OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE (9-1)

Geography A (Geographical Themes)

J383

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice for future examinations

It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the OCR website. If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on the OCR website.

Further support from OCR

activeresults

Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/getting-started/

CPD Hub
Your route to OCR's teacher training

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Geography A (Geographical Themes) (J383)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

J383/01 Living in the UK Today

1. General Comments:

The range of questions allowed candidates sitting the paper to showcase what they could do, while being accessible to those who might have previously taken the Foundation Tier paper. Most candidates used the exam time appropriately, on the whole, spent, an appropriate amount of time on each of the questions.

Most students understood many of the questions and demonstrated some excellent knowledge, understanding and skills. Others misunderstood or misread some of the command words. In many cases, candidates provided explanations where descriptions would suffice, or visa-versa, while the command word 'examine' requires comments beyond description and explanation.

The responses which were credited the highest marks were those which were well developed by providing the point, followed by the evidence – if required – and the explanation. This was particularly true in the higher tariff questions. Often, knowledge was excellent while for some, their understanding was impressive. Those questions asking for application of understanding required the higher level thinking to which some candidates responded very well.

In the case study questions, most candidates could recall correct case studies, but found it difficult to recall appropriate specific place detail. It is not necessary to learn excessive factual information, but rather provide a clear sense of place. Many candidates achieving the top level in the higher tariff questions produced outstanding answers.

As well as the command words, it was noticeable that the most successful candidates grasped the key words which are often used in geography and certainly in this paper, such as characteristics, formation, landscape, river basin, pattern, responses, sustainable, causes, people and environment. In addition, some key concepts and physical processes provided particular challenges, not least the formation of spits, geomorphic processes in river basins and continentality.

Most candidates provided clearly written responses. Many used the resources provided with precision and were generally able to interpret the maps, photographs and graphs, while others made fundamental errors relating to points of the compass, basic knowledge of the UK and interpreting the multiple line graph.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

Q1(a)(i)

Most candidates answered this question correctly, while some provided C as the answer.

Q1(a)(ii)

Most candidates answered this question correctly. Some did not possess the knowledge of the UK to be able to reach an accurate decision, often giving A as the answer.

Q1(b)(i)

Many candidates were credited full marks because they correctly identified two characteristics of the spit in the photograph. Some higher quality responses used specialist terms such as 'recurves' and 'sediment' while most identified more simple, but accurate, features such as vegetation. Many responses offered explanations of the formation of the spit, which received no credit; a good example of a misinterpretation of the command word or an attempt to provide a 'catch-all' account.

Q1(b)(ii)

Examiners reported seeing some excellent annotated and accurate diagrams, which were credited full marks on their own, while some candidates simply repeated these explanations in the paragraph beneath. Some excellent understanding was demonstrated; not least, the higher level ideas regarding the salt marsh formation and the changes in wind direction leading to the recurve.

Some candidates gave just a simple statement about longshore drift or deposition without showing an understanding of what these processes involve. Furthermore, one of the biggest areas for centres to practise with their candidates is the accurate depiction of longshore drift on their diagrams, most notably that the backwash should be perpendicular to the coastline and that the transportation of sediment by this process is via the waves, not the wind.

Q1(c)

Most of the candidates who completed a full response picked up a few marks simply by showing some reasonable knowledge and understanding. On the other hand, there were many first-class evaluative responses.

The most common examples used were the Wye, Tees, Severn and Ogwen, the latter suggesting that fieldwork played a part in a number of responses. Very good responses contained appropriate place specific detail from these river basins to substantiate some well developed good knowledge and understanding.

Many candidates struggled with the term 'geomorphic processes' or even omitted them completely from their responses. Their responses would discuss human activities, but many struggled to go beyond stating erosion, or possibly deposition. Some candidates went a little further and gave specific examples such as abrasion. Only a few could convincingly show how geomorphic processes had an impact on the landscape.

Furthermore, the concept of a landscape proved problematic with many responses focusing on generic impacts, such as flooding, pollution and litter. Better answers viewed the landscape in many different ways, such as geomorphological, biological and human, going beyond a discussion of landforms.

Candidates producing more evaluative responses formulated their arguments coherently by applying knowledge to consider the extent to which one factor was more important than the other. This often took the form of a conclusion but top quality responses contained evaluation throughout. Some candidates making judgements in regards to impact over time; that human processes had a sudden impact, but geomorphic processes had a greater impact over a longer period of time. Some arguments focused on different parts of the

river's course, identifying the lower course as the region most affected by human activity. Many analysed the impact of human activities on geomorphic processes.

Most responses of any length or relevance scored two or more marks for SPaG. Occasional errors were unlikely to result in a loss of mark unless it hindered meaning, but there were common linguistic errors identified by examiners: misuse/omission of capital letters where appropriate, misspelling of geography terms such as *hydraulic* action and sentences that were unstructured and hard to understand.

Q2(a)

Although this question was worth just three marks, there were many ways for candidates to access full marks. Many candidates were good at identifying areas that were high or low, quoting specific areas such as London or more generic patterns such as urban and rural areas. Additionally, most candidates communicated their ideas clearly by identifying at least two elements of pattern.

Many candidates were good at identifying areas that were high or low but were not specific enough in their responses. Some saw it purely as a north-south divide without recognising the variations in the pattern. Further confusion was provided by inaccurate knowledge of the UK's constituent parts.

Q2(b)(i)

Most candidates correctly stated 1950 as the answer. Some chose the wrong line to interpret and provided the death rate instead.

Q2(b)(ii)

Most candidates answered this question correctly.

Q2(b)(iii)

Those candidates who correctly interpreted the question and explained the responses to an ageing population in the UK were generally able to accrue a number of marks. Candidates who provided a range of points tended to obtain higher marks than those who tried to provide development; these explanations were often vague or unclear. Unfortunately, some candidates explained the effects of an ageing population while others explained the causes.

Q2(c)

Most responses were able to state that 'immigrants get jobs which benefits the economy,' but went no further. Whereas, responses picking up the second mark made specific references to increasing tax revenues, for example. Some candidates outlined the social advantages derived from more diversity in culture, food and music but made no mention of those elements linked with economic factors.

Q2(d)

When candidates achieved level 3, their answers referred to more than one strategy – as required in the question – and were concise, accurate, analytical and exemplified with

reference to a UK city, usually London, Leeds, Bristol or Manchester. Good answers usually focused on the positive and negative aspects of the strategies and got to the heart of sustainability, eg creates jobs as well reduces carbon emissions.

On the other hand, many candidates did not get beyond level 2. If they referred to more than one strategy, they often lacked place specific detail relating to, or explanation of, the strategy, as well as little on sustainability. Others spent far too long explaining the challenge while adding little on the strategies.

Those candidates that focused on transport as a challenge did particularly well, with candidates naming strategies and considering their impact on the area. Those candidates mentioning HS2 in Leeds rarely got the heart of why the project would benefit the city's transport provision.

Responses, which looked at housing often, spent too long talking about the challenges, without focusing on the strategies used to tackle the problem. Further, responses focusing on housing often simply stated that 'building more houses' or increasing/decreasing the prices' was the answer. The more successful answers looking at affordability for certain groups, the rate at which housing is being built to meet demand, and the impact on the urban-rural fringe.

Few candidates tackled the challenge of waste management, but those that did were able to accurately explain the strategies. Others considered the strategies to deal with unemployment or other challenges and, due to the nature of the question, these were credited.

Unfortunately, some candidates did not make it beyond level one because they merely listed strategies or even tried to cover all three challenges.

Q3(a)(i)

Many candidates scored full marks. Others scored just one mark by correctly identifying the description of a tropical maritime air mass but mixing up the polar air masses. The descriptions for the latter were not necessarily as clear cut as these candidates were expecting.

Q3(a)(ii)

Most candidates struggled because of a lack of understanding of the term 'continentality.' Some candidates used the descriptions in the previous question to aid them and could sometimes accrue a mark, but it is the movement of these air masses as wind from a continent - which brings the air with those characteristics with it - that influences the weather in the UK. Some candidates explained clearly how the land temperatures change quickly relative to the sea, while others went one stage further and outlined differences in specific heat capacity (although this was not required for full marks).

Q3(b)

The most common example used was the Somerset Levels but Boscastle and Cumbria were also well-used events. Examiners also read of local examples and, by and large, the case studies related to events that had occurred in the 21st century, a requirement in the specification.

The causes that were explained were clearly dependent on the example chosen. Whichever were chosen, good responses clearly explained how they caused flooding using terms such as

'run-off,' 'saturated,' 'interception' and 'capacity.' Coastal flooding was perfectly valid; the specification does not specify fluvial events/causes.

Some candidates misread the question entirely and wrote about the effects of flooding. Many, however, were able to identify two clear and valid causes of their flood event but then struggled to explain how these lead to flooding. A third or fourth cause was irrelevant; only the first two causes were creditworthy in a question requiring two points.

Responses gaining full marks, not only clearly explained two causes, but also provide a sense of place, which made it clear to the examiner that the response was about that particular case study. Some candidates went beyond this and provided excellent place specific information.

Q3(c)(i)

Most candidates obtained the one mark available. Some did not because they stated that renewable energy can be 'used over and over again' without saying that it would not run out.

Q3(c)(ii)

Many candidates were accurate as expected but if they were not it was down to three reasons: showing the workings without giving the answer, providing a qualitative answer and giving the percentage decrease rather than a simple decrease.

Q3(c)(iii)

Most scored full marks. Candidates could simply interpret the pie charts or they could state that gas is a non-renewable resource. A less common but valid approach was to provide more advanced reasons for the changes such as the increased cost of extraction of gas or environmental concerns linked to global warming.

Q3(d)

Some candidates wrote long responses to this question, although this did not always translate into a high mark. This was usually because the responses were descriptive about the types of energy sources, rather than showing how their development impacted on people and the environment. When this was done well, it was usually via wind (onshore and offshore) and solar power but also anaerobic digesters. These moved beyond simplistic statements about noise, eye-sores and 'destroying' habitats to explain what it was about these issues that caused people or the environment problems, such as house prices, quality of life and food chains.

High quality answers went beyond description and explanation to examine the impacts. Some candidates commented on the positive and negative impacts, while others argued that the bigger impacts were for people (social/economic) or environment. Others went a step further and compared two types of renewable energy or even onshore versus offshore wind.

Some candidates wrote about renewable energy sources in a generic way without referring to actual types, while others wrote about nuclear power, fracking and non-renewable sources.

J383/02 The World Around Us

1. General Comments:

This was the first examination for J383 02, the World Around Us component of the new GCSE (9-1) Geography Specification A. The structure of the examination, the wording of some questions, the nature of the mark scheme and the absence of tiering make this examination very different to OCR's GCSE Geography legacy examinations.

J383 02 is comprised of three main questions, one for each theme within - The World Around Us component of the Specification. Each question has low, medium and high tariff question items. The high tariff questions ranged from 6 to 8 to 12 marks and these were the only questions that were level-marked. The total mark for the examination was 60.

Candidates' performance across the three questions was similar. Question 1 was slightly the highest scoring, closely followed by question 3, then question 2. There was more variation in the performance for the higher tariff questions. Question 1c) scored slightly higher than question 3d), while question 2d) scored lower by comparison. The latter's focus on the links between international trade and economic development proved too challenging for all but the most able candidates.

The following general points may support Centres in preparing their candidates for future examinations:

- The examination will cover themes of the GCSE Specification A, within The World Around Us component
- The number and type of questions (low, medium, high tariff) will vary from year to year
- Medium and high tariff questions can and will cover a range of assessment objectives
- Skills questions will also include mathematical skills in a geography context
- Multiple choice questions can be targeted at the full range of ability, not just the less able
- Subject specific vocabulary (key words) are taken directly from the wording used in the Specification Themes

In their reports all Assistant Examiners agreed that the 2018 examination was appropriate for the range of candidates. This judgement did cover a range of opinions as follows:

'In catering for the widest range of candidates, I think this paper worked well.'

'Generally I thought that the paper enabled good candidates to shine with some excellent answers showing good application of their knowledge and understanding.'

'All candidates seemed able to complete the paper in the time allowed. The paper did differentiate well, however, some of the rubric of the questions clearly caused many of the lower ability candidates to either not respond or to write all that they knew, without having looked at the command words, such as evaluate or comment.'

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1:

Question 1 assessed the Ecosystems of the Planet theme. This was the highest scoring question with the most successfully answered higher tariff question. The resources were Fig. 1, a diagram showing characteristic features of selected ecosystems and within the question paper a set of temperature data and a partially completed climate graph. It is hoped that Fig. 1 may be a useful resource for teaching the ecosystems element of this theme.

For question item 1a) i) candidates had to interpret Fig. 1 to identify the ecosystem with the lowest temperatures. Three quarters of candidates successfully gave tundra as the correct answer. A common error was to cite Arctic regions from Fig.1 or to give polar without referring to Fig. 1. Candidates who did this but also gave tundra were given the benefit of the doubt and credited a mark. Question item 1a) ii) was linked and required candidates to use Fig. 1 to explain the relationship between climate and vegetation. Three quarters gained at least one mark with about fifteen percent securing all three. Basic responses covered the link between rainfall and/or temperature and the amount, type or density of vegetation. A third mark was gained by referring to growing conditions or by making good use of Fig. 1 to support the ideas. Candidates who did not gain marks wasted time by giving definitions of climate, explaining links between temperature and rainfall or giving rambling accounts of processes such as photosynthesis without any links to climate.

Nearly eighty percent of candidates were able to use the data to accurately complete the line graph to show temperature for question item 1b) i). Question item 1b ii) was the first multiple choice question (MCQ) with just over half the candidates choosing A: hot desert as the correct answer. The most common error was to select D: tropical rainforest. Perhaps these candidates did not consider the bars showing rainfall on the climate graph.

Question item 1c) had the highest tariff of twelve marks. The complex demands covered knowledge of the features of tropical rainforests and coral reefs, understanding of their value to humans and the planet and evaluating whether or not rainforest are of more value. This proved daunting to some lower ability candidates as one examiner noted:

This is a valid point but Centres should note that the high tariff questions will vary in their positioning within the examination in future years. A possible strategy for less able candidates would be to encourage them to tackle the question with the six mark question item first. The three questions can be answered in any order. However question item 1c) was better answered than the other higher tariff items 2d) and 3d). Only about seven percent candidates did not gain a mark or attempt the question item 1c), with over fifty percent producing answers that were level 2 or higher.

Centres should note that each of the four Levels Statements within the mark scheme cover three assessment objectives. At each level candidates were expected to show knowledge, understanding and include an evaluation. Higher level responses showed developed and well developed knowledge and understanding with an evaluation supported with ideas and evidence. Examiners used the annotation ‘DEV’ to indicate developed or well developed ideas. The annotation ‘PLC’ was not used for place specific knowledge as ‘case study’ knowledge was not needed to achieve full marks. However case study knowledge was recognised and rewarded using the ‘DEV’ annotation providing that there were clear links to the requirements of the question.

In common with the other higher tariff questions, 2d and 3d, valid knowledge recall was closely linked to the OCR endorsed textbook. Ideas from the case study examples of the Peruvian rainforest and the Andros Barrier Reef were common along with general ideas from the textbook. Relevant ideas included biodiversity, medicinal potential, livelihoods of indigenous peoples, tourism and other economic activities such as logging and fishing. Successful answers also included the role of rainforests as the 'lungs of the earth' and their part in the global carbon cycle. Developed and well developed ideas had detail about a specific point; this could include evidence, an example, detail or data.

Centres should note that examiners are required to check such ideas for their accuracy. At each level candidates needed to show knowledge and understanding of the value of rainforest and coral reefs with an evaluation of their relative value. At level 1 this would be expressed with a few simple ideas. At level 4 this would need well developed ideas with a clear and logical structure. Most of the higher level responses were in three sections: rainforests; coral reef; and evaluation. With the latter including comparative judgements to support a well-reasoned conclusion. However other higher level responses included embedded evaluations as they compared specific themes such as biodiversity.

Weaker candidates wasted their time by covering ideas outside the remit of the question. Most common were ideas about the threats to both ecosystems, or detailed accounts of vegetation, wildlife and climate without any link to the value of such features. Most Centres now have sophisticated strategies for enabling candidates to highlight key elements of and complex demands of higher tariff questions. It may be helpful to use question item 1c) to practise these strategies to prepare candidates for future examinations. Question item 1c) could also provide the basis for focused research leading to a classroom debate regarding the relative value of each ecosystem.

Question item 1c) was the only item where candidates were credited a mark for their spelling, punctuation and grammar. The criteria were similar to those of the legacy examinations. It was encouraging to note that about three quarters of candidates were credited at least 2 marks with nearly a third gaining the highest mark of 3. This is impressive when the time pressure of examinations and the complex demands of question item 1c) are taken into account.

Question 2:

Question 2 assessed the People of the Planet theme. This was marginally the third best performing question, question item 2d) also saw the lowest performance for a higher tariff question item. The resources included a data table showing life expectancy for five countries in South East Asia, with information about a computer aid project in Kenya in the Resource Booklet, sadly both resources were underused.

Most candidates recognised the context of the question, with about eighty percent gaining at least one mark and one fifth achieving full marks. To gain full marks candidates needed to explain two consequences. Examiners marked the initial idea with a tick and then credited further detail with the annotation 'DEV' for development of the idea. This could include how or why the idea was caused by rapid urbanisation or further consequences linked to the given idea. The most common themes were squatter settlements, traffic congestion, lack of formal employment, strain on waste collection and other services. Some candidates gave list like responses and were only given two marks for two valid ideas. Candidates who attempted the question but did not score either wrote about rural areas or LIDCs as a whole as they did not

understand the key word urbanisation. When using the mark scheme Centres should note that not all possible answers are given. The statement 'credit other valid responses' was included in the mark scheme so that other ideas could be credited such as, new businesses move in to create improved job opportunities.

Just over eighty percent of candidates were able to calculate the mean of the life expectancy data for question item 2b) i). This was an example of a fairly straightforward mathematical skill. The correct answer was 70.25 or 70.3, incorrect answers ranged from 7.6 to 323. For question 2 b) ii), seventy percent of candidates gained a mark. Most indicated that economic development was linked to money, credit was also given to those who gave a valid definition of social development.

Question item 2c) i) is an example of a higher level MCQ. Just over half the candidates gained the mark, option D: voluntary aid, with an even spread of incorrect choices given by those who did not score. Question item 2 c) ii) shows how the subject specific vocabulary of the specification was used to generate the question (section 2.2.2). Just over seventy five percent of candidates gained marks, with about fifteen percent being credited full marks. A balanced answer was required for full marks, although up to three marks were possible for detail about how aid promotes or hinders development. Credit was given for separate ideas or single ideas with accompanying detail or development. Most candidates were more adept at suggesting how aid hinders development with dependency, tied aid, corruption and inappropriate aid being the most common. Positive aspects of aid were covered in more general terms such as skills, wealth, and improved quality of life. Some candidates successfully embedded their ideas within the context of an aid project, with direct reference to Fig. 2 or an account of 'goat' aid.

As with question item 2a) Centres should note that not all possible answers are given in the mark scheme. A few candidates referred to recent media reports of abuse by aid workers which is hinted at in the final idea in the mark scheme.

Question item 2d) was the lowest scoring of the high tariff questions. A quarter of all candidates did not score or attempt the question, about one third produced basic level 1 responses with only about ten percent achieving level 3. Most candidates chose Ethiopia as their case study with valid ideas about trade closely linked to the OCR endorsed textbook. Information about Ethiopia's imports, exports, trade partners, trade deficit and accurate data were checked and credited using the annotation 'PLC' for place specific knowledge. At each level the answer also needed show understanding of how trade affects the economic development of the chosen country. This proved too challenging for most candidates. They were unable to link trade to job creation, money to invest in infrastructure, increased GNP or to negative consequences such as a trade deficit, dependency on primary produce and world price fluctuations. Many focused on other factors which affected Ethiopia's economic development such as aid, famine and the presence of TNCs. Some ideas were also incorrect; some candidates insisted that Ethiopia had nothing to trade or that its landlocked location meant that international trade was not possible. As with legacy examinations there were candidates who selected an inappropriate case study example and then tried to mould their knowledge to fit the question's requirements. A common example was Rosario, the EDC city case study example from the OCR textbook. On the other hand some Centres had covered interesting, alternative case study countries. The best of these included Lithuania and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Question 3:

Question 3 assessed the Environmental threats to our Planet theme. Candidate performance was very close to question 1 for both the whole question and the higher tariff question item 3d). The resources were Fig. 3 a diagram showing the greenhouse effect and Fig. 4 a world map showing the distribution and frequency of tropical storms.

For question item 3a) i) about two thirds of candidates correctly identified X in Fig. 3 as showing option D: incoming solar radiation. A common error was the choice of option C: infrared radiation. A similar proportion of candidates successfully stated two valid greenhouse gases for question item 3a) ii), with carbon dioxide and methane being the most common. Carbon monoxide, nitrous oxide and water vapour also featured. About eighty percent of candidates gained marks for question item 3a) iii), with only about eight percent achieving all four. These candidates were able to explain sources of greenhouse gases linked to human activity and also how this increased the amount of infrared radiation/heat trapped by these gases. The most common sources were burning fossil fuels for energy, vehicle emissions linked to fossil fuels and methane produced by cattle farming. Some candidates made reference to deforestation and the role of forests as carbon sinks. Less able candidates incorrectly wrote about the depletion of the ozone layer for the enhance greenhouse effect.

Question items 3a) i), ii) and iii) show how a section of theme 2.3 (Environmental Threats to Our Planet) may be explored through a sequence of linked questions. This was a more common feature of the legacy examinations but will also feature in future examinations for J383 02.

Fig. 4 marked a shift to a different section of theme 2.3. Question item 3b) included one mark for communicating the answer in a clear and logical order. This is shown by the annotation ‘COM’ at the end of the candidate’s response. To gain this mark candidates needed to write two correct, clear and concise statements regarding the distribution pattern shown on Fig. 4.
Common valid responses included general statements such as in between the Tropics of Cancer and Capricorn and also valid statements about specific features of the pattern such as off the coast of South East Asia or in the western Pacific Ocean. About forty percent of candidates gained all three marks. Candidates could practice by producing clear, concise, descriptive points with as few words as possible.

Question item 3c) was the only mid tariff question item that did not differentiate fully. Just over half the candidates gained one mark for stating that global warming would increase the frequency of drought in the future. A minority also scored further marks by linking their answer to increased El Nino/La Nina events or the migration of the ITCZ. Some gained a mark for stating that areas previously not affected would be susceptible to drought. Credit was also given to those who suggested that increased water vapour in the atmosphere, due to polar ice caps melting, could reduce the frequency of future drought events. Unfortunately many candidates spent time describing the effects of drought or the causes of drought without any link to either frequency or global warming.

Candidate performance for the higher tariff question item 3d) was only marginally less than that for question item 1c). Interesting given the overall difference of six marks. However, one quarter of candidates did not score marks or attempt this question. This may be due to examination fatigue for less able candidates. These candidates could be encouraged to seek out and attempt the question containing the six mark question first in future examinations. The most common case study example used was the ‘Big Dry’ in Australia as featured in the OCR endorsed textbook. The annotation ‘PLC’ was used to credit accurate knowledge of the methods used to

manage this long lasting drought event. Common ideas included hose pipe bans, four minute showers and the use of grey water in a domestic context. These responses were often limited to level 1 or low level 2 as they did not include a clear evaluation of the success of these methods. This was a feature of the better responses which also covered larger scale methods such as desalination plants, targets for state water use and government management the Murray-Darling basin. Credit was also given for support for farmers affected by the drought. However some candidates wasted time by giving detailed accounts of the impact and effects of the Big Dry drought. As with question item 2d) some Centres had chosen interesting, alternative case study examples. Most impressive were detailed accounts of the methods used to avert Day Zero in response to the drought crisis in Cape Town. It is heartening to conclude that the new, more challenging specification and examination can provide a vehicle for the teaching and learning of up to date and interesting geography case study examples.

J383/03 Geographical Skills

1. General Comments:

This paper was the first sitting of the new GCSE exam and therefore was always going to be less familiar for the candidates sitting it. The removal of tiers meant that there was a greater range of question type, ranging from multiple choice through to the extended writing. Inevitably, there were a number of candidates who, in the past would have sat in the Foundation Tier, left a lot of the paper blank and did not score highly. Candidates performed well overall, within quite a wide range. Most 6-mark questions achieved good differentiation, with better responses making a number of points with some development of ideas. Few candidates appeared to run out of time, although a minority did not attempt 5c. Significant numbers appeared unaware of the existence of 3 blank continuation pages at the back of the booklet and had used extra booklets, often for only one answer extension.

Typically, those candidates who performed highly:

- Attempted all of the questions
- Showed their working when asked
- Referred to figures and sources, or used examples when requested
- Laid out extended answers in clear paragraphs. This is particularly important in the level-marked questions to highlight clear points or ideas.

Those who did not perform strongly tended to do the opposite of the above.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1:

1(a)(i) This was well answered by all candidates but there were a few variations notably 6855 or 5669. Many candidates used brackets, commas or colons in their grid references, which is fine. There were a small number who gave 6-figure references, but as this was not what was asked for, no marks were credited.

1(a)(ii) While most candidates achieved a mark on this question, the most common incorrect answer was C. The actual size of the lake is well over 1km^2 and many candidates will have been thrown by this, but should be prepared to read the question carefully and give the nearest answer.

1 (a)(iii) Majority of candidates scored a mark on this question, most candidates opting for “cross section” and “contour lines”. A small minority of candidates, who attempted the question, missed out on a mark because they described a method of presentation.

1 (b)(i) Majority of candidates referred to this landscape as a “lowland landscape” perhaps due to the fact the slopes are gentler and less dramatic than images candidates have seen in their lessons, instantly scoring 0 marks. When candidates achieved a mark for correct identification, not many of them gave a valid reason why. The type of trees, reservoir and little human activity are all indicators of the upland nature of the area.

1 (b)(ii) Majority of candidates scored a mark in this question, the majority of answers that did not score a mark were for the "south".

1(c) Most candidates achieved two marks on this question for the "use of colour" and the "addition of information to the key". Some candidates did not score two marks as they repeated their first point.

Question 2:

2(a)(i) Majority of candidates corrected selected option A, Beef and Sheep.

2(a)(ii) Majority of candidates provided the correct answer "pie chart" or "proportional symbols/circles". Small minority of candidates missed this question out, or misread the question. Many did have a guess, which is pleasing, as it is always better to have a go than leave an answer blank.

2(a)(iii) Majority of candidates score 1 mark on this question. Candidates missed out on marks by giving 200 as their answer.

2(b)(i) Most candidates were able to obtain marks on this question, however very few were able to get full marks. The majority of responses fell into 3 main categories; those scoring 4 marks, 2 marks or 0 marks. Candidates who included the unit of measure most likely went on to achieve 4 marks, whereas candidates who discussed the general pattern without referring to the unit of data scored 2, and those who discussed the distribution of farms scored 0. Most common errors were not using units when quoting data and referring to the south of the catchment area but not picking out named places eg Plymouth. It is also important to remember that the units are *people per km^2* as there were a number of candidates writing an incorrect derivative of this. Too many candidates just gave a list of places with the number of people and often without the units and did not identify if they were more or less or sparsely or densely populated and so did not gain any marks.

2(b)(ii) Most candidates were able to gain 1 mark here for Plymouth having more people and so therefore having more infrastructure and so made the connection between the number of people and amount of infrastructure. Better candidates then went on to get a further 1 or 2 marks usually for the demand idea or government investment and then for roads. Some candidates then went to discuss the flip side of the mark; hence, this would have resulted in double crediting.

2(c) The vast majority of candidates were able to gain at least 1 mark here usually for more older people than younger people and also for the 60-65 age group having the most people. Many were able to score full marks so it was generally well answered. However, there were too many candidates who were working out males v females and just listing age groups and numbers, which was not required. Very few candidates picked up marks for the "shape" of the population pyramid. Some candidates made a single point then went on to give reasons why, which was not what the question was asking.

2(d) Nearly all candidates managed to achieve some points on this question. Very few candidates managed to get into the L3 banding, as they were lacking comparison-using data from a named UK city. Many candidates discussed reasons why "Devon's ageing population

was worse than England's" just by using comments developed from the resource table. Some candidates commented generally about comparison to city life for elderly people. Some gave examples of problems facing cities like crime, housing, waste but did not develop their ideas beyond listing the problems. Others named a city but then focused on comparing levels of healthcare in the city compared to Devon. On the whole, there was a lack of discussion needed in order to assess the extent that candidates agreed with the statement.

Question 3:

3(a)(i) The majority of candidates managed to score a mark on this question. D was the most common alternative.

3(a)(ii) Most candidates picked up 2 marks on this question, mainly as they had written more than what was required with many candidates giving 4-5 statements to describe the location. Some candidates achieved 0 marks as they used words like "next to", "near" or "close to" to describe the location or included ambiguous terms. References to the equator were not credited as 'north of the equator' covers the entire northern hemisphere and was too vague; there were plenty of more specific reference points that enabled candidates to access full marks.

3(b)(i) Most candidates picked up at least 1 mark with this question. The common marks were for candidates correctly identifying the decrease and then going on to say mostly in the north and to identify that there were some new places with rainforest.

3(b)(ii) A moderate number of candidates simply stated "deforestation" as a reason for the decline in rainforest cover. Some candidates did miss out on marks as they did not say initially what the decline was attributed to.

3(c) The majority of candidates who answered this question answered correctly, with correct working out. The most common error for candidates, who scored 0 marks, was for them to provide the answer of 29% - instead of adding, they were subtracting. Some candidates did not respond to this question. Many candidates managed to get the development marks, even if they did not get the full marks, which highlights the importance of showing working when asked to do so.

3(d) This question was well attempted, but not well answered; it is evident to see this is a well-taught area in Centres. However, most candidates were hindered as they discussed development rather than sustainable development. Where candidates did explicitly discuss sustainable development there were only a few who were able to provide any real data from real places, about real strategies. Some good responses seen but management strategies were lacking – with the most commonly used ideas being to plant a tree or more for each one removed or to create conservation areas like national parks. Very few named an example of a TRF those that did named Peru, which is the case study from the text book.

Question 4

4(a)(i) The vast majority of candidates were able to identify that there are no units for depth or that they didn't know where the near or far side would be and gained the mark. A significant minority missed this question out. When candidates did not pick up a mark, it was mainly due to them commenting on the validity of the data.

4(a)(ii) Majority of candidates scored marks for velocity and bedload but It was clear that some candidates had not read the question as they suggested, “measure the depth and width”

4(a)(iii) The majority of candidates who attempted this question scored 2 marks. Some candidates did not correctly calculate, and used the data to work out the average.

4(b) This question was not answered well, there were a significant number of candidates who did not attempt this question. When candidates attempted the question, the justification of their choice tended to be weak and generic. Some candidates misinterpreted the question and suggested alternative fieldwork ideas, rather than data presentation idea. There were, however, some extensive responses explaining how a cross section could be used and the reasons for choosing that method.

4(c) This question was not answered well, and when candidates had not attempted the previous question, they were more likely to not attempt this question. When candidates did attempt, the majority repeated information from the table, without applying it to the question. Some candidates tried to explain reasons for the changes they had noticed which caused them to not achieve full marks as they went off at tangent. However, candidates did not always make it explicit that they had used Fig. 8 but this could usually be determined from how they had written their answer. A lot of candidates got stuck at L2:4 marks because they had either only discussed width or depth or had not used Fig 8.

Question 5

5(a) Most candidates offered the idea that their fieldwork location was suitable as “it helped them answer their question and gave them the data they needed”. Very few candidates picked up marks for highlighting the logistics and practicalities of the fieldwork location. Most candidates also did not complete the prelude section to this question. Too many candidates clearly did not understand what human fieldwork was and stated a physical fieldwork question.

5(b) Candidates were specifically asked for an answer relating to human fieldwork, having been assessed on physical fieldwork in the previous question. Therefore, no marks were credited if candidates wrote about physical fieldwork. Nearly all candidates managed to say which fieldwork technique was most effective and why, however not all candidates managed to pick up marks for the explanation of them and some discussed only one method. Most candidates described their fieldwork techniques. Some marks were lost because candidates simply stated ‘we did a questionnaire’ or ‘a traffic count’ without saying what they did them for, meaning they didn’t really assess the technique.

5(c)* Most candidates were able to say that why the data collected was useful in helping them to reach a conclusion and the stronger ones were able to state what that conclusion was which is where they gained marks. Some candidates did not score highly on this question as they extended their answer from the previous question, discussing their methods. Other candidates discussed physical fieldwork or the use of secondary data. This question was clearly misinterpreted by a vast majority of candidates, most of these because they evaluated how well their data collection went highlighting errors and possible ways to overcome these errors in the future. The error that candidates often made was that they just continued to evaluate their techniques as required for 5(b). Not many candidates talked about the data very well at all and

even less included it in their response. It is important, especially in the longer answer questions, to ensure that the responses are well structured to help candidates with their flow.

SPaG. Nearly all who attempted the question correctly picked up at least 1 mark for SPaG.

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553