendations for the future guidance of candidates by their teachers

- Analyse exam questions paying particular attention to command terms.
- Be prepared to give an essay title its broadest interpretation by considering scale, place, time and factors. All these should be checked for relevance when the essay is being planned.
- Allocate time evenly between questions.
- Avoid unnecessary and lengthy description; this is no substitute for analysis.
- Select case studies carefully to ensure that they support the discussion appropriately.
- Write clearly and assume that the examiner has no time to decipher illegible handwriting.
- Always complete the required number of questions and check that these are from the correct sections.

