AQA

GCSE

Geography B

90352F   Hostile world and Investigating the shrinking world
Report on the Examination

9035
June 2015

Version: v0.1

General

The paper proved to be an effective discriminator of geographical ability. It allowed candidates of all abilities at this tier to demonstrate positive achievement. The majority of candidates gave good responses to the range of data provided. Geographical skills such as interpreting diagrams, bar graphs, pie charts, photographs, articles and maps of various scales and types were good. Opportunities for extended writing were given in one or more parts of each question, and even the lesser ability candidates at this tier were able to offer a response, which demonstrated some good geographical understanding. The more able of the candidates were able to offer high quality, well developed responses, demonstrating good understanding of geographical issues, backed up with the correct of geographical vocabulary and use of case study examples in some instances. They were able to apply their knowledge and understanding well in unfamiliar contexts.

As with the previous series, there was an imbalance between the numbers of candidates completing questions 2 and 3 of the examination paper, compare with questions 1 and 4. A vast majority of candidates opted for questions 1 and 4.

The vast majority of candidates completed the paper and there were relatively few parts of the questions that were not attempted.

SECTION A – HOSTILE WORLD

Question 1 - Living with Natural Hazards

Question 1 (a)(i) and 1 (a)(ii) were generally well answered with most candidates being able to interpret the map. Question 1 (b)(i) was well done by most candidates. Question 1 (b)(ii) was generally well done by many candidates with some good knowledge of physical process and use of geographical terminology. Some candidates gave little more than a simple idea of movement and/or named the different types of plate interaction. Some candidates however, demonstrated clear knowledge of physical process and used geographical terminology. The most common option was the destructive plate boundary and candidates at this tier did link together the plate boundary with divergence and were also able to show some knowledge of processes such as subduction at a destructive plate boundary and therefore, gained a Level 2 mark. This tended to be done better than the constructive plate boundary.

Question 1 (c) was well done, with some candidates getting maximum marks. However, there were still a significant number of candidates who believe that seismographs could be used to predict an earthquake, and therefore arrange an evacuation. However, the more able candidates at this tier, demonstrated sound knowledge of specific 'high tech' and 'low tech' building technologies and preparedness techniques. Question 1 (d)(i) was not always well answered with many candidates unable to use direction. Question 1 (d)(ii) was generally well done with most candidates able to describe possible effects and/or to develop these to gain the maximum two marks. Question 1 (e) was generally well answered with most candidates being able to interpret the diagrams. Question 1 (f)(i) did not prove problematic for the majority of the candidates. Question 1 (f)(ii) was well answered by the majority of candidates. Use of the photograph was good with most candidates able to develop their responses to gain two marks and some were able to continue the development to gain the maximum three marks.

Question 1 (g) elicited a wide range of responses. Many candidates were able to offer simple reasons for their chosen viewpoint; these were often taken directly from the resource provided. These were valid statements and many candidates were able to gain a top Level 1 and score three marks. Use of the resource was generally good. Some of the candidates did develop these ideas further to gain a Level 2 mark through good use of the resource along with the application of their own their own knowledge and understanding in constructing an argument for or against the issue. There was some use of case study examples to develop points and there were some well developed descriptions of a range of reasons for either the natural causes of wildfires, and/or clear arguments for the main cause being human activity in wildfire-prone areas. These often expressed the view that the climatic factors were vital for wildfires to start, but that it was usually a human action that provided the ignition.

Question 1 (h)(i) was well answered with most candidates being able to differentiate between the human environment and the natural environment. In Question 1 (h)(ii), many candidates were able to list valid methods to score up to two marks. Some of the candidates did develop these ideas further to gain a Level 2 mark and answers were enhanced by reference to case study examples which demonstrated geographical knowledge.

Question 2 - The Challenge of Extreme Environments

Question 2 (a) was generally well answered with most candidates being able to interpret the diagram. Where errors did occur they tended to be due to an inability to use the map scale. Question 2 (b)(i) was well done by most candidates. Question 2 (b)(ii) many candidates gave more than a simple description of what the causes given entailed with limited knowledge of human effects and/or physical process and limited use of geographical terminology. Some candidates did

however show clear knowledge of physical processes such as soil erosion and use of geographical terminology. The most common option was overgrazing and some candidates at this tier did link together the effects on vegetation and were also able to show some knowledge of the processes acting on the exposed soil, such as wind/water erosion and therefore, gained a Level 2 mark.

Question 2 (c) elicited a range of responses. Many candidates merely listed methods or made limited attempts at elaboration e.g. 'the stone lines trap rain water'. The more able candidates at this tier were able to move from Level 1 to Level 2 by linking together points and clearly show how the method reduced desertification or use examples to add clarity. Question 2 (d)(i) did not prove problematic for the majority of the candidates with good interpretation of the map. Question 2 (d)(ii) was well answered by most candidates. In Question 2 (d)(ii) many candidates were able to offer a simple climatic reason, but fewer were able to develop the response to gain the maximum two marks. Question 2 (e) did not prove problematic for the majority of the candidates.

Question 2 (f) elicited a range of responses. Most candidates were able to offer simple reasons for their chosen viewpoint; these were often taken directly from the resource provided. These were valid statements and many candidates were able to gain a top Level 1 and score three marks. Use of the resource was generally good. Many of the candidates did develop these ideas further to gain a Level 2 mark through good use of the resource along with the application of their own their own knowledge and understanding in constructing an argument for or against the issue. There was some use of case study examples to develop points and there were some well developed descriptions of a range of reasons for either allowing development of Antarctica to take place or for banning development. The best responses were those that clearly stated reasons for their chosen viewpoint and/or used case studies to back up their chosen view. A minority of the candidates combined good use of the resource with learned knowledge to back these points up.

Question 2 (g) was generally well answered with most candidates being able to interpret the diagrams. Question 2 (h)(i) was well answered with most candidates being able to differentiate between the human environment and the natural environment. In Question 2 (h)(ii) many candidates were able to offer a simple reason, but fewer were able to develop the response or offer a second reason to gain the maximum two marks. In Question 2 (h), many candidates were able to list valid suggestions to score up to two marks. Some of the candidates did develop these ideas further to gain a Level 2 mark and answers were sometimes enhanced by reference to parallel case study examples which demonstrated geographical knowledge.

SECTION B – SHRINKING WORLD

Question 3 – Investigating the globalisation of industry

Question 3 (a) was well answered, with most candidates being able to interpret the map. Question 3 (b) was generally well answered with most candidates being able to identify the correct changes. In Question 3 (c) many candidates tended to give general reasons for the ways that the factors given affected the growth of industry, but failed to develop these points by linking them to the global context in order to gain to a second mark. The better candidates stated how the factors contributed to the growth of links to distant markets and to interdependence.

Question 3 (d) was well answered, with most candidates being able to interpret the map. Question 3 (e) elicited a range of responses. Many candidates were only able to identify basic advantages of TNCs; principally 'jobs' and 'money' and answers at Level 1 tended to be very unstructured and vague. Phrases such as 'reinvested the money in infrastructure,' or 'improved their quality of life,' need further elaboration to access Level 2. Some candidates were able to develop ideas to start to explain the nature of the opportunities brought by TNCs. This was sometimes set in a case study

context, however there tended to be much repetition, with several examples of the same point being given. The more able candidates at this tier, demonstrated some knowledge of specific opportunities brought by TNCs and linked these to an appropriate example. Question 3 (f)(i) did not prove problematic for the majority of the candidates, but some candidates missed the question out. Where this was the case, those candidates did not score well on Question 3 (f)(ii), which was otherwise generally well answered.

Question 3 (g) also elicited a range of responses; it was poorly done by some candidates, with vague statements being offered and widespread misunderstanding of the term 'industrial structure'. Many candidates merely described environmental/economic/social problems caused by general industrial growth. Where the term was understood, de-industrialisation was the most popular option; responses were often reversals of points made in Question 3 (e) i.e. 'no jobs' and 'no money'. Relatively few candidates were able to develop points and link ideas together, or to exemplify impacts with a case study and gain a Level 2 mark.

In Question 3 (h)(i) many candidates were unable to use direction. Question 3 (h)(ii) was also not always well answered with many candidates being unable to clearly state the nature of the locational advantages. Once again, there many vague statements and these were lacking any elaboration to show the advantages of these factors. In Question 3 (h)(iii), most candidates were only able to list problems or conflicts and were limited to Level 1. However, some candidates were able to clearly develop these points or take a case study approach to exemplify the nature of the problem and gain a Level 2 mark. Question 3 (i) elicited a wide range of responses. Most candidates were only able to identify basic methods of managing problems caused by industry e.g. 'filters on chimneys', 'recycle water', or simple, sustainable energy sources e.g. 'solar panels' to gain a Level 1 mark. There were many very vague statements such as 'they should not build factories', or 'they should not burn fossil fuels', without any sense of how these would be achieved i.e. no scheme. A few candidates did clearly explain how real schemes made industry more environmentally sustainable, the best of these being set in a case study context.

Question 4 – Investigating global tourism

Question 4 (a) was well answered with most candidates being able to interpret the map. Question 4 (b) was generally well answered with most candidates being able to identify the correct changes. In Question 4 (c) many candidates tended to give general reasons for the ways that the factors given affected the growth of tourism, but failed to develop these points by linking them to the global context in order to gain to a second mark. The better candidates stated how the factors contributed to the growth of tourism to long haul, distant locations.

Question 4 (d) was well answered, with most candidates being able to interpret the bar graph. Question 4 (e) elicited a range of responses. Many candidates were only able to identify basic advantages of tourism; principally 'jobs' and 'money' and answers at Level 1 tended to be very unstructured and vague. Phrases such as 'reinvested the money in infrastructure,' or 'improved their quality of life,' need further elaboration to access Level 2. Some candidates were able to develop ideas to start to explain the nature of the opportunities brought by tourism. This was sometimes set in a case study context, however there tended to be much repetition, with several examples of the same point being given. The more able candidates at this tier demonstrated some knowledge of specific opportunities brought by tourism and linked these to an appropriate example. Question 4 (f)(i) did not prove problematic for the majority of the candidates, but some candidates missed the question out. Where this was the case, those candidates did not score well on Question 4 (f)(ii), which was otherwise generally well answered.

Question 4 (g) also elicited a range of responses; it was poorly done by many candidates, with many vague statements being offered. These were often reversals of points made in Question 4

(e) i.e. 'no jobs' and 'no money'. Some candidates were able to develop points and link ideas together, or to exemplify impacts with a case study and gain a Level 2 mark. Relatively few candidates gave Level 2 responses, but those that did were usually in a clear case study setting and gave some 'sense of place'; Benidorm and Blackpool being popular and appropriate choices. Many candidates gave reasons for the decline of tourism in a locality, when this was not demanded by the question.

In Question 4 (h)(i) many candidates were unable to use direction. Question 4 (h)(ii) was also not always well answered with some candidates being unable to clearly state the nature of the locational advantages. Once again, there many vague statements and these were lacking any elaboration to show the advantages of these factors. In Question 4 (h)(iii), most candidates were only able to list problems or conflicts and were limited to Level 1. However, some candidates were able to clearly develop these points or take a case study approach to exemplify the nature of the problem and gain a Level 2 mark. Question 4 (i) elicited a wide range of responses. Most candidates were only able to identify basic methods of managing problems caused by tourists e.g. 'litter bins', 'activity zoning', or simple, sustainable energy sources e.g. 'solar panels' to gain a Level 1 mark. There were many very vague statements such as 'they should not build hotels', or 'they should not put sewage in the sea', without any sense of how these would be achieved i.e. no scheme. A few candidates did clearly explain how real schemes made tourism more environmentally sustainable, the best of these being set in a case study context. Ecotourism exemplars were used to some effect.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the Results Statistics page of the AQA Website.

Converting Marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) marks by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator