GCE

Geography

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H081**

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice for future examinations

It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the OCR website. If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on Interchange.

Further support from OCR

activeresults

Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/getting-started/

CPD Hub
Your route to OCR's teacher training

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Geography (H081)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

H081/01 Landscape and place

General Comments:

Across the range of candidate answers, it was good to see a high-level of geographical understanding and subject specific knowledge. It is clear that candidates and centres have taken on board some of the advice and comments from last year's examinations and use them to their advantage this year. There was a similar breakdown as last year in the number of candidates choosing the three landscape options and most candidates had clearly chosen their area of expertise.

Those scoring the highest marks tended to have the following qualities in common:

- Good time management with appropriate division of efforts across the paper, ensuring that everything was completed.
- Well-structured extended writing, evidenced by succinct introductions, followed by discrete paragraphs and a relevant conclusion which sums up, rather than repeated, the argument.
- Appropriate balance between AO1 and AO2 for the essay questions.
- Good analysis of statistics and the subsequent interpretation.

Candidates who scored marks in the lower bands displayed some of the following characteristics:

- Uneven time management resulting in lengthy answers for short tariff questions and not enough detail destination for those longer questions which required it.
- Unstructured essays which did not use paragraphs or contain a clear thread of arguments.
- Over simplistic description where more complex application or analysis was required for the top levels.

Candidates should be reminded of the importance of clear and legible handwriting. Moreover, whilst there were many examples of excellent penmanship, there are an increasing number of poorly presented, and therefore difficult to read, papers. A small number of candidates chose to add in a diagram to support their answers and this is, as always, a welcome addition to an answer if clearly labelled and relevant. Whilst it is perfectly acceptable for candidates to answer the questions in any order they choose to do so, it is important that these answers are clearly and properly labelled.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Landscape Systems

Coastal Landscapes

Q1(a)(i) gave candidates an image of a cliff with a beach below and were asked to describe how it was formed. There was no credit for simply naming the landform and, at this level; candidates should be able to describe it in detail. Most were able to answer this well, citing the steepness, the rock fall and the wave-cut notch as three of the key features. Candidates should be conscious of the command word 'describe' so as not to lose time in explanation.

Candidates were required to demonstrate their understanding of geology in **Q1(a)(ii)** and the vast majority demonstrated the connection between harder rock type and slower erosion. Only the strongest candidates were able to move past this simple point to develop answers into a detailed answer including ideas about the joints in the rock, the bedding planes or particle densities. It was clear that many candidates were less confident about this area of the topic.

Formation of spits in **Q1(b)** was a very well answered question with well-developed knowledge shining through many answers. Typically, high end answers discussed the movement of material via longshore drift and the change into open water, followed by deposition, recurved end and a salt marsh behind. Often, these were accompanied by diagrams, the best of which were clear and labelled. Weaker candidates, falling back on knowledge from GCSE were unable to reach the highest levels due to the lack of developed ideas.

For candidates to achieve the highest marks in **Q1(c),** it was necessary to demonstrate their comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the ways in which humans can impact upon the coastal landscape, as well as to apply this in order to make a judgement as to the extent to which is it the main cause of change. This often took the form of case studies, such as erosion on the Holderness Coast, or management in Swanage or Sandbanks to name but a few. It is not necessary for candidates to rewrite the question into an introductory paragraph, and the best answers contained distinct paragraphs, each with a discrete point, and a conclusion which brought the argument together as opposed to repeating the information. Place-specific detail was used throughout the top answers, and those who did not use any often struggled to get out of the bottom level.

Glaciated Landscapes

Q2(a)(i) gave candidates an image of a corrie with a scree slope and tarn and were asked to describe how it was formed. There was no credit for simply naming the landform and, at this level, candidates should be able to describe it in detail. Most were able to answer this well, citing the steepness, the shape and the corrie lip as three of the key features. Candidates should be conscious of the command word 'describe' so as not to lose time in explanation and should also be able to use subject specific language; thus 'lake' was not accepted, instead requiring 'tarn'.

Candidates were required to demonstrate their understanding of geology in **Q2(a)(ii)** and the vast majority demonstrated the connection between harder rock type and slower erosion. Only the strongest candidates were able to move past this simple point to develop answers into a detailed answer including ideas about the joints in the rock, the bedding planes or particle densities. It was clear that many candidates were less confident about this area of the topic.

Formation of terminal moraine in **Q2(b)** was a very well answered question with well-developed knowledge shining through many answers. Typically, high end answers discussed the production of material via freeze-thaw or plucking, movement of material en- / supra- / sub-glacially followed by deposition at the point of maximum extent. Often, these were accompanied

by diagrams, the best of which were clear and labelled. Discussion on the sorting of material and post-glacial adjustment of the landform further served to demonstrate a candidate's expertise.

For candidates to achieve the highest marks in **Q2(c),** it was necessary to demonstrate their comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the ways in which humans can impact upon the periglacial landscape, as well as to apply this in order to make a judgement as to the extent to which is it the main cause of change. This often took the form of case studies, such as the Trans-American Pipeline in Alaska. It is not necessary for candidates to rewrite the question into an introductory paragraph, and the best answers contained distinct paragraphs, each with a discrete point, and a conclusion which brought the argument together as opposed to repeating the information. Place-specific detail was used throughout the top answers, and those who did not use any, often struggled to get out of the bottom level.

Dryland Landscapes

Q3(a)(i) gave candidates an image of a desert landscape with ventifacts and pedestal rocks and were asked to describe how it was formed. There was no credit for simply naming the landform and, at this level; candidates should be able to describe it in detail. Most were able to answer this well, citing the steepness, the shape and the corrie lip as three of the key features. Candidates should be conscious of the command word 'describe' so as not to lose time in explanation. Some wrote about buttes and mesas, but these are on a much larger scale.

Candidates were required to demonstrate their understanding of geology in **Q3(a)(ii)** and the vast majority demonstrated the connection between harder rock type and slower erosion. Only the strongest candidates were able to move past this simple point to develop answers into a detailed answer including ideas about the uniform lithology of the rock, and the resulting smoothness of the erosion. It was clear that many candidates were less confident about this area of the topic.

Formation of alluvial fans in **Q3(b)** was a very well answered question with well-developed knowledge shining through many answers. Typically, high end answers discussed availability of material in the desert environment which, with little to keep it stable, is easily transported in times of heavy rainfall. Discussion using specific terminology such as 'delta-shaped fans' or 'ephemeral streams' further served to demonstrate a candidate's expertise.

For candidates to achieve the highest marks in **Q3(c),** it was necessary to demonstrate their comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the ways in which humans can impact upon the dryland landscape, as well as to apply this in order to make a judgement as to the extent to which is it the main cause of change. This often took the form of case studies, such as the Hoover Dam on the Colorado River, or tourism in and around Las Vegas. It is not necessary for candidates to rewrite the question into an introductory paragraph, and the best answers contained distinct paragraphs, each with a discrete point, and a conclusion which brought the argument together as opposed to repeating the information. Place-specific detail was used throughout the top answers, and those who did not use any often struggled to get out of the bottom level.

Changing Spaces; Making Places

Q4(a) required candidates to show they understood how religion could influence perception of place. A number of answers contained prejudiced or unsubstantiated views and it is important that candidates ensure their answers are based in fact. Saying that, exemplified answers, including pilgrimages to Lourdes or Mecca, or spiritualism at Uluru were common.

In order to get the mark for **Q4(b)(i),** candidates needed to interpret the data and give a comparative, such as higher / lower or to work out the difference. Giving a simple repetition of the data from the two boroughs was not enough to be creditworthy.

Like the question above, simply repeating data from the figure for **Q4(b)(ii)** was not enough to gain marks. Candidates had to ensure that they were identifying the reasons for social inequality, such as the level of education of the population being lower in Barking and Dagenham. It was not enough to say education 'was worse' as this is not derivable from the data. Clear links between these points were needed for development, such as lower level of education limiting people to lower paid jobs.

For many candidates, **Q4(c)** was well answered insofar as there was reasonable explanation of how places are created. The command in the questions is to use evidence from the figure, and many would have achieved a higher level if there had been more explicit links from the evidence to the points made, as was seen in the best answers. Variety of housing and building stock, and the inclusion of Heritage Housing were some of the more common points raised.

Rebranding is a popular topic and the quality of answers in **Q4(d)** reflected this. Barcelona, Stratford and Salford were some of the most popular case studies candidates used to assess their response. Most followed a similar pattern of introduction, an example where rebranding was a success and an example where it was less successful, followed by a conclusion. This format worked well and allowed candidates to explore the 'to what extent' element of the question. It is important to remember that a judgement is required, and candidates should feel confident in offering a supported opinion, rather than sitting on the fence.

Fieldwork

Candidates had been given a map of Barcelona with the location of photos taken by tourists and locals and for **Q5(a)(i)** they were asked to give a suggestion for a geographical question (or hypothesis) for study. Most were able to offer a suggestion of a suitable question. Only some were able to access all the development marks by giving linked evidence to support the justification of their suggested question; this was often to do with the location of the photos.

Perhaps due to the relatively new ideas of crowd-sourced data which **Q5(a)(ii)** refers to, some of the answers demonstrated a lack of understanding as to what it was. That said, many correctly identified that it was often quicker, cheaper and broader in its collection field than traditional methods.

It was clear that some candidates answering **Q5(a)(iii)** did not understand what crowd-sourced data was, and it was also striking the number that assumed that any photos that people took would have their faces in them – a reflection upon the 'selfie' generation, perhaps. Informed consent, taking photos in sensitive or restricted areas and ownership of data were all possible considerations that were common and the very best answers were clearly structured with two points in separate paragraphs.

Sampling strategies was the focus for **Q5(b)** and for a number of candidates, this presented a challenge as they interpreted this as the same as methodology. As a result, some did not score any marks as they were not answering the question. However, there were numerous answers focusing on random, stratified, opportunistic and systematic sampling strategies to name some of the more common answers. The very best candidates were those who not only referenced their fieldwork, but carefully evaluated the success (or otherwise) of their strategies and, in some cases, offered alternative suggestions of how they might refine their investigation in the future, demonstrating a clear grasp of the sampling process.

H081/02 Geographical debates

General Comments:

Responses showed a preference in favour of three topics, Hazardous Earth, Disease Dilemmas and Climate Change with the first mentioned accounting for over sixty percent of all scripts. Exploring Oceans and Future of Food were represented by similar but very small numbers of candidates.

The paper has three sections representing a variety of opportunities for candidates to display their knowledge, understanding, application to data or a resource, analysis and evaluation. Section A consists of five sub-parts of short and medium length questions. Sub-parts (a) and (b) tested candidates knowledge and understanding of aspects of the option. Sub-part (c) is divided into two. (i) Asked candidates to use a skill in the context of some numerical data with (ii) focused on interpreting and analysing the data. Sub-part (d) was a medium length question asking candidates to evaluate an issue.

Section B consists of two questions concentrating on synoptic links between the respective topic and either a landscape System or Changing Spaces; Making Places. In this context, as is made clear in the specification, it is fundamental in all three landscape systems, that candidates know and understand how their chosen landscape can be viewed as systems. Once grasped, this way of organising their knowledge and understanding can allow candidates to investigate various influences and interactions, as asked for in Section B.

Section C offered a choice of two questions in each topic which candidates were required to select one. These were extended response questions demanding full prose responses.

The section of the report that follows is organised by topic so that all three examination paper sections (A-C) for a particular topic are dealt with one after the other.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Topic 2.1 Climate Change

Section A

Q1(a) asked for evidence of the two methods used to reconstruct past climates. Candidates were confident in their knowledge and understanding of methods used to construct past climates. Many candidates made reference to ice cores and dendrochronology (tree rings). Most candidates explained how the method shows an explanation of past climates. A few candidate responses did tend to describe the method rather than explain how it shows a link to past climates.

Q1(b) asked candidates to suggest how changes in atmospheric factors influenced the global mean energy balance. Candidates showed a clear understanding of the changes which are occurring in the atmosphere. The understanding of how the change can influence the global mean energy budget was very rarely developed. Whilst most candidates showed an awareness of the factors influencing the atmospheric factors, too few offered authoritative details such as identifying the impact on the energy budget.

Q1(c)(i) candidates struggled with working out the standard deviation calculation. A number of candidates did not use calculators which affected their ability to work out the answer and also the time it had taken to answer the question. Candidates who were able to carry out the calculation did not always provide the answer to one decimal place.

Q1(c)(ii) asked candidates to analyse reasons for the changes in carbon dioxide emissions between countries, using evidence from the table. This latter instruction in the question was too often ignored although the more convincing responses made good use of the trends over time and quoted figures directly from the table. The reasons offered for the variations tended to be appropriate such as level of development, international agreements and energy use. Responses were particularly successful when these reasons were linked to the differences between countries. Weaker responses did not make reference to the variations of countries.

Q1(d) asked for analysis and evaluation of the influence the media and scientific evidence have over the climate change debate. There were some interesting discussions based around the power the media has in presenting views on climate change. Candidates presented higher ability arguments linking to the accessibility of media compared to scientific evidence. This included reference to the bias the media play. Candidates presented less convincing arguments about the influence of scientific evidence. Whilst the understanding of the roles of the media and scientific evidence is secure the ability to discuss the importance of these two parts of the debate was less developed.

Section B – Synoptic questions

Q6(a) used a choropleth map showing global surface temperature variations. Candidates were asked to suggest how the changes on landscapes may vary globally. Candidates showed convincing understanding of how climate change can impact landscapes. Most candidates focused on providing synoptic links to coastal and cold environments. This involved a discussion on how a change in surface temperatures would impact sea level changes. Developed responses were able to focus on the system which was impacted as a result of changes to

global surface temperatures. These were, however, in the minority with too many candidates unable to link climate change with the impact on the landscape system. Greater use could be made of the resource to show how variations occur globally.

Q6(b) asked candidates to examine how climate change can influence the informal representation of places. Candidates tended to describe how climate change can impact a place rather than focusing upon how the representation of a place can be influenced by climate change. A large number of candidates presented discussions on how climate change will affect tourist destinations and how this can result in an informal representation of place. Candidates tended to spend the majority of their response discussing the effects of a change in surface temperatures, but did not really engage in detail with the idea of informal representations of places. When informal representations of places were discussed they tended to focus on the representation presented via the media, films and television programmes.

Section C

Q11 asked candidates to consider the evidence that the world has warmed since the late-nineteenth century. Candidates had a secure knowledge of the evidence that the world has warmed. This included detailed references made to changes in surface temperatures, shrinking of valley glaciers and rising sea levels. Candidates did occasionally tend to lose focus and spend a large amount of time describing the evidence rather than presenting a discussion of the extent to which the statement was true. Candidates were less secure on their discussion about the extent to which it is not true that the world has warmed since the late-nineteenth century. The consensus was that there is strong evidence that the world has warmed since the late-nineteenth century.

Q12. Candidates generally felt that that effective response to climate change did require more than international directives. Candidates had a secure knowledge of the various international directives that are in place to respond to climate change. The most popular international directives discussed included the Kyoto and Paris agreements on climate change. Candidates made clear reference to the importance of scale when responding to climate change. Most candidates structured their answer to include responses made at an individual, local, national and international response. Few candidates focused on the response taking place in terms of land use change or changes to transport initiatives. Whilst candidate's knowledge was secure on the directives there was less discussion on the effectiveness of the policies. The majority of the answers that did examine the effectiveness of the policies tended to focus on the effectiveness in terms of countries carbon dioxide emissions or countries willingness to take part in the directives. The more convincing discussions were able to offer factual discussions about the effectiveness of the directives.

Topic 2.2 Disease Dilemmas

Section A

Q2(a) asked candidates to explain two ways physical barriers negatively affect disease mitigation. Candidates had a good understanding of the different physical barriers which can affect diseases. The most popular answers made reference to mountains and isolated locations. Fewer candidates made reference to natural hazards impacting the disease mitigation. Candidates that did not achieve full marks on this question often did not explain how the barrier negatively impacted the disease mitigation.

Q2(b) asked candidates to suggest how raising standards of living can influence a country's epidemiological transition. Candidates showed a good understanding on the epidemiological transition model. Candidates who gained the most marks were able to draw on the multiple factors that enable control of communicable diseases and the move to non-communicable diseases. Secure understanding of the transition model was presented. The best answers referenced countries to illustrate points.

Q2(c)(i) was answered by the majority of candidates. Some did not show their working or did not give the mean to one decimal place. Few candidates were able to execute the formula with the figures provided.

Q2(c)(ii) asked candidates to analyse reasons for differences in neonatal mortality rates using Figure 2. This latter instruction in the question was too often ignored although the more convincing responses made good use of variations amongst the countries and quoted figures directly from the table. Candidates often focused on a discussion about mortality rates rather than focusing upon neonatal mortality rates. The majority of the answers discussed the reasons being caused by economic development and access to healthcare. The candidates tended to focus on the impact on the standard of healthcare and access varying across the development spectrum. The more authoritative candidates were able to categorise the countries (AC, EDC and LIDC) in terms of varying neonatal mortality rates.

Q2(d) asked candidates to evaluate the suggestion that disease vectors are influenced more by physical factors than human factors. Candidates tended to conclude that physical factors were more influential in the speed of disease vectors. Climate related factors were the most popular explanations provided on how a disease vector would be influenced. Human factors often made reference to migration of farmers, vaccinations and globalisation. Examiners were pleased to read responses which made reference to countries where physical factors had influenced the spread of the disease vector. The more convincing arguments focused on the disease vector. Candidates who gained highest marks were those who were able to identify a range of physical and human factors and who could provide accurate place/vector specific information.

Section B – Synoptic questions

Q7(a) was based on a paragraph on an extract from a newspaper linking Federal funding through Obamacare to vaccinations. The candidates were asked to suggest how the healthcare mitigation strategies of organisations might impact social inequality in places. Candidates generally used the resource well and discussed the inequality caused by a removal of the Obamacare. Fewer candidates made reference to other organisations such as the NHS. Candidates that did make reference to the NHS often made a global comparison to impacts on

social inequality. Those who scored highest were able to identify health mitigation strategies of (different) organisations and understood what is meant by social inequality and how it relates to health care.

Q7(b) asked candidates to examine patterns of disease and landscape systems can be both influenced by climatic factors. The candidates had a good understanding of how climatic factors can influence disease. There was some difficulty with relating landscape systems to climate and then to patterns of disease. The pattern of disease was often ignored by candidates.

Section C

Q13 asked candidates to evaluate the success of mitigation and response strategies for a named no communicable disease. Highest performing candidates were able to integrate different organisations and entities who provide or develop mitigation and response strategies. These candidates were able to identify a range of strategies; analyse their effectiveness and provide place-specific information. The majority of candidates focused on cancer within the UK or India. Some candidates did make general comments about cancer rather than specifying the type of cancer. The success of the strategies was sometimes overlooked in favour of a description of the strategies being used to mitigate the disease. The candidates had a good understanding of the role of NGO's and charities in mitigating and responding to the disease. The success of NGO's and charities was often overlooked. Some candidates spent too long describing the mitigation and response strategies, particularly treatment, without considering or analysing issues to do with delivery or spatial inequalities. A few candidates did answer this question with reference to a communicable disease.

Q14 was answered by significantly fewer candidates. Those who did choose to answer this question concluded that global mobility made it more difficult to respond to disease diffusion. Candidates had a secure knowledge of disease diffusion. Those who were most successful had included good place-specific data and analysis. The more detailed analysis tended to include a range of factors including social, economic, political and physical factors affecting disease diffusion through global mobility. They also included how global mobility may make it easier as well as more difficult to respond to disease diffusion. Candidates tended to focus on Malaria or HIV/Aids.

Topic 2.3 Exploring Oceans

Few candidates offered responses for this topic therefore it is difficult to draw generalisations.

Section A

Q3(a) Most candidates were able to identify the change in temperature influencing ocean ecosystems. Candidates tended to focus on increasing temperatures impacting the ocean ecosystem. Candidates had a secure understanding of how an increase in temperature can influence the ocean ecosystems. Occasionally candidates spent too long discussing the impact on coral reef ecosystems. Very few candidates discussed the ways changes in temperatures can impact salt marshes

Q3(b) asked for explanations of how pollution can impact marine organisms. The type of pollution tended to be discussed in terms of litter/ debris and oil spills. Convincing examples of incidents were used by candidates including oil spills. There was less discussion of agricultural or industrial pollution being responsible for impacting marine organisms. The type of organism was often vague. Little discussion was provided linking the impact of the pollution to the food chains and webs.

Q3(c)(i) the majority of candidates did not show their working or did not give the mean to one decimal place.

Q3(c)(ii) asked candidates to analyse reasons for the differences in the amount of cargo imported via oceans between countries with reference to Figure 3. This latter instruction in the question was too often ignored although the more convincing responses made good use of the quoted figures from the table. Most candidates looked at the reasons being factors such as access to trade routes and having a coastline.

Q3(d) asked candidates how far they agreed with the statement ‘treating the oceans as ‘global commons’ has been detrimental to them’. There was some very detailed understanding of the global commons. The tragedy of the commons was well understood by the majority of the candidates. The candidates used the tragedy of the commons to provide a framework for the answer. The International Whaling Commission was discussed by a number of candidates. There were some sensible discussions about the difficulties of global commons. Stronger answers made reference to the various zones extending out from a country’s coastline nor the existence and operation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

Section B – Synoptic questions

Q8(a) asked about how oceans are used in determining place profiles. Candidates made good use of Figure 8. The candidates had a good understanding of how important the ocean is in creating place profiles. Most answers tended to focus on ocean margins.

Q8(b) Candidates were asked to identify the influence climate change has on both the oceans and landscape systems. Candidates were able to provide synoptic links to the impact on climate change. The majority of the landscapes discussed related to coastal landscapes. There was less discussion about how climate change impacted the landscape system.

Q15 was answered by a small number of candidates. The candidates provided a good discussion of the impacts on the high latitude oceans. Effective use of examples were provided. Candidates provided convincing arguments which made reference to the threats to indigenous people. Threats and opportunities tended to be discussed in terms of social and economic aspects. Less discussion was provided in an evaluative manner to consider the extent of the impact. Opportunities tended to focus on economic aspects.

Q16 required candidates to assess the extent to which oceans have become locations of conflict. The candidates had a good understanding of the concept of the global commons and how this can lead to conflict. There was a number of interesting answers about the issues in South China. Candidates tended to focus on the conflict being related to piracy, resources and political issues. The discussion surrounding the argument that the oceans are not a location of conflict was not as well established. Candidates could have pointed out that there are a large proportion of oceans that have no conflict or are mutually beneficial for trade, tourism or energy uses.

Topic 2.4 Future of Food

Few candidates offered responses for this topic therefore it is difficult to draw generalisations.

Section A

Q4(a) asked for two ways globalisation of the food industry has created opportunities. Most candidates were able to identify the ways and provide an explanation as to how the food industry has created opportunities. There were a good number of candidates who focused on the diversity of food. The use of technology was also discussed a number of times with reference to modified crops.

Q4(b) asked candidates to suggest why patterns of food security within a country is dynamic. Most of these responses offered relevant case study detail. The stronger answers showed a clear understanding about the dynamic nature of the pattern of food security. Greater detail on the pattern could have been described in terms of seasonality or location.

Q4(c)(i) some did not show their working or did not give the mean to one decimal place.

Q4(c)(ii) asked candidates to analyse reasons for differences in the global food security index with reference to Figure 4. This latter instruction in the question was too often ignored although the more convincing responses made good use of variations amongst the countries and quoted figures directly from the table. Human factors featured prominently in answers such as the political system. There was less focus on the physical factors such as the climate and soils. Economic factors were also mentioned by many and were based on the contrasting economic resources of the selected countries with the more authoritative candidates able to categorise these (AC, EDC and LIDC).

Q4(d) asked candidates how far they agreed with 'food security is most likely to be affected by human factors'. Most candidates were able to discuss effectively the view that food security is affected by human factors. Candidates based the framework of the discussion around the idea that ACs and many EDCs have high levels of food security and that it is amongst the LIDCs where food security remains a serious issue. Evaluation came from some candidates when they discussed contrasts in food security compared to physical factors. Physical factors that were highlighted as influencing food security were natural disasters such as earthquakes and flooding. Candidates would benefit from spending more time looking at the extent to which they agree or disagree with the argument.

Section B – Synoptic questions

Q9(a) looked at how food security may be affected by migration to cities with reference to Figure 9. This was generally done very well. Candidates focused on the impact of food security changing due to the movement in LIDC's of migrants from rural areas to the cities. Candidates tended to discuss the reasons for lower production in rural areas caused by migration and also the impacts on urban areas of having a larger urban population. Candidates generally considered the term affected to make reference to the access and availability of food. Most candidates discussed the problems created by migration to the cities. Fewer candidates discussed the potential benefits such as migration improving food security as remittances can ensure populations have access to food for consumption.

Q9(b) asked candidates to focus on how food security can be negatively affected by landscape systems. Responses tended to focus on climate but too rarely did an answer include location specific detail. There was less focus on the landscape systems which would be negatively affected.

Section C

Q17 was answered by very few candidates. Their examinations of the extent to which food shocks being caused by natural rather than human factors tended to focus on issues to do with natural hazards. This often provided a framework for a large amount of discussion as well as links to the human factors in terms of management. A good range of case studies were used to present the arguments.

Q18 asked candidates to discuss whether 'international cooperation is essential to guarantee a future food security for all nations'. International organisations were discussed such as the EU, WTO and FAO. Examiners were pleased to see that candidates had also included and made reference to international aid helping to ensure food security for a number of nations. Fewer candidates moved on to focus on how outside of the international cooperation there are stakeholders such as TNC's and agribusinesses who have a role in decision making.

Topic 2.5 Hazardous Earth

Section A

Q5(a) asked candidates for two pieces of evidence to support the theory of continental drift. Candidates were able to provide two pieces of evidence. Most candidates were able to explain how that piece of evidence supported the theory of continental drift. The most popular answers being a discussion of the continents fitting together and fossil based evidence. Candidates could make greater use of locations when looking at where the continents fit together. Examiners were pleased with the specific nature of fossils being discussed.

Q5(b) asked candidates to explain how volcanic hazards are affected by the types of volcanic eruptions. Candidates tended to answer the question in terms of a comparison between explosive and effusive eruptions. The use of terminology was generally effective but too often responses offered 'mirror' points. Those who scored highest were those who knew most about different types of volcanic eruptions and who could link these to their possible hazards. Candidates did tend to end up describing the volcanic eruptions rather than focusing upon how the hazards are affected by the eruption.

Q5(c)(i) Candidates tended to struggle with the calculation of standard deviation. Some did not show their working or did not give the mean to one decimal place.

Q5(c)(ii) asked candidates to analyse reasons for differences in the number of deaths from volcanoes between countries with reference to Figure 5. This latter instruction in the question was too often ignored although the more convincing responses made good use of the information provided with quoted figures directly from the table. Candidates often made reference to reasons for the differences being due to economic development. A number of candidates missed the importance of the frequency and type of volcanic activity in specific countries.

Q5(d) asked for a discussion on whether volcanic hazards are easier to manage than earthquake hazards. Candidates who gained the highest marks were those who knew the hazards posed by earthquakes and volcanoes. Many candidates did talk in general terms about earthquakes being harder to manage without reference to the specific hazard. When discussing volcanic hazards candidates should think about the management with a close relationship being made to the type of hazard such as lava flows, pyroclastic flows, tephra and lahars. Candidates had a secure knowledge of the different types of management used. Candidates used a wide range of case studies with effective use. Candidates generally concluded that earthquakes were more difficult to manage. Candidates did discuss management in a number of contexts such as individual management compare to national management of the hazard.

Section B – Synoptic questions

Q10(a) used a photograph showing the active Mount Agung, a volcano in Bali, Indonesia. Candidates were asked to suggest how tectonically active areas are important in influencing the representation of a place. It was encouraging that the vast majority of candidates knew what is meant by a representation of a place. Many were able to discuss the photograph and how this would have an impact on the representation of place. Candidates successfully discussed the different stakeholders such as farmers, governments and residents who would want to represent the place as safe to attract people to live and to visit the area. Most candidates tended to focus

on the importance of informal representations of place. Fewer candidates consider the importance of formal evidence in representing tectonic active areas.

Q10(b) asked for an examination of how responses to tectonic hazards might be influenced by landscape systems. Only a few related it to how landscape systems might affect responses in the aftermath of a tectonic event, however some did relate it to how landscape systems may affect responses to the potential occurrence of a tectonic event (ie, mitigating strategies – eg sea walls against tsunamis). Candidates did not seem to develop the discussion about the landscape system or were not able to make the connections. This was a question that required careful reading. A large number of candidates looked at coastal landscapes systems impacting the responses to tectonic hazards. Generally, candidates were not that convincing in their linking of their landscape system with tectonic activity.

Section C

Q19 asked to what extent are impacts of tectonic activity related to a country's level of development. This was by far the most popular of the pair in this topic with candidates. Candidates generally understood the question and were able to provide a comparison of two different countries at contrasting levels of economic development. Candidates were generally secure in their knowledge and understanding of the range of impacts arising from tectonic activity. The real world examples tended to be Haiti and Japan. There were some very convincing discussions of how the level of economic development can affect the country's ability to prepare for tectonic events. This was a question where some candidates possibly spent too much of their time on case study information and not enough analysing the extent to which the impact is related to the country's level of development. The case study of Haiti was used effectively to discuss a countries ability to recover from a tectonic hazard.

Q20, asked for an assessment of how people's ability to cope with tectonic hazards has changed over time. Candidates were keen to demonstrate that risks have indeed reduced over time, quoting advances in monitoring and prediction due to technology such as satellites and equipment such as tilt metres and seismometers. Most candidates looked at the question in terms of advancement in technology impacting people's ability to cope. Candidates did occasionally make reference to the Park Model to show disaster response over time. Generally candidates performed better in demonstrating their knowledge and understanding compared to their analysis and evaluation. Candidates could discuss the extent to which people's ability to cope is influenced by other factors such as the frequency of the hazard or severity of the hazard. Too often, however, candidates were so taken up with giving detailed descriptions of coping strategies and techniques, especially those concerned with buildings; as a result the time element in the question was forgotten. Responses were greatly helped in their authority if they contained some understanding of what is meant by coping.

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip candidates with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

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:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2018