

# GCSE

# **GEOGRAPHY B**

Unit 2 / 90352H – Hostile world and Investigating the shrinking world  
Report on the Examination

---

9035  
June 2014

---

Version: 01

---

---

Further copies of this Report are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2014 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

## **General**

This was the first sitting of this examination.

Within each section (A Hostile World and B Investigating the Shrinking World), candidates chose one question, either Question 1 *Living with natural hazards* or Question 2 *The challenge of extreme environments* in Section A and, in Section B, either Question 3 *Investigating the globalisation of industry* or Question 4 *Investigating global tourism*. Questions 1 and 4 were the more popular.

### **What was done well**

- using resources to support responses, for example to the decision-making items
- using learned geographical knowledge and case studies to support clear descriptions and explanations.

### **What could be improved**

- using rather than lifting information from resources
- choosing relevant and appropriate case study examples to support answers
- obeying the rubric and always answering the questions for which their studies had prepared candidates – a minority of candidates, clearly, did not.

---

## Section A

### Question 1

**1 (a)** The most successful candidates gained full marks by accurately describing the location of the earthquake epicentre using map evidence. They were able to quote correct and accurate distance, direction and named location information.

**1 (b)** This item was marked according to levels of candidate response. Basic answers scored at Level 1 and made simple statements such as “You could have earthquake drills.” Up to 3 Level 1 marks were available. Clearer answers described how the effects of earthquakes can be reduced and scored 4 or 5 of the 5 marks on offer. A typical Level 2 response would be to describe the contents of a earthquake emergency kit, first aid supplies for instance, and clarify how it would reduce effects such as injury.

**1 (c)** In explaining why volcanoes occur at plate boundaries, Level 2 candidates showed awareness of processes linked to different type(s) of plate boundary(ies). They clearly explained what happens at a certain type of plate boundary to cause an earthquake. Level 1 responses, on the other hand, were limited to largely descriptive observations about plate movement or rising magma that were not linked or explained.

**1 (d)** Another levels of response item. Here, clearer explanations scored at Level 2 because they showed development of ideas and/or reasoning. Typically a Level 1 candidate might cite ‘fertile soil’ as a simple statement, while the Level 2 candidate would go on to explain why volcanic soils are often fertile and what this means for the farmers who live in such areas.

**1 (e) (i)** Accurate descriptions, using factual material from the map provided, of the path of Hurricane Dean scored all 3 marks on offer by accurately:

- locating the 17 August start point
- describing the route with correct reference to direction/places
- locating the 22 August Mexico end point

**1 (e) (ii)** The most successful scored the maximum three marks here because they explained how the hurricane would lose energy as it moved from the warm water onto land so that its source of fuel was lost.

**1 (e) (iii)** This was a decision-making item, marked according to three levels of candidate response. In addition, up to 3 spelling, punctuation and grammar marks were available. At Higher tier, a typical candidate writing in sentences whose meaning could readily be followed would be likely to score 2 SPaG marks, with 3 marks awarded to those answers written in more fluent English, using correct geographical terminology adeptly. So far as the geographical content of answers was concerned, Level 1 responses made simple points such as the lack of predictability of hurricanes. Clearer Level 2 responses clarified reasoning by developing such points in more detail, often using evidence from the resource. Detailed Level 3 work reasoned in more depth showing continuous development of ideas, often through the use of examples drawn from learned case study material to support the argument – whether yes or no.

**1 (f)** Another levels of response item that was marked at three levels – basic, clear and detailed. In this case, those candidates who developed points such as carelessness with matches by linking them to another factor such as dry grass following a period of hot, dry weather that scored the 3 or 4 marks available for Level 2 responses. More detailed answers scored within Level 3 because

they showed a continuous development of ideas with statements that were well linked to form a continuous, explanatory narrative thread.

**1 (g)** It was important here to get beyond the resource. No marks were available for simply lifting words and phrases from the map provided. Successful candidates clearly indicated what the effect of wildfires would be on the area – destruction of tourist facilities and consequent economic damage, for example.

## Question 2

**2 (a)** The most successful candidates gained full marks by accurately describing the distribution of areas at very high risk of desertification in Australia, using map evidence. They were able to quote correct and accurate distance, direction and named location information.

**2 (b)** This item was marked according to levels of candidate response. Basic answers scored at Level 1 and made simple statements such as “very few plants are able to grow.” Up to 3 Level 1 marks were available. Clearer answers described how deserts are formed, referring to the map provided and/or own knowledge, and scored 4 or 5 of the 5 marks on offer. A typical Level 2 response would be to describe the factors at play in the rain shadow effect, and clarify how this could help form deserts.

**2 (c)** The most successful candidates gained all 3 of the available marks either by making three separate points or, more often, by developing a point, for example by identifying changing rainfall patterns and linking that to plant survival difficulty and the consequently heightened risk of soil erosion.

**2 (d)** This was another item that was marked according to levels of candidate response. Here simple Level 1 responses were often characterised by lists of schemes such as earth bunds, magic stones, crop rotation etc. They lacked the clear developed descriptions of such schemes given by Level 2 candidates who scored 4 or 5 marks as a result.

**2 (e) (i)** The most successful candidates gained full marks by accurately describing the distribution of areas of tropical rain forest, using map evidence. They were able to quote correct latitudinal and named location information.

**2 (e) (ii)** This was a point-marked item. Typically, successful candidates developed one or more points to gain extra credit, though it was possible to gain all marks with four separate statements. Responses often began with climate change or deforestation through logging/farming/mining activities and developed these points by use of examples or clear linkage to show how they lead to deforestation.

**2 (f)** This was a decision-making item, marked according to three levels of candidate response. In addition, up to 3 spelling, punctuation and grammar marks were available. At Higher tier, a typical candidate writing in sentences whose meaning could readily be followed would be likely to score 2 SPaG marks, with 3 marks awarded to those answers written in more fluent English, using geographical terminology adeptly. So far as the geographical content of answers was concerned, Level 1 responses made simple points related to economic benefits (for yes) and environmental damage (for no). Level 2 responses clarified reasoning, often using evidence from the resource. Level 3 marks were awarded to responses that gave detailed reasons in a continuous development

of ideas that formed a coherent case – on either side of the argument. The strongest answers integrated examples drawn from learned case study material.

**2 (g)** Another levels of response item, marked at three levels – basic, clear or detailed. Simply stated ideas such as exploiting minerals or whaling/fishing gained Level 1 credit. Clear reasons that linked cold environments (often exemplified) to economic opportunities entered Level 2. Detailed Level 3 responses were those that provided in-depth explanations referring to a named area/s including specifically detailed explanation of actual economic opportunities taken up there.

**2 (h)** It was important here to get beyond the resource. No marks were available for simply lifting words and phrases from the map provided. Successful candidates clearly indicated what the effect of development could be on the area – destruction of animal habitats leading to ecosystem disruption, for example.

## Section B

### Question 3

**3 (a) (i)** This item was marked according to levels of candidate response. Basic answers scored at Level 1 and made simple statements about the spread of TNC activity across the world, often noting more such activity in the northern hemisphere, in the case of the TNC in the figure provided. Up to 2 Level 1 marks were available. Clearer answers scored at Level 2 because they explained the meaning of a Transnational Corporation using map information to show how the example TNC is typical of many, having a more developed country HQ and branch factories clustered in the country of origin but also spread around the world, including in less developed countries.

**3 (a) (ii)** Many candidates correctly suggested reasons why many TNCs have opened factories in less developed countries that tended to revolve around cheaper and plentiful labour and favourable tax regimes. The three available marks could be scored either by making separate points or by developing a point to score an extra mark.

**3 (b)** This levels of response item was assessed at three levels – basic (Level 1), clear (Level 2) and detailed (Level 3). Commonly cited problems that TNC development can cause included atmospheric pollution (note that the word ‘pollution’ must be qualified to score), consumption of finite resources or loss of pre-existing local jobs/businesses. Simply stated problems scored at Level 1. To advance to Level 2, an answer needed to clearly explain why TNCs cause such problems, often with reference to an identified example(s). At Level 3 greater explanatory detail was provided by the use of broader case study knowledge to make justified points.

**3 (c) (i)** Correct answers enabled candidates to score up to 2 marks by describing the nature of change (more) and by correctly quantifying it.

**3 (c) (ii)** Reasons suggested for the growth of trade between China and other countries (1992-2010) included the growth/proliferation of TNCs, increased globalisation and differences in production/labour costs among countries. More successful candidates not only identified a reason in each of the two sections of the writing frame provided, but went on to develop it through exemplification or through clear linkage to trade growth.

**3 (d)** Candidates could either qualify (e.g. ‘large’) or quantify the *size* of the gap. A 2-mark description of the development gap between Canada and Sri Lanka typically did both.

**3 (e)** Marked at three levels of response, this item also attracted up to three Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar marks. At Higher tier, a typical candidate writing in sentences whose meaning could readily be followed would be likely to score 2 SPaG marks, with 3 marks awarded to those answers written in more fluent English, using geographical terminology adeptly. So far as the geographical content of answers was concerned, Level 1 responses made simple points related to social/economic benefits. Level 2 responses offered a more clarified explanation, often referring to an example(s). Level 3 marks were awarded to responses that gave detailed reasons in a continuous development of ideas that demonstrated broader case study knowledge of industrial growth in a place(s). The strongest answers integrated detailed examples drawn from clearly learned case study material.

**3 (f)** This item was marked according to levels of candidate response. Basic answers scored at Level 1 and made simple points, often related to government support. Up to 3 Level 1 marks were available. Clearer answers made links between factors and the growth of science and research parks in more developed countries. These scored 4 or 5 of the 5 marks on offer. A typical Level 2 response would be to link the presence of nearby university research facilities to the provision of hi-tech know-how. The strongest responses referred to a learned case study example, such as the Cambridge Science Park.

**3 (g)** This was another instance (see **1g/2h**) where it was important to get beyond the resource. No marks were available for simply lifting words and phrases from the figure provided. Successful candidates scored at Level 2 when they clearly explained how features of the factory shown in the photograph contribute to sustainability. Level 1 responses often simply stated a range of environmentally-friendly features without clearly linking them to the goal of development today with minimal negative effect on the future.

#### Question 4

**4 (a) (i)** In describing, with the help of the map provided, how tourism has become a global industry, successful candidates gained Level 2 credit by clearly developing ideas concerning global tourism and/or the distribution of hotels shown on the map. They described, for example, the development of airports, growth of long-haul travel and emergence of global tourism companies. Level 1 responses were limited to basic observations about tourism existing in many countries or about people going on holidays throughout the world.

**4 (a) (ii)** The three available marks here could be gained by making separate or developed points. Valid candidate suggestions as to why the global tourism company shown in the map had opened hotels in less developed countries included lower costs (of land and/or labour for example), increased availability of long-haul holidays and improved aircraft technology allowing more people to travel further.

**4 (b)** Commonly cited social and economic problems that the growth of tourism can cause included the unsustainable consumption of scarce resources (water, for example), loss of traditional ways of life and social conflicts caused by tourist behaviours that may cause offence to local people. The item was marked according to three levels of response. Level 1 (Basic) answers simply stated problems, clear Level 2 answers clearly explained such problems, often referring to an example(s) and detailed Level 3 responses offered detailed explanations using Figure 13 and/or their own broad case study knowledge to illustrate their answer.

**4 (c) (i)** Correct answers enabled candidates to score up to 2 marks by describing the change in international tourist arrivals between 2010 and 2012 either in terms of continued increase or of there being a reduced rate of increase. The second mark came for correct quantification.

**4 (c) (ii)** Responses given to the question how international travel has an impact on the global environment featured increased atmospheric pollution and loss of vegetation/habitat/natural landscape due to clearance and building of tourist infrastructure such as airports and resorts/hotels worldwide, especially in coastal zones. More successful candidates not only identified a way in each of the two sections of the writing frame provided, but went on to develop it through exemplification or through clear linkage to the global environment.

**4 (d) (i)** To correctly describe the development gap between the UK and Egypt, candidates could either qualify (e.g. 'large') or quantify the *size* of the gap. Candidates scoring both available marks typically did both.

**4 (d) (ii)** Stronger answers made use of Figure 15 and candidates' own knowledge to clearly explain how tourism can help to raise standards of living and income and gain Level 2 credit (5-6 marks) often by means of a good, sequenced explanation of the multiplier effect. Level 1 responses referred simply to increased employment or simple citing of the term 'multiplier effect', without the actual explanation needed for Level 2.

**4 (e)** The geographical scale of a 'honeypot' was, as in previous series, an issue for some candidates. A 'honeypot' is a site – a locality, rather than a region. So, for example, Dove Cottage or Grasmere are honeypots. The Lake District includes honeypots. Candidates were not directly penalised for such misunderstanding of scale, but the quality of answers did become self-limiting in terms of reaching the top end of the mark range. Detailed Level 3 responses gave developed explanations of just how particular management or planning strategy(ies) have reduced conflict, typically in named, appropriate honeypot example place(s). Clear Level 2 answers referred to a correct example(s) of honeypot/s or management/planning strategy(ies), making clear what conflict existed there and what had been done to address it. In addition, up to 3 spelling, punctuation and grammar marks were available. At Higher tier, a typical candidate writing in sentences whose meaning could readily be followed would be likely to score 2 SPaG marks, with 3 marks awarded to those answers written in more fluent English, using geographical terminology adeptly. So far as the geographical content of answers was concerned, Level 1 responses made simple points related to potential sources of conflict such as overcrowding, car parking issues and walkers leaving gates open.

**4 (f)** This was another instance (see **1g/2h**) where it was important to get beyond the resource. No marks were available for simply lifting words and phrases from the figure provided. Successful candidates scored at Level 2 when they clearly explained how features of the ecotourism development shown in the photograph contribute to sustainability. Level 1 responses often simply stated a range of environmentally-friendly features without clearly linking them to the goal of development today with minimal negative effect on the future.

Centres seeking to raise the attainment of future candidates should encourage candidates to:

- respond carefully and exactly to the wording of the question
- carefully revise specified terms and concepts, such as, for this examination, *sustainability* and *development gap*
- integrate their knowledge of case studies, especially where prompted by the question, into detailed descriptions and explanations.



## **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](#)