



ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2015

Geography

Assessment Unit A2 1

assessing

Human Interactions and Global Issues

[AG211]

TUESDAY 12 MAY, MORNING

MARK SCHEME

MARK SCHEMES

Foreword

Introduction

Mark Schemes are published to assist teachers and students in the preparation for examinations. Through the mark schemes teachers and students will be able to see what examiners are looking for in response to questions and exactly where the marks have been awarded. The publishing of the mark schemes may help to show that examiners are not concerned about finding out what a student does not know but rather with rewarding students for what they do know.

The Purpose of Mark Schemes

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of 16- and 18-year-old students in schools and colleges. The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

The questions and mark schemes are developed in association with each other so that the issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed right from the start. Mark schemes therefore are regarded as a part of an integral process which begins with the setting of questions and ends with the marking of the examination.

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to provide a uniform basis for the marking process so that all markers are following exactly the same instructions and making the same judgements in so far as this is possible. Before marking begins a standardising meeting is held where all the markers are briefed using the mark scheme and samples of the students' work in the form of scripts. Consideration is also given at this stage to any comments on the operational papers received from teachers and their organisations. During this meeting, and up to and including the end of the marking, there is provision for amendments to be made to the mark scheme. What is published represents this final form of the mark scheme.

It is important to recognise that in some cases there may well be other correct responses which are equally acceptable to those published: the mark scheme can only cover those responses which emerged in the examination. There may also be instances where certain judgements may have to be left to the experience of the examiner, for example, where there is no absolute correct response – all teachers will be familiar with making such judgements.

The Council hopes that the mark schemes will be viewed and used in a constructive way as a further support to the teaching and learning processes.

Introductory Remarks

The assessment objectives (AOs) for this specification are listed below. Students must:

- AO1 demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the content, concepts and processes;
- AO2 analyse, interpret and evaluate geographical information, issues and viewpoints and apply understanding in unfamiliar contexts;
- AO3 select and use a variety of methods, skills and techniques (including the use of new technologies) to investigate questions and issues, reach conclusions and communicate findings.

General Instructions for Markers

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to provide a uniform basis for the marking process so that all markers are following exactly the same instructions and making the same judgements so far as this is possible. Markers must apply the mark scheme in a consistent manner and to the standard agreed at the standardising meeting.

It is important to recognise that in some cases there may be other correct responses that are equally acceptable to those included in this mark scheme. There may be instances where certain judgements have to be left to the experience of the examiner, for example, where there is no absolute, correct answer.

Markers are advised that there is no correlation between length and quality of response. Candidates may provide a very concise answer that fully addresses the requirements of the question and is therefore worthy of full or almost full marks. Alternatively, a candidate may provide a very long answer which also addresses the requirements of the question and is equally worthy of full or almost full marks. It is important, therefore, not to be influenced by the length of the candidate's response but rather by the extent to which the requirements of the mark scheme have been met.

Some candidates may present answers in writing that is difficult to read. Markers should take time to establish what points are being expressed before deciding on a mark allocation. However, candidates should present answers which are legible and markers should not spend a disproportionate amount of time trying to decipher writing that is illegible.

Levels of Response

For questions with an allocation of six or more marks three levels of response will be provided to help guide the marking process. General descriptions of the criteria governing levels of response mark schemes are set out on the next page. When deciding about the level of a response, a "best fit" approach should be taken. It will not be necessary for a response to meet the requirements of all the criteria within any given level for that level to be awarded. For example, a Level 3 response does not require all of the possible knowledge and understanding which might be realistically expected from an AS or AL candidate to be present in the answer.

Having decided that the level is, it is then important that a mark from within the range for that level, which accurately reflects the value of the candidate's answer, is awarded.

Knowledge and understanding	Skills	Quality of Written Communication	Level
<p>The candidate will show a wide-ranging and accurate knowledge and a clear understanding of the concepts/ideas relevant to the question. All or most of the knowledge and understanding that can be expected is given.</p>	<p>The candidate will display a high level of ability through insightful analysis and interpretation of the resource material with little or no gaps, errors or misapprehensions. All that is significant is extracted from the resource material.</p>	<p>The candidate will express complex subject matter using an appropriate form and style of writing. Material included in the answers will be relevant and clearly organised. It will involve the use of specialist vocabulary and be written legibly and with few, if any, errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.</p>	3
<p>The candidate will display an accurate to good knowledge and understanding of many of the relevant concepts/ideas. Much of the body of knowledge that can be expected is given.</p>	<p>The candidate will display evidence of the ability to analyse and interpret the resource material but gaps, errors or misapprehensions may be in evidence.</p>	<p>The candidate will express ideas using an appropriate form and style of writing. Material included will be relevant and organised but arguments may stray from the main point. Some specialist terms will be used and there may be occasional errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. Legibility is satisfactory.</p>	2
<p>The candidate will display some accurate knowledge and understanding but alongside errors and significant gaps. The relevance of the information to the question may be tenuous.</p>	<p>The candidate will be able to show only limited ability to analyse and interpret the resource material and gaps, errors or misapprehensions may be clearly evidenced.</p>	<p>The candidate will have a form and style of writing which is not fluent. Only relatively simple ideas can be dealt with competently. Material included may have dubious relevance. There will be noticeable errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. Writing may be illegible in places.</p>	1

Section A**AVAILABLE MARKS****Option A: Impact of Population Change**

1 (a) Migration characteristics – age, gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status – will vary with the nature of the situation. If people are refugees migrating from conflict as in Syria when this mark scheme was written, the stream will contain family groups. If the migration is of people seeking to work abroad to support their families, the characteristics will be different, the migrants will be younger in the economically active age groups.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

There is a clear understanding of the two types of migration and the associated characteristics of the people involved. The answer is clearly presented using appropriate language and terminology.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

There is some understanding of the reasons why migration characteristics vary, but the level of explanation and the reasoning might be somewhat banal.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level are limited in terms of understanding and reasoning, perhaps through lack of length or inadequate expression. [6]

(b) Resources 1A and 1B show that adult mortality is higher in situations where there is a higher incidence of infection with AIDS/HIV, that death rates have tended to rise; that urban death rates are higher, especially where there is a high incidence of AIDS/HIV and that male death rate is higher than female. The description should mention some if not all of these trends.

The explanation should use the information to weave the story: things tended to get worse over the period but especially so in the countries with high incidence, particularly for urban males. Any material they bring in from their own study of HIV/AIDS is to be welcomed. The explanation itself is not required to have detailed figures; they should have presented those already.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

There is a decent use of the material to present the picture. The answer is expressed in appropriate language and uses correct terminology. Not every comparison has to be made but the candidate shows command of the situation.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

The answer is convincing and has some detail but may lack the depth of those getting into Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers here lack command and understanding, perhaps they do not understand the graphs or display other weaknesses.

Maximum [4] if answer is description only.

[9]

(c) This is the fertility policy; if they answer with migration, confine to Level 1. Two things have to be done: how the policy worked has to be explained and its impact has to be evaluated. If only one task is completed, maximum Level 2. If the answer is just about the reasons for the policy being set up, Level 1 maximum.

AVAILABLE MARKS

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

The answers here are full and detailed, for example the notorious Chinese 'granny police' might be mentioned. There is clear information on how successful the policy was; what changes it has brought about with also some discussion as to its social cost where appropriate. The candidate displays command and answers using correct language and terminology.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

A good answer dealing with only one aspect of the question might be here, but most will be from candidates who present a full answer that has quality and displays understanding, but may be requiring more depth and detail.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Suboptimal routes to Level 1 were detailed above. Otherwise the answers will display other inadequacies, lacking detail or understanding and certainly having little command of the material. [15]

30

2 (a) Any two from a choice of four. If they do more than two, this is a rubric violation and should be dealt with in the usual manner; if they only do one, they are marked out of [3]. Do not seek dictionary definitions, rather, as the question states, an explanation of the meaning of these terms. This could include examples, anything to make the explanation stronger. [3] × 2 [6]

(b) The question is about the morality of population policies as applied to the case of Uzbekistan, no other place-related material is required. They can see that the number of births has fallen and that the number of abortions has been reduced, which are positives. The moral issues are that IUDs are being fitted inappropriately in some cases; VSS performed without consent whilst pills and injections are, despite official policy, charged for, forcing women to opt for the cheaper but perhaps riskier alternatives. The Uzbekistan case is troubling and the resource gives them a good many ethical problems to consider.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Good use is made of the resource. Their discussion is focused on the morality of the situations identified set against the positive outcomes of the policy and the answer has depth, shows clear understanding and is couched in appropriate language and terminology.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

The focus is on moral issues. If the answer is full (see Level 3 above) there might be a lack of depth and understanding.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers with an incorrect focus will be here along with those lacking command through a lack of length or understanding. [9]

(c) Fertility and mortality, so if either is missing, Level 2 maximum.
 Time and space, so if either is missing, Level 2 maximum.
 Place reference is required to make global contrasts, so if it is absent, Level 2 maximum.
 Multiple problems, Level 1.

AVAILABLE MARKS

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Above all the answer is full. Everything needed is here and the place references are in good detail rather than just being generalities. There is command of the material and use of appropriate language and terminology.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Most things are here and the answer is competent. Excellent theoretical answers without spatial reference can be here, but mostly we will expect to see at least some valid place reference. Answers may lack balance.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Suboptimal routes to Level 1 were detailed above. Full answers will certainly be wanting, probably in terms of understanding and depth of cover. [15]

30

Option B: Planning for Sustainable Settlements**AVAILABLE MARKS**

3 (a) Economic impacts are simple enough. Varosha as can be seen was a major tourism resort prior to 1974 with the characteristic buildings of that era. Once fenced off, all the income streams dry up; investors and business owners lose their money and people who used to work there lost their jobs. Such is not sustainable economically. Environmental is more subtle. There are obvious environmental issues, some of the buildings are just crumbling away after being untouched for so many decades, but on the other hand the place being untouched means that nature will be taking over, that flora and fauna will be recolonizing the area, which has become a de facto nature reserve.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

The answer is full and deals with both economic and environmental aspects. Language and terminology are appropriate.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Both economic and environmental issues are covered in reasonable depth with valid comments made.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers which miss either economic or environmental issues entirely must be here, together with those that are too short to display proper understanding or are unfinished.

[6]

(b) Urban conservation does not require a definition as such but a demonstration of an understanding thereof. It can aid sustainability for example by saving the energy that would be needed to demolish and rebuild and by retaining an area's character and heritage which makes it an attractive place to live in and visit which provides economic support. Better answers might include commentary on redevelopment vs regeneration vs restoration. Examples will certainly help an answer but they are not formally required.

Any candidate who sees urban conservation solely in terms of protecting plants should be confined to Level 1.

[3] for the definition; [6] for the explanation.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

The answer is full, thus has more than one benefit of urban conservation in terms of sustainability. Any examples will be valid and contribute to the discussion. Appropriate terminology is used.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

The candidate displays decent understanding of the issue and is able to couch the answer in a satisfactory fashion, if maybe lacking in depth and detail.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Urban conservation is not understood and the candidate fails to present a convincing answer. Terminology and language may be as inadequate as the concepts displayed.

[9]

(c) Singapore's policy is to make acquiring a car very expensive and then charge for its use by fuel levies and in recent years Electronic Road Pricing. There are indications that car usage in the central area has fallen and hints that what is actually a very efficient public transport system has benefitted thereby. Candidates might ponder on the ethics of making cars so expensive: are poorer people being discriminated against? On the other hand they are told Singapore has the second highest population density in the world (after Monaco), so a strict policy is justified. Then they have to bring in their own case study. If, by chance this is also Singapore you will see more detail than is given in the Resource. It is the evaluation of the policy we need to see. Details of the operation are valid as background; if that is all you see, Level 2 maximum.
 No extra material, Level 2 maximum.
 No Resource use, Level 1.

AVAILABLE MARKS

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

The answer considers both Singapore and their own material in good detail. There is a focus on the evaluation with some detail given, maybe in terms of statistics, but other issues might be raised, too, perhaps the policy has increased congestion or caused massive inconvenience. Strategies, plural, are mentioned and the answer has appropriate language and terminology.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Suboptimal routes to Level 2 were detailed. Otherwise the answers lack clarity perhaps; maybe there is not quite enough focus on evaluation or detail of the places under review is lacking.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Other than the suboptimal way route to this level, answers will be inadequate in terms of understanding and depth, maybe through being too short or superficial. [15]

30

4 (a) They might be brownfield sites or it can be a reuse of buildings, either or both is fine. Reuse is sustainable as there is no extra greenfield land taken. Industrial sites can be reckoned to be probably polluted so being cleaned up for reuse will be good for the environment. Reusing empty sites within a city just increases activity within the pre-existing area which can be efficient. They will have examples to bring to bear, which would add depth to their answer but there is no requirement for them.

Level 3 ([5–6])

The answer is complete and written in adequate language with appropriate terminology. Any examples used are detailed and add depth. There are at least two reasons.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

The answer is adequate and there is reasonable understanding of the issues relating to reuse of industrial land. However, depth and command may not be as good as those at the higher level.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

The answer is weak because of a lack of understanding or through being short or incomplete. [6]

(b) The description does not have to be from a textbook; understanding will be sufficient. They must distinguish between carbon and ecological footprints. Knowledge is important because the footprints give evidence about sustainability and that is vital to our understanding of how the earth is being treated. Geographers need to know how the world works; 'and others' might allow them to think about those who make the policies which includes the political leaders. If they understand what is happening they are more likely to establish policies to deal with the issues.

[3] for the definition; [6] for the explanation.

AVAILABLE MARKS

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

There is clear understanding of the need for such knowledge and the answer is well written in appropriate terminology. The 'and others' is discussed and an awareness of the need for sustainable environmental policies established.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

The answer is acceptable and straightforward and has some mention of the geographers and others idea. There is understanding shown but there may well be issues regarding the depth of their response.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

If the range of response is limited to generalities without mention of the different categories they will be here. As will those whose answers lack length, depth and/or understanding. [9]

(c) 'Potential benefits' is the key here; the question does not require a formal evaluation of policies; such is not available in the Jakarta material anyway. So what are the policies attempting to do: lessening pollution; controlling water; dealing with flooding; community engagement, all these are seen in Jakarta. Look for that and for the equivalent from their own case study. If their study is also Jakarta you will see material that is not available from the Resource. Beware of them using the Resource in an excessively verbatim way.

Just Jakarta based on resources, maximum Level 2.

If their case study is also Jakarta and they add it to material they can access Level 3.

No Resource use, Level 1.

The answer is not seeking material on traffic management but if is set within a land use framework it must be accepted.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

The answer is full with good resource use and depth and detail from their own case study. There is a focus on the issues raised by the question and good understanding is shown. Language and terminology are adequate.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

A suboptimal route to this level was given. Otherwise answers are straightforward but may be overly descriptive and lack depth.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

These answers are flawed through being partial in some way. If complete there will be a lack of focus and/or understanding. [15]

30

Option C: Issues in Ethnic Diversity

AVAILABLE MARKS

5 (a) (i) **Primary factor** – language, nationality or race (unlikely choice)
Secondary factor – residential concentration, social status

[1] for each correctly identified factor and out of [2] for a brief comment on how each factor helps define the Roma.
Brief answers only are required but make sure the answer is tied to the Resource and not just a comment on the chosen primary and secondary factor.
If anyone gives 2 primary or 2 secondary factors, follow the usual guidelines for rubric violation – mark both but only credit the better answer.
([3] × 2) [6]

(ii) **Segregation** – walls, poverty, evictions, semi-nomadic lifestyle. All of this prevents social interaction, etc.

Discrimination – poverty, poor health, lack of education, high levels of unemployment, water turned off, racially motivated attacks. All of this alienates a section of the population leaving the Roma in this case an underprivileged class.

The situation in Spain is very different and the Roma are more integrated.

Candidates have to bring in some extra material to help them explain how segregation and discrimination maintain ethnic diversity.

- No extra material used, maximum Level 2
- No use of the Resource, confine to Level 1. The photographs are there to help them but do not penalise if there is no overt reference to them.
- Omitting either segregation or discrimination from the resource, award from Level 2 maximum
- Multiple errors, confine to Level 1.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

This is a thorough answer that demonstrates sound understanding of the role of segregation and discrimination in maintaining ethnic diversity. The discussion is based around rigorous Resource use and the extra material is well integrated into the answer. Use of English is very good.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

The suboptimal situation described above is here. Apart from this, answers at this level are still adequate but lacking some depth and detail. Resource use may be less rigorous, perhaps omitting the reference to the situation in Spain. Alternatively, there is inadequate emphasis on how segregation and discrimination maintain ethnic diversity. Use of English is quite good.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Apart from the suboptimal situations described above, an answer at this level is seriously flawed by inaccuracies or irrelevant material. There may also be grammatical errors. [9]

(b) The specification lists migration, colonisation and annexation as processes creating ethnic diversity. Obviously, the detail of their answer will depend on their case study choice. However, they will need to give a sound description of the ethnic diversity of their chosen country and then evaluate the role these processes played in creating this ethnic diversity before reaching a decision on the statement. They need to refer to other processes such as colonisation or annexation.

AVAILABLE MARKS

- If there is no case study and there is only a discussion of processes, then award out of **Level 1 maximum**.
- If the answer is at the wrong scale confine to **Level 1**.
- If there is no clear statement of the extent of their agreement with the statement award from **Level 2 maximum**.
- Multiple errors, confine to **Level 1**

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

The pattern of ethnic diversity is outlined clearly with facts and figures. There is good understanding shown. The processes are understood and there is depth, detail and the extent of their agreement with the statement is clear. The answer is well written.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Apart from the situations described above, there is less detail and depth throughout or the processes/discussion are handled less rigorously than at the previous level. English is still good.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Apart from the situation described above, this answer is lacking in detail and depth on all aspects or there may be incorrect information. Use of English may be flawed.

[15]

30

6 (a) (i) **Sectarianism** – Pashtun are Sunni Muslim and Hazara are Shia Muslim – a clearly identified group has been attacked, suicide bombs, etc.

Unequal distribution of resources – Hazara seem to have had fewer opportunities in education, jobs, etc.

Both of these create disharmony. A power struggle eventually led to civil war between Pashtun and other ethnic groups. Award (2 × [1]) if only definitions presented.

(2 × [3])

[6]

(ii) **Outcomes** (any **two** from) **ethnic cleansing** (people forced from their homes within Afghanistan and refugees) **social and economic impact** (poverty, etc) **international intervention** in the form of UN peace process not US invasion.

Candidates need extra material and this will probably be another example(s).

- No extra material used, confine to Level 2.
- No use of the resource, confine to Level 1. The map is there to help their understanding but do not penalise if there is no overt reference to it.
- Only one outcome from the resource, award from Level 2 maximum
- Multiple errors, confine to Level 1.

AVAILABLE MARKS
Level 3 ([7]–[9]) This is a thorough answer that demonstrates sound understanding of the outcomes of ethnic conflict. The discussion is based around rigorous resource use and the extra material is well integrated into the answer. Use of English is very good.
Level 2 ([4]–[6]) The suboptimal situation described above is here. Apart from this, answers at this level are still adequate but lacking some depth and detail. Resource use is less rigorous than at the previous level. Use of English is quite good.
Level 1 ([1]–[3]) Apart from the suboptimal situations described above, an answer at this level is seriously flawed by inaccuracies or irrelevant material. There may also be grammatical errors. [9]
(b) This is their urban case study. They have to discuss the economic social and spatial outcomes of ethnic diversity in their chosen city. Allow some flexibility in the interpretation of social and economic outcomes as they do overlap. However, if either social or economic outcomes is omitted completely award from Level 2 maximum . They only have one case study to use here but if anyone should answer at the national scale award from Level 1 maximum .
Level 3 ([11]–[15]) There is a correct choice of case study. There is good understanding shown with depth and detail in all aspects. The answer is well written.
Level 2 ([6]–[10]) The case study is still correctly chosen but there is less detail and depth throughout or one aspect is only dealt with in a superficial manner. English is still good.
Level 1 ([1]–[5]) This answer is lacking in detail and depth on all aspects or there may be incorrect information. Use of English may be flawed. [15]
Section A
30
60

Section B		AVAILABLE MARKS
Global Issues		
7	<p>(a) Carbon dioxide contributes to global warming and, as such, has many environmental effects. If only a simple statement/discussion referring to carbon dioxide's environmental effects is given, a maximum of [2] may be awarded. Detailed, valid comments making explicit reference to environmental threats may be awarded a maximum of [4].</p> <p>(b) One data collection technique relating to air pollution should be described and its appropriateness to the aims of the investigation discussed.</p>	[4]
	<p>Level 3 ([5]–[6]) The chosen technique is described fully and related to the aims of the investigation. The appropriateness of the technique is discussed. Appropriate terminology is used.</p> <p>Level 2 ([3]–[4]) At this level the answer still has merit but it lacks the required depth and detail. Alternatively, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the technique is limited. There may be inadequacies in terminology.</p> <p>Level 1 ([1]–[2]) The chosen technique is not described accurately and/or linked inadequately to the aims of the investigation. There is limited use of terminology.</p>	[6]
	<p>(c) The candidate is asked to discuss the extent to which they agree with the given statement. Thus, reference to the statement is an integral expectation of the response.</p> <p>Level 3 ([14]–[20]) The candidate makes strong and appropriate reference to the statement. Each element of the statement (obligation of MEDCs; obligation of LEDCs; the extent to which the candidate agrees with the statement) is addressed. A high level of detail is given.</p> <p>Level 2 ([7]–[13]) The candidate makes some appropriate reference to the statement. There is some, albeit restricted, clarification as to the extent to which the candidate agrees with the statement. Although each element of the statement (obligation of MEDCs; obligation of LEDCs; the extent to which the candidate agrees with the statement) is addressed, this may be in an unbalanced or underdeveloped manner. Details may be restricted.</p> <p>Level 1 ([1]–[6]) The candidate may make limited appropriate reference to the statement. Either each of the elements of the statement (obligation of MEDCs; obligation of LEDCs; the extent to which the candidate agrees with the statement) may be addressed in a cursory manner only, or a number of elements neglected or mishandled. Details may be very restricted.</p>	[20]
		30

8 (a) Relevant effects may include, for example, direct deaths, a range of cancers, impaired fertility, birth abnormalities and emotional problems. If only a simple statement/discussion referring to long term health effects is given, a maximum of [2] may be awarded. Detailed, valid comments making explicit reference to relevant long term health effects threats may be awarded a maximum of [4].
 (2 × [2]) [4]

(b) One data collection technique relating to nuclear energy should be described and its appropriateness to the aims of the investigation discussed.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

The chosen technique is described fully and related to the aims of the investigation. The appropriateness of the technique is discussed. Appropriate terminology is used.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

At this level the answer still has merit but it lacks the required depth and detail. Alternatively, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the technique is limited. There may be inadequacies in terminology.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

The chosen technique is not described accurately and/or linked inadequately to the aims of the investigation. There is limited use of terminology. [6]

(c) The candidate is asked to discuss the extent to which they agree with the given statement. Thus, reference to the statement is an integral expectation of the response. Reference to places within the British Isles should be made.

Level 3 ([14]–[20])

Each element of the question is strongly addressed: clarification in relation to the statement; risks; benefits; strong, valid references to the British Isles. Comments are well-developed and with good use of terminology. A high level of detail is given.

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

Each element of the question is addressed (clarification of position in relation to the statement; risks; benefits; references to the British Isles) albeit, perhaps, in an unbalanced fashion. One element may be omitted entirely. Comments may be underdeveloped and terminology/details may be restricted.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

More than one element (clarification of position in relation to the statement; risks; benefits; references to the British Isles) may have been neglected. Comments may be cursory only, perhaps lacking validity or detail validity. Use of terminology may be poor.

[20]

30

AVAILABLE
MARKS

9 (a) Agribusiness: refers to the 'industrialisation' of farming. Often there is some connection with a large corporation. Farms are very large, modern, highly mechanised, employ modern farming methods and often concerned with the production of one product only. The benefits range from increased productivity, increased variety of food produce, lower food prices and new job opportunities. They have to give a definition of agribusiness and a brief description of one of its advantages. For [4] we do not require a lot of detail. They will have studied examples of this in their regional case study of agriculture change and this might be the best way to tackle this question. Award out of [2] for the definition and out of [2] for the description. [4]

(b) One data collection technique relating to agricultural change should be described and its appropriateness to the aims of the investigation discussed.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

The chosen technique is described fully and related to the aims of the investigation. The appropriateness of the technique is discussed. Appropriate terminology is used.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

At this level the answer still has merit but it lacks the required depth and detail. Alternatively, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the technique is limited. There may be inappropriacies in terminology.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

The chosen technique is not described accurately and/or linked inadequately to the aims of the investigation. There is limited use of terminology. [6]

(c) This is their chosen global issues case study. They need to use their material to answer the question set. Do not overreward a candidate who does not follow the exact requirements of the question. They will have studied agricultural change at a regional scale. They have three things to do here. They will need to outline the nature of agricultural change within their chosen region, describe and evaluate the attempts to manage these changes effectively. The details will be determined by their case study but we need to see at least two management issues in some detail to get beyond a Level 2 mark.

- If there is only one management policy, award Level 2 maximum.
- If there is no evaluation, award Level 2 maximum
- If the answer is not focused on managing agricultural change confine to Level 1
- If there is no case study, or it is at the wrong scale, confine to Level 1.

Level 3 ([14]–[20])

At this level the candidate has provided a balanced answer. There is detail on agricultural change and the attempts to manage these changes are described and evaluated competently. The candidate has facts and examples and these are used to good effect. The answer is well written using appropriate terminology and showing very good written communication skills.

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

Apart from the situations described above, an answer at this level still addresses all aspects of the question but the level of depth and detail is less than above. There may be fewer examples or the evaluation is not effective. Nevertheless, there is still adequate understanding shown and the main difference between a Level 2 and a Level 3 answer is the depth and detail used. Quality of language is good.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

		AVAILABLE MARKS
		30
10 (a)	<p>Level 1 ([1]–[6]) Apart from the situations described above, an answer at this level is seriously flawed by lack of accuracy, depth and/or detail. The candidate is not in control of the topic. The answer is short, showing only partial understanding or knowledge. Written English may be flawed. [20]</p> <p>10 (b)</p> <p>Ecotourism is a form of green tourism that takes place in environmentally sensitive areas whilst minimising environmental damage. Accommodation typically provides basic amenities only, local people are employed and leakage of profits is prevented. The benefits range from employment opportunities for locals, profits remain in the area and benefit the local community, education and social welfare packages can be initiated with the profits, tourists are educated about the region, etc.</p> <p>They have to give a definition of ecotourism and a brief description of one of its potential benefits. For [4] we do not require a lot of detail. They will have studied examples of this in their global issues debate on ecotourism and this might be the best way to tackle this question.</p> <p>Award [2] for the definition and [2] for the description. [4]</p> <p>One data collection technique relating to tourism and its management should be described and its appropriateness to the aims of the investigation discussed.</p>	
	Level 3 ([5]–[6]) The chosen technique is described fully and related to the aims of the investigation. The appropriateness of the technique is discussed. Appropriate terminology is used.	
	Level 2 ([3]–[4]) At this level the answer still has merit but it lacks the required depth and detail. Alternatively, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the technique is limited. There may be inappropriacies in terminology.	
	Level 1 ([1]–[2]) The chosen technique is not described accurately and/or linked inadequately to the aims of the investigation. There is limited use of terminology. [6]	
(c)	<p>This is their chosen global issues case study. They need to use their material to answer the question set. Do not overreward a candidate who does not follow the exact requirements of the question. They will have studied tourism change within a regional/national setting. They have three things to do here. They will need to outline the nature of tourism change within their chosen region/country, describe and evaluate the attempts to manage these changes effectively. The details will be determined by their case study but we need to see at least two management issues in some detail to get beyond a Level 2 mark.</p> <p>If there is only one management policy, award Level 2 maximum.</p> <p>If there is no evaluation, award Level 2 maximum</p> <p>If the answer is not focused on managing tourism confine to Level 1</p> <p>If there is no case study, or it is at the wrong scale, confine to Level 1</p>	
	Level 3 ([14]–[20]) At this level the candidate has provided a balanced answer. There is detail on tourism change and the attempts to manage these changes are described and evaluated competently. The candidate has facts and examples and these are used to good effect. The answer is well written using appropriate terminology and showing very good written communication skills.	

Level 2 ([7]–[13])

Apart from the situations described above, an answer at this level still addresses all aspects of the question but the level of depth and detail is less than above. There may be fewer examples or the evaluation is not effective. Nevertheless, there is still adequate understanding shown and the main difference between a Level 2 and a Level 3 answer is the depth and detail used. Quality of language is good.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

Apart from the situations described above, an answer at this level is seriously flawed by lack of accuracy, depth and or detail. The candidate is not in control of the topic. The answer is short, showing only partial understanding or knowledge. Written English may be flawed.

[20]

30

Section B

30

Total

90