GEOGRAPHY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 13	14 - 27	28 - 42	43 - 53	54 - 64	65 - 75	76 - 100

Standard Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 -13	14 - 27	28 - 40	41 - 51	52 - 63	64 - 74	75 - 100

Higher and standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 20	21 - 24	25 - 30

The range and suitability of the work submitted

As always, the work submitted for moderation covered a very wide range of topics. The strongest investigations all had a clear spatial component.

Considerations of health and safety should always be taken into account when undertaking fieldwork. Local policies cover the entire range of approaches. In work related to Oceans and their coastal margins (part two, option B) these ranged from undertaking a study of marine waves where the candidates were not allowed in the water to obtaining information and species counts for coral reef studies using snorkels and scuba gear.

Common topics were those related to: Patterns in environmental quality and sustainability (part one, core theme topic 3); Freshwater – issues and conflicts (part two, option A); Oceans and their coastal margins (part two, option B); Leisure, sport and tourism (part two, option E); and Urban environments (part two, option G). Fieldwork based on other topics in the core and the part three higher level extension (global interactions) rarely met the same high standards as work related to part two.

Note that, with some exceptions, most vegetation studies have limited relevance to the current syllabus.

In this session, very few internal assessment (IA) reports were entirely based on secondary information and failed to meet the formal requirements for fieldwork.

Fieldwork questions including the word "sustainable" or "sustainability" are becoming more common, but are rarely handled effectively. In several cases, candidates considered only one (often minor) aspect of sustainability, while completely ignoring other aspects.

In many centres, candidates worked in groups to collect suitable primary data. Though not required by the syllabus, most centres are now allowing candidates some choice in deciding the fieldwork question and/or the hypotheses to be investigated.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A – Fieldwork question and geographic context

A small number of candidates failed to state the fieldwork question as a question. Expressing the fieldwork question as a statement of expected findings or hypothesis is unacceptable.

Most work had a well-focused fieldwork question, sometimes accompanied by appropriate hypotheses.

The best work tended to have fieldwork questions which were narrowly focused, appropriate and with manageable hypotheses. Fieldwork questions that were vague, had obvious outcomes, or were based on overly simplistic questions, inevitably led to poorly developed reports.

Fieldwork questions including the phrase “to what extent” are unlikely to be answerable within the word limit.

It is important to find a spatial focus for the fieldwork and use techniques of data representation that can reveal any spatial patterns in the fieldwork results. Non-spatial topics rarely score well.

Almost all candidates included a clear link stating the area of the syllabus to which the fieldwork related. This link should be stated in the introduction, and not only on a title page or elsewhere.

Most reports included some good background theory to the topic.

Locational maps are essential and must show the study area(s) and include additional material such as sample points and pertinent geographical features. All maps must follow standard

conventions and include a title, key, scale and orientation. **All** maps should have scales.

The maps used in many fieldwork reports could be greatly improved. There is no value in including a downloaded map unless it is annotated to show the key places relevant to the study being undertaken.

Maps of rivers should indicate their direction of flow.

Almost all candidates provided the source of maps and diagrams used in reports. This requirement applies equally to any photos and non-original base maps used by candidates for showing data. The source should be placed as near as possible to the diagram or map, rather than only being given in end notes. All sources should also be included in the bibliography.

Criterion B – Method(s) of investigation

In most cases, methods were described, adequately justified, and likely to yield sufficient data of good quality to enable adequate interpretation and analysis.

Many reports would be improved if candidates explained the details of how the sample size and locations were determined, including the selection method employed.

While using annotated photographs is helpful in describing the methods used, relying on a table of methods (presumably in an attempt to circumvent word count restrictions) is unacceptable. In extreme cases (such as when the methods used are described **only** in a table) every word used in the table will count towards the formal word count.

Weaker reports lacked sufficient justification for the methods used.

In cases where questionnaires are used, the methods section should incorporate some justification for the precise questions asked, together with clear reference to the number of responses, time of survey and choice of survey points. A copy of the questionnaire should be included in the appendix.

The methods section should also refer, even if only briefly, to how any secondary material used in the report was selected and obtained.

Criterion C – Quality and treatment of information collected

A wide range of maps, graphs, diagrams, photographs and other illustrations was used.

The best reports included some truly outstanding techniques of data treatment and display, which easily exceeded the demands of the top markband for this criterion. However many candidates still fail to label axes on graphs, do not include scales or orientation on maps, and make poor use of colour when it would improve clarity.

Many reports used statistical methods such as Spearman's Rank Correlation and Chi-squared. However, these tests were not always appropriate or calculated accurately. Statistical tests

should not be used when the sample size is insufficient. Some candidates did not have a good grasp of how to check the statistical significance of their findings. Some candidates did not use statistics, even when their data was suitable and where it might have been helpful to their analysis.

Many candidates are now producing maps based on their findings; this is a key to success in IA fieldwork as it guarantees that the report has a clear spatial focus. An increasing number of candidates are now placing their graphs/data directly onto background maps, making it much easier to visualize any spatial patterns that may exist.

Weaker candidates continue to offer multiple, repetitive graphs on dozens of pages where the possible spatial connections between them are impossible to determine easily. Candidates should avoid choosing inappropriate graphical techniques such as the use of histograms to show temperatures.

For this criterion, the choice of scales and use of colour remain two relatively weak areas. For graphs to be compared, it is essential that scales are identical. In the case of quantitative maps, such as choropleth maps, it is important that the colours chosen help the viewer discern which is the highest class and how the classes are ordered, for example, by grading several tones of a single colour from light (= less) to dark (= more).

Criterion D – Written analysis

The written analysis was the most variable section of reports. Better candidates wrote perceptive analyses, including valid explanations, and quickly reached the top mark descriptors. They referred confidently to findings by actually quoting graphs and figures. Trends, spatial patterns and any anomalies found were identified, linked and discussed. In the best reports these discussions were associated strongly to the specific fieldwork question and the established geographical theory and context.

Weaker candidates tended to resort to simplistic statements and descriptive summaries. In the worst cases, they largely ignored the data they had collected.

Reports which investigated more than one hypothesis and then presented separate analyses for each hypothesis tended to score less well on this criteria than reports which integrated the discussion of results into a single section where the connections between hypotheses could be readily explored.

Criterion E – Conclusion

Most conclusions did refer back to the original fieldwork question and were based on the evidence and consistent with the results and analysis. Weaker candidates sometimes introduced new material into their conclusions or included information which might have been better placed in their analysis.

Criterion F – Evaluation

Most candidates were able to make some sensible evaluations of methods, with valid suggestions for improvements. However, this criterion is designed to make candidates think beyond any problems resulting from the weather, teachers and class mates, and evaluate the fieldwork process in terms of such things as sample size, choice of locations and the quality and quantity of data/information collected.

Note that where evaluation is undertaken using **only** a table, **all** the words used in the table will count towards the total word count.

Many candidates failed to consider how the original fieldwork question or hypothesis might be modified or improved. There were more recommendations for improvements to methods than for worthwhile extensions.

Criterion G – Formal requirements

A small number of reports exceeded the word limit. Teachers are reminded that any deliberate attempts to circumvent the word limit (for example, by the excessive use of tables) should not be encouraged.

The formal requirement that illustrative material be "integrated" into the text is meant to signpost the need for candidates to make clear reference in the main body of the report to graphs and other material, by referring to their figure number or page number.

It is disappointing that many candidates still fail to gain full marks for this criterion. There are still too many reports which lack a final “polish”. Moderators would like to see all candidates gaining the full four marks available for this criterion.

Though almost all reports did respect the 2,500-word limit, teachers are reminded of the need to check word limits carefully and to award zero marks for this criterion if the limit is exceeded. Candidates must take care to ensure that the word count stated on the report's title page or cover is correct. Some candidates also (helpfully) provide the number of words for each section of the report.

Some candidates failed to number all illustrations sequentially, or included material in the appendix that was of central importance to the report and which should have been incorporated into the main text. Centres are reminded that moderators are not required to read the appendix, which means that any diagrams or maps essential to the study must be included in the main body of the report.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates should be encouraged to:

- Choose a tightly focused fieldwork question and, if relevant, a strictly limited number of hypotheses.

- Annotate any introductory map to show the location, choice of topic and/or sample points.
- Avoid using extensive tables in reports, particularly in the sections for methods and evaluation.
- Incorporate a greater variety of appropriate graphical and mapping techniques in their analysis.
- Focus in the analysis on interpreting (not just describing) results and explaining their findings, focusing on any spatial patterns or trends identified.
- Quote and refer to graphs and images during the written analysis.

Teachers should be encouraged to:

- Help candidates choose an appropriate fieldwork question, and any related hypothesis or hypotheses.
- Prepare candidates to be able to draw good introductory maps, including well-chosen annotations specific to their chosen fieldwork question.
- Ensure that ample quantitative data is collected.
- Ensure that the work has a clear spatial component, and involves collecting data that the candidates can then represent on a map or maps.
- Ensure that candidates are familiar with the assessment criteria.
- Add comments to all reports explaining why particular marks have been awarded.
- Teach candidates (prior to fieldwork) the best techniques for representing and analysing data. This process should place emphasis on the need to follow established conventions relating to scales, symbols, colours and other aspects of formal presentation.
- In preparation for the electronic submission of IA, some consideration should be given to avoiding the use of fold-out diagrams in future fieldwork reports.

Further comments

The general standard of work seen at moderation was encouraging. Most candidates are acquiring a valuable knowledge and a sound understanding of basic fieldwork investigations. Thanks are due to all the teachers concerned for helping candidates undertake fieldwork and to further develop their candidates' skills in researching, processing and interpreting empirical data.

Higher and standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 10	11 - 20	21 - 27	28 - 33	34 – 39	40 - 45	46 - 60

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

Some candidates failed to read the questions with extreme care and there were too many instances of inappropriate answers, for example explanation when only description was required; failure to define terms in a precise way; failure to give precise named countries or regions; failure to give the correct number of different reasons/suggestions; failure to notice key terms such as ‘physical’, ‘cartel’, ‘trends’, ‘falling’.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Interpretation of data such as that from maps, graphs and tables was well handled, with patterns described and supported with quantification. Candidates are now looking for anomalies. Essay structure in section B continues to improve with satisfactory balance in discussion and analysis. Many very clear, specific, up to date and geographically accurate case studies and examples are being used.

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

Section A

Question 1

a) Most candidates were able to describe the pattern with emphasis on areas of high maternal mortality ratio (MMR) and low MMR with quantification and reference to anomalies. However, there were some responses that only quoted figures without reference to the pattern. Some candidates lacked precision in their description and mentioned vague groupings such as MEDC or LEDC. These terms are dated and did not recognize the detail of the pattern on the map.

b) Most candidates were able to give two different and valid possible reasons but there were some repetitive and mirrored answers. Development and further explanation was poor in places, displaying an inability to link the identified reason with maternal mortality. There was some confusion between MMR and infant mortality.

c) There were some very good answers that examined trends in life expectancy and gave well integrated explanations. Many good responses used recent changes in the countries of sub-Saharan Africa using the impact of HIV/AIDS, and recent medical advancements, to explain selected trends. In some responses the named country or region was imprecise consisting of vague generalizations such as 'in Africa' or 'in S E Asia'. The key phrase 'recent trends' was interpreted with wide deviation; the best answers contained specific dates and figures for life expectancy with 'recent' defined within the life time of the candidate. Explanation was often clear, precise and effectively linked to the changes in life expectancy in the best responses. Some answers failed to examine trends and used dated examples to explain high or low life expectancy.

Question 2

a) This was generally well answered and many candidates scored full marks.

b) Mostly good description from candidates but some were inaccurate with quantification and dates. A small number concentrated on aid rather than remittance flow.

c) Many candidates suggested three valid reasons with explanation. Some candidates were hard pressed to give three reasons and only managed one or two with repeated information in some cases. Perhaps the most common reason for losing marks was the lack of precision in explanation of the effectiveness of financial aid.

Question 3

a) The vast majority were able to identify agriculture/farming but some just included irrigation.

b) Many answers were only partial rather than the full definition. There is a full definition in the guide and candidates should be aware of this, along with other definitions that may be assessed. There were many scripts using a definition which included a water usage figure of 60% of available water supply.

c) Many were able to identify valid factors the most popular of which were climatic and distance. However, a significant number of candidates failed to focus on the word 'physical' and included human factors such as industrial and agricultural pollution. Explanation was sometimes inadequate.

d) Many candidates had a good understanding of the content required for this question. There were some insightful comments associated with soil erosion and leaching. However some responses were rather rambling and contained much irrelevant material. The best answers gave specific geographical locations to illustrate their ideas.

Question 4

a) The vast majority correctly identified China.

b) Many candidates were able to recognize what OPEC is and gave a brief description of how the

cartel operates. However a significant number failed to identify or define the OPECs.

c) The best answers gave very clear geographical evidence of geopolitical issues such as conflicts in the Middle East, the growing power of the oil producers or arguments over territorial claims in potential oil rich environments. Some candidates drifted away from strict geopolitical impacts and concentrated on economic issues, unfocused pollution impacts or the alternative energy debate.

d) There were many sound answers with candidates awarded full marks for valid reasons and satisfactory explanation. Where candidates had problems it was with the appropriate nature of their development which at times became repetitive.

Section B

Question 5

The best answers had plenty of specific geographical examples to illustrate their ideas. Many candidates were able to highlight and develop the different aspects of economic development and how they linked with water and biodiversity. Sound reference was made to industrial and agricultural growth and some candidates saw the link between economic development and urban growth. There were some good case studies of tourism as economic development and the link to changes in the coastal environment. A range of case studies was essential to cover both water and biodiversity issues in a balanced way. Poor responses were characterized by little knowledge and understanding of negative environmental impacts, with content that was mostly superficial or marginal and very generalized. Although it was not required, very few candidates took the debate further with an investigation of how environmental controls/conservation can be put in place as economic development takes place.

Question 6

The best answers used the MDGs as a platform for serious debate. These answers tended to be accurate and specific with well detailed knowledge and understanding of gender equality; precise and named examples/case studies were well chosen and allowed detailed application. The best candidates presented well balanced evaluations with sound structure and organization. Some of the good responses also looked at other methods of development and evaluated these against gender equality. There were some competent answers that identified that development could be seen in a variety of ways and argued the case for gender equality very effectively. The most common distraction was a straying into a discussion of the causes of gender inequality or the methods by which it could be addressed. At the bottom end of the mark range, responses were characterized by superficial levels of knowledge and sweeping generalizations.

Question 7

This was by far the most popular question. The best answers gave a balanced discussion on the benefits or problems of falling fertility rates. These answers were supported by accurate and up to date quantification, applied to particular countries or regions for example Singapore, Germany, Japan, China and Kerala. Some candidates drifted from the thrust of the question and wrote at

length about population policies without a focus on falling fertility rates. There was also evidence that some candidates used the topic as a spring board for Malthusian evaluation with wide variation in success. Some candidates failed to indicate that they had a sound knowledge and understanding of fertility rates and some ignored the word 'falling'.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be encouraged to learn the definitions of key words in the guide. Candidates should be encouraged to research and analyse up to date case studies that can be applied to the content in the guide. This makes the subject more relevant and interesting for candidates and brings the subject to life.

- Question analysis should be part of the learning experience so that candidates are able to sift through the material they have acquired during the course and apply it in an appropriate fashion.

- The use of writing frames is a good preparation for the exam and a useful skill to take on to further education. This allows candidates to organize information and construct an argument that is related to the question set. It avoids the outpouring of **all** facts that have been learned.

Further comments

Some very good work was seen with plenty of very sound geography; case studies and examples were often very well selected and pertinent.

Higher and standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 22	23 - 28	29 – 35	36 – 41	42 - 60

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 14	15 - 18	19 – 23	24 - 27	28 - 40

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

Some areas of the syllabus were evidently less popular than others. Particular areas of the syllabus caused significant problems, especially the 10-mark questions in the following: question 2 (Freshwater – issues and conflicts), question 4 (Oceans and their coastal margins), 5 and 6 (Extreme environments), and 13 (Urban environments).

The map extract was problematic for many. Few could give correct grid references, read elevation or use scale correctly. There was little understanding of using map evidence, for example, being unable to refer to a place on the map.

Describing a distribution or interpreting data seemed to be a issue with limited or incorrect references to visual material in the exam – graphs, diagrams for example to describe a pattern (questions 1bii, 5a, 11aii, 14b).

Simple definitions were often not known – for example, suspension, saltation, hazard risk and hazard vulnerability, leisure, tourism, urban ecological footprint. Changing location of economic activities was not dealt with well. Few had detailed knowledge of the changes in one urban area.

Examination technique often let candidates down rather than geographical knowledge and understanding. In particular, not reading questions properly, for example, writing about countries when urban areas were required (questions 9c, 10d, 14c).

Some of these are fairly simple issues, and candidates lost valuable marks.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

The Freshwater option and Leisure option were the better answered of the popular options.

There were some very good answers on river management strategies, the sustainability of the fishing industry, diseases, causes of famine, tourism as a development strategy, hazards, and the pros and cons of food aid and trade.

A number of candidates wrote a rough plan of the 10-mark questions before commencing their answer. This was reflected in well structured answers, with appropriate use of paragraphs.

It was pleasing to note the increased attention being given in most instances to the command terms with many candidates being able to go beyond description to reach band E by beginning to discuss and evaluate questions.

An increasing number of candidates added a conclusion and attempted an evaluation of the 10-mark questions.

Some excellent, detailed and relevant case study knowledge was demonstrated with improvement in the attention to specific detail. The danger is that these may become too descriptive, and they should always be used to constructively argue a point, or in comparison. Most case studies were relatively up to date, although there were some exceptions.

Many candidates had a solid understanding of sustainability, a concept that occurred several times in the paper.

Although still mainly poor, there were a few excellent, well labelled diagrams of the hydrological cycle (question 2b).

There were relatively few rubric infringements and, for most candidates, the timing was appropriate: there were very few incomplete answers.

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

Question 1

a) Generally acceptable definitions

b) (i) No problems

(ii) This part caused problems as candidates tended to state changes to the river and its flow (for example, velocity and discharge) rather than to the river channel.

(iii) This was generally answered well although in some instances explanations were weak.

c) There were some excellent answers with case studies used to complement the response. In order to gain band E there should be evidence of evaluation and not just a description of benefits and problems. A few candidates tended to approach this as “all I know about dams”.

Question 2

a) Well done

b) Good understanding was shown in the majority of cases although there were descriptive answers that did not focus on the stream responses of the hydrograph.

c) Many candidates who responded well to parts (a) and (b) did badly on part (c). Too many named a country but not an actual named river flood event (which needed to be located and dated). A few used outdated case studies. Bangladesh was a commonly used case study, but in many cases there was no mention of the name of the river. Some attempted to look at relative importance of the natural and human causes but tended to be descriptive and answered in general terms concentrating on the effects not the causes. In these cases, human causes were poorly covered. Good responses could succinctly analyse the various factors that supported their stance and those that did well used a wide range of factors to support their conclusion.

Question 3

a) Generally there were few problems in finding two depositional landforms, however, map evidence was lacking and in many instances, grid references were given the wrong way round.

b) This question was well done with both conflicting countries and an oceanic resource identified. There were some very vague responses as to how the conflict was subsequently developed or managed.

c) Some very good and well exemplified answers given for this question. Fishing and sustainability are obviously being well taught in schools. Weaker candidates failed to address the part of the question “can never be sustainable”.

Question 4

a) and b) Most could define exclusive economic zone and describe continental shelf but seldom developed the answers in enough depth to warrant two marks for each.

c) Knowledge of the benefits of mangrove swamps was generally very good though distinction between environmental and economic value could have been made clearer in some cases.

d) This appeared to be a challenging question. In some cases, examples of coastal hazards were weak and in others answers were descriptive and failed to identify the actual conflict, stakeholders, and so on. Stronger candidates were able to examine two conflicts and two hazards with some effective use of examples.

Question 5

a) Few problems

b) A surprising number referred to climate factors; other answers tended to be descriptive and lacking in explanation. In most cases, a suitable example was given.

c) There was great difficulty with this part – contrasting erosional and depositional landforms/processes. Often, a very poor description of each and limited knowledge of landforms was common and even when knowledge was evident, no distinction between the processes was made.

Question 6

a) Definitions were often not developed adequately for two marks each.

b) Other factors that affect sustainability in extreme environments were not well understood. The key term here was “sustainability” which was often not addressed. Many responses were descriptive.

c) This question posed quite a challenged for some. The responses were often descriptive with little attention to the phrase “more opportunities”. The best answers used examples to demonstrate opportunities.

Question 7

a) Weak map skills were evident in part (a), including confused grid references.

b) Although candidates could partially explain vulnerability to the impacts of Hurricane Irene, they did not appear confident to use map evidence.

c) Strong candidates used a range of detailed accurate case studies and were able to demonstrate strong evaluation. There was an effective use of examples and many sought to challenge the statement. Unfortunately some case studies were vague, for example, the earthquake in Japan, and several considered **only** the level of economic development with the necessary balance missing. A superficial acceptance of economic development as main factor was quite frequently seen.

Question 8

a) Describing risk and vulnerability was done reasonably but often with no development or explanation to be awarded two marks.

b) Although building design was covered, most did not refer to *land-use* planning, and discussed planning in general, such as level of preparedness. Weaker candidates did not appear to know any actual strategies beyond ‘strong buildings’.

c) Speed of onset was generally understood but responses that only used two hazards of similar speed of onset were self-limiting. Exemplification was necessary. The best looked at a comparison between hurricanes and earthquakes and also included drought before coming to a conclusion, and demonstrated strong evaluation. Weaker responses had poor use of examples and misinterpreted the term 'speed of onset' to mean 'duration' or used examples where comparative speeds were not explicit. It was interesting to find responses that compared volcanic eruptions and earthquakes since only one of these tectonic hazards needs to be taught, not both. A few used floods.

Question 9

a) No problem with defining leisure and tourism (although "away from home for at least one night" was needed for tourism)

b) Understood and a straightforward question

c) Environmental damage being minimized in one named city/large town seemed an easy question, but too often countries or purely rural areas were used or the action seemed to be more aimed at residents than tourists. The use of Venice was a good example that answered the question.

d) A logical question that was well attempted showing accurate knowledge and understanding. Evaluation was particularly strong here. Weaker candidates tended to veer away from economic development and describe all they knew about tourism in a specified country.

Question 10

a) Many candidates identified individual sports rather than stadiums.

b) There was limited understanding of hierarchy shown and reference to the given maps was limited.

c) Some knowledge was shown but answers were not developed enough to gain the second mark.

d) There were only a few good evaluative answers and the general trend was to not discuss all three elements (leisure, sports and tourism). The Olympics tended to be the major focus for many, thereby not discussing the statement more broadly.

Question 11

a) i) Although B was the correct answer, A was acceptable if justified.

ii) This was not understood and in many cases, the same comments as for part (i) were reiterated. Only a very small minority realized that due to the given figures diabetes was the correct answer. Many could not refer to the graph correctly.

b) Most could distinguish between diseases of affluence and poverty, but were weak on factors such as geographical distribution or how diseases are acquired/transmitted. Some good case study knowledge was shown.

c) This question elicited some excellent responses, with good knowledge and understanding shown of a specific famine. Weaker ones only referred to crop failure and the weakest seemed unsure about what this actually was. Cases of a recent famine were often generalized to a country name or region of Africa with no date.

Question 12

a) Generally sound

b) Graph generally understood with comments about relative inputs/outputs, with quantification, between China and Japan. However the reasons/implications of the differences were not done well and not developed.

c) This was done reasonably well and many gained full marks.

d) Some very good responses, with good understanding and high quality discussions of the differences and limitations of food aid and free trade. Weaker answers tended to focus only one aspect and did not discuss the statement. There was also some confusion over free trade and fair trade and generally the limitations of food aid were better addressed than those of free trade.

Question 13

a) No problems

b) i) Well answered

ii) Not really understood and very generalized. Few could explain how this affected the footprint.

c) The understanding of the urban heat island effect was often weak – human activities were named but processes not clear. Reasons for heat island often confused with global warming.

d) This produced some answers that had good knowledge of urban land use but these were often descriptive and failed to focus on change. There tended to be a lack of focus on changing location with poor use of examples. Overall this was not well done with many making occasional good reference to retailing but largely shifting focus on CBD core resulting in a very narrow interpretation.

Question 14

a) This was almost universally answered correctly.

b) This was straightforward but some candidates focused on percentage growth rather than distribution. Most were able to identify patterns rather than merely make lists.

c) This was often answered well but weaker candidates chose to write overly long answers about why certain countries had high fertility rates without focusing on the question or referred to either natural increase or migration, but seldom both. Some responses focused on countries, rather than cities.

d) In this question there were many good responses that did attempt to discuss the question. Some detailed case studies were used, mostly Curitiba. The weakest answers did not grasp the meaning of sustainability or could suggest few strategies and wrote largely descriptive accounts without adequately comparing cities.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Ensure candidates understand command terms especially the AO3 terms such as “evaluate”. Most 10-mark questions require some form of evaluation – candidates should make this explicit within a separate concluding paragraph, if necessary referring back to the question. Candidates should be prepared to argue a point.

- The longer answers gaining the higher markbands should be more discursive – candidates should avoid simply agreeing or disagreeing with discussion statements.

- Encourage candidates to read each question several times before beginning their answer and ensure that the question asked is the one answered: for example, urban areas compared to countries. One of the most common problems was that answers were too descriptive, did not address the question, or wandered off the point.

- Candidates need to be familiar with geographical terminology.

- Encourage candidates to feel confident to use diagrams in their answers, even when not specifically requested in the question. These should be clear and well labelled.

- Make sure that examples are incorporated into their answers, even when not specifically demanded in the wording of a particular question. The use of one or two detailed examples or relevant case studies can often provide the framework for a really strong answer.

- Make sure all case studies are ‘recent’.

- Study all areas of the syllabus.

- Understand the importance of good examination technique. If a question asks for two reasons, or the marks available indicate 2 + 2, or 3 + 3 for example, then two clear, well-outlined and well-illustrated reasons should be given in order to obtain maximum marks.

- Make sure that definitions identified in the syllabus are learnt – many lost marks due to poor or incorrect definitions.

- Improve map-reading skills (especially grid references and use of scale and direction). It is worth emphasizing that a map question may appear with any option on the syllabus.

- Practise use and interpretation of a wide range of resources: for example, graphs; tables.

- Encourage greater awareness of current issues, for example, geopolitical issues, not just those related to coastal hazards.

Higher level paper three

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	13 - 15	16 – 17	18 - 20	21 - 25

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

As in previous years, there was a tendency amongst many mid-ability candidates to fail to distinguish between the very broad concepts of globalization / global interactions and more narrowly defined concepts such as 'financial flows' or 'shrinking world'. As a result, their essays were uneven and variable in focus. Lack of familiarity with important terms and phrases used in the subject guide was a frequent reason for under-performance. For instance, some answers to question 1a were focused on migration and tourism (which, while giving rise to financial flows, are not financial flows themselves).

The term 'international organization' was sometimes weakly understood.

Many candidates failed to make use of the key geographical concept of *scale*. They did not really differentiate between the local, national and global level when asked about, say, the consequences of the relocation of polluting industries. To do so was not a strict requirement; however, an appreciation of the importance of scale is always likely to lift a candidate's mark when evaluating the veracity of a discussion statement.

More widely, what constitutes a *proper* evaluation continues to be a stumbling block for some candidates. Good levels of synthesis and use of evidence were often witnessed; but fewer candidates could present a substantiated (evidence-based) evaluation. Instead, the majority were unable to end their essays with anything other than a simplistic or unsubstantiated finishing statement.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

Ideas about consumerism and culture were well understood and often carefully exemplified. Glocalization was analysed with the use of detailed examples.

Most candidates wrote confidently and knowledgeably about certain aspects of the geography of transnational manufacturing and services. Many candidates showed understanding of a range of ways in which TNCs build their global businesses. The advantages and disadvantages for poorer countries were widely appreciated.

Large numbers of candidates demonstrated synthesis that was, at times, quite sophisticated. Mid-ability candidates used their time well to provide a sensibly balanced account when tackling the discursive

statement. This is a strategy that helps ensure a strong mark overall even when the final evaluation remains weak, or lacking.

An appropriate balance was usually seen between part (a) and part (b) responses in terms of the time allocated by candidates for writing.

Some excellent, relevant, annotated diagrams, sketches and maps were seen. These should be encouraged as they can be used to illustrate many points succinctly.

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

Question 1

a) Most candidates who attempted this question knew exactly what to talk about, usually focusing on remittances and foreign direct investment (FDI) and often providing accurate and relevant data as support. Better answers were either more thorough (additionally explaining the operation of aid and loans) or more thoughtful (stressing the bi-directional nature of flows between places). Diagrams were effectively used in some cases, visualizing the bi-directional flows between core and peripheral regions. Too often, however, candidates' fixation on 'LEDCs and MEDCs' closed down the discussion rather than opening it up. Too many missed the opportunity to look at transfers between BRIC nations and poorer African states (aid, FDI and remittances all figure here) or to look at the huge financial flows that *link developed countries with other developed countries* (such as 'north-north' (rather than 'north-south') FDI flows, including acquisitions and branch plants, for EU, US and Japanese TNCs).

b) Most candidates grasped that this was a 'synthetic' essay title that invited some comparison of glocalization with other factors influencing TNC growth. The other factors most frequently discussed were technology (time–space compression) and (less commonly) the growth of trade blocs / multi-governmental organizations. Quite a few took the viewpoint that globalization was more important to some TNCs than glocalization. They argued that some TNCs have built global brands through advertising and that these self-same brands are desired – globally – in their *unadulterated*, original form. This was an intelligent line of inquiry to take that also justified some synthetic exploration of the concept of cultural imperialism. The very best answers were explicit in their recognition that not all TNCs need to glocalize to the same extent (compare retailers with oil companies, for instance).

   Alternatively, some high-scoring candidates were more considered in their explanation of what glocalization practically entails. As a corporate practice, it may involve building local supply chains, gaining consent from consumers and actually being able to gain entry to protected markets. In India, glocalization is an economic, cultural and political strategy for McDonald's: ingredients need to be locally sourced, local customs and religion must be catered for, and India's strict rules about foreign ownership must be obeyed (though the stance has softened recently). With regard to this latter point, almost every candidate used McDonald's in India as an example. Not one, however, was apparently aware that it takes the form of a *joint venture* with a local,

Indian business, hence the success of the expertly glocalized Indian menu. This fact in itself provides excellent scope for evaluation of the essay title. Weak answers sometimes got weighed down in descriptive detail (providing multiple examples of McDonald's, Kit-Kat, Wal-Mart, and so on, but failing to advance further advance in terms of meeting other assessment objectives). Others failed to do more than agree that glocalization is a very good strategy to use indeed.

Question 2

a) This topic had clearly been well taught in many centres, often using e-waste in Ghana as an example. The majority of candidates followed procedures well and provided a balanced response that could explain both causes and consequences in a fairly balanced way. Inevitably, weaker or less well-revised candidates got some of their example details wrong (several argued wrongly that Trafigura had polluted Nigeria, rather than Ivory Coast) or omitted factual evidence altogether. Instead, they merely asserted that pollution causes soil erosion, deforestation and 'toxic' problems in all of the (unspecified) destination countries. Weaker candidates were more likely to link waste movements with global warming rather than investigate the local impacts of waste *in situ*. Good answers frequently incorporated both lines of argument.

The best answers showed some understanding of how such movements of waste are linked with a bigger picture of global interactions. They comprehended that waste is a valuable resource for many countries, especially emerging economies, including China. A few even provided a distinction between the human impacts of un-regulated waste disposal in peripheral countries such as Ghana (involving child labour) and waste recycling in increasingly regulated and higher wage economies such as China (not involving child labour).

b) A lot of mediocre answers were seen here, with few that excelled but also relatively few that had little of value to say. Good answers were clearly focused on the impacts of technology and transport, rather than global interactions *per se* (a different essay question); they also gave consideration to different categories of 'benefit' (incomes, entertainment, familial contact) and questioned the scale of the statement ('all societies' is very broad and some comment might be expected on the applicability of the statement at a national or local level). Weaker answers typically discussed too wide a range of ideas (for instance, by discussing the benefits of the green revolution) and lacked a clear focus on the shrinking world, expressly understood as a reduction in travel times and faster flows of information. Weaker answers were also excessively generalized to the point of becoming plain incorrect. The statement 'MEDCs benefit and LEDCs do not' has no currency whatsoever in a world where more than half of all Africans now own a mobile phone.

Question 3

a) Answers were generally very good, reflecting the fact that only a minority of mostly able candidates attempted this question. As expected, the strengths of the chosen index were shown to be largely self-evident: the use of a multi-strand index is a sensible way to try to generate valid data when measuring a complex concept such as globalization or development. Candidates were generally able to point to some significant weaknesses such as the arguably Eurocentric choice of criteria or flawed assumptions underlying the inclusion of some elements, such as book exports, as a proxy for social globalization. Few were side-tracked into describing the scores of

different countries, reflecting (again) the relative strength of those candidates that chose question three.

b) This was a challenging question, given that some discussion was required of three scales of global interaction. Moreover, different types of global interaction could be discussed in each of the three cases. Popular themes included the English Defence League, Australian immigration policies, Greenpeace lobbying and local food movements. For most candidates there was no problem encountered in selecting content for discussion either at different scales, or according to positive and negative viewpoints. The problem lay in arriving at a meaningful conclusion that did more than repeat what had already been said, or could do more than say 'response are therefore mixed at all scales.' One very good candidate did progress further, however, and concluded that: 'at various scales, migration increasingly meets with resistance, challenging the view we are moving towards a borderless world. Even EU states are re-considering whether they want free movement. However, flows of investment, and the jobs they bring, tend to be welcomed, by local communities, national governments and the IMF.' Distinguishing between different types of global interaction was a good strategy to reach an interesting, nuanced conclusion for this candidate.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In making future teaching recommendations, we can distinguish between the delivery and acquisition of (i) geographical subject knowledge and (ii) the procedural knowledge candidates need to succeed in the examination.

Recommendations for future delivery of guide content (geographical subject knowledge)

- Section 3 of the guide – especially 'financial flows' – should be covered thoroughly. Too many candidates can only offer vague comments about transfers of money other than remittances. The variety of different forms of FDI is particularly poorly understood. It is perhaps a challenge to make this part of the syllabus interesting to candidates. However, once grasped, the ideas link in a range of important ways with many other elements of the programme. After all, 'money makes the world go around', as the saying goes.

- All candidates ought to know a detailed located example of a polluting industry that has relocated to a poorer country.

- Examples of TNCs other than McDonald's would be a useful addition to many candidates' stores of knowledge. An Indian telecoms company investing in Africa might provide a useful contrast, for example.

- It is important that the candidates learn the course as a holistic unit where they can connect all the topics and establish as many links as possible within the extension (and also with the core and when possible with the options).

Recommendations for helping candidates gain procedural knowledge (essay writing)

- Candidates should be trained in how to use evidence and examples and to avoid simplistic generalizations or personal opinions, especially in the evaluation sections of their essays.

- Teachers might provide more opportunities for classes to work collaboratively to 'un-pack' part (b) questions as conceptual statements. Ability to do this, and plan content around it, is important.