

November 2014 subject reports

GEOGRAPHY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 13	14 - 28	29 - 42	43 - 53	54 - 64	65 - 75	76 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 14	15 - 28	29 - 41	42 - 53	54 - 64	65 - 76	77 - 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

Candidates presented some very sophisticated projects and the overall standard of fieldwork was quite impressive. The strongest investigations all had a clear spatial component.

As in previous sessions, common topics for fieldwork included: earthquake hazard perception; microclimates; coasts; rivers; glacial environments; urban; and leisure and tourism (all included in the part two options) as well as patterns in environmental quality and sustainability (part one, core theme topic 3). Fieldwork based on other sections of part one, or on part three, often failed to meet the same high standards.

Some reports were not sufficiently geographical. Examples of non-geographical fieldwork included the non-spatial investigation of gender differences related to topics such as choice of career, and studies that relied too heavily on historical rather than geographical (spatial) data. Candidates in such centres did not score well in their internal assessment (IA).

Almost all centres collected sufficient primary data, though the quality of data could sometimes be improved. On the other hand, examples of “fieldwork” that did not meet the IB requirements (because it does not count as primary information) included the use of data from social media such as Facebook, and data collected from the Internet and World Wide Web. Reports deemed to contain no primary information (as defined in the syllabus) usually score zero for all criteria except D (written analysis) and G (presentation), though some non-fieldwork reports may also receive partial credit for criteria A and B.

It is clear that some topics are more suitable than others, depending on the location of the fieldwork study and ease of access by the candidates. Fieldwork must be planned with care. Pilot studies may be helpful in order to ensure that sufficient primary data of good quality can be collected in the time and locations available.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Most candidates followed the recommended format of presenting the fieldwork report. A few candidates did not integrate Criteria C and D, or exceeded the word count.

Criterion A – Fieldwork question and geographic context

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

In order to access the higher marks for this criterion, candidates need to state clearly the section of the syllabus to which their fieldwork question relates.

The best projects had tightly focused fieldwork questions. In the best examples, a good theoretical framework for the study was offered near the start. Geographical context and theory must be applied to the localized fieldwork study area, and not just repeated verbatim from a text book.

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, often led to poorly developed reports.

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

Maps varied greatly in quality. Downloaded, unannotated maps are of little value. Good maps will show specific features pertinent to the particular study.

Internet images other than maps may provide a suitable base for information such as study areas, sample points and other relevant geographical facts, such as direction of river flow, prevailing winds, or location of PLVI (peak land value intersection) in urban studies. Conventions such as the inclusion of a key, scale and north arrow on maps, must be observed. Also, it is poor geography to attach a “not to scale” label to any map.

The source of all non-original material (including base maps) must be given. Note that this requirement also applies to any photos. The source should be placed as near as possible to the photo, diagram or map, and a list of all sources should be given in the bibliography. Where fieldwork has been done on a group basis, any shared photographs should be credited to the original photographer. Any and all annotations to photographs must be the individual work of each candidate.

Criterion B – Method(s) of investigation

The group collection of data in many centres showed evidence of good cooperation. In most cases, methods were described, adequately justified, and likely to yield sufficient data of good quality to enable adequate interpretation and analysis.

Whenever empirical measurements are taken (for example of the orientation of the long axis of pebbles on a beach), candidates should state a clear purpose and justification for the procedure used.

Weaker candidates tended not to provide any justification and also failed to explain the sampling methods used in data collection. Many reports would be improved if candidates explained the details of how the sample size and locations were determined, including the selection method employed.

In cases where questionnaires are used, the methods section should include 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 appendices.

The use of annotated photographs showing methods can be helpful but the excessive use of tables (presumably in an attempt to circumvent word count restrictions) is not acceptable.

Criterion C – Quality and treatment of information collected

A very wide range of maps, graphs, diagrams, photographs and other illustrations was seen. In weaker reports, the range of graphical techniques was very narrow and

there was often a tendency to ignore units or fail to present meaningful keys and titles.

The best reports included some truly outstanding techniques of data treatment and display, such as isopleth and choropleth maps of spatial trends and patterns, which easily exceeded the demands of the top markband for this criterion.

The use of annotated photographs and other diagrams (kite, rose, isopleths, and choropleths) is to be applauded. Accurate statistical and relevant tests with knowledge of significance were presented in many very good projects.

Many reports used statistical methods such as Spearman's Rank Correlation and Chi-squared. In most cases, the choice of test was appropriate, and the calculations had been performed with accuracy. Statistical tests should not be used when the sample size is insufficient. It is important that candidates check the statistical significance of their findings; too many candidates failed to do this, or did so incorrectly.

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

There were several cases (usually weaker candidates) where multiple pages of very similar graphs were included. These represented a significant amount of work but led to little extra value in terms of analysis. The use of spatial data presentation should be stressed, not only because it is better, but also because it is more succinct and would save time and space for candidates.

Criterion D – Written analysis

A small number of candidates failed to integrate criteria C and D, offering instead two entirely separate sections. It is a requirement of the IA that criteria C and D be combined into a single, unified, coherent section.

A small number of candidates mistakenly presented significant data/information in an appendix instead of in the main body of their fieldwork report.

The quality of written analysis varied from superficial (markband 3–4) to very detailed (markband 9–10). Better candidates wrote perceptive analyses, including valid explanations, and quickly reached the top mark descriptors. They referred confidently to findings in accompanying graphs and figures. Trends, spatial patterns and any anomalies found were identified, linked and discussed. Many top range samples used statistical testing very effectively. In the best reports these discussions were associated closely to the specific fieldwork question and the established geographical theory and context.

Weaker candidates tended to resort to simplistic statements and descriptive summaries. In some cases, they presented pages and pages of raw data in rough

tables but made little reference to the material. In the worst cases, they largely ignored the data they had collected. In general, they relied too much on describing the data and paid insufficient attention to offering an objective scientific analysis of the primary data 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

Some candidates wrote conclusions that were overly brief. The conclusion offered by some of the weakest candidates showed little connection to their fieldwork findings. Weaker candidates also sometimes introduced new material into their conclusion, or included information which would have been better placed earlier, in their analysis.

The strongest conclusions referred back to the original fieldwork question and were fully consistent with the evidence, results and analysis.

Criterion F – Evaluation

It is important for candidates to evaluate their fieldwork methodology in terms of the equipment used, size and selection of sample, location and time of surveys, quality and quantity of data. Weaker projects tended to offer few or no appropriate recommendations for improvements or extensions.

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

Criterion G – Formal requirements

Almost all reports respected the 2,500-word limit, but it was disappointing that many candidates failed to gain full marks for this criterion. There are still too many reports which lack a final check and proofread.

Candidates should take care to ensure that the word count stated on the report's title page or cover is correct. It is helpful if word counts are provided for each sub-section. Relying on automated word counts may give higher totals than the true "IB count", since the latter excludes titles, labels (though not annotations) on diagrams, and so on.

Teachers are reminded of the need to check word counts carefully and to award zero marks for this criterion if the limit is exceeded. They are also reminded that any attempt to circumvent the word limit, such as by the excessive use of tables, should be actively discouraged.

Standards of presentation were improved, but some candidates still missed full marks on account of poor referencing or failure to number and integrate illustrative material appropriately within the text. The formal requirement that illustrative material be integrated into the text is meant to signpost the need for candidates to number (consecutively) all graphs, maps and photos, and then make clear reference in the main body of the report to these graphics by referring to their figure number or page number.

Some candidates included material in the appendices 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 appendices, which means that any diagrams or maps essential to the study must be included in the main body of the report.

The fieldwork reports of the very best candidates are invariably presented in an exemplary fashion.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Ten-point plan for candidates:

- Choose a tightly focused fieldwork question and, if relevant, a strictly limited number of hypotheses.
- Link the fieldwork question, which should have a spatial dimension, clearly with the syllabus.
- Personalize any downloaded maps to show the location, choice of topic and/or sample points, following standard geographic conventions such as including a scale and north arrow. Hand drawn (candidate-generated) maps with scale, orientation and relevant details are very useful.
- Justify (in detail) all the methods used and explain the sampling method(s) employed.
- Avoid using extensive tables in reports, especially in the sections for methods and evaluation.
- Incorporate a greater variety of appropriate graphical and mapping techniques in their analysis.
- Limit the application of statistical tests such as Spearman's Rank Correlation to situations where sufficient data has been collected.
- Focus in the analysis on interpreting (not just describing) results and explaining their findings, focusing on any spatial patterns or trends identified.
- Number and place all the illustrations appropriately within the text (not in an appendix), and then refer to them throughout the written analysis.

- Pay close attention to the assessment criteria and follow the recommended structure for fieldwork reports. This includes using any appendix appropriately. Appendices should contain only examples of materials that have been used (for example, data sheet, translation, questionnaire) but should not include every survey or questionnaire completed, or secondary information.

10-point plan for teachers:

- Introduce the geographic skills listed in the subject guide (pages 15–18) in the lead-up to undertaking IA fieldwork. Candidates need to be introduced to a wider range of graphical techniques and simple statistical tools. Fieldwork investigations really are better when a variety of techniques are used.
- Look at the feedback from moderators on previous performance and take particular note of the IA section in the subject report published after each examination session.
- Help candidates appreciate the distinctions between any key terms that are relevant to the fieldwork question.
- 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, placing particular emphasis on the level descriptors at the highest end of the mark range.
- Add comments to all reports explaining why particular marks have been awarded.
- In preparation for the electronic submission of IA reports, some consideration should be given to avoiding the use of oversize and non-standard diagrams in future fieldwork reports.

Further comments

The range of fieldwork topics was impressive, and the general standard of work seen at moderation was encouraging. Most candidates have acquired valuable knowledge and a sound understanding of basic fieldwork techniques and how to conduct geographic investigations.

All the teachers concerned in organizing IA fieldwork are to be commended for helping candidates undertake fieldwork and to further develop their candidates' skills in researching, processing and interpreting empirical data.

Fieldwork reports should be originals, not photocopies. Where candidates have used colour on maps and illustrations, the submission of black and white copies may hinder candidate achievement.

Form 3C/S should be used to provide general details of the fieldwork conducted. This is particularly important, for example, to describe situations where joint fieldwork was carried out with other IB centres.

Higher and standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 10	11 - 20	21 - 28	29 - 34	35 - 40	41 - 46	47 - 60

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

This paper covered many aspects of the course and no section appeared more difficult than another. The only areas that seemed to be more problematic than others in terms of knowledge and understanding were: debt relief and neo-Malthusian viewpoints.

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

Most had been well prepared and could apply their knowledge to the questions. Interpretation of data such as that from maps, graphs and tables was well handled, with patterns described and supported with quantification. Section B responses were characterized by well-structured, planned and exemplified essays with some thoughtful evaluation. The majority of candidates are reading the questions with care and understanding the command terms.

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 global pattern with emphasis on areas of birth control use with quantification and reference to anomalies. However, there were some responses that looked at the pattern with no quantification. There were also some responses that failed to look at the global pattern, leaving entire continents out of their description. The best responses were very specific in location with named countries or regions and made sound use of data from the key. Some candidates lost time in attempts to explain the pattern using terms such as “MEDC” and “LEDC”.
- (b) Most candidates were able to give two distinct and valid reasons but there were some repetitive and mirrored answers. In some cases the candidates did not demonstrate how the selected reasons could influence the choices or lack of choices of some type

of birth control. This was essential to get the second mark. Some weak answers were far too generalized and named examples tended to enrich responses.

- (c) There were some very good answers that examined the rollout of ARVs (antiretroviral therapies) in some Sub-Saharan African nations and the impact this has had on lowering the death rate. Other candidates were able to explain the importance of improvements in such things as: medical care; infrastructure; food security; diets; clean water and sanitation. Two distinct, valid reasons, with development and/or exemplification were required.

Question 2

- (a) (i) This was generally well answered and many candidates scored full marks if they also made use of the data in the graph to exemplify the relationship.
- (a) (ii) On the whole this was well answered although some candidates struggled, as it was obvious that they did not understand the term “informal employment”. There was a tendency for the second reason in the answer to mirror the first point, this reduced the marks awarded.
- (b) This was well answered at times with many responses explaining what debt relief is and how it can increase the amount of money available to a government to fund development projects. There were some good answers with reference to the HIPC (heavily indebted poor countries) initiative of the IMF and the World Bank. Weaker candidates struggled with a clear understanding of debt relief often confusing it with aid. There were a number of candidates who did not attempt this question at all.

Question 3

- (a) A relatively straightforward question, most candidates were able to give two valid descriptions with quantification/use of the data.
- (b) Again a very straightforward question where most candidates achieved the full marks. Some very good answers with clear valid choices often illustrated with accurate and specific geographical locations.
- (c) On the whole well answered, although some responses did not reflect the question posed and instead focused their answer on why we should maintain tropical rainforests as opposed to why we should maintain their biodiversity. This was self-limiting. On the whole most candidates demonstrated a solid knowledge and understanding of biodiversity and tropical rain forests.

Question 4

- (a) Few candidates struggled with the demands of this question. Most were able to give valid statements with effective use of quantification/data.

- (b) Most candidates were able to present more than one valid limitation with some development and/or exemplification. There was however some confusion between recycling and reuse.
- (c) Most candidates were able to give an explanation of Malthusian ideas but fewer noted the key word “neo-”. This was self-limiting. There was some sound knowledge and understanding of the “limits to growth” model and it was pleasing to see so many using annotated graphs to help their answer.

Section B

Question 5

This was a popular question and many responses had many case studies to draw upon. Many looked at rural to urban migration within a nation and China and Brazil were popular case studies. Good responses also gave a balanced view of the question, looking at the positive and negative outcomes of the migration in terms of how it reduced disparities. Developed answers covered most parts of the question, with both social and economic disparities exposed. The most accurate, specific, well-detailed answers demonstrated solid attempts at evaluation. Unfortunately there were a minority of responses that addressed international migration between countries and these were penalized, as this was not the question asked.

Question 6

This was also a popular question and many candidates approached this with a good knowledge and understanding of issues related to consumption and resource use. The best responses tended to look at a range of resources and ideas supported with evidence or actual case studies. Some responses neglected to use examples of places when discussing specific resources and this resulted in a very generic response, which was penalized by the markbands. Many responses also tended to limit themselves just to oil or energy resources, this was fine but the question was open to many other types of resources. Many candidates focused their discussions around the neo-Malthusian versus Boserup debate and examined the relationship between population size and resource consumption. The best answers had appropriate application and were developed to cover most aspects of the question. Good scripts demonstrated some evaluation of wasteful living and sustainability options.

Question 7

This was the least popular question. The best answers had knowledge and understanding of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in terms of their purpose. Often specific MDGs were highlighted with particular case study evidence. Most candidates recognized that, as countries move out of poverty, they will consume more energy but other MDGs require a change in attitude not just more energy. The top candidates gave detailed evaluation/application and were generally accurate with their understanding of the progress towards the goals. The greatest weakness in the

poor answers was a combination of lack of knowledge and understanding of the individual “goals” and a lack of case study material.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should continue to encourage the use of contemporary case studies and data. It is also helpful to encourage candidates to refer to the mark allocation in the short questions as many are writing well beyond what is needed to obtain full marks. This appears to impact on the time they then have for the extended writing needed in section B. Continue to encourage the use of diagrams if it helps the answer to a question.

Higher and standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Higher Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 14	15 - 22	23 - 28	29 - 35	36 - 41	42 - 60

Standard Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 19	20 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 40

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

A small minority answered more than the required number of questions. A worry is that a few candidates write an answer to a question, cross it out and then answer the other question in that option.

Knowledge of physical processes is often very weak, as shown in the options oceans and their coastal margins, and extreme environments.

Some geographical terms appear to be a problem. For example, aquaculture, desertification, drought, vulnerability, land-use planning, catchment area, gentrification, in-migration, counter-urbanization, squatter settlements.

The ability to describe features shown in a photograph was weak.

The ability to discuss and evaluate a question is often weak. Candidates should be able to consider both sides of an argument and go beyond a simple descriptive regurgitation of facts.

Candidates are not reading the questions carefully and are ignoring the significance of command terms. As a result some responses did not answer the question or contained information that was superficial.

In part (b) of each question rarely did candidates score the full marks because either they did not use examples to support or did not give explanations and develop an answer.

There were many incidences of inappropriate case studies and examples or appropriate ones that lacked the detail required to answer a specific question and illustrate a point.

There seems to be a difficulty in differentiating between the terms *pattern* and *trend*. In fact they tend to be used interchangeably.

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

There was a pleasing improvement in map-reading skills.

There was an improvement in quality and variety of diagrams and sketch maps being presented by candidates to support the written material of their answer.

A large number of candidates were able to correlate the marks awarded for a question with the length of answer and depth required.

Case studies were generally relevant, up-to-date and used appropriately with comprehensive detail.

Many candidates started their response to the 10-mark question with an introduction that defined the terms used in the question and although not essential it is good practice as it demonstrates understanding of the question and leads to the development of a fluent structure.

Most appear to have a good basic geographical knowledge with clear and accurate understanding shown.

There were some excellent comprehensive responses with evidence of critical thinking, evaluation and a reasoned conclusion.

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

Question 1

- (a) (i/ii) No problems encountered.
- (b) These had to be natural and surface, for example, lakes, springs. Too many candidates named oceans, aquifers, reservoirs and were therefore unable to identify a second type of freshwater.
- (c) Generally done well although the explanations were sometimes very descriptive rather than backing up the consequence.
- (d) There were some very good answers showing that hydrographs and the factors affecting their characteristics are being well taught. There were some good annotated diagrams and terminology was clear. The main weakness was not considering the relative importance of the factors. However, many wrote generalized answers on rivers and showed no understanding of the term hydrographs.

Question 2

- (a) Although many were able to recognize discernible features, for example, braided river channel, meanders, delta, very few were able to relate the features to the photograph, or identified features that were not present, such as ox-bow lakes.
- (b) Generally done well with valid modifications.
- (c) Wetlands are obviously being studied comprehensively, with the Kissimee and the Murray Basin being the most commonly read case studies. However, at least two strategies had to be discussed in order to reach the higher markbands. A number of responses could not elaborate on the strengths and weaknesses of the strategies adopted.

Question 3

- (a) (i) Correct locations were described.
 - (ii) Dead zones could be attributed to toxicity/mortality but few were able to link this to the wider implication of affecting the food chain.
- (b) Both parts to this were generally done well, with some excellent supporting diagrams, referring to an example. A concerning number of candidates were unable to identify and explain either an erosional or a depositional coastal landform; consideration of processes was often weak.
- (c) A straightforward question that was reasonably well answered. Most were able to describe management strategies and comment on their effectiveness. Again, the best responses included an annotated sketch map, and there were some good examples from the Australian coastline.

Question 4

- (a) Both parts were understood.
- (b) Stores and sources were attempted but were rather descriptive and were often more guess work than knowledge.
- (c) There were some excellent responses on overfishing causes/solutions with valid examples. However, the majority did not understand the term aquaculture. It was either ignored or attributed to establishing quotas, for example. The better candidates were able to discuss the relative merits of preventing overfishing and promoting aquaculture, with some good discussion of advantages and disadvantages of both strategies.

Question 5

- (a) Very few could accurately identify the landform or explain its formation. Only some were able to show basic knowledge of processes.

- (b) Straightforward but too many gave generic environmental impacts and did not refer to a named extreme environment.
- (c) Many seemed to look at the challenges for living in periglacial/arid areas and did not relate it to mineral extraction. In some no actual mineral was mentioned. The better responses were able to describe some of the challenges, but few offered a contrast between the different environments.

Question 6

- (a) Candidates had few problems in interpreting the given graph for parts (a)(i/ii) but in part (iii) there was often no link to explain why another climatic characteristic made it extreme for the environment or people.
- (b) Adaptation to weather extremes was answered adequately but linking it to the extreme weather in seasons was not done well, often being descriptive and lacking in detail.
- (c) There seemed to be few problems describing desertification and the problems for agriculture, albeit very superficially, but very few looked at any other environmental threats to agriculture risk, for example, salinization. Whether or not desertification is the main environmental risk was often ignored.

Question 7

- (a) There were some very good responses showing the numerous trends on the graph. However, some identified patterns rather than trends.
- (b) Drought was generally misunderstood, with many simply stating that it was a period of low rainfall. Causes seemed to be for arid regions rather than for specific drought events. There were, however, some good answers referring to recent drought in Australia and its physical and human causes.
- (c) This was done well with some comprehensive responses including good contrasting case studies. Weaknesses included not applying the answer to a range of hazards or writing at length about other factors.

Question 8

- (a) Many misunderstood the concept of land-use planning and there were some elaborate answers about building design. Floodplains were frequently used and although not part of the hazards option in the syllabus these were credited.
- (b) No problems found although a few found it hard to explain with sufficient depth as to why the people tolerated the risk.
- (c) This seemingly straightforward question proved a challenge. Most were able to discuss the predictability (or otherwise) of hazard events, but were often unable to consider that of disasters. There were many descriptive accounts of hazard events in

LEDCs and MEDCs, which often did not relate to the question. A worrying number of candidates believe that earthquakes are predictable as to timing and strength.

Question 9

- (a) Good answers with most able to outline primary and secondary tourist resources.
- (b) Most were aware of the basic reasons, but too many did not provide examples as required and therefore did not score the second mark in each of the three reasons.
- (c) There were a few well-considered and exemplified answers to this question, with good evaluation. However, the majority of responses were rather weak. The problem was that many candidates had an imperfect idea of the concept of ecotourism; many merely equated it with environmental protection, ignoring social and economic issues. Many answers were descriptive, and relatively few considered the advantages and disadvantages. Disadvantages were particularly not well known and tended to focus on tourism generally.

Question 10

- (a) It was pleasing to see that most candidates could locate a place on a map by the use of grid references (although they were sometimes expressed the wrong way round).
- (b) Poorly attempted with the shape of the catchment area being misunderstood to mean the shape of the stadium.
- (c) Well answered with some sound supporting case studies. The London Olympics of 2012 continued to be the location of choice. It was disappointing to see very out-dated examples, for example, Atlanta or Barcelona Olympics, still being used. There were some very good responses based on local examples that candidates were clearly able to relate to.

Question 11

- (a) Overall well answered.
- (b) Most candidates were able to cite three reasons for increased life expectancy, but these sometimes included improved health programmes. Some did not score full marks as they did not provide named regions.
- (c) This question was generally poorly answered, with little idea of the role of TNCs and agribusinesses in food production/availability, and limited understanding of the question. The weakest answers discussed the merits of Starbucks and McDonald's. A few good responses looked at the role of TNCs in production, distribution and marketing/retail.

Question 12

- (a) Many did not understand the term physical factors and cited human factors.
- (b) This was straightforward.
- (c) Management strategies were identified but further description and explanation were, at times, not fully supported. Unfortunately the use of Ebola in responses was not acceptable for this question as it is not water-borne or vector-borne.
- (d) There were some very good answers to this question; a range of diseases were considered (including the recent Ebola outbreak in Africa) and many were able to discuss the relative merits of prevention and treatment.

Question 13

- (a) Good understanding was shown on the characteristics of a CBD.
- (b) Surprisingly only a few candidates could explain the processes of gentrification and counter-urbanization adequately to cover all the main points.
- (c) This question elicited some very weak responses. Most candidates could name two areas correctly but could not do justice to contrasting the causes and effects of air pollution. There were some general statements regarding air pollution but specific details were missing.

Question 14

- (a) This was often not well done. It appeared candidates are not clear about the difference between pattern and trend.
- (b) Factors influencing location of squatter settlements were satisfactory but development or exemplification was less so. Some confused the term with squatting in disused buildings.
- (c) This caused difficulty for candidates as very few fully understood the question. The question was about controlling in-migration and not about controlling the effects of rapid city growth. The example of Curitiba was used, inappropriately, to show how rapid city growth could be managed in a sustainable manner. Others used migration controls into specific countries.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Continue to practise map skills, especially the use of grid references.
- Ensure that candidates know the precise definitions and terms from the IB geography guide, not the ones from supporting textbooks, as valuable marks can be lost through imperfect definitions.

- Ensure that candidates have relevant and up-to-date case studies and examples. Local examples are often better than dated examples taken from a textbook.
- Examples/case studies are needed for the 10-mark questions in order to enforce the concept or idea. This is always the case, even when examples are not actually asked for in the question.
- Candidates must read the questions carefully in the reading time, concentrating on the command words to plan how the answer is to be structured.
- Encourage the use of well-labelled sketch maps and diagrams, as they often enhance an answer.
- Encourage candidates to discuss, compare and contrast statements in a question, rather than being merely descriptive.
- Practice improving the 10-mark questions to include evaluation, a conclusion and more than one point of view (if applicable).
- Candidates should be clear on the number of questions to be answered.
- Emphasize that if the candidates give more points or examples than are asked for, only the number indicated in the question will be marked, even if the extra ones are correct.
- Writing in a pale blue pen does not lead to clear scanning and may be disadvantageous. Similarly, poor handwriting makes examining difficult.

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 candidates to fail to distinguish between what the question was actually asking about (“sociocultural interactions” or “barriers to global interactions” in this session, for instance) and more general ideas about “globalization”. Thus, some essays presented a pre-learned series of case studies that only fitted very loosely with the actual task that had been set for them.
- Some candidates, while grasping the need for synthetic writing, failed to use the examination time wisely, and struggled to present a balanced discussion showing two sides to the argument, in those questions requiring such an approach (1b and 3b).
- The exact role and purpose of multi-governmental organizations (MGOs) was a challenge for some candidates, despite the fact that most will have studied for their IB exams in a country that belongs to an MGO, such as the EU or NAFTA. A minority failed to write about an MGO in 1a and instead analysed the influence of a transnational corporation, for which only very limited skills credit (AO4) could be awarded.
- Important words or phrases from some questions were largely side-stepped by all but the best candidates, the most notable omissions being “pattern” (2b) and “rising global demand” (3a).

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

- Candidates wrote in an informed and confident way about ICT.
- Candidates demonstrated that they understood some of the complex ways in which cultural exchanges and interactions are played out in the twenty-first century; some excellent answers to 2b were seen.
- An appropriate balance was usually seen between part (a) and part (b) responses in terms of the time spent writing.

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

Question 1

- (a) Some excellent answers were seen that addressed “influence” in multiple ways. Trade, geopolitics and migration were common themes that candidates using the EU or NAFTA explored. These were far and away the most popular examples, although a small minority wrote about Mercosur. Middle-ability candidates were sometimes shaky on important details, such as the number of EU member states.
- (b) Well-informed and well-revised candidates were likely to attain band D, as this was achievable by synthesizing a series of “positive” and “negative” case studies of almost any variety and concluding that global interactions have brought “mixed” results. Far fewer candidates displayed the ability to produce a nuanced evaluation of the statement that was more sensitive to the concepts of geographical place and scale. Where band E marks were awarded, candidates had generally progressed beyond a mere “costs and benefits” approach and were able to focus on the veracity of the statement that every part of the world is adversely affected by global interactions. They debated explicitly whether effects such as the spread of English language, or diffusion of plastic pollution in the oceans, are truly globalized phenomena or not.

Question 2

- (a) Those that attempted this question generally knew something about call centres in India, or the uptake of mobile phones in Kenya. The best answers addressed the stem phrase “growth trends” and understood that supporting data would, logically, gain more marks. Weaker answers tended to assert that “high” and “low” use of ICT could be seen in different countries around the world, due to disparities in economic development.
- (b) Some excellent answers were seen, when judged against their knowledge of different processes of sociocultural interactions, such as assimilation, glocalization or hybridization. Lively and informative supporting examples were provided, and centres are encouraged to suggest to candidates that they research local examples, rather than rely purely on textbook case studies of McDonald’s. Fewer candidates engaged quite as well with the word “pattern” which often resulted in a band D, rather than band E, mark being awarded. Interrelationships were sometimes hinted at but not fully explored (such as the tendency of Hollywood to increasingly adopt Indian, South Korean or Japanese tropes, for instance).

Question 3

- (a) Many mediocre responses were seen. Some very generalized impacts were described, with many candidates offering little beyond “pollution” or “global warming”. Also, the phrase “rising global demand” was glossed over in most cases, with candidates simply asserting that more oil or timber (the most popular choices) is needed today than in the past. Few could link the rising demand with important global

development such as the rise of consumption in emerging economies. Higher level diploma geography candidates really ought to be in possession of supporting data in relation to the changing global pattern of wealth. One good starting point for updating content, already mentioned in a previous subject report for this paper, is this recent McKinsey report:

http://www.mckinsey.com/insights/consumer_and_retail/capturing_the_worlds_emerging_middle_class

- (b) A pleasing number of candidates who chose this question were able to offer a proper evaluation that gave nuanced consideration to what is meant by a “barrier” (poverty, languages, and political obstacles were all possibilities). Many grasped the paradox that trade blocs simultaneously increase and decrease barriers (according to who is a member of the bloc, and who is not).

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.

It is important that candidates are helped to gain an improved:

- understanding of contemporary shifts in wealth distribution
- understanding of (and ability to explain) why landscapes are changing
- ability to explicitly link specific global interactions with incidents of environmental harm
- grasp of geopolitics and what the concept of “sovereignty” means.

The global interactions studied are extremely dynamic, and change is occurring rapidly. This makes the subject potentially very exciting, but candidates do need to stay abreast of current affairs and not rely only on standard texts written around 2009–10. The use of news items pertinent to the course should be integrated into teaching wherever possible (for example, in 2014, China became the world’s largest economy and strong opposition to “Western” values and culture were evidenced in several parts of the world, including Nigeria and parts of the Middle East).