# OCR
## Oxford Cambridge and RSA

# GCSE (9-1)

# Geography B (Geography for Enquiring Minds)

**J384**

# OCR Report to Centres June 2018

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations

**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 Interchange.

**Further support from OCR**

**active**results

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 B (Geography for Enquiring Minds)
(J384)**

**OCR REPORT TO CENTRES**

# J384/01 Our Natural World

1.    General Comments:

The level of challenge in the exam was high with a wide spread of marks, and many questions effectively differentiating between high quality and low-quality answers. Candidates who scored highly were able to write fluently and coherently about a range of topics using specific details from case studies that they had learnt. They were very clear about their sustainably managed rainforest area, physical fieldwork and river geology. This allowed them to access higher marks in the levelled questions. The best answers were those that identified the command words in the questions, such as assess and evaluate, and then linked their answer to those words. Weaker answers tended to be generic, and could be any river, rainforest or fieldwork. These candidates were unclear about case study details and were unable to write consistently and coherently about them. Reasons for this included a lack of specific detail, and that they struggled to develop an answer and changed topic too quickly. To reach Level 3, it is best to take 1 idea and develop it as fully as possible rather than try to explain 3 or 4 ideas much more basically, ending up with a list like answer. The exam was not too long and although there were some blank answers this did not seem to be due to a lack of time as they were spread throughout the paper.  Some candidates seemed to struggle to comprehend geographic terminology, such as mitigate or isoline. There is also a need for candidates to come up with more ideas or extend the ideas that they have identified to gain all the marks in a 3 or 4 mark question.

2.     Comments on Individual Questions:

Q. 1a  Most candidates were able to construct a reasonable definition for extreme weather. Candidates need to be clear that repeating the defined word or providing examples without an attempt to define the term gain no credit.

Q. 1b The resource provided helps to give candidates a clear idea about conditions that occur prior and during an El Nino period. Changes to wind and ocean temperature and direction can be inferred from the resource and developments of those ideas, such as rainfall and flooding, were also credited. The impacts of El Nino on South America are wide ranging with some areas experiencing flooding and other areas suffering from drought. It is possible to be awarded credit for both, but candidates have to be clear that the two contrasting ideas were occurring in different locations. Impacts on the Eastern Pacific Ocean were also given credit. Some answers describe the impacts on Australia and North America, and these answers were not given any credit.

Q. 1c A and C were the two most widely chosen answers, with a high proportion of candidates choosing incorrectly. The correct answer was A: bar graph.

Q. 1d The word mitigate was fairly widely understood, or deduced, and most answers were on the correct topic. There were some answers that dealt with climate changes or weather-based hazards, limiting the mark that could be awarded. Some answers intertwined tectonic and climatic hazards making it hard to differentiate which technological based strategy candidates were referring to. The biggest discriminator between levels was the quality of the assessment that occurred. Level 1 answers tended to be descriptive in nature, listing or describing what had

been done to help mitigate the hazard. To reach Level 2, this need to be developed and some assessment carried out. This could be implicit assessment, explaining the way that the chosen technological development helped to protect people from tectonic hazards. The best answers chose one specific development and examined it in detail, considering the advantages and disadvantages of the strategy. The best way to do this was to consider the suitability of a scheme for countries of different levels of development. There was no need to include case study detail in the answer given but using it to exemplify the point being made helped add context and often led to an increased level of assessment. One issue that candidates encountered was changing idea too soon, and trying to write about three of four different strategies, failing to add enough detail to any of them and limiting the mark that could be awarded.

Q. 2a The correct answer was B and this was the most common answer given.

Q. 2b The description of the trends in the graph posed a challenge to some candidates and differentiated between them. The 4th mark in the question is given for communication one approach for candidates to structure their answer could be: the acronym TEA (Trend, Example, Anomaly). The best answers identified that there was a fluctuating or cyclical nature to the data and backed this point up with evidence from the graph. This could be the highest and lowest points on the graph, or the time between peaks. Many candidates did not realise that the graph showed temperature in relation to 1950, rather than absolute temperature, so the data that they provided was not accurate.

Q. 2c There were a range of responses to this question. The best answers identified that the River Thames hasn't frozen in the 21st century and this indicates a warmer climate. Candidates need to ensure that they are specific and do not just refer to a changing climate. Some answers did not take note of title of the resource and referred to other aspects of the picture such as the clouds or chimneys. These answers did not receive any credit.

Q. 2d There were two ways to answer this question, both of which would allow candidates to reach the highest mark for this question. The first approach was to take one issue caused by climate change, such as sea level rise, and develop the idea fully, giving examples from around the globe to show why it should be considered a global issue. This could include the loss of farmland to drought, the displacement of people due to a loss of food security and subsequent problems faced by refugees or the need to import food from other locations. These answers were often the most effective as they provided a coherent and logical narrative that dealt fully with the demands of the question. The second approach was to use a variety of different ideas from around the globe demonstrating a breadth of knowledge rather than depth. Whilst it was possible for these responses to reach the highest level, they often lacked coherence, limiting their overall mark. Level 1 answers tended to describe a single issue in a single country and not answer the question.

The question used the word 'issue' so although most candidates took this to mean impacts, it was possible to reach 6 marks with a fully developed answer that dealt with the sources of climate change gases, possible management of climate change or a combination of all three ideas. This was not a case study question, so it was possible to reach the top of Level 3 without using case studies, but they often provided exemplification and reinforced the point that the candidate was trying to make.

Q. 3a The types of map were not well understood, and it is important that centres cover the full range of geographical skills listed in the specification.

Q. 3b The only answer that can be deduced from the resource booklet is that this is an area of low or flatland or a plain.

Q. 3c The most effective answers identify a pattern of highland that encompasses the whole of the UK, before exemplifying that pattern with further relevant detail. This order, from a wider to a narrower scale also allowed the communication mark to be awarded. It is also possible to answer the question by starting with an example and using it to exemplify a wider point concerning the whole of the UK. A list of places that are at a similar scale is not describing the distribution and this prevents the communication mark from being awarded.

Most candidates were able to identify the highland in the North and the West of the UK. Some candidates were able to name places, mountain ranges or parts of countries to help add extra detail to the answer. Candidates need to be aware that only one mark will be awarded when two statements are made that are direct opposites, such as highland is in the North and lowland is in the South. There are also no marks for stating where highland is not found.

Q. 3d This was generally well answered with a lot of candidates scoring two marks.

Q. 3e Generally, this was not well answered. Case study choice made a big difference to the ease of the question, but it was possible to reach 6 marks using any case studies. The best responses tended to focus on the formation of waterfalls and the role of geology in the speed of erosion and the formation of landforms such as overhangs and plunge pools. There were also good answers that dealt with the formation of rapids, v -shaped valleys and steep-sided gorges. It was also possible to describe the influence of geology on the rate and speed of formation of meanders and their migration across the floodplain. This was a harder argument to make and candidates did not score as highly as the answers tended to move away from the role of geology into a long description of meander formation and then continuing to the formation of an oxbow lake.

The question required case study detail to move beyond 3 marks. This needs to be more than just the name of the river with the generic description of a landform and its formation. Named landforms, such as High Force Waterfall, or accurate rock types, Whin Sill, are the types of place specific detail to reach Level 3, if the quality of the landform formation was also detailed enough.

Q. 4a This was well answered with most candidates being awarded this mark

Q. 4b The word flora was not well understood with a wide variety of answers, some of these including animals, climate, landscape and management. The best answers showing detailed knowledge of Arctic plants and their adaptations and features for survival in this ecosystem.

Q. 4c This was well answered with most candidates being awarded this mark

Q. 4d This question is asking about the nutrient cycling in the rainforest and the impact that it has on the quality of the soil. Candidates that had clear knowledge of this topic were able to make relevant suggestions and achieve all the marks. This, however, was a minority with some candidates making suggestions such as the role of interception, the impact of high temperatures and adaptations of the vegetation. Some candidates who understood the concepts of nutrient cycling stopped after making 1 or 2 relevant points but did not continue so that they could be awarded the final marks. Candidates also needed to be clear whether they were referring to leaching of nutrients down the soil profile or the loss of soil through soil erosion as the language

used was unclear at times and this obscured the meaning. The impact of deforestation was not considered and was not given any credit.

Q. 4e Detailed evaluation of a named sustainable management strategy using place specific detail was needed to reach Level 3. The case study requirement is clear and this needs to be more than the name of a country as the specification requires candidates to investigate sustainable management at a regional or local scale. Many answers named a country, such as Costa Rica, and then described generic management techniques that could be applicable to any other rainforest country. These answers were limited to Level 2 (3 marks).

Other Level 2 answers tended to identify many techniques within one management strategy, such as ecotourism. Each technique was described in detail but there was only implicit evaluation of the effectiveness of the sustainable management. The overall marks awarded were limited by switching between techniques without fully developing them. The most effective answers tended to focus on one or two techniques and evaluate their effectiveness by examining the positives and negatives in detail.  Levelled answers are marked holistically and candidates could focus on increasing the quality of each paragraph before moving on to the next point.

Q. 5a This question challenges candidates to visualise what is happening at groynes and drawing a diagram may have helped, enabling them to understand what the table is showing. A lot of candidates were able to identify that the drop on the north side of the groyne was smaller than that on the south side. Some candidates did not understand that this was the drop and instead thought that this was the amount of sand that had been piled up on each side of the groyne. There were some candidates that compared changes between groynes 1-5 rather than north/south. This was also acceptable but was a more difficult pattern to describe.

There was one mark for using data from the table to exemplify the pattern with some possible examples in the mark scheme. The third mark is for identifying a pattern within the data. This could be where the highest or lowest difference is, the consistency of the data or the direction of longshore drift.

This was the third question in the paper where a communication mark could be awarded. The answer needs to be written in a logical order moving from a general point to another which is more specific and developed (including data) to gain this mark with the TEA acronym being a useful template for describe the pattern questions.

Q. 5b There were a disappointing number of responses that used words like up/down and left/right rather than north or south. There were also a lot of answers that identified a correct pattern and then stopped, meaning that they cannot get full marks. The easiest way to get the second mark was to use data or to identify the anomaly. Candidates need to be careful not to write two sentences that are directly opposite, the largest sediment is to the south and the smallest sediment is to the North, as this will only get one mark.

Q. 5c The question is looking at how to improve the quality of the presentation, not the underlying technique. Ideas like add units or improve the scale were the most common answers. Candidates need to be aware that only their first answer will be marked, if they feel their second is better than the first one, it needs to be crossed out clearly.

Q. 5d Most of the fieldwork appears to have been river or coast based, although there were a few other examples. Footpath erosion was allowed as physical fieldwork. Some of the

techniques, such as EQIs, were assumed to be physical as there was not enough detail to judge as their content was not clear. A small minority of students wrote about human fieldwork and they were limited to Level 1. It is possible to achieve the marks by looking at the original design of the fieldwork or by assessing the techniques used.

Effective answers looked at only one or two techniques, highlighting the benefits and the problems of that technique and coming to an assessment of the level of success. This may have been comments about the reliability, validity or repeatability of results. Level 1 answers tended to be descriptive in nature saying what the candidate did but not going any further than that. Level 2 answers usually made an implicit attempt at addressing the successfulness of the fieldwork. Responses that tried to link the success of the fieldwork to the hypothesis are not worth any credit. Results that are successful because they allowed you to draw a graph or to answer a hypothesis do not gain a lot of credit as they don't say why. It would be possible to use very poor techniques that collect inaccurate data to draw a graph or for a hypothesis to be proven.

*OCR Report to Centres – June 2018*

# J384/02 People and Society

1.    General Comments:

Having removed the tiered levels of entry for the first time, the paper was successful in producing a full range of marks and therefore it differentiated well. Candidates achieving the very highest marks on the paper overall, demonstrated exceptional understanding and application of geographical knowledge and skills, using sophisticated subject specific vocabulary accurately and demonstrating the ability to speculate about levels of success relating to strategies applied. Less able candidates were confident in addressing shorter responses but frequently their extended writing was limited and often candidates did not attempt the case study questions, Centres must encourage all candidates to attempt all questions, accurately naming a relevant country with limited detail is worthy of credit.

Many candidates found the numeracy skills related questions challenging and in addition were limited in their understanding of the selection of fieldwork graphical techniques and their relevance to the set task. Centres should further encourage candidates to devise their own data gathering techniques and give them the freedom to choose their own methods of presentation. The benefit of a more independent approach facilitates candidates making mistakes and learning from them, thus giving them an understanding of the appropriateness of a variety of techniques and the ability to reflect on a range of techniques in the examination.

The examination was an appropriate length, there was no indication that candidates were unable to finish in the time given.

2.        Comments on Individual Questions:

Q.1(ai). Candidates performed well on this question with very few wrong answers.

Q.1(aii). A significant proportion of the candidates answered this question incorrectly and were unable to estimate the area from the map. The most common incorrect response was 2.5Km².

Q.1(b). Many candidates achieved full marks on this question. A significant number used the labelling given on the map to formulate their response. Most responses related to housing, jobs or open land/ country parks.

Q.1(c). Candidates generally performed well on this question, however a significant number of candidates confused 'suburbanisation' and 'urbanisation', therefore incorrectly selecting response 'C', this consequently impacted on their subsequent answer to Q.1(d).

Q.1(d). A significant proportion of candidates demonstrated a limited understanding of the concept of suburbanisation. Many wrote vague responses about pollution and population growth and a significant number wanted to link it to international migration. Many candidates referred to cheaper housing as opposed to either cheaper land prices or larger housing so did not get credit. A number of candidates began their responses with 'better' and then proceeded to list housing, jobs, schools, healthcare etc this was not worthy of credit and Centres should advise their candidates to avoid this approach to writing responses.

Q.1(e). The majority of candidates chose as their case study either London or Birmingham. This question differentiated well, as it was possible to gain Level 1 marks through generic statements relating to food, shops or music. Good candidates were able to get to Level 3 with place specific detail; however, this was severely lacking in most responses and needs to be learnt by candidates. The concept of changing culture/ character linked to international migration caused problems for many candidates, who did not look at specific cultural change. These candidates focussed on generic ideas linked to migration such as pressure on housing, services and jobs. Many candidates made no distinction between internal or international migration and a common error was not mentioning the origin of migrants.

Q.2(ai). Candidates performed well on this question with very few wrong answers.

Q.2(aii). Candidates performed well on this question with very few wrong answers. This was the only geographical skills (numeracy) question, which was answered well by almost all candidates.

Q.2(b). The majority of candidates responded well to this question. Many identified a single piece of data, which suggested Gabon was an EDC as opposed to a LIDC (as were the other examples in the data table given). Candidates were able to explain the significance of that development indicator and extended their responses by describing the subsequent consequences of improvements in GNI per capita, Literacy Rate or Infant Mortality Rate. Some candidates looked at this from a different viewpoint and suggested that from the data given; Gabon could not be considered an AC and therefore was an EDC. Centres must encourage candidates to highlight key command words in the question; a significant number of candidates wrote about more than **one** piece of data and therefore were only credited for the first piece of data written about.

Q.2(c). This question differentiated well, in that there was a full range of marks credited. Less able candidates had a limited knowledge of the Millennium Development Goals and tended to mix a few together in their response. Many candidates who did not know specific MDGs often wrote about aid projects such as goat aid or the Kariba Dam. Some candidates managed to make some tentative links to MDGs, but others missed out completely. Literacy and poverty were common generic answers, which were largely credited at Level 1. More able candidates tended to focus on Primary education, equality for women and /or disease eradication. Many of these candidates were able to quote accurate data to demonstrate the successes and consequently achieved Level 3. The best answers here came from good knowledge of the Zambia and DRC case studies from the textbooks; the 'Room to Read' example was very popular.

Q.3(ai). Candidates performed well on this question with very few wrong answers.

Q.3(aii). Few candidates gained both marks on this question. Most candidates referred to the correct response relating rainfall to relief/height of land. Some candidates simply wrote 'wind' but did not specify direction / prevailing and a number of candidates mentioned proximity to the coast, temperature and climate change which were not worthy of credit.

Q.3(b). This was a challenging question, which differentiated well, only a few candidates demonstrated a maturity of understanding relating to this political geography question and a thorough understanding of the extent to which the United Kingdom's contribution was important was rarely evident. The best responses focussed on the Russia/Ukraine conflict however, Somalia and the Middle East were also written about – but some of the answers lacked detail and in the responses, which referred to Middle Eastern countries there, was some confusion

**10**

between Iran, Afghanistan, Syria and Iraq. Some candidates who misunderstood the question or came from Centres who have misunderstood the specification wrote about pre 21st century conflicts, particularly WW2. Some candidates did not name a specific conflict.

Some candidates were able to recount specific detail of the UK's involvement and consequently did answer this aspect of the question well but generally many struggled with the evaluation part of the question and simply stated what the UK's involvement was rather than evaluating the effectiveness. Some candidates did not understand the term 'global conflict' and wrote about other topics such as climate change or the UK's involvement in natural disasters and trade. A minority of candidates did not respond to this question.

Q.4(ai). The graph was accurately plotted by most candidates.

Q.4(aii). Candidates performed well on this question with most candidates attaining at least 2 marks. Candidates wrote about a variety of impacts relating to flora and fauna and many were able to develop their responses to predict long term damage to ecosystems. Some candidates incorrectly wrote about drilling for oil at sea or fracking for shale gas, these were not credited. Centres should encourage candidates to highlight command and key words in the question.

Q.4(b). This question was misinterpreted by many candidates. Candidates confused the command words or did not read the question carefully; again, Centres should encourage candidates to highlight command and key words in the question. Some candidates incorrectly described the location of 'areas' most at risk and as a result many focussed on Africa. Where candidates interpreted the question correctly, many gained full marks with good use of ACs/Northern hemisphere and reference to continents or specific named countries. Many candidates however wrote vague terms such as 'above' or 'below' to locate places. Some candidates simply wrote a list of countries and other candidates described all three different categories from the map. While the question did not require it, some candidates developed their responses to explain why the levels of food security risk were as they had identified.

Q.4(c). Many candidates were credited at Level 3 for this question. Candidates demonstrated a good case study knowledge especially relating to Goat Aid in Tanzania, candidates quoted statistics and developed their responses in relation to families achieving food security. Zambia and Ethiopia also featured with goat aid being used in most cases. Good UK based case studies focussed mainly on 'Food Banks' with Newcastle being the most common, however candidates who opted for this often lacked specific detail, facts and figures to support their answer and therefore were credited at Level 2. Some candidates incorrectly interpreted the scale of the question and wrote about national or international food security projects such as the Canada Wheat Project.

Q.5(a). Few candidates accessed the second mark on this question. Some form of traffic count was common for one mark or photographic evidence of traffic congestion. Too many candidates suggested the photograph would support an investigation of pollution (generic).

Q.5(b). Most candidates did not know how to work out the lower quartile value. Many did not order their data first, choosing instead to calculate the mean. Very few candidates made reference to the formula for calculating the lower quartile value. A significant number of candidates did not respond to this question.

Q.5(c). Many candidates described what they did to gather data and did not refer to data presentation. Other candidates made reference to a graphical technique but did not attempt to

justify the method chosen. Credit given for simple reference to easy to draw or read/clear/allows for comparison. Very few candidates gained more than 1 mark.

Q.5(d). This question was well done and attempted by the majority of candidates. Most candidates identified enough relevant material from the sources to be credited at Level 2. Candidates wrote a lot of detail for this question and were good at quoting data from the resources, which suggested they were confident in interpreting data and that they had adequate time at the end of their examination to write a considered response. Good use of data and evidence from the sources allowed candidates to explain how factors would impact transport provision in the future. There were some very good, concise 'conclusions' integrating all the evidence. However, many candidates did not include a counter argument and did not state how the public may use more public transport/walk/cycle in the future and therefore not create a traffic issue. Some candidates allowed their responses to drift into lots of detail about pollution (generic) and global warming rather than using the data/evidence provided.

# J384/03 Geographical Exploration

1.    General Comments:

The first Geographical Exploration paper of this GCSE, set in Rio de Janeiro, combined elements of the distinctive landscapes and urban futures specification content within this synoptic paper. Overall, candidates responded well to the demands of a new style of examination and generally had shown that they had been prepared for the unseen resource booklet and the synoptic questions well. The vast majority of candidates answered every question on the paper with very few candidates not attempting the longer 12 mark questions which was pleasing to see.

With no AO1 marks on this paper, many candidates demonstrated good understanding of the wider context of the resources presented in the resource booklet and interpreted the issues and challenges represented in the resources well. Candidates applied their knowledge well to the unseen context in many cases and demonstrated a good level of the more basic geographical skills.

Many candidates were not able to access the marks for some of the more complex geographical and mathematical skills, particularly estimating an area, measuring a distance, measuring trends and extrapolating trends from data and using proportions and different units of measurement. The specification has a specific list of the different cartographic, graphical, numerical and statistical skills that could be examined through the papers for this specification and it would be advisable that candidates are given the opportunity to practise these skills throughout the teaching of this course.

Many candidates wrote on the additional pages and, in a minority of cases, these were not well linked from the main pages. The additional writing, particularly on 2, 3 and 4 mark questions, often did not enhance the quality of the answer and instead led to some candidates expanding answers in areas that were not being tested on the question. This was sometimes the case in the longer answer questions as well where candidates wrote a large quantity on one aspect of the question without expanding the depth of their answers and so may still only achieve a Level 2. Candidates should be spending their time developing points further in order to allow well-developed points to be seen and Level 3 or 4 can be credited.

2.    Comments on Individual Questions:

Q.1ai – Candidates were asked to use the base map of a satellite image used for GIS to identify a human feature of Rio de Janeiro. Many candidates were not able to access the wide range of acceptable answers on the mark scheme due to a lack of clear understanding of the human features seen on the map. Many answers referring to physical features were frequently seen such as beaches. Centres would be advised to refer more explicitly to human and physical elements of maps that are used within lessons.

Q.1aii – More candidates were able to name a physical feature of Rio de Janeiro from the GIS map which was pleasing with the majority of the answers referring to the named beaches highlighted on the map although there was evidence of some detailed map analysis from some candidates correctly identifying spits and islands.

Q. 1aiii – This question proved very challenging to candidates and, although a large tolerance was applied to this question, many candidates were still not able to access the marks. The estimation of an area on a map required a clear understanding of the concept of area as well as understanding the function of the scale bar. The simplest way to estimate this would have been to multiply the 10km North to South, 15km East to West and then halve this number to take into account the rough triangular shape to get 75km$^2$.

Q. 1aiv – Candidates generally answered this question very well with many candidates able to confidently use compass directions to describe the location of Copacabana beach. Terms such as 'under', 'near', 'above' and 'next to', which were not acceptable for credit, were seen in a minimal number of cases which demonstrates this is a skill where candidates feel confident.

Q. 1b – Candidates were able to use the resources clearly to identify the uses of the coastal areas of Rio de Janeiro with few candidates unable to achieve the 2 marks on this question.

Q. 1ci - The majority of candidates were able to understand the sum and calculate it correctly. The most common mistake was where there was an error in the decimal place of the calculation with answers of £4500 or £450000 the most common misconceptions.

Q. 1cii - Most candidates had correctly identified rock armour and used the idea that it absorbs wave energy better and lasts longer to achieve the development mark. However, there were a high number of candidates who had put beach nourishment as their answer and used the explanation that hydraulic action only works on rocks and not on the beach sediment showing a misconception of the processes of coastal erosion. As a result many lost marks in this question for this confusion with a few candidates also achieved no marks through a lack of choice of the options or suggesting an alternative to the two options.

Q. 1d – Candidates found this question the most difficult to answer fully with very few candidates able to achieve Level 4. This was due to the more complicated synoptic element tested within the question – the link between the identification of the challenges within the city and the affect that these challenges have on the coastal landscape. The most effective answers focussed on the challenges of inadequate sewage disposal, the growing size or population of the city or the unequal incomes which were then developed as challenges and then further developed and linked to the impact on the coastal areas in order to achieve a Level 4 mark. The majority of candidates were able to develop either the cause or impact of the challenge or the impact of the coastal landscape for Level 2 or 3 marks.

In order to help candidates in the future, it would be useful to look at the specific wording of the question and break down the different elements of the tasks candidates are asked to complete in order to encourage a greater understanding of the synopticity required here.

Q. 2ai - Most candidates correctly plotted on clearly the 2 points on the graph. The most common mistakes were where a line was drawn and did not clearly show where the plots were made or where the plots were correct but the line was not completed limiting the candidate to 1 mark. A few mistakes were made by plotting on 11.9 million mark higher than the 12 on the scale.

Q. 2aii - A minority of candidates managed to predict the correct population although most incorrect answers were close to the correct answer therefore the skill was shown however the accuracy of response was missing. This is another of the numerical and statistical skills that

Centres could direct candidates to practice using both the trend from the graph and from the table of data in order to develop the accuracy further.

Q. 2b - Very few candidates were able to achieve full marks in this question. Most common mistakes were saying it had to be a population of over 10 million, confusing the terms world city and megacity, and stating that it had to have a lot of trade which was too vague for credit. Most common responses were 'globally important' 'HQ of TNCs' and 'Diversity of culture' elements and very few candidates used any of the other responses in the mark scheme. Many candidates gave generic answers relating to Rio de Janeiro rather than the characteristics of a world city so focussed on tourism or landmarks within their answers.

In order to support candidates further, it would be advisable for Centres to ensure that candidates know the difference between a world city and a megacity in more detail.

Q. 2c – Most candidates competently used the data in figure 5 to compare Rio de Janeiro to Brazil as a whole and give reasons why people may move to the city using data extracted from the table although few candidates manipulated the data further. When a candidate linked to urban growth and people moving to Rio, many were able to achieve high Level 2. Few candidates linked to internal growth within their answers and few achieved Level 3 as they tended to list the differences and develop briefly. In order to achieve a Level 3, candidates needed to use their own understanding of urban growth to explain how younger people moving to the city could also increase the natural population increase or similar well-developed points.

Q. 3ai – Measuring the distance between the two points on the map was done with reasonable accuracy and a lot of the candidates were able to use the scale to correctly come to a conclusion within the allowable tolerance however a large proportion of candidates did not achieve a mark for this question as they were not able to convert the metres on the map scale to the kilometres measurement stated within the answer space to the question.

In order to support candidates further, a simple 'logic' check would be useful here with many candidates stating that the favela was 1300 km away from the beach. It is important that candidates read the question carefully, including the answer space given, in order to avoid simple mistakes such as this one.

Q. 3aii - Most candidates were able to identify communal shower, steep land and open sewers as challenges within the favela with many being able to explain these challenges for the development mark. Those who didn't achieve full marks lacked of development of the challenge and some did not use the resource to identify a challenge and therefore did not achieve the marks.

Q. 3b – This question once again referred to challenges which led to some candidates reusing some of their points from question 1d rather than specifically considering the challenges created by the inequality in Botafogo. Most candidates were able to provide examples of challenges to be able to gain a Level 1 on this question, such as conflicting use of the beach, crime, sanitation or education but few were able to do more than offer a basic comparison between the lives of the rich and the poor for further credit. A large proportion of the candidates gave developed information on the inequality but did not focus on the actual contemporary challenge so, again, few candidates developed responses to allow them to achieve Level 3.

Q. 4 – Many candidates were able to understand the open nature of this question, which was in line with those seen in the Sample Assessments materials and practice papers, in order to give

answers to both elements of the question stem within their answer. When marking this question, Examiners considered whether the candidate had used the resources within the booklet and developed their understanding of these, whether the candidate had developed their ideas on long term sustainability and whether the candidate had examined both the improvements to the favelas and the coastal management options in order to determine the complexity of the answer given and, therefore, the level credited.

Very few candidates achieved Level 4 as they had not examined both options – indicating that many candidates did not understand the command word in the first part of the question. Some candidates missed the second part of the question on sustainability completely within their answers although some did so in a simple way through their explanations of their choice. There were a similar number of candidates that chose improving the squatter settlements as opposed to coastal management which demonstrated that either option was equally viable and arguments for one or the other could be clearly justified.

Candidates generally developed ideas on sustainability well with this question with many able to discuss this further using, for example, the positive multiplier effect and could, therefore, gain higher marks. Highest marks were gained when candidates developed their answers linking across topics they had studied in a truly synoptic answer.

The SPAG marks were only linked to question 4 which did affect a minimal number of candidates who did not answer this question. In many cases, a good use of geographical vocabulary was seen which allowed candidates to achieve the highest mark.