

# **Geography A**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J380**

## **Report on the Units**

---

**June 2010**

**J380/R/10**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates 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.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## **CONTENTS**

### **General Certificate of Secondary Education Geography A (J380)**

#### **REPORT ON THE UNITS**

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Chief Examiner's Report	1
A671/01 Extreme Environments (Foundation Tier)	1
A671/02 Extreme Environments (Higher Tier)	3
A672 You as a Global Citizen - the impact of our decisions (Controlled Assessment)	5
A673/01 Similarities and Differences (Foundation Tier)	7
A673/02 Similarities and Differences (Higher Tier)	10

## **Chief Examiner's Report**

Centres are to be thanked for their support of this new Specification and the manner in which they have accepted and adopted the ethos behind it. The hard work that they have undertaken in preparing candidates for the first assessed units was clear to see. Much good geography has been identified and it is hoped that the comments provided by this report prove both informative and helpful to future cohorts.

The Extreme Environments Unit (A671) saw a range of performance at the Higher Tier, with the best candidates producing some outstanding answers. At Foundation Tier performance was more mixed, with a significant number of candidates struggling to offer sufficiently extended answers to some of the questions. However, the papers discriminated well and candidates did not appear to dislike the examination experience.

Unit A672, Controlled Assessment, saw quite a small entry but produced some interesting and well-planned investigations which spanned the full mark range. A variety of work was seen and centres have obviously used a range of approaches in the production of the Controlled Assessment tasks. ICT was used to good effect by most candidates in the research phase but, understandably, it was less evident in the analysis and evaluation of their findings, although a significant number of centres managed to overcome these difficulties.

Candidates achieved expected levels on the Foundation Tier on Unit A673 - Similarities and Differences. Many candidates proved quite adept at interpreting the data sources provided but their attempts at developed reasoning were less successful. At Higher Tier the better candidates displayed a clear and sustained understanding of 'their place' and their 'non-UK place' and were able to communicate the comparison between them very successfully.

## **A671/01 Extreme Environments (Foundation Tier)**

### **General Comments**

The paper was considered appropriate for the ability of Foundation candidates, the wide range of marks suggesting that it differentiated well. Many of the structured tasks provided candidates with the opportunity to achieve positively, as, for many of these tasks, candidates were able to demonstrate simple skills and understanding by effectively using the resources provided, or alternatively recall basic knowledge. There were also opportunities for the C and D grade candidates to succeed in demonstrating their abilities, with more challenging tasks and opportunities for extended written answers. Whilst there were some excellent responses, many candidates did themselves no favours by failing to read the questions properly and respond to the command words. Examiners read some very good geography, but sadly could not always award marks for it when candidates did not answer the questions which had been set.

There was little evidence of candidates being entered for this tier who would have been better entered for the higher tier although, at the bottom end there were papers from candidates who did not have sufficient geographical knowledge and understanding or linguistic skills. It appeared that all candidates had enough time to complete the paper; those sections that were left blank being more likely due to the candidate being unable to answer the question, rather than not having enough time. Most candidates made a genuine attempt to complete the paper, with most gaining marks on each of the four questions. A minority avoided attempting the questions involving extended writing.

The following general advice, which apply to any examination, should be shared with future candidates:

- read the entire question first before answering any part, in order to decide which section requires which information, to avoid repetition of answers
- highlight the command words and other key words so that answers are always relevant to the question
- use the mark allocations in brackets as a guide to the amount of detail or number of responses required
- ensure that the focus of each response is correct, rather than including all facts about the chosen topic or area and develop each point wherever possible instead of writing extensive lists of simple, basic points
- study the resources such as maps, graphs, diagrams and extracts carefully and use appropriate facts and statistics from resources to back up an answer, and interpret the resources by making appropriate comments, rather than just copy them.

### **Comments on Individual Questions:**

#### **Question 1**

(a) This was a very accessible question for which many candidates scored full marks, but a surprising amount were not familiar with compass directions.

(b)(i) Mistakes were made by some candidates when reading the climate graph; they frequently confused the rainfall and temperature.

(ii) The instruction here was to suggest how day and night temperatures are likely to differ in the desert in August. Some candidates did not read the question properly, writing about seasonal changes or trying to explain the differences between day and night.

(iii) The idea here was to estimate the annual average precipitation rather than to add together the figures for all the months, and, of the four alternatives offered, 216mm was the only plausible response. Many candidates got the correct answer.

c) Candidates benefited from the support offered by the structure of this question and many scored either two or three marks, showing some knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the hot, dry desert climate. The box for 'E' was the commonest mistake with 'rising air' being a common answer.

(d)(i) Providing candidates did as instructed and described the vegetation, using only evidence in the photographs, they got three marks for reference to cacti, sparse vegetation, spikes, waxy skin etc. Some candidates attempted to explain the features (or the lack of vegetation in a desert) or wrote about features of desert vegetation which could not be seen in the photographs, usually the long roots.

(d)(ii) Most candidates scored at least one mark on this question; many scored full marks.

#### **Question 2**

(a) This was well-answered by almost all candidates.

(b) This question differentiated well as only the better prepared candidates were able to develop their ideas about the users of the desert beyond simple statements which described what was shown in the three photographs e.g. 'get oil from the ground'. A small number of very good candidates introduced their own knowledge, about uses of a desert area which they had studied,

for example by tribes such as the Bedouin or by tourists. Some candidates simply lifted words/phrases from (a) to use in (b) (e.g. adventure tourists) without describing how each group actually used the desert, which gained no credit.

(c) This was generally answered well, the excessive heat and arid conditions being the most common answers.

### **Question 3**

(a) Given the fact that all candidates should have studied a polar or mountain area it was disappointing that some could not name the area or accurately locate it on a world map. Some left the task completely blank.

(b) Generally this was answered quite well, though some candidates did not appear to understand the term 'accessibility'. Most candidates were able to write about features of the climate of their chosen area, and some gave good descriptions of landscape features. Some candidates had not read the rubric correctly and continued to write about features of hot deserts.

(c) Some candidates did not name a landform and wrote about a process instead. Some candidates who did pick an appropriate landform tried to explain how it was formed rather than just describing it.

### **Question 4**

(a)(i) Generally well-answered though some candidates gave the predicted figure for 2020 rather than the 2010 figure.

(ii) Most candidates recognised the upward trend in temperature for one mark and some developed their answers by using statistics or referring to the fluctuations.

(iii) Some candidates did not get beyond the idea of 'melting ice'. Some wrote irrelevant details about why global warming is happening or about impacts in places other than the environment that they had selected or about the effects of melting ice on people.

(b) Many candidates did not score at all on this question as they either wrote about the effects of climate change or simply left the answer space blank.

## **A671/02 Extreme Environments (Higher Tier)**

### **General Comments**

The paper was regarded as being appropriate for the higher ability range of candidates and it achieved a good degree of differentiation. There were plenty of opportunities for A and A\* candidates to demonstrate their skills, knowledge and understanding, whilst the less demanding and/or more structured tasks were designed to provide all candidates with opportunities for positive achievement. Good practice was demonstrated by those candidates whose answers were focused, were written in complete sentences, showed good development of ideas (where appropriate in longer answers) and used specialist terms (where that was possible).

Some candidates who did not achieve so much success tended to misinterpret questions, failing to take notice of the command words and/or key words. Others lost marks where extended writing was required and where answers were typically too short and lacking in development and detail. Outstanding quality scripts were seen from a few candidates, showing a superb grasp of the content of the unit. In contrast there were entries from candidates who not quite ready for a

GCSE examination; they did not have enough knowledge and understanding of the required content, and lacked 'examination technique'. Some appeared wrongly entered and would have benefited from being entered for the Foundation tier.

The general advice given previously applies equally to the Higher tier and should be shared with future candidates:

### **Comments on Individual Questions:**

#### **Question 1**

(a) A large number of candidates achieved the maximum 3 marks. However some gave answers which suggested that they were unaware of the meaning of 'location', or wrote in vague terms such as 'close to the Pacific Ocean' or 'near the border with Mexico'. Such statements need to be substantiated by use of the scale. Some candidates appeared to ignore the resource and wrote in general terms about the location of deserts.

(b)(i) A surprising number of candidates did not calculate the annual range correctly. Some gave just the highest figure, presumably being unaware of the meaning of 'annual temperature range'.

(ii) This was well-answered by most candidates who gave a clearly expressed difference in temperatures between day and night, backed up by a sound explanation. Some gave a plausible explanation but did not suggest the likely difference between daytime and night time temperatures as the question clearly required, whilst others referred to the high diurnal range without making it clear that it was the daytime temperatures which were highest. Simplistic explanations referred to the sun not shining during the night, but to gain the mark for the explanation, candidates needed to refer to the absence of clouds.

(c) This differentiated very well, but some candidates demonstrated little understanding and knowledge of why it is hot and dry in deserts. They gave simplistic responses such as 'there is no rain and that is why it is dry', some referred to the deserts being 'within the Tropics' without developing their statements to explain why this makes them hot and dry, and some wrote irrelevant statements about the lack of vegetation.

Well-prepared candidates wrote in detail and with confidence expressing clear ideas about the Hadley Cell, trade winds, rain shadows and cold currents.

#### **Question 2**

(a)(i) Candidates who followed the question instruction gained two simple skills Marks. Some candidates found it difficult to relate their answers to the evidence given in the photograph and did not limit their answers to 'features of the vegetation' which could be seen, giving explanations rather than descriptions.

(ii) There were many excellent responses, especially relating to long roots and ability to store water, however some described the features without the qualification of how they relate to survival in hot and dry climates. Most candidates wrote about 'spikes', but some wrote about how they protect the plants from animals rather than explaining that these reduced evaporation in order to help conserve water.

(b) There were some excellent responses. Better prepared candidates considered activities and evaluated the extent of the challenge for each.. They showed good knowledge of nomadic herding in a desert area which they had studied, making explicit reference to tribes such as the Bedouin. Surprisingly references to oil extraction and tourism were rarely as impressive.

### **Question 3**

(a)(i) Most candidates had an appropriate polar or mountain environment which they could name. Whilst answers were accepted at any scale, the South or North Pole was considered inappropriate as a case study area.

(ii) On the whole candidates responded well to this question and there were many answers which showed an excellent understanding of the ways in which their chosen environment could be considered extreme. It is worth noting that some candidates wrote about a hot desert area which gained no marks.

(b) Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge and could, to some extent, explain the physical processes that created their chosen feature, although descriptions were not always included. Some candidates selected a process, such as abrasion, rather than a physical feature. The choice of landform/physical feature was significant in gaining marks. Candidates generally achieved at a higher level if they selected a corrie, arete or nunatak rather than an iceberg, glacier or ice sheet, though potentially all examples could have scored full marks. Many candidates produced good diagrams which enhanced their answer, though some did not label their diagrams, thus they were of little or no value. Ideally a good diagram should add to the written answer not simply replicate the information in it. It is worth noting that some candidates wrote about a desert landform which gained no marks.

### **Question 4**

(a)(i) The majority recognised that there was a general overall increase but some failed to read the figures accurately or make reference to the fluctuations in temperature to gain more than one mark.

(ii) There were some very good responses, but some candidates only made a basic reference to melting ice or snow. Some candidates had not read this question carefully enough and therefore failed to focus on the natural environment, making irrelevant references to the effects on people instead. Some failed to link their response to their chosen extreme environment and made references to effects on other countries or even world-wide. High quality answers developed ideas about the local effects of ice melting on the landscape, specific wildlife and ecosystems/food chains.

(b) Some candidates continued to write about the impacts of climate change in their chosen extreme environment, despite the clear instruction in the question to focus on one 'other' change. Candidates who read the question carefully and wrote about another change, such as increased tourism or the extraction of a natural resource were generally successful in scoring high marks by explaining how the change is likely to affect people and/or the natural environment. Some particularly impressive accounts were seen about the impact of tourism on the Himalayas, Machu Picchu and to a lesser extent on Antarctica.

## **A672 You as a Global Citizen - the impact of our decisions (Controlled Assessment)**

### **General Comments**

The moderation of the first Controlled Assessment tasks for the new specification saw quite a small entry but proved interesting and very informative.



For Task 1, centres chose from the full range of tasks with no one investigation proving significantly more popular than the others. The Investigations in Task 2 all attracted entries and Investigation C, with a focus on recent changes to a retail area, proved the most popular.

A variety of work was seen and centres have obviously used a range of approaches in the production of the controlled assessment tasks. The moderating team saw illustrated essays about ecotourism from one centre, while candidates in another produced posters showing retail change which were supported by an environmental quality survey. Illustrated reports on clothing purchases, and the impacts of these, gave candidates the opportunity to examine some of the ethical issues behind consumer decisions whilst other centres located in densely populated areas took advantage of fieldwork opportunities afforded by local shopping centres. One centre asked its candidates to explore the effects of farmers' markets on a variety of different groups – supermarket shoppers, High Street store managers and the market stall holders themselves. This gave the candidates a rich source of data from which to extract the impact of such markets on local economies. It is helpful if candidates are encouraged to have a clear focus on the exact wording of the Investigation chosen as only then will they have access to the full mark range.

A small number of candidates did not follow the exact wording of the Investigations and this caused some difficulty for the moderating team. For clarification, Task 1, Investigation C from 2010 is worded 'Investigate the impact of ecotourism on people'; candidates who discuss the impact on the environment are not addressing the investigation correctly, and are in effect losing time by offering irrelevant discussion. Similarly, again from 2010, Task 2, Investigation A asks candidates to consider transport issues and their effects on a local retail area. Candidates who offer explanations about the effects on people, and who pay little regard to the local retail area, may not be doing themselves justice. In this example, the effects on people may form part of the analysis, but only in the context of the local retail area (e.g. its shoppers, store owners etc). Guidance on this at an early stage would be beneficial for candidates.

It is acceptable for centres and candidates to contextualise the Investigation, but centres should not change the Investigation title completely. For example, taking the Ecotourism title given above and changing it to 'How does ecotourism affect Ghana?' gives a slightly different, yet important, change in emphasis that will not advantage the candidate. However, an investigation of the impact of tourism on the people of Ghana is more contextualised and, as a result, perfectly acceptable.

Posters offer candidates a great opportunity to visualise the geography in an issue but candidates should always ensure that they offer some level of analysis and evaluation, rather than relying on mere description. It is helpful if centres submit work of this nature either to the OCR Repository or as a series of digital photographs. It is particularly helpful if the important pieces of text on the posters could be word-processed to enable ease of translation and also give more space for candidate analysis. In addition it is helpful if one image is taken of the poster as a whole with perhaps five other images focussing on those elements of the text that reflect best the marks awarded. These photographs could then be put on a CD or memory stick, in individually named e-folders bearing the candidate name and number.

A more general point about analysis can be made here. Candidates should be encouraged to move away from mere description of data or research.

The nature of the control for this unit meant that moderators saw less use of ICT in the presentation of work than had previously been the case. While this is disappointing, it is very understandable and moderators recognise the difficulties that many centres face. Candidates are not disadvantaged in any way if they do not use ICT in the analysis and evaluation of their findings, but it is perfectly acceptable for graphs and charts to be produced in the research phase.

The use of annotation effectively - a skill in itself – should be encouraged as it discourages the inclusion of maps, photographs, graphs and charts as just decoration. It also involves the use of explanatory notes, as opposed to descriptive labels.

It was noted by moderators that some of the conclusions and evaluations were a little brief which meant that marks in AO1 at Levels 2 and 3 were more difficult to justify. Candidates should be encouraged to develop these skills, and also ensure that they devote sufficient time to this very important part of the assessment.

It is important that candidates adhere to the word limit, as exceeding it does not advantage the candidate. Centres should ensure that the candidates are clearly focused and are discouraged from spending a disproportionate amount of time on their Investigation. It also helps the moderation process enormously if only the Investigations that are to be moderated are sent for moderation; including more confuses and delays the process.

The use of a best-fit mark scheme is new to many centres. All centres are reminded that both Investigations are marked holistically; the underlining, ticking or highlighting of statements in the mark scheme will allow them to produce a final mark for their candidates. Centres should then look at the rank order for their candidates, and then fine-tune the marks as necessary so that the final rank order accurately represents candidate performance. It is very helpful if centres annotate the marking grids (URS966) to show how marks are awarded, and ensure that the candidate and centre details at the top are completed. It is helpful if the marking grid is used in a constructive fashion, using pagination or annotation on the grid or the work to point out where marks had been awarded.

Administratively the moderation process ran smoothly and centres are thanked for their adherence to deadlines and for the useful comments on the URS966 form. There were, however, some points to note:

- there were arithmetical errors when adding up candidate marks or when transposing them between the work and the URS966 form
- some candidates did not put their Centre and candidate number on every piece of work they produced. If the work is not secured together, then candidates are advised to include such information on every page. Good practice was established where all word-processed work included this vitally important information as a header or footer.

Further guidance on the organisation and the assessment of the Controlled Assessment for this specification (Guide to controlled assessment in Geography A) can be found on the OCR website under Support materials:

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/qualifications/type/gcse/geography/a/documents/index.html>

## **A673/01 Similarities and Differences (Foundation Tier)**

### **General Comments**

Candidates achieved at expected levels on this paper. Most candidates were able to state some knowledge about their place and their non-UK place. Some candidates gave generic statements which could relate to anywhere - UK or non-UK. Many candidates were successful at interpreting the data sources provided and were able to use the evidence given to their advantage however this was not the case for all candidates and it should be an on-going focus for centres to develop

candidates' skills. Literacy skills regarding comparison statements were limited - centres must continue to develop candidates' abilities to describe both locations using subject specific language.

Many candidates took time to consider what the questions were requiring them to do but some misinterpreted exam command words - specifically the difference between *describe* and *explain*. Most candidates were able to describe the differences between their UK place and their non-UK place but sometimes their reasoning was limited. Centres need to remind candidates that descriptions between 'nations' as opposed to UK and non-UK places will not be credited.

It was positive to read candidates responses where they had a clear understanding of 'their place' and their 'non-UK place', however the use of place-specific references was sometimes limited, which prevented candidates achieving Level 3. Many candidates provided generic descriptions in answering questions to compare locations however very few candidates wrote everything they knew about their UK/non-UK place.

### **Comments on Individual Questions:**

#### **Question 1**

(a) Candidates who could interpret the map achieved well. Some candidates were unable to measure from the scale accurately and/or use 8 point compass directions.

(b)(i) A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question; those candidates who did failed to interpret the graph's scale correctly.

(ii) Most candidates identified 'Hotels and Catering' as an employment sector where a greater percentage were employed in Aviemore rather than Scotland as a whole. Fewer candidates could accurately identify an employment sector where the percentage employed in Aviemore was less than in Scotland as a whole.

(c) Most candidates correctly matched the photographs to the descriptions.

(d)(i) Many candidates made a summative statement regarding the employment opportunities in 'your place' for which they were credited. Most candidates wrote about generic jobs applicable to any UK area such as shops/factories/offices. Candidates needed to write specifically about employment in 'your place' to achieve full marks - e.g. high achieving responses wrote about "agricultural employment in the Fens", " car production plants in Croydon" or named industrial employers from their locality.

(ii) Candidates could articulate their feelings but most gave simplistic reasons for their views. Good sentence starters included "I feel great about living in.." or "I have mixed feelings about living in..". Many candidates stated generic positive or negative reasons about their place such as "good leisure facilities like swimming pools or skate parks" or "very few places for teenagers to go in the evening".

#### **Question 2**

(a)(i) Most candidates correctly matched the photographs to the descriptions.

(ii) Most chose photograph 'H'. Many candidates wrote about features that were not evident in the photograph e.g. no electricity, no transport, no services. The question required photographic evidence.

Candidates referring to photograph 'H' could have developed ideas around: the wooden houses constructed by the people from locally available materials because the government were unable

to fund housing for all, poor unmade or crumbling roads, individuals in the photograph wearing ill-fitting westernised clothing, makeshift shops in stalls providing informal employment on the street etc.

Candidates who chose photo 'G' identified an extensive farming area associated with subsistence farming. There was evidence in the candidates' responses that they understood the characteristics of an LEDC and many could provide a good description of a shanty settlement but unfortunately they did not use evidence from the photograph. Centres should continue to develop each candidate's ability to interpret photographic evidence.

(b)(i) Many candidates accurately described the location of their non-UK place using the names of the countries or regions, compass directions or references to physical features e.g. mountain ranges, seas, rivers.

(ii) Many candidates misread the question and answered it based on the similarities between the two locations or they described links between one location and a whole nation or between the two nations. These could not be credited. There were some examples of strong links between locations e.g. "a garage in ..... sells cars for the Tata group based in Mumbai, Maharashtra".

(iii) Most candidates achieved at Level 2 on this question. There were good generic descriptions of the differences between the two locations. The most able candidates accessed Level 3 through the correct use of named place-specific locations or the accurate use of data.

### **Question 3**

(a)(i) A significant number of candidates failed to select the correct statement using the source Fig. 4.

(ii) A significant number of candidates could not select three ways in which there were links between the Cairngorms and other places. Responses would suggest candidates that, as in 2(b)(ii), had failed to interpret the word 'links'.

(iii) Many candidates limited their marks by not developing their responses to outline the likely benefits for local people.

(b)(i) Two common errors occurred in this question, which required candidates to write about one change.

Some candidates wrote about a number of changes; it was then for the examiner to review the candidates' response to 3(b)(ii) to determine which 'change' would give the candidate most credit. The second error was that many candidates began to outline how their change had affected the people in their place; these could not be credited as they were answering the next question.

(ii) Most candidates were able to access Level 2 marks. Candidates stated generic impacts of changes on identified groups of people e.g. "more jobs becoming available for the unemployed in the new shops which have been built." Most candidates focused only on describing impacts on people rather than both people and the environment as the question asked. Candidates needed to describe impacts on both to access full marks. Good candidates described the impacts using place specific references..

## A673/02 Similarities and Differences (Higher Tier)

### General Comments

Higher achieving candidates had developed a comprehensive knowledge of 'your place' and 'non-UK place', they wrote in place specific detail and were able to compare and contrast the locations. However most candidates achieved at Level 2 - their descriptions and explanations, particularly of their UK place, were generic and could have been applied to any location in the UK.

Some candidates were not competent in accurately interpreting graphs and photographs.

A focus on developing candidates' understanding of 'links', 'similarities' and 'differences', exam command words such as 'describe' and 'explain' and knowledge of place specific detail could improve performance.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

#### Question 1

(a)(i) Most candidates stated accurate location references. Some candidates chose to use phrases such as 'near to' or 'in-between' - only one mark was credited. Some candidates confused compass directions to other places in relation to Aviemore.

(b)(i) The majority of candidates accurately matched the photograph to the description.

(ii) The majority of candidates failed to accurately interpret this graph. The graph compares percentage employment in named employment sectors between Aviemore and Scotland as a whole.

(c)(i) Some candidates failed to 'name' their facility and 'describe' it. Higher achieving candidates gave specific examples.

(ii) Most candidates achieved at Level 2. There were several reasons for this:

- some wrote extensively about how they felt about their place; they gave good generic reasons for feeling that way and they wrote about several aspects of their place and how they felt differently about the positives and negatives of their place. They never mentioned groups who did not feel the same
- some candidates stated their feelings about their place with good development and reasoning but the 'other people' they quoted had the same feelings as they did
- some candidates wrote generic statements about their good feelings and 'other peoples' good feelings.

#### Question 2

(a) Most chose photograph 'H'. Many candidates wrote about features that were not evident in the photograph e.g. no electricity, no transport, no services. The question required photographic evidence.

Candidates who chose photo 'G' identified an extensive farming area associated with subsistence farming. There was evidence in the candidates' responses that they understood the characteristics of an LEDC and many could provide a good description of a shanty settlement but unfortunately some did not use evidence from the photograph.

(b)(i) Most candidates achieved 1 mark.

(ii) The mark scheme credited candidates who commented on the 'strength of the links'. Some candidates interpreted the question to be about 'similarities' not links.

(iii) Most candidates achieved at Level 2 on this question. There were good generic descriptions of the differences between the two locations. Some candidates were able to describe only one location accurately. Good candidates were accessing Level 3 through the correct use of named place-specific locations or the accurate use of data.

### **Question 3**

(a)(i) Most candidates selected statements from the source (Fig. 4) to accurately link the Cairngorms to other places.

(ii) Many candidates developed ideas relating to the re-introduction of the reindeer. Most candidates identified the impact on visitor numbers, the likely overgrazing and the increase in job opportunities in hotels or reindeer herding.

(b)(i) Most candidates identified a single change. The scale of the change varied from the regeneration of a bus station to the demolition of Dahravi. Most changes were the development of a named shopping centre or redevelopment area. Candidates at this level successfully described the change without entering into the realms of the impacts. Most successful descriptions included costs, numbers of jobs, number of houses or descriptions of the previous brownfield site. Candidates who listed new housing, shops, offices, green areas gained 1 mark.

(ii) Irrespective of the scale of the change identified in 3(b)(i) candidates were able to achieve Level 3 on this question if they showed a comprehensive knowledge of 'your place' or their 'non-UK' place.

*Report on the Units taken in June 2010*

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**



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