

Subject: Geography

Level: 2

Standards: 91240, 91242, 91243

Part A: Commentary

The examination was made up of three assessments and candidates had sufficient time to complete all three in the time allowed. Candidates who read the questions carefully before beginning their responses were able to achieve to a higher standard. Candidates who integrated and explained geographic concepts, as well as relevant information from their case study area, were able to achieve with Excellence.

Some candidates attempted to use pre-prepared answers that did not answer the question.

The space given in the examination booklet is an indication of the expectation of the length of a response. Candidates who wrote on extra paper may not necessarily achieve to a higher level.

Part B: Report on standards

91240: Demonstrate geographic understanding of a large natural environment

Examination

The examination was made up of one question with multiple parts.

Observations

Candidates who demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of their chosen natural environment with supporting evidence achieved a higher grade than those who wrote in generalities.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- read the question fully and used terminology from the question in their answer
- included a sufficient level of detail to support their answer only at Achievement level
- explained a one-sided interaction of how people affect the environment
- provided basic case study information.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- wrote descriptively with no explanation
- provided no case study material
- showed limited understanding of the environment with a lack of depth in their response.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- provided appropriate and relevant facts and figures
- referred to specific groups or individuals
- explained more than one idea in each part of the question
- provided relevant, detailed case study information in their accurate response.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- displayed understanding of, and were able to comprehensively apply, interaction as it affected both the group/individual and the natural environment
 - used groups that allowed discussion of multiple interactions
 - incorporated geographic terminology and concepts
 - showed insight through high quality, comprehensive answers.
-

91242: Demonstrate geographic understanding of differences in development

Examination

The examination was made up of one question with multiple parts.

Observations

The question required candidates to explain the advantages of an indicator for measuring differences in development. Some candidates simply described their chosen indicator, e.g., discussing reasons for the indicator, giving reasons for the GDP or HDI in a particular location.

Chosen strategies need to be specific. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) were not suitable unless specific strategies for fulfilling the SDGs were explained within the response. Other strategies such as simply stating “improve education or healthcare”, or “reduce HIV” also needed to be more specific and give explanation of actions to achieve the outcomes recognised.

Candidates who chose to write about how a strategy improved the standard of living for a particular gender needed to relate this further to the development of a location overall and discuss how this reduced differences in development between two locations.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- lacked explanation and described many aspects of their responses
- implied differences in development between two locations
- included some supporting case study evidence
- included vague strategies in Part B, e.g., increase education, but the responses did not give specific detail of how this would impact development.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- described the indicator rather than explaining either reasons for its advantages or how a strategy improves development
- lacked evidence and content knowledge
- made no reference to case study locations or chose to use gender or ethnicity differences, and included no evidence of differences in development in named locations
- implied differences in development between two locations
- did not answer the question.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- answered both questions with some level of explanation
- stated differences in development between two locations
- selected suitable strategies and explained them in detail with reference to reducing differences in development between two locations
- supported their responses with case study evidence of areas at different levels of development.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- showed explicit understanding of differences in development through evidence of two different locations
- explored numerous aspects of development
- supported their response with comprehensive case study evidence
- demonstrated geographic insight through their application of geographic concepts and terminology.

91243: Apply geography concepts and skills to demonstrate understanding of a given environment

Examination

The paper consisted of one question with multiple parts. The resource booklet provided all the information and support material required.

Observations

Many candidates were able to unpack and apply the concept of sustainability but their understanding of interaction was weaker. The interaction needs to be explained rather than just defined.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- completed all parts of the examination
- could show basic understanding of the concept of sustainability but needed to demonstrate further understanding of interaction
- provided minimal supporting evidence
- did not apply the concepts explicitly

- did not apply common geographic conventions appropriately
- used their own knowledge instead of the information provided in the resource booklet, e.g., the historical/biblical significance of the area.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not attempt the whole paper, specifically leaving out the final part
- did not include any supporting evidence
- were descriptive in their responses and did not answer the question
- lacked understanding of the application of the required concepts
- were inaccurate with mapping and/or conventions.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- carefully read and answered all parts of the question
- applied the concepts explicitly
- showed understanding of both sustainability and interaction
- used specific evidence from the resources to support their answer
- were accurate with both the mapping and conventions
- used relevant geographic terminology in the analysis of the resources.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- wrote specifically and in context of the question
- unpacked and applied the concepts using the definitions provided
- supported their answers with a wide range of specific evidence
- used the planning page effectively for the long answer
- linked all parts of the paper in their final response
- completed the skills with accuracy.