

GCSE

Geography B

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **J085**

OCR Report to Centres June 2014

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2014

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Geography (J085)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
A771 Geographical Enquiry	1
A772/01 (Foundation Tier)	3
A772/02 (Higher Tier)	8

A771 Geographical Enquiry

This session for the controlled assessment for Units B562 and A771 has seen a combined entry from nearly 550 centres of approximately 30,000 candidates. This is the first session where the Geographical Enquiry has had just the one component of Fieldwork Focus.

Administration

Administration by centres continues to improve with many centres submitting their marks well in advance of the 15th of May deadline. Once again, only a few centres made errors on the MS1 forms and nearly all sent the CCS160 form promptly. The majority of centres completed assessment grids fully and included appropriate annotation on the form and on candidates' work indicating where credit was given. Only a few centres included their instruction sheet for candidates for the Fieldwork Focus. The majority of centres completed the new GCW304 form and it would help if all centres did so. This is to be recommended along with candidates indicating their word counts.

Moderation

The new enquiry, without the Geographical investigation, requires an increased word limit of 2000 for the Fieldwork Focus. It was obviously important that centres realised this and also the need to look at the new assessment grid carefully. A major requirement was the need to set out expectations and to collect more primary data in the field.

The Enquiry requires centres to select one Fieldwork Focus title from four. All four Fieldwork Focus titles were selected but the majority chose Coasts, or Population and Settlements. It is expected that candidates "contextualise" the title to match their study area. Most candidates did this, but some did not and as a consequence undertook general reports rather than a route to enquiry.

The majority of candidates did break down their title into 3 or 4 key questions or hypotheses, justified them and gave reasoned expectations. They also made reference to models or theories, and to how their study had relevance in a wider context. Those who did not do the above suffered from a lack of a clear focus. Many centres also located their study area in a series of annotated maps at different scales and included annotated photographs to help describe the character of their study area in detail. There is no need to give detailed definition of terms and, too often, candidates described geomorphic processes rather than apply them to their study area.

The vast majority of candidates did provide a methodology table linked to their key questions with details of their methods and a justification for them. There is a requirement for more primary data to be collected and some centres did not provide sufficient opportunities for this. They relied too much on secondary data collection. The primary data collection has to relate directly to their key questions and should go beyond basic questionnaires.

Some centres included raw data tables above their graphs and analysis, a method to be encouraged where appropriate. Most candidates presented their work in a variety of forms with different types of graphs, excellent annotated photographs, diagrams and maps. The best candidates combined maps, graphs and photographs. Unfortunately, some centres need to encourage candidates to draw a variety of graphs beyond simple bar charts.

As mentioned earlier there were some excellent examples of candidates who integrated their analysis with their maps and graphs. They gave detailed descriptions with reference to their data and also gave reasons for the patterns they saw. This allowed them to use this to help them draw substantiated conclusions. However, centres which did not have key questions often had candidates struggling to give focused substantiated conclusions.

Some centres had candidates who made evaluations of their methods on their methodology table very well. There is also a need to evaluate the success of the enquiry overall and to give realistic and detailed solutions. They also need to suggest who might be interested in their findings.

One common problem continues to be the word count, which in some centres, was exceeded significantly. This meant that their work lacked focus, precision and succinctness and centres need to ensure that students are aware of this failing. The over use of tables and text boxes needs to be avoided. It is recommended that only the methodology be presented in a table form.

Overall, there continues to be an improvement in the quality of the presentation and structure of the work produced. It was very encouraging to see candidates enthusiastically take the opportunities offered and demonstrate high levels of ICT skills. They showed initiative, imagination and independence at a high level. Once again, it was also encouraging to moderate complete pieces of work, even from weaker candidates, where they had attempted all elements of the assessment.

The majority of centres marked accurately and some responded very well to the moderator's report from last year. Adjustments to centre marks were as a result of not having a clear focus with key questions; not providing expectations and not collecting insufficient primary data. Some centres also did not have sufficient variety in their graphs.

It is important that centres read their moderator's report and act upon the advice given. It is also advisable to look at the OCR web site which will soon have examples of good practice from this year.

A772/01 (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

The June 2014 series of the Key Geographical Themes examination saw significant changes.

Question choice was removed from the examination, meaning that candidates were required to answer all the elements of two compulsory questions.

The marks allocated to each Question increased from 25 to 30, with the addition of 3 marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar for the study sub-question bringing the total to 33. The examination total mark increased from 56 to 66, although the examination still constitutes 75% of the candidates' final GCSE grade.

The additional five marks for each Question were comprised of an application of knowledge and understanding question for four marks and an additional mark, at Level 3, awarded for the case study response. This third mark at Level 3 was allocated for additional place specific information for the case study example.

Within each question there was a more diverse coverage of the Specification Themes requiring candidates to shift their thinking from one sub theme to another as they progressed with their answers.

Overall the examination drew positive comments from both the Principal Examiner and the Assistant Examiner.

Both agreed that the examination was set at an appropriate level of difficulty for Foundation candidates. They also felt that the Examination was a positive experience for candidates given the numbers who attempted all parts of the Examination Questions. Fewer 'no responses' were noted and candidates showed better use of time during the Examination to focus on answers which counted towards the final mark. The removal of Question choice brought about the long awaited end to rubric error. The only possible mis-use of examination time was for candidates who began an answer, crossed it out and then wrote a revised answer on the additional pages in the Examination booklet.

The total number of candidates was approximately 150, an entry in line with previous examinations.

As with previous Examinations, there were aspects which candidates found challenging.

The 2014 Examination made use of Ordnance Survey map extracts for both of the questions assessing a range of map interpretation skills. Many candidates were able to follow instructions and find the necessary information to score marks. However, others appeared to be unable to demonstrate the required map reading skills to access the information presented on an Ordnance Survey map extract.

Centres should consider the use of Ordnance Survey maps when covering UK based elements of the Specification Themes and set a variety of map reading and interpretation tasks.

Candidates should also be familiar with common examination command words through their normal learning repertoire. In particular, learning could focus on the difference between 'describe' and 'explain' so that candidates focus their thinking on the relevant elements of knowledge and understanding required.

Candidates should also know the meaning of Specification-specific vocabulary or key words in order to unlock the specific knowledge required to gain marks.

Key words that caused difficulty for candidates for the 2014 Examination were:

Question 1: headland, landform, erosion

Question 2: factory, primary, secondary, tertiary, location, economic activity, physical environment, measures of development

It was encouraging to note that some candidates had underlined key words and/or command words. This practice can slow candidates down and get them to consider the question requirements and the exact knowledge, understanding and type of response needed. Both Examiners felt that candidates could have read the questions more carefully and made better use of the Resource Booklet to support their answers when directed to do so.

Candidates should also be aware of the two types of four mark question. Those which require two parts to the answer are more challenging in that the response needs development in terms of detail or further explanation. On other questions, four marks can be secured with four basic, valid ideas, almost in list form.

As with previous Examinations the case study questions are the key to success. Each question is split into three parts to support candidates in constructing their answers. The entire response is 'levels marked' holistically and candidates who write valid content in the 'wrong' section are fully credited. A valid named example is needed to progress beyond Level 1, and Examiners may make use of the internet to check the validity of unusual or unfamiliar examples. Correct place specific detail is also checked including additional place names or number data.

Candidates and centres should note that in the 2014 Examination knowledge that would have been learned in the context of a case study was assessed via a four mark question. Examples included river and coastal landforms in Questions 1d) and 1e); economic activity location factors in Question 2c) and how an economic activity can damage the physical environment in Question 2d). Place specific recall was not required to access any of the marks for these questions but knowledge learned via case study revision could be applied to achieve full marks.

Following its introduction in 2013, marks were awarded for spelling, punctuation and grammar for the extended prose generated by each case study question. For Questions 1g) and 2g) the most common SPaG mark was 1, closely followed by 2. SPaG marks were slightly higher on Question 1g) compared to Question 2g). The lower performance was partly due to more zero marks or no responses, for which a SPaG cannot be awarded. For some atypical scripts, awarding SPaG was made difficult as Centres had not completed the cover sheets clearly enough to indicate the exact support their candidates had received.

Question 1:

Question 1 assessed the Rivers and Coasts Theme of the Specification. This was the highest scoring question overall and the most successfully answered case study sub-question. The Resources were an Ordnance Survey map extract of the area around Swanage with a matching geology map for south of gridline 84. There were also colour photographs of Old Harry stack and High Force waterfall.

The skills questions in part (a) required candidates to use their OS map reading and interpretation skills.

Just over one quarter of candidates were able to correctly name Peveril Point as the headland in grid square 0478. The most common error was to name Durlston Head in grid square 0377. This could be a map reading error or hastily scanning for a word associated with headland. Three quarters of candidates were able to give the approximate length of Swanage Bay, but less than one third could use the map key to identify the beach material at Studland Bay in grid square 0384. A common error was for candidates to use Fig. 1 instead of the OS map extract to incorrectly give 'sand and clay' as the beach material.

Sub-question (b) was unsuccessful in that it did not yield the obvious, simple answers for features of a coastal cliff, such as they are tall, high, vertical and made of rock. Many gave information about processes of erosion or non-geographical responses such as the 'views are great'. Credit was given to those who named arches and caves as features of coastal cliffs.

Exactly half the candidates gained both marks for matching rock types and landforms for part (c) (i).

Spit was a common incorrect answer even though there is no spit shown on Fig. 1. Just over half the candidates gained marks for (c) (ii), by referring to the relative hardness of one of the rock types and linking this to the rate or amount of erosion. A common error was stating that chalk was a 'softer' rock than clay and therefore easier to erode.

Sub-questions (d) and (e) focused on well known landforms and the processes which created them. Scores were higher for 1e)i) than 1d)i), although the understanding of processes was more secure for d)ii) than for e)ii). Just over one third of the candidates correctly identified Old Harry as a stack, with stump being the most common error. The majority of candidates gained marks for part (ii). The best answers had accurate diagrams showing the correct sequence of headland erosion to create a stack. Some also included relevant information about the erosion processes. Some candidates wasted time with unnecessary detail in their diagrams or provided accurate detailed sketches of the landforms shown in Fig. 2.

About two thirds of candidates correctly identified High Force as a waterfall although understanding of the processes was less convincing. Accurate diagrams showing the undercutting of a layer of soft rock, overhang collapse and the retreat of the waterfall were the most successful. Some candidates drew detailed sketches of the landform shown in Fig. 3 and misinterpreted the name 'High Force' as a process involving powerful flows of water carving through the landscape.

The landform theme continued into sub question (f). The most common correct answers were meanders and ox-bow lakes. Many candidates did not follow the 'describe' command and gave detailed accounts of the processes which create their chosen river landforms. Others missed the key word 'river' and gave coastal landforms for their answers. Just over half the candidates failed to score any marks for this sub-question.

The river flood case study was the best answered of the case study sub-questions. One third of responses were at the top of Level 2 and into Level 3, however, only a few candidates were able to include relevant and credible place specific detail. Less able candidates gave a generic description of flood impact with a basic cause, usually high rainfall, along with a valid named example.

The most common example was the Boscastle Flood of 2004, Cocker mouth and Carlisle were also popular choices, with some well supported with accurate impact data and rainfall figures for the causes. Bangladesh was another high scoring example with some accurate detail about impact, flood years and coverage of multiple causes with named rivers and the Himalayas. Other non-UK examples were Mozambique, the river Zambezi and the Mississippi. A few candidates wrote about valid, up to date examples from 2014, such as Somerset, possibly drawing upon their own personal flood experiences.

Question 2

Question 2 assessed the Economic Development theme with a wide range of Resources. These included a 1:25 000 OS map extract, a location map of England and an aerial photograph all linked to sugar manufacturing. There was also a scatter graph showing changes in life expectancy and average income for selected countries.

Question (a) was not successful. About half the candidates did not score any marks. The range of incorrect responses indicated that they had not 'studied' Fig. 6 closely enough for the correct ideas about sugar beet being a raw material and lower transport costs if the factories are located near this source. Many speculated about the climate, soils, proximity to London and export via ports not shown on the map.

Sub-question (b) also yielded mixed responses. Only two thirds of candidates knew a factory was an example of a secondary economic activity. Half were able to state a feature of the factory, with larger buildings/chimneys being most common. Just under half the candidates were able to locate and give the number of the A road required in part (iii)

Understanding of the location factors for the sugar factory was weak. Basic ideas about transport links were most common with size and relief of land also given. Many candidates showed limited map interpretation skills by referring to the 'motorways' on the OS map extract. Similarly, some stated that the factory was away from housing for pollution reasons. Closer scrutiny of the OS map extract shows housing areas adjacent to the factory site.

Sub-question (d) also had mixed success. Nearly half the candidates failed to score any marks. Some clearly did not understand the requirements of the question or failed to respond.

Those who gained marks gave vague ideas about factory pollution, often linked to the sugar factory featured in the other Resources. Some good examples were noted, especially those linked to primary industries such as quarrying, mining and plantations. Those with vague ideas about industry, transport and energy were able to gain further marks with credible links to greenhouse gases and global climate change.

Sub-question (e) probably saw the greatest shift in focus within a Question due to the diverse nature of the Economic Development Theme. However, 90% of candidates selected the correct answer for part (i). Candidates also provided some thoughtful response to the more challenging part (ii). The most able wrote sophisticated responses linking health, education and lifestyle to income and increased life expectancy.

Birth and death rate were the most common correct answers for sub-question (f) with infant mortality and adult literacy also given. Only a few candidates could give accurate definitions of their chosen measures in terms of rates per 1,000 or percentages. Some candidates misread the question and gave explanations of how their chosen measures changed over time and/or indicated how developed a country was. Just over half the candidates failed to score any marks at all.

For sub question 2g) most candidates were able to name a multi-national company and provide some valid information about its effects in a chosen country. About one third of candidates achieved top of Level 2 or Level 3 marks. Although very few were able to give credible place specific detail about their chosen MNC and country. No candidates scored the full 9 marks on this question.

Nike based in named south east Asian countries was by far the most common response with cheap labour being given as a location factor and an effect. Both Examiners noted the exaggerated tone of some accounts of poor working conditions associated with 'sweatshop' style operations. Coca Cola in India and Apple/Foxconn in China were also popular examples. The

former had some clear accounts of the environmental impact of water usage and the latter showed awareness of workers' suicides in Foxconn's factory. Some candidates also included positive effects of MNCs in LEDCs such as job creation, development of skills and technology, and contribution to national economies through taxation and the multiplier effect. Candidates who linked a named MEDC with their chosen example were less successful in giving valid location factors or effects.

Other MNCs cited were: Dyson; Fiat; Ford; MacDonalds; Primark; Toyota and Walmart. A few candidates chose to use their well learned aid project case study and consequently did not score any marks.

A772/02 (Higher Tier)

General Comments

The paper allowed widespread differentiation. There were many excellent answers in which candidates demonstrated a thorough grasp of geographical principles and a detailed knowledge of place specific case studies to support their argument. However, it was suggested by examiners that some centres might be entering candidates for the higher tier who may be better suited to the foundation paper. A strong characteristic of weaker candidates is vagueness in many of their answers, especially where case study knowledge is required. If candidates are to reach Level 3 in case study sections there is a requirement that their answer is place specific in addition to being comprehensive. A good way to test this requirement is for candidates to read their answer and 'cover up' the name of the case study. A suitable answer about a particular place or event will be recognisable through the detailed references being made.

Where case studies were on familiar topics, candidates scored well. Most candidates selected appropriate case studies which they had learned in detail. This included some weaker candidates for whom the case studies were the best answers. For some candidates, the challenge was to select the appropriate detail to use in answering the specific question. Weaker candidates sometimes decided to write all they knew about the case study, whether it was relevant or not. Relevant place detail is often the main differentiating factor between Level 2 and Level 3 case studies. Although there are a limited number of case study topics, the focus of each case study will vary from year to year. It is worth noting that some case study examples may be better than others to answer questions with a different focus, for example where there is a focus on flooding or urban change.

Examiners felt that some weaker candidates did not understand what was required in some questions because they did not take notice of key commands such as 'use map evidence' (Question 2bii) and 'compare changes' (Question 2di).

Particular areas of examination technique which candidates must practice are as follows. Centres should give their candidates the opportunity to revise and apply basic map interpretation skills which they have learned. There are opportunities in each question for candidates to develop answers, and in some questions they are instructed to do so. Candidates need to consider how they might do this when the opportunities arise.

The change in format of the question paper did not seem to have hindered candidates. Maybe the removal of question choice helped them as they no longer had to make the decision of which question they would choose to answer. There was limited evidence that candidates had evaluated questions before starting to answer them or made rough plans for their answers. Candidates are advised to read through the whole paper before they begin their answers in order to pick out their best-known topics to start with. Also they should plan their answer in order to check relevance to the question before it is too late.

Time management was not a major issue for candidates. Some candidates lost marks by misreading or misinterpreting sections and consequently writing irrelevant answers. For example, they described how flooding could be prevented in their question 1 case study.

The award of marks for SPaG was not a major issue as most candidates were able to meet the high performance criteria in their case study answer. Where candidates omitted a case study or wrote very little their SPaG mark reflected this.

Although the examination system is perpetual it must be remembered that in each year the examination is a unique experience for that group of candidates. Consequently the following

advice may be useful to candidates about to embark on their final preparation for their 2015 examination, based on the revised specification.

- Read each question carefully;
- Pay particular attention to key words which are often emboldened, also 'command' words and words which set the context or scale of the answer;
- Be prepared for changes of topic within the general question focus;
- Do not repeat the same answer in different sections - such answers do not gain double credit;
- Be precise when using information from maps, graphs and diagrams;
- Relate questions to examples and identify appropriate case studies which have been learned;
- Learn the details of case studies to give them authenticity;
- Use the number of marks available for a section as a guide to the number of points needed;
- Develop ideas and extend answers in order to increase the marks which can be awarded;
- Re-read and check the answers if there is time at the end of the examination;

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

ai) Most candidates were able to give an accurate six figure grid reference within the range of accepted responses. A small number of candidates wrongly gave a four figure reference.

aii) Most candidates chose the correct definition of a spit.

aiii) Many candidates found this question difficult. Although most showed some familiarity with the processes of spit formation they did not explain them accurately. The process of longshore drift was not clearly explained with many answers not linking the direction of longshore drift to the prevailing wind. Some candidates explained the process of longshore drift but did not link the process to the formation of a spit. Candidates referred to deposition, and swash and backwash but did not explain their significance in the formation of a spit. Only the better candidates were able to link these separate strands together to produce a coherent explanation. Occasionally candidates gave a detailed description of a spit which was not asked for. A small minority of candidates used a diagram in their answer which usually aided their explanation. Correct ideas, which were in better answers, included the action of constructive waves depositing material, the influence of the wind on the recurved end of the spit, and material being moved along the coast. Some weaker candidates thought that a spit was formed by erosional processes and the spit was the remains of a cliff.

b) This question was well answered by many candidates. Although few candidates referred to a discordant coastline many did correctly identify the hard and soft rock types from the map and linked these to the formation of headlands and bays, showing good knowledge of geology and landforms. Some candidates, who correctly identified the rock types, failed to link these to the formation of the features. The answers of weaker candidates were characterised by poor terminology such as referring to 'rocks sticking out' rather than a headland. Some candidates did not study the resource carefully and so explained the formation of caves, arches, stacks and stumps.

c) The formation of the waterfall was generally explained well by candidates. Most were able to explain the process and usually identified specific erosional process as required, usually abrasion and hydraulic action. Some candidates had specific knowledge of High Force waterfall and identified the rock types, although this was not required to gain credit. Some answers included an explanation of how a gorge is formed, which was not required by the question. Some candidates included diagrams which usually helped their explanation, especially if they were labelled. Some candidates explained erosional processes but did not link these to the formation of the waterfall. The poorest answers referred to methods of transportation rather than erosion, and confused waterfalls with cliffs and therefore wrote about marine processes forming a wave-cut notch.

di) Many candidates described a floodplain accurately. Good answers identified the ideas that a floodplain is flat land, on either side of a river, and is an area that will be potentially flooded by the river. Some candidates also made reference to deposits of silt or alluvium which would be found there. A common misconception was that a floodplain is designed to control flooding or allowed to flood to protect other areas, rather than being a natural feature. Some candidates incorrectly focussed on the use of a floodplain rather than its natural features.

dii) This question discriminated well. Good answers identified the location of fast and slow flow in a meander and linked this to erosion and deposition. As with earlier questions a minority of candidates illustrated their answer with a labelled diagram which reinforced or developed their written ideas. Weaker candidates confused the processes operating on the inner and outer banks of a meander. Some answers included the development of an ox-bow lake which was not required. A minority of candidates focused on why a river starts to bend in its course which gained credit, but these answers also needed to explain the processes happening on the bend.

e) The case study answer was the better overall than Question 2. The most popular examples were rivers Valency and Ganges, although other common examples included Zambezi, Derwent, Eden and Severn. Many candidates included detailed knowledge about their chosen example which accessed the higher levels. Some answers were characterised by detailed information but lacked place specific references and so failed to score the highest marks. Weaker answers were characterised by inaccurate or exaggerated details about the effects. Answers which did not name the river were limited to Level 2; the most usual example where this happened was failing to name a river which was flooded at Boscastle and occasionally at other towns in the UK such as Carlisle and Cocker mouth. More able candidates were able to explain in detail the causes of the river flood, whereas weaker candidates focused on the impacts. Good answers included appropriate terminology such as antecedent rainfall, impermeable surfaces and interception. Some candidates went into detail about subsequent flood prevention measures which were not required by the question.

Question 2

a) Many candidates realised that the factories are located in the sugar beet growing area but few realised the importance of transporting the bulky raw material. Many candidates copied the sentence from the resource but did not link the idea to location. Weaker candidates referred to coastal location which is not shown on the map. Some candidates did not relate their answer to the map but gave general reasons for factory location.

bi) This question was challenging. The correct direction was the most common answer but many other directions were suggested. Some candidates showed little understanding of the skill required and gave answers such as bird's eye view, downwards, from right to left, from above, or from the side.

bii) Most candidates used map evidence as required, although a minority ignored that instruction. The most common evidence given by candidates referred to the main roads, Bury St Edmunds (although many candidates just referred to it as the town or urban area), the local

farms and an area of open or flat land. Candidates then explained why they might affect the factory location using ideas such as easy transport of raw materials or products, local workforce, access to raw materials and room to build or expand the factory. Weaker answers contained a number of misconceptions or errors. Candidates referred to a motorway or the A35 or A30 which are named in the key rather than identifying road numbers from the map. Some candidates interpreted the evidence incorrectly, for example that the road links in the area would benefit workers travelling to the factory. Weaker candidates referred to 'good roads' rather than main roads, they made reference to 'transport' with no detailed map evidence. Some candidates thought that the plantations shown on the map were the growing areas.

c) The question differentiated well and gave further evidence of the need to read the question carefully. Some candidates ignored the instruction 'for one other economic activity' and wrote about sugar manufacturing. This gained no credit, although answers about manufacturing were acceptable. Better candidates used a specific example which they had studied, such as a palm oil plantation, tourism, farming or forestry. They were then able to give developed ideas about the impacts of the activity on the environment. Answers which suggested general economic activities such as transport or factory were characterised by vague responses. Some candidates did not make it clear what their chosen activity was. Other errors included a focus on local people (suggesting visual impact or eyesore) or economy rather than the physical environment. Deforestation was sometime named as the activity rather than logging.

di) The quality of answers were variable. The best answers made a clear comparison between changes in life expectancy in the two countries, supported by accurate statistics. Weaker answers did not compare or use data appropriately, often misreading the graph. Some candidates included irrelevant reference to income.

dii) The question proved to be a good discriminator. Many candidates focused their answer on reasons such as improvements in diet or food supply, healthcare, clean water supply and education. As in other questions the degree of development often differentiated between the quality of the answer. Weaker candidates wrote little beyond the basic idea. A minority of candidates misunderstood or misread the question to relate the ideas to the change shown on the graph which is an increase in income and life expectancy. These candidates incorrectly wrote about change from the point of view of low or decreasing average income producing a fall in life expectancy.

e This proved to be a challenging question with many candidates being vague in their answers. These were characterised by ideas about help and development in LEDCs with no specific detail of what this might be. The better answers referred to specific examples of aid including short-term aid to respond to a natural disaster or long-term aid to help farmers or to improve water supply. Many good answers also included details about specific development aid, maybe linked to a particular project such as Goat Aid or an HEP scheme. Weaker candidates identified an advantage such as improving education but did not explain how this could be achieved. There were vague answers about providing food or water but no link to the specific reason why this might be required. Candidates wrote about 'helping the country to develop' without explaining how this might be done for farming, industry or infrastructure. Other unacceptable answers included 'it's free' and 'it helps to improve the lives of people'.

f) Many candidates gave well developed ideas about their chosen MNC. The main weakness in the answer of many candidates was a lack of any specific place detail about their chosen example. Answers could have related to many different MNCs in many countries. The most common choice of MNC was Nike. Other popular examples included Coca Cola, Walmart, Toyota, Fiat, Apple and McDonalds. Nike's location in Vietnam was the most popular choice which provided good case study material about reasons for location in the country and effects on people and the country as a whole. The only failing in many answers was a lack of place detail. Many candidates focused their answers on sweatshops and how they affected workers.

Generally candidates found more difficulty in explaining the reasons for location in many countries. Only the best candidates showed a clear understanding of globalisation. Better answers were also characterised by including positive as well as negative effects, and an understanding of how these had changed over time in terms of the economy, society and environment.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 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

© OCR 2014

