

# Mark Scheme (Results) January 2011

GCE

## GCE Geography (6GE02) Paper 1



Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **Geography** telephone line: **0844 372 2185**

January 2011

Publications Code US026348

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## General Guidance on Marking

All candidates must receive the same treatment.

Examiners should look for qualities to reward rather than faults to penalise. This does NOT mean giving credit for incorrect or inadequate answers, but it does mean allowing candidates to be rewarded for answers showing correct application of principles and knowledge.

Examiners should therefore read carefully and consider every response: even if it is not what is expected it may be worthy of credit.

Candidates must make their meaning clear to the examiner to gain the mark. Make sure that the answer makes sense. Do not give credit for correct words/phrases which are put together in a meaningless manner. Answers must be in the correct context.

Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the Team Leader must be consulted.

## Using the mark scheme

The mark scheme gives:

- an idea of the types of response expected
- how individual marks are to be awarded
- the total mark for each question
- examples of responses that should NOT receive credit.

- 1 / means that the responses are alternatives and either answer should receive full credit.
- 2 ( ) means that a phrase/word is not essential for the award of the mark, but helps the examiner to get the sense of the expected answer.
- 3 [ ] words inside square brackets are instructions or guidance for examiners.
- 4 Phrases/words in **bold** indicate that the meaning of the phrase or the actual word is **essential** to the answer.
- 5 ecf/TE/cq (error carried forward) means that a wrong answer given in an earlier part of a question is used correctly in answer to a later part of the same question.

## Quality of Written Communication

Questions which involve the writing of continuous prose will expect candidates to:

- Show clarity of expression
- Construct and present coherent arguments
- Demonstrate an effective use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Full marks will be awarded if the candidate has demonstrated the above abilities.

Questions where QWC is likely to be particularly important are indicated "QWC" in the mark scheme BUT this does not preclude others.

**Additional Comments specific to 6GE02**

- Always credit bullet points and similar lists, but remember if the list is the **only response**, then this is unlikely to be able to get into the top-band (L3 or L4) based on QWC shortcomings. However, bullets and lists as **part of a response** should permit access to the top band.
- Credit reference to the full investigative fieldwork and research process when referred to in any sections of the paper.
- Remember to use the full range of marks for all questions.
- Credit reference to GIS as a fieldwork and research tool in all questions.
- Credit reference to candidates own fieldwork and research across ALL questions.
- Credit use of case studies and exemplar material where relevant.

| Question Number          | Question   |  |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| 1(a)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii) |  |  |
| Series                   | Indicative content   |  |
|                          | <p>There may be a number of factors causing change from year to year:<br/>E.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• El Nino, La Nina</li> <li>• Changes in land use ie. Urbanisation, deforestation</li> <li>• Shifting jet-stream/polar front</li> <li>• Natural variations in frequency of events</li> <li>• Pressure systems</li> <li>• Global warming/climate change</li> </ul> <p>Also credit candidates who comment on variability, reliability or subjectivity of data and patterns in data, e.g. Increasing incidence. Credit sensible use of examples.</p> <p><i>Note: Question requires two events to be discussed</i></p> |  |
| Level                    | Mark   | Descriptor   |
| Level 1                  | 1-4  | Basic response using one or two lift-offs only. No real understanding of information in table, likely to be limited to one reason. Considerable errors in language.                                  |
| Level 2                  | 5-7  | May use data in table to develop own ideas/reasons. Uses at least one column. Some structure and some written language errors. Some use of terminology.  |
| Level 3                  | 8-10   | A clear response with use of data in table, with a range/detail of ideas/reasons. Comments on 2 events / columns of data, and over time. Well structured response. Written language errors are rare. |

| Question Number            | Question  |   |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
|----------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--------|--|--------------|--|---------|--|
| 1(b)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii)   |   |   |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
| Series                     | Indicative content  |   |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
|                            | <p>Remember to credit <b>development</b> (causes and processes) rather than <b>impacts</b>.</p> <p>In the context of <b>river flooding</b>, credit development of flood linked to precipitation, hydrology, land-use etc, <b>not the subsequent impacts</b> (i.e. a case study approach).</p> <p>Extreme weather events could include hurricanes, extra tropical and temperate storms, snow and ice and droughts. Extreme can be interpreted as a freak, severe or unusual - i.e. bucking the normal trend.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Event</th> <th>Development conditions / factors</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tropical Storm (Hurricane)</td> <td>Warm (tropical) seas &gt;26.5C, rising moist air from the sea, influence of ITCZ etc. Upper winds mustn't be too strong. Grow from low pressure centres. Coriolis force.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Storms</td> <td>Deep depression - associated cold fronts etc. Get energy from horizontal temp gradients in atmosphere; develop under jet streams along polar front. Junction of cold and warmer air.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Snow and ice</td> <td>Cold, precipitation, antecedent conditions. Associated with low pressure. Temperature and moisture gradients must be just right to produce snow. Also allow ideas about development of sleet, freezing rain, hail etc.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Drought</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meteorological</i>: prolonged period with less than average precipitation</li> <li>• <i>Agricultural</i>: insufficient moisture for crop production (may be influenced by poor land / soil management)</li> <li>• <i>Hydrological</i>: water reserves in aquifers, lakes, reservoirs etc fall below average.</li> </ul>           Causes: lack of precipitation caused by changes in track of mid latitude depressions, El Nino and impact on atmospheric circulation, movement of ITCZ.         </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Also accept other extreme weather events e.g. tornadoes. El Nino/La Nina should be treated as causes of an extreme weather event, rather than an extreme weather event on its own.</p> <p>Candidates should only choose one type of event, but credit multiple examples of the same event in different locations and / or at different times.</p> | Event   | Development conditions / factors | Tropical Storm (Hurricane) | Warm (tropical) seas >26.5C, rising moist air from the sea, influence of ITCZ etc. Upper winds mustn't be too strong. Grow from low pressure centres. Coriolis force. | Storms | Deep depression - associated cold fronts etc. Get energy from horizontal temp gradients in atmosphere; develop under jet streams along polar front. Junction of cold and warmer air. | Snow and ice | Cold, precipitation, antecedent conditions. Associated with low pressure. Temperature and moisture gradients must be just right to produce snow. Also allow ideas about development of sleet, freezing rain, hail etc. | Drought | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meteorological</i>: prolonged period with less than average precipitation</li> <li>• <i>Agricultural</i>: insufficient moisture for crop production (may be influenced by poor land / soil management)</li> <li>• <i>Hydrological</i>: water reserves in aquifers, lakes, reservoirs etc fall below average.</li> </ul> Causes: lack of precipitation caused by changes in track of mid latitude depressions, El Nino and impact on atmospheric circulation, movement of ITCZ. |
| Event                      | Development conditions / factors  |   |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
| Tropical Storm (Hurricane) | Warm (tropical) seas >26.5C, rising moist air from the sea, influence of ITCZ etc. Upper winds mustn't be too strong. Grow from low pressure centres. Coriolis force.   |   |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
| Storms                     | Deep depression - associated cold fronts etc. Get energy from horizontal temp gradients in atmosphere; develop under jet streams along polar front. Junction of cold and warmer air.  |   |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
| Snow and ice               | Cold, precipitation, antecedent conditions. Associated with low pressure. Temperature and moisture gradients must be just right to produce snow. Also allow ideas about development of sleet, freezing rain, hail etc.  |   |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
| Drought                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meteorological</i>: prolonged period with less than average precipitation</li> <li>• <i>Agricultural</i>: insufficient moisture for crop production (may be influenced by poor land / soil management)</li> <li>• <i>Hydrological</i>: water reserves in aquifers, lakes, reservoirs etc fall below average.</li> </ul> Causes: lack of precipitation caused by changes in track of mid latitude depressions, El Nino and impact on atmospheric circulation, movement of ITCZ.  |   |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
| Level                      | Mark  | Descriptor  |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
| Level 1                    | 1-4   | Basic and generalised with one or two ideas only relating to chosen extreme weather. May focus on impacts rather than development. Lacks structure and very limited use of geographical terminology. Considerable errors in language. |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |
| Level 2                    | 5-7   | Some ideas examined, but likely to be restricted either in range and or depth. Some links to how it develops is present but is not comprehensive. Some structure and some written language errors.                                    |                                  |                            |   |        |  |              |  |         |  |

|                    |             |  |
|--------------------|-------------|--|
| <b>Level<br/>3</b> | <b>8-10</b> | A response where some range of factors are discussed providing or depth and / or detail. Development is clearly incorporated. Well structured and balanced response. Written language errors are rare. |
|--------------------|-------------|--|

| Question Number          | Question   |   |                      |  |                       |  |
|--------------------------|--|---|----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| 1(c)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii) |  |   |                      |  |                       |  |
| Series                   | Indicative content   |   |                      |  |                       |  |
|                          | <p>Candidates can choose a range of extreme weather events including: river flooding, hurricanes, tornadoes, heat wave and drought. Expect floods since it is more realistic to do fieldwork on, although some candidates may have done others so credit.</p> <p>The specification indicates the range of <b>impacts</b> may be social, environmental or economic. In the context of fieldwork and research it may be difficult to investigate all of these in any depth, although large events may have measurable / reported economic impact. Other impacts on health, infrastructure etc could also be suggested. Evidence of research into these should be well credited.</p> <p>Types of fieldwork and research chosen will vary according to the event, so the information below should just be taken as a guide. Fieldwork approaches can be linked to increasing risks and there is overlap.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Fieldwork (primary):</td> <td>Evidence can come from qualitative sources, e.g. historic / eye witness accounts. Use of interviews / focus groups. Evidence of levels may be anecdotal, e.g. previous signs of damage. Risk maps. May also be based on some quantification e.g. bankfull levels etc; use of hardware models, e.g. storm simulation. Also credit work which looks at perception of risk / impact, e.g. via interviews. Questionnaires may also feature. Also use of weather diaries/local monitoring of weather.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Research (secondary):</td> <td>Use of various sources to get a picture of impacts of extreme event e.g. GIS Environment Agency maps; flood risk maps for insurance companies, historic newspaper cuttings / reports and other documentary evidence e.g. newscasts etc<br/>The best responses will provide detailed evidence of specific sources, e.g. specialist weather websites etc, National Rivers Flow Archive (NRFA), NOAA, MET Office rather than 'the internet'.</td> </tr> </table> |   | Fieldwork (primary): | Evidence can come from qualitative sources, e.g. historic / eye witness accounts. Use of interviews / focus groups. Evidence of levels may be anecdotal, e.g. previous signs of damage. Risk maps. May also be based on some quantification e.g. bankfull levels etc; use of hardware models, e.g. storm simulation. Also credit work which looks at perception of risk / impact, e.g. via interviews. Questionnaires may also feature. Also use of weather diaries/local monitoring of weather. | Research (secondary): | Use of various sources to get a picture of impacts of extreme event e.g. GIS Environment Agency maps; flood risk maps for insurance companies, historic newspaper cuttings / reports and other documentary evidence e.g. newscasts etc<br>The best responses will provide detailed evidence of specific sources, e.g. specialist weather websites etc, National Rivers Flow Archive (NRFA), NOAA, MET Office rather than 'the internet'. |
| Fieldwork (primary):     | Evidence can come from qualitative sources, e.g. historic / eye witness accounts. Use of interviews / focus groups. Evidence of levels may be anecdotal, e.g. previous signs of damage. Risk maps. May also be based on some quantification e.g. bankfull levels etc; use of hardware models, e.g. storm simulation. Also credit work which looks at perception of risk / impact, e.g. via interviews. Questionnaires may also feature. Also use of weather diaries/local monitoring of weather.   |   |                      |  |                       |  |
| Research (secondary):    | Use of various sources to get a picture of impacts of extreme event e.g. GIS Environment Agency maps; flood risk maps for insurance companies, historic newspaper cuttings / reports and other documentary evidence e.g. newscasts etc<br>The best responses will provide detailed evidence of specific sources, e.g. specialist weather websites etc, National Rivers Flow Archive (NRFA), NOAA, MET Office rather than 'the internet'.   |   |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level                    | Mark   | Descriptor  |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level 1                  | 1-4  | Very limited range of fieldwork / research described. Fieldwork may not be appropriate / linked to a weather / flood event. Lacks structure. Considerable errors in language.   |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level 2                  | 5-8  | Descriptive style but with some statements about either fieldwork or research approaches linked to a weather / flood event. Impacts may be implied. May be a description that lacks focus on the question / less relevant techniques. Likely to be unbalanced and lacking detail. Expect limited use of geographical terminology. There are some written language errors. |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level 3                  | 9-12   | Describes a range of fieldwork and/or research approaches linked to a weather / flood event impacts, but may lack balance. Some use of geographical terminology. Response shows some structure, limited written language errors.<br>Max 10 if only fieldwork or research.   |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level 4                  | 13-15  | Structured account which describes a balanced range of personal weather / flood fieldwork and research techniques in detail linked to impacts; shows good use of own / group fieldwork, with good use of terminology. Written language errors are rare.   |                      |  |                       |  |

| Question Number          | Question           |   |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---|
| 2(a)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii) |                    |   |
| Series                   | Indicative content |   |
|                          |                    | <p>The map shows two obvious clues as to the changes that have taken place along this stretch of the coast:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retreat of the coast from the original 2000 year ago dotted line indicated on the map. Degree of loss looks like an average of 3-5km from the scale.</li> <li>• Loss of villages between Bridlington and Sunthorpe (&gt;30 lost).</li> <li>• Geology is a controlling factor, looks like most rapid with softer boulder clay compared to chalk (headland).</li> </ul> <p>These are evidence of coastal erosion.</p> <p>An alternative route through the question will be to draw on other sources of evidence for coastal erosion. These may include documentary sources such as old maps and photographs, historic documents, oral histories etc... Credit own fieldwork and research.</p> <p>Candidates may also mention the importance of LSD on this part of the coast, evidenced from the build-up of material near Sunthorpe at the mouth of the Humber Estuary (this is therefore an area of the coast which has not suffered rapid coastal erosion).</p> |
| Level                    | Mark               | Descriptor  |
| Level 1                  | 1-4                | Basic response only with very limited range / depth of detail. Restricted to simple lift-offs from the map resource or very limited other evidence. Considerable errors in language.  |
| Level 2                  | 5-7                | Uses resource as a stimulus to develop own ideas, possibly including other evidence. May also focus on factors affecting coastal erosion. Expect some written language errors, but generally satisfactory structure.  |
| Level 3                  | 8-10               | A clear response with effective use of map linked to question. Some detail in either depth or range; focuses on evidence. Tries to deal with rapid for top of band. Well structured good use of correct terminology. Written language errors are rare.  |

| Question Number          |      | Question  |
|--------------------------|------|---|
| 2(b)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii) |      |   |
| Series                   |      | Indicative content  |
|                          |      | <p>Hard defences: breakwaters, gabions, embankments, rip-rap, sea walls, cliff re-grading etc) to soft engineering and management: beach nourishment, beach profiling, dune stabilisation / regeneration, offshore reefs etc. These are more sustainable approaches.</p> <p>Hard engineering is often designed to protect high value coastal locations, e.g. towns and energy installations, but suffer from problems of high expense, loss of amenity, and problems of failure especially with sea levels rise.</p> <p>Sustainable coastal defence / management attempts to accommodate copy or work alongside natural systems and processes, with ecosystems often playing a key role. Typically such approaches are small scale, localised and bottom-up or community driven. They have the advantages of being environmentally friendly, sometimes cheaper and longer-lasting.</p> <p>Managed retreat is where the sea is allowed to flood parts of the intertidal zone - thus creating mudflats and valuable salt marsh habitat.</p> <p>Coastal realignment may be more controversial since it involves 'retreating the line', e.g. Kent, N. Norfolk and Essex. Many examples overseas where credit should be given.</p> <p>There may be reference to integrated coastal management, which sustainable / soft options vs hard defences may be discussed. Large coastal cells are broken down into smaller units and then action is taken via SMP (Shoreline Management Plans).</p> <p><b>NB. Accept a broad interpretation of "success" to include engineering success as well as broader environmental or socio-economic/CBA.</b></p> |
| Level                    | Mark | Descriptor  |
| Level 1                  | 1-4  | Basic and generalised with few ideas on coastal management. Lacks structure and very limited use of geographical terminology. Very limited or no reference to an example. Considerable errors in language.  |
| Level 2                  | 5-7  | Is exemplified to support response. Some structure. Likely to be lacking in depth, but shows / implies some understanding of range of ideas. There are some written language errors. May mention success on occasion.   |
| Level 3                  | 8-10 | A clear response which shows understanding of different approaches. Deals with idea of success. Well structured and balanced response which uses named location effectively and in depth. Written language errors are rare.   |

| Question Number          | Question   |   |                      |  |                       |  |
|--------------------------|--|---|----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| 2(c)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii) |  |   |                      |  |                       |  |
| Series                   | Indicative content   |   |                      |  |                       |  |
|                          | <p>There are a range of fieldwork opportunities - expect these to include:</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fieldwork (primary):</td> <td>Create land use map and compare to historic plans; speaking to residents and visitors (questionnaires / structured interviews), oral histories, footfalls, parking etc. Use of video or transcripts to record ideas (could be group approach).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Research (secondary):</td> <td>Historic maps to illustrate change, e.g. <a href="http://www.old-maps.co.uk">www.old-maps.co.uk</a> ; also local newspapers, blogs / forums etc. Old photographs and post cards may be a useful source (again could be internet sourced). Possible use of GIS / electronic maps to illustrate change, e.g. 'Wheresthepath'<br/>The best responses will provide detailed evidence of specific sources, e.g. specialist local historical websites etc, rather than 'the internet' .</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Provide credit for possible reference to sampling strategies, e.g. systematic and stratified, no of people etc; also some candidates may have used a pilot survey, e.g. to format questionnaires.<br/>Also credit more detailed description of land use map categories and justification for this.<br/>Allow liberal interpretation of 'over time', i.e. 150 years to 5 years (e.g. for a recent regeneration strategy at coastal town).</p> <p>Credit any work which shows innovation.</p> |   | Fieldwork (primary): | Create land use map and compare to historic plans; speaking to residents and visitors (questionnaires / structured interviews), oral histories, footfalls, parking etc. Use of video or transcripts to record ideas (could be group approach). | Research (secondary): | Historic maps to illustrate change, e.g. <a href="http://www.old-maps.co.uk">www.old-maps.co.uk</a> ; also local newspapers, blogs / forums etc. Old photographs and post cards may be a useful source (again could be internet sourced). Possible use of GIS / electronic maps to illustrate change, e.g. 'Wheresthepath'<br>The best responses will provide detailed evidence of specific sources, e.g. specialist local historical websites etc, rather than 'the internet' . |
| Fieldwork (primary):     | Create land use map and compare to historic plans; speaking to residents and visitors (questionnaires / structured interviews), oral histories, footfalls, parking etc. Use of video or transcripts to record ideas (could be group approach).   |   |                      |  |                       |  |
| Research (secondary):    | Historic maps to illustrate change, e.g. <a href="http://www.old-maps.co.uk">www.old-maps.co.uk</a> ; also local newspapers, blogs / forums etc. Old photographs and post cards may be a useful source (again could be internet sourced). Possible use of GIS / electronic maps to illustrate change, e.g. 'Wheresthepath'<br>The best responses will provide detailed evidence of specific sources, e.g. specialist local historical websites etc, rather than 'the internet' .   |   |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level                    | Mark   | Descriptor  |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level 1                  | 1-4  | Very limited range of fieldwork / research described. Fieldwork may not be appropriate / linked to land use and / or time. Lacks structure. Considerable errors in language.  |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level 2                  | 5-8  | Some statements about either fieldwork or research approaches linked to change. May be a description that lacks focus on the question / less relevant techniques. Likely to be unbalanced and lacking detail. Expect limited use of geographical terminology. There are some written language errors. |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level 3                  | 9-12   | Describes a range of fieldwork and/or research approaches linked to coastal land use / development, but may lack depth and detail. Some use of geographical terminology. Response shows some structure, limited written language errors.<br>Max 10 if only fieldwork or research.                     |                      |  |                       |  |
| Level 4                  | 13-15  | Structured account which describes a balanced range of ideas and approaches linked to development and idea of 'time' fieldwork and research techniques in detail; shows good use of own / group fieldwork, with good use of terminology. Written language errors are rare.                            |                      |  |                       |  |

| Question Number                        |      | Question  |
|--|------|---|
| <b>3(a)</b><br><b>QWC (i, ii, iii)</b> |      |   |
| Series                                 |      | Indicative content  |
|  |      | <p>The bipolar / generic quality sheet could be improved (I) + extended (E) in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of adjectival descriptors for each evaluation, e.g. +1 - (-)1 (I)</li> <li>• Larger range of bi-polar scores (E)</li> <li>• Addition of centre '0' (E/I)</li> <li>• Quantitative amounts, e.g. for litter (I)</li> <li>• Greater range of categories; more focused on inequality (too general at present) (E)</li> <li>• Some of the descriptors are not clear or polar opposites, so some ambiguity should be removed (I)</li> <li>• Using photos to accompany the sheet (I)</li> </ul> <p>Give credit for any other reasonable ideas as there will be an alternative approach. Candidates may:</p> <p>i) Examine the wider concept of inequality and suggest extensions to Figure 3<br/> ii) Comment on the scoring categories and language on Figure 3 (or a combination of both).</p> |
| Level                                  | Mark | Descriptor  |
| Level 1                                | 1-4  | One or two basic items of data described from the resource, but not real improvements / extensions; limited to simple lift-offs. Lacks structure and considerable errors in language.   |
| Level 2                                | 5-7  | A range of descriptive comments linked to resource including one or two ideas regarding possible improvements and / or extensions. Some structure; there are some written language errors.  |
| Level 3                                | 8-10 | A clear response with good use of resource to suggest both valid improvements + extensions to the environmental quality sheet. Well structured and expect use of specific use of data. Ideas are sensible. Written language errors are rare.  |

| Question Number          | Question   |   |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
|--------------------------|--|---|----------|---|--------|---|-------------------|---|---------------|--|
| 3(b)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii) |  |   |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
| Series                   | Indicative content   |   |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
|                          | <p>Inequality and problems in urban areas may manifest themselves in a number of forms:</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Economic</td> <td>Uneven distribution of wealth in a society. Things money can buy: housing, basic services such as electricity, sanitation, healthcare, education, career prospects etc<br/>Bus / train / rail / port infrastructure proximity and frequency.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social</td> <td>Lack of access to opportunities such as affordable housing, good schools, jobs, health. Employment and status important here.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Institutionalised</td> <td>Inequality built into social and political structures, e.g. unfair legislation.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technological</td> <td>Access to computers (affordability?) , mobile phone reception, wi-fi, high speed broadband, mobile broadband etc</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Many other types - provide credit.</p> <p>In LEDCs and MEDCs urban inequality may be driven by physical barriers (e.g. mountains / hills), remoteness or the economics of delivery of a particular service. Other factors will also be at play.</p> <p>Note must be named <b>urban area</b>.</p> |   | Economic | Uneven distribution of wealth in a society. Things money can buy: housing, basic services such as electricity, sanitation, healthcare, education, career prospects etc<br>Bus / train / rail / port infrastructure proximity and frequency. | Social | Lack of access to opportunities such as affordable housing, good schools, jobs, health. Employment and status important here. | Institutionalised | Inequality built into social and political structures, e.g. unfair legislation. | Technological | Access to computers (affordability?) , mobile phone reception, wi-fi, high speed broadband, mobile broadband etc |
| Economic                 | Uneven distribution of wealth in a society. Things money can buy: housing, basic services such as electricity, sanitation, healthcare, education, career prospects etc<br>Bus / train / rail / port infrastructure proximity and frequency.  |   |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
| Social                   | Lack of access to opportunities such as affordable housing, good schools, jobs, health. Employment and status important here.  |   |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
| Institutionalised        | Inequality built into social and political structures, e.g. unfair legislation.  |   |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
| Technological            | Access to computers (affordability?) , mobile phone reception, wi-fi, high speed broadband, mobile broadband etc   |   |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
| Level                    | Mark   | Descriptor  |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
| Level 1                  | 1-4  | Basic and generalised with few ideas on urban inequality. Lacks structure and very limited use of geographical terminology. Very limited or no reference to a named urban example. Considerable errors in language.               |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
| Level 2                  | 5-7  | Uses an urban example to support response. Some structure. Likely to be lacking in either range or depth, but shows / implies some understanding of problems of urban poverty/inequality. There are some written language errors. |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |
| Level 3                  | 8-10   | A clear response which shows understanding of urban inequality. Well structured response which uses the example effectively to illustrate the problems. Written language errors are rare.   |          |   |        |   |                   |   |               |  |

| Question Number                        |  | Question  |                        |  |
|--|--|---|------------------------|--|
| <b>3(c)</b><br><b>QWC (i, ii, iii)</b> |  |   |                        |  |
| <b>Series</b>                          |  | <b>Indicative content</b>   |                        |  |
|  |  | <p>There are a range of possibilities here - they may include:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Results &amp; Conclusions:</td> <td> <p>Expect references to specific places and data e.g. improvements seen through a range of surveys, the results from a questionnaire/interviews. Patterns of economic and environmental change e.g. land-use, job creation, improvements in infrastructure, education.</p> <p>Conclusions could involve summaries as well as discussions of patterns and trends.</p> <p>May include evaluation + comments on reliability</p> </td> </tr> </table> <p>Credit presentation if it can form part of the results, e.g. scatter graphs etc.</p> <p>Expect a wide variety of ideas discussed, but limit credit to results and conclusions and not how it was done.</p> | Results & Conclusions: | <p>Expect references to specific places and data e.g. improvements seen through a range of surveys, the results from a questionnaire/interviews. Patterns of economic and environmental change e.g. land-use, job creation, improvements in infrastructure, education.</p> <p>Conclusions could involve summaries as well as discussions of patterns and trends.</p> <p>May include evaluation + comments on reliability</p> |
| Results & Conclusions:                 | <p>Expect references to specific places and data e.g. improvements seen through a range of surveys, the results from a questionnaire/interviews. Patterns of economic and environmental change e.g. land-use, job creation, improvements in infrastructure, education.</p> <p>Conclusions could involve summaries as well as discussions of patterns and trends.</p> <p>May include evaluation + comments on reliability</p> |   |                        |  |
| <b>Level</b>                           | <b>Mark</b>  | <b>Descriptor</b>   |                        |  |
| <b>Level 1</b>                         | <b>1-4</b>   | Very limited / no results or conclusions described. Outcomes may not be appropriate / linked to inequality. Maybe just a description of the fieldwork / research. Lacks structure. Considerable errors in language.   |                        |  |
| <b>Level 2</b>                         | <b>5-8</b>   | Descriptive style but with one or two statements about results and/or conclusions. May be mostly a description of the fieldwork approach. Expect limited use of geographical terminology. There are some written language errors.   |                        |  |
| <b>Level 3</b>                         | <b>9-12</b>  | Describes some results and/or conclusions partly linked to inequality within a named place. May describe schemes and strategies, including some limited evaluation. Some use of geographical terminology. Response shows some structure, limited written language errors.   |                        |  |
| <b>Level 4</b>                         | <b>13-15</b>   | Structured account which describes a range of results and conclusions; shows good use of own / group fieldwork, with good use of terminology and linked to inequality. Clear linkage to idea of 'schemes' and success. Evaluative in some instances. Written language errors are rare.  |                        |  |

| Question Number          | Question  |  |                 |   |                 |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|-----------------|---|-----------------|--|
| 4(a)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii) |   |  |                 |   |                 |  |
| Series                   | Indicative content  |  |                 |   |                 |  |
|                          | <p>Photos may show a variety of evidence:</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>4a Belfast 1911</td> <td>B&amp;W photo, showing people in old dress etc. 20C industrial scene, workers (manual / skilled) cranes etc feature in the landscape. Large Titanic gantry can be seen in the distance.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4b Belfast 2009</td> <td>Tour bus prominent to 'see the new sights'. Links to historic past and association of ship building. New architect-deigned building (CITI group) in the background - change of use + links to finance (typical of rebranding).</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Therefore evidence of rebranding might come in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change of land-use (industry to commerce + tourism)</li> <li>• New buildings / conversion of industrial warehousing</li> <li>• Change of 'image'</li> <li>• Use of history / heritage tourism (link with popular Titanic story) to attract visitors</li> </ul> <p>Some may argue that the images alone may not be sufficient evidence of Belfast experiencing rebranding - need additional evidence.</p> <p>Credit any reference to own fieldwork or case study material which supports response.</p> |  | 4a Belfast 1911 | B&W photo, showing people in old dress etc. 20C industrial scene, workers (manual / skilled) cranes etc feature in the landscape. Large Titanic gantry can be seen in the distance. | 4b Belfast 2009 | Tour bus prominent to 'see the new sights'. Links to historic past and association of ship building. New architect-deigned building (CITI group) in the background - change of use + links to finance (typical of rebranding). |
| 4a Belfast 1911          | B&W photo, showing people in old dress etc. 20C industrial scene, workers (manual / skilled) cranes etc feature in the landscape. Large Titanic gantry can be seen in the distance.   |  |                 |   |                 |  |
| 4b Belfast 2009          | Tour bus prominent to 'see the new sights'. Links to historic past and association of ship building. New architect-deigned building (CITI group) in the background - change of use + links to finance (typical of rebranding).  |  |                 |   |                 |  |
| Level                    | Mark  | Descriptor   |                 |   |                 |  |
| Level 1                  | 1-4   | One or two basic lift-offs described only. Lacks structure and very limited use of geographical terminology. Considerable errors in language.  |                 |   |                 |  |
| Level 2                  | 5-7   | Some range of ideas linked to Q, but may lack either breadth or depth. May use one image more than the other. Some structure and use of terminology. There are some written language errors.                               |                 |   |                 |  |
| Level 3                  | 8-10  | A clear response with good use of number of evidence from both images to support ideas / comments. Well structured good use of geographical terminology. May try to consider 'evidence'. Written language errors are rare. |                 |   |                 |  |

| Question Number  | Question   |  |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|-------|-------|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 4(b)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii)   |  |  |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
| Series   | Indicative content   |  |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
|  | <p>Players are really stakeholders, i.e. are individuals, groups or organisations who have an interest in the development or outcomes of a particular project. Their role is as interested parties as they may be involved financially or emotionally as the development is within a neighbourhood close to where they live.</p> <p>Depending on projects / examples chosen there could be a number of stakeholders - 'bigger players' examples can include:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Urban</th> <th>Rural</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>The Arts Council offers various funding opportunities for arts linked projects.</td> <td>European Union , e.g. Objective 1 programme and LEADER programme</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Partnerships - principle aim is to 'deliver high quality sustainable growth in England'.</td> <td>Action with Communities in Rural England, or ACRE promotes local rural initiatives</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Advantage West Midlands - Development Agency</td> <td>Natural England - grants to farmers for various agri-environmental schemes.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Also Regional Development Agencies (can be both urban and rural); Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), Big Lottery Fund.</p> <p>Could also be local small-scale / bottom-up / community groups acting as stakeholders. Huge range of possibilities here, including more unusual overseas agencies and organisations.</p> <p>May also have mention of the important of 'partnership' working.</p> |  | Urban | Rural | The Arts Council offers various funding opportunities for arts linked projects. | European Union , e.g. Objective 1 programme and LEADER programme | English Partnerships - principle aim is to 'deliver high quality sustainable growth in England'. | Action with Communities in Rural England, or ACRE promotes local rural initiatives | Advantage West Midlands - Development Agency | Natural England - grants to farmers for various agri-environmental schemes. |
| Urban  | Rural  |  |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
| The Arts Council offers various funding opportunities for arts linked projects.                  | European Union , e.g. Objective 1 programme and LEADER programme   |  |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
| English Partnerships - principle aim is to 'deliver high quality sustainable growth in England'. | Action with Communities in Rural England, or ACRE promotes local rural initiatives   |  |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
| Advantage West Midlands - Development Agency   | Natural England - grants to farmers for various agri-environmental schemes.  |  |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
| Level  | Mark   | Descriptor   |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
| Level 1  | 1-4  | Identifies one or two players only. No reference to any examples. Little structure and very limited use of geographical terminology. Considerable errors in language.  |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
| Level 2  | 5-7  | Identifies some players in using either reasonable range / detail. Uses at least one example to support response. Some structure. Likely to be unbalanced. There are some written language errors.                 |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |
| Level 3  | 8-10   | A structured account which considers role of players using good range / detail. Well structured and balanced response which uses example(s) effectively (at least one in depth). Written language errors are rare. |       |       |   |  |  |  |  |   |

| Question Number          | Question  |   |                        |  |
|--------------------------|---|---|------------------------|--|
| 4(c)<br>QWC (i, ii, iii) |   |   |                        |  |
| Series                   | Indicative content  |   |                        |  |
|                          | <p>There are a range of possibilities here - they may include:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Results &amp; Conclusions:</td> <td> <p>Expect references to specific places and data e.g. improvements seen through a range of surveys, the results from a questionnaire/interviews. Patterns of economic and environmental change e.g. land-use, job creation, improvements in infrastructure, education.</p> <p>Conclusions could involve summaries as well as discussions of patterns and trends.</p> <p>May include evaluation + comments on reliability</p> </td> </tr> </table> <p>Credit presentation if it can form part of the results, e.g. scatter graphs etc.</p> <p>Expect a wide variety of ideas discussed, but limit credit to results and conclusions and not how it was done.</p> |   | Results & Conclusions: | <p>Expect references to specific places and data e.g. improvements seen through a range of surveys, the results from a questionnaire/interviews. Patterns of economic and environmental change e.g. land-use, job creation, improvements in infrastructure, education.</p> <p>Conclusions could involve summaries as well as discussions of patterns and trends.</p> <p>May include evaluation + comments on reliability</p> |
| Results & Conclusions:   | <p>Expect references to specific places and data e.g. improvements seen through a range of surveys, the results from a questionnaire/interviews. Patterns of economic and environmental change e.g. land-use, job creation, improvements in infrastructure, education.</p> <p>Conclusions could involve summaries as well as discussions of patterns and trends.</p> <p>May include evaluation + comments on reliability</p>  |   |                        |  |
| Level                    | Mark  | Descriptor  |                        |  |
| Level 1                  | 1-4   | Very limited / no results or conclusions described. Outcomes may not be appropriate / linked to rebranding. Maybe just a description of the fieldwork / research. Lacks structure. Considerable errors in language.   |                        |  |
| Level 2                  | 5-8   | Descriptive style but with one or two statements about results and/or conclusion. May be mostly a description of the fieldwork approach. Expect limited use of geographical terminology. There are some written language errors.  |                        |  |
| Level 3                  | 9-12  | Describes some results and/or conclusions linked to rebranding within a named place. May describe schemes and strategies, including some limited evaluation. Some use of geographical terminology. Response shows some structure, limited written language errors.        |                        |  |
| Level 4                  | 13-15   | Structured account which describes a range of results and conclusions; shows good use of own / group fieldwork, with good use of terminology. Clear linkage to idea of schemes and success of rebranding. Evaluative in some instances. Written language errors are rare. |                        |  |

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Publications code US026348  
January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH