

GEOGRAPHY (BRUNEI)

Paper 2230/01
Paper 1 (Themes)

Key messages

There were some noticeable issues identified that might help improve performance in the future:

- Management of time/extent of responses gauged against the number of marks available in the question – while most candidates gauged this well, there were some mismatches of effort vs. marks available (even among the moderate to stronger candidates)
- Misinterpretation of what questions are asking for – this is often on questions requiring some analysis or explanation where there might be causes or consequences. Some work may need to be done on ensuring candidates get the focus correct from command words.
- Use of data resources provided – especially graphical data and ‘describe’ command questions. A firm grounding and realisation that describing data from a graph does not usually require simply lifting the data stage by stage. Emphasis should be on broader interpretation of trends together with some manipulation of data.
- Finally, some concerns about understanding of some terms/vocabulary by some candidates – in particular on this paper ‘adapted’ in **2(d)(i)** and ‘strategies’, which appeared in quite a few of the level marked questions but seemed to be better understood in some e.g. **Question 3(e)** than in others. This may be that some strategies are inherently and specifically linked to the teaching of a topic (e.g. pro-natal population policies in Singapore) whereas otherwise the concept is applied more generally and perhaps in a more unfamiliar context.

General comments

The performance from candidates continues to show a wide variation, from many very good candidates to those candidates who struggled with certain themes on the paper, namely the natural world and their responses to **Question 2**. However, there were some excellent individual responses and virtually all candidates followed the rubric and only completed one question from each section. The number of candidates who did not complete the paper was higher than in previous years – this showed that candidates had a great deal of knowledge and were able to write a large amount in their first 2 questions but ultimately this came at the expense of the 7-mark question in Theme C. It is very important that candidates study the number of marks per question and write their answer accordingly. There were some very long answers for some of the lower mark questions which did not add anymore to the individual answer but cost the candidates valuable time in the examination. **Question 1(a)(iii)** stands out as an example – candidates clearly knew this really well but quite often 3/4 of a page was given for this answer and there was a lot of repetition in the response.

Comments on specific questions

Theme A: The natural world

Question 1

- (a) (i) The vast majority of candidates recognised that this was a conservative/transform boundary and were able to acknowledge that earthquakes would be the hazard taking place here. However, a few candidates seemed to think that this was a destructive boundary and therefore this also had a knock-on effect in their next response.
- (ii) Most candidates acknowledged that plates were sliding past each other but very few seemed to develop this any further. Some candidates mentioned friction occurring but very few achieved full

marks. Those candidates who thought it was a destructive boundary talked about subduction of the heavier oceanic plate and, although this showed excellent knowledge, was not creditworthy in this case.

- (iii) This was very well answered and candidates knew this subject material very well, but many wrote too much and did not structure their answer correctly. There was a great deal of repetition in answers and a lot of irrelevant material when a candidate had already gained a mark and a development mark for a point they made. This really cost the candidates a great deal of time at the expense of the final 7-mark question in **Question 5/6**.
- (b) This was answered well and candidates achieved highly on this question. There was a reserve mark for the diagram and as it was a shield volcano, it was expected that candidates would draw a wide base and a low volcano with gentle sides. However, although many answers gained 3 marks for the labels, a mark was often lost for the incorrect sketch.
- (c) (i) This is a perfect example of a question where the candidates had to study the resource very carefully. The answer 'Eurasian Plate' was clearly labelled on the resource and many gained this mark. However, some candidates appeared to rush their answer and did not see this label, so did not achieve the mark.
- (ii) Most responses stated that Brunei was not at risk as it was in the middle of the plate. Two marks were gained for this. Candidates did struggle to get the third mark with many saying that Brunei was not on a plate boundary – however, this was the same point as being in the middle of a plate and therefore no extra marks were awarded. It was good to see that some candidates acknowledged that although Brunei had no volcanoes, they could in fact receive ash from the neighbouring volcanoes.
- (d) Candidates were able to acknowledge that living close to any plate boundary was very dangerous and achieved credit for stating that this could result in earthquakes, volcanoes and tsunamis. However, very few of these points were developed and quite often were just left as three Level 1 statements. When examples were used and enhanced the statements made (not just simply stating Mt. Etna at the end of a sentence) Level 2 statements could be credited. It was excellent to see some candidates acknowledging that although it was dangerous living close to plate boundaries, there were often benefits (fertile soil/tourism) and this gained Level 2 credit. This was an example of high-level evaluation skills.

Question 2

- (a) In general candidates struggled to explain the difference between weather and climate. Clear differences were required for 2 marks and a large number of candidates who completed this question achieved 0 or perhaps one mark for a vague difference.
- (b) (i) Candidates seemed to struggle with describing the global distribution and fixated on the reference points of equator and tropics (as guidance) but often did not use these as well as they might. Better responses that achieved more marks were those that went on to refer to specific named countries within each continent.
- (ii) There was some quite accurate lifting of data from the graph but it was not always used well in terms of providing a general description of temperature or rainfall. There was a tendency to only rely on lifting data from the graph to provide description so candidates rarely gained full marks. References to rainfall were better and more accurate than those relating to temperature.
- (c) Most candidates were familiar with at least the main features of typhoons, so this question was usually attempted more successfully with mention of strong winds and heavy rainfall. Many went beyond the 'Describe' command word and wasted some time on explaining (at least partially) how typhoons are formed in the first place.
- (d) (i) Of all items in **Question 2**, responses to this question were the weakest. With the occasional exception of the idea of tall trees reaching for sunlight and waxy drip tip leaves enabling rapid run off of water, candidates rarely referred to any development of adaptations that were relevant. Many candidates seemed to misunderstand the question and possibly the word 'adapted'. There were descriptions of the photograph with reference to different parts or all of the rainforest typical 4/5 tier

structure and also very general discussion of growing conditions, climate soils and even nutrient recycling.

- (ii) Most candidates were able to provide a valid reason for deforestation and were awarded this mark. Answers were very wide ranging, which was okay, as long as it provided a valid reason to describe why deforestation was taking place. Occasionally the term 'infrastructure' appeared which is seen as being too general and so was not credited.
- (e) Responses to this question were mixed but generally weak. Many candidates gave very basic statements on creating forest reserves or replanting trees, sometimes linking answers to impacts of tourism but again statements that were developed with enough breadth or depth beyond the initial point made were rarely seen. Candidates can make a lot of Level 1 statements but most realise that these have to be developed to gain Level 2 credit.

Theme B: People, food and settlement

Question 3

- (a) (i) This question was very well answered and candidates also included the unit 'million' which was very encouraging to see.
- (ii) The answer to the question was very straightforward which was that there were very few elderly and many young children and also a low number of economically active. However, many candidates referred to the shape of the pyramid, birth rates and death rates, and life expectancy which was not creditworthy. Some recognised that as the age increased, the number decreased but this was only worth 1 mark.
- (iii) Overall, candidates were able to gain marks from commenting on the pressure in schools and in health care settings. Answers relating to overpopulation did not receive any credit. Unemployment was only worth a mark if it linked to the fact that this would happen in the future when the young dependents entered the economically active age group.
- (b) There was a clear misunderstanding of the factors used to measure HDI. Most candidates recognised that one factor was life expectancy but did not appreciate that the education aspect was related to years of schooling and not the literacy rate. GDP was also referred to frequently which was not creditworthy.
- (c) (i) Candidates who knew this were able to define the term and explain why this may occur. However, too many answers talked about rural to urban migration and then could not provide a correct reason. Pollution on its own received no credit – it must be named such as air/water or noise.
- (ii) From the photograph candidates were often able to recognise that a greenfield site was farmland or a rural area and often gained 1 mark for stating this. However, candidates struggled to describe a problem that may occur from developing the area. Those answers that were creditworthy talked about the lack of services in the area or deforestation taking place, but these responses were quite rare.
- (d) This question was very well answered. Candidates were very confident with this subject material and the vast majority were able to achieve full marks very easily. Common responses included lack of health care, lack of jobs, lack of access to education, lack of clean water and food.
- (e) In general, a lot of responses gained three Level 1 marks for simply listing ideas such as providing financial support, government advertising campaigns and encouraging early marriage. Some candidates were able to develop one of these points and achieve one Level 2 mark. However, even when candidates did refer to the correct case study of Singapore the responses were generally too vague and quite often the figures used were incorrect. Some good evaluation points acknowledged that despite the assistance from the government, women still wanted a job and a career and so opted not to have many children. Too many candidates referred to China which was not the correct case study.

Question 4

- (a) (i) Candidates do seem to prefer interpreting graphs and data and the DTM provided an opportunity to do this, so this question was generally well answered with many candidates achieving full marks for differentiating the progress of the birth rate line through the various stages.
- (ii) Candidates also performed well in this question. There was recognition of the increase of total population in Stage 2 with supporting explanation, though most of the explanation came from the model and differences between or changes in birth rate and death rate. Underlying causes of birth rate remaining high or reductions in death rate were less commonly referred to but seen occasionally.
- (iii) The majority of candidates achieved a mark for stating that the DTM was useful and often went on to explain why, by referring to its tracking and predictive qualities in terms of birth rate/death rate and total population change. However, a very small number of candidates acknowledged the fact that although the DTM was useful, one criticism was the fact that migration was not taken into account and so credit was awarded here.
- (b) (i) Responses to this one-mark question suggested that candidates were not familiar with the term 'terracing'. Various descriptions of the landscape were provided, some of which roughly fitted a description of the idea of terracing but the term itself was only seen on a very limited number of responses.
- (ii) Responses on this climate question were generally weak. It was very rare to see candidates attaining full marks. Descriptions of climatic factors were generally vague and 'hot and wet' was often the best response that was seen. Recognition of high temperatures (with occasionally appropriate figures in degrees C) was generally more common than accurate descriptions on rainfall. Many candidates drifted into other features of growth such as the fertility of soils which was not creditworthy.
- (c) (i) Most candidates, on seeing the line graph proceeded to describe by lifting the data from the graph in year by year or 3/5 yearly intervals and thus gained no marks. As a consequence, some rather lengthy responses were given, which must have taken up much time. Consequently, it was generally poorly completed with only occasional overall increases, idea of fluctuations and even more rarely appropriate use of beginning and end figures that could be credited.
- (ii) This question was generally completed very well and many candidates recognised how the increase in rice production (which could then be sold) would increase incomes, solve food shortage problems and enable re-investment by farmers.
- (d) This proved to be a difficult question for candidates who, it seemed, did not quite know where to go with their response. There was good knowledge and understanding of the terms – malnutrition and obesity – and where and why they were likely to occur. There was often a focus on the underlying causes of each condition rather than a clear evaluation of the problems they caused. Having said that, many candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of specific diseases and other conditions that each condition might lead to, though development beyond this was often limited. Responses comparing the consequences and ways of overcoming the problems in each case, were the most focused and successful.

Theme C: Industry, energy and tourism

Question 5

- (a) (i) In this question differences should have been observed between the MEDC and LEDC with regards to the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors. Those candidates who answered in this format did very well. However, some candidates described the difference between the sectors within the MEDC or the LEDC and did not actually compare the MEDC and LEDC. Candidates read the figures very well and the correct use of the figures enhanced answers and enabled candidates to achieve full marks.
- (ii) Many candidates simply stated the difference and the fact that the employment in the LEDC in primary was higher by 35 per cent. This was not creditworthy as the question asked the candidate to explain the difference and not simply state it. Those who did answer the question correctly

generally only achieved 2 marks for identifying that LEDCs had less machinery and that LEDCs had less education and so were restricted to certain jobs. Four separate points were required for full marks.

- (iii) Most candidates were able to achieve 1 mark for naming a type of job in this sector, which was often a scientist. Candidates generally struggled to define the term but those that did it correctly made a link to the research and development aspect involved in the quaternary sector.
- (b)(i) This question was answered well and many candidates gained full marks. Most were able to refer to the labour and the raw materials with the extra mark often being awarded for the capital/money. However, the term 'resources' was often used incorrectly for raw materials.
- (ii) There had to be links made to Brunei in order for credit to be given in this question. However, candidates wrote too generally about the factors and very rarely made links to Brunei, so the marks awarded for this question were low. The small number of marks that were awarded described the fact that oil and gas was available as a raw material, flat land was available along the coast to expand on and that government investment had taken place in Brunei.
- (c) Candidates did not achieve as highly on this question as expected. There were lots of Level 1 statements relating to air pollution and water pollution and on occasions these were developed to make a Level 2 statement. Candidates must be reminded to develop Level 1 points or their answer will remain at 3 out of 7 marks. Strategies were a little simplistic and included ideas such as using wind and solar energy or building factories away from cities or settlements. However, it was very encouraging to see that candidates did refer to all the different aspects of the question including the negative aspects on the people and the natural environment and the strategies used, with some degree of evaluation.

Question 6

- (a)(i) This question was answered very well and most candidates gained marks for the description of the scenery in the photograph and gave a range of appropriate reasons for why it would appeal to tourists.
- (ii) As a follow up to the previous question, candidates recognised the potential threats and disadvantages to both the natural environment and to residents of the area that might be brought about by increased numbers of tourists. Many drifted into a focus on the possible cultural clashes and were quite general about impacts on the natural environment but, generally, the question was well answered. The dropping of litter seemed to appear in every answer, which was fine and was credited.
- (iii) The majority of answers picked up the general relationship and the reserve mark but were generally less successful at providing data to support their finding. Expressing this relationship in terms of identifying comparative data proved to be more challenging for many.
- (b) Responses to this question were mixed but were generally quite weak, especially given that credit was available for developing initial points with reasons to support it. It was on the development that many responses were lacking. Answers were often very generic and made some relevant basic points, most usually relating to increase in accessibility because of better international travel or more attractions (not necessarily always more diverse) or increases in income or leisure time but development of ideas beyond these was limited. Some responses were pitched at the wrong scale, focusing on factors at a national scale rather than global scale, while a significant minority seemed to misinterpret the question and covered economic consequences rather than causes of the growth. Many candidates talked about the advantages that tourism brought to a country, such as Brunei, which was irrelevant to this question.
- (c) Most candidates seemed to understand the term but were not always able to provide a more precise definition, for example referring to part-time rather than temporary work. However, most gained some credit for relating the need for seasonal employment to meet tourist demand at certain times of the year. Not many candidates gained full marks on this question.
- (d) Although many candidates were able to identify generic strategies in this question and broadly linked them to named places, only a minority were able to give well developed responses that discussed more specific strategies used in Brunei. Again, a significant number of candidates seemed unfamiliar with the idea of 'strategies' and instead focused on how specific tourist features

and attractions that had been developed in Brunei were designed to increase tourist numbers. Evaluation of success (or otherwise) on this question, while seemingly understood as a concept, was generally weakly addressed.

GEOGRAPHY (BRUNEI)

Paper 2230/02
Paper 2 (Skills)

Key messages

- Candidates need to learn the points of the compass and understand that rivers usually flow into the sea and always flow downhill from higher land.
- Candidates can improve the quality of their shading when completing pie charts or bar graphs by using a ruler and HB pencil to replicate the pattern shown on the key.
- Candidates need to understand that a map extract with scale 1:25 000 means that 4 cm on the map equals 1 km and therefore each 4 cm² grid square represents 1 km².
- It is important to write a full answer, not a one word answer, when asked for a description.

General comments

A notable improvement was the lack of scripts with multiple blanks. This year there was much more willingness to attempt all the questions. Neither did candidates avoid questions requiring longer answers, even the more difficult ones such as **Questions 3(b), 4(a)(ii), 4(b)(iv) and 5(b)(iii)**.

Candidates are getting better at handling groups of data and looking for patterns, rather than just quoting the highest and lowest figures. Candidates are also much better at graph completion, as demonstrated by very good responses to **3(d)(i), 4(b)(i) and 5(a)**. Many candidates were aware of the importance of including units in answers such as **5(b)(iii)**.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

This question, based on a 1:25 000 map extract of Roseau in Dominica, tested a variety of map skills. These skills have continued to improve year-on-year. Particularly noticeable this year was an improvement in candidates' ability to measure and calculate a straight-line distance and to give an accurate six figure grid reference.

- (a) (i)** Most candidates correctly identified 6586 as the grid square for POINTE MICHEL.
- (ii)** On a 1:25 000 scale map 4 cm = 1 km. Many candidates were able to accurately measure the distance between the two trigonometrical stations as 14 cm and then divide 14 by 4 to arrive at the correct answer 3.5 km.
- (iii)** The distance between the two trigonometrical stations was $1024 - 1016 = 8$ feet.
- (b)** Responses to this descriptive question were often characterised by one word answers. Correct answers using full sentences were rare and many candidates were not aware of simple geographical terminology that they could use. Candidates need to know the difference between relief and drainage. Relief is the shape and height of the land as shown by the contours. Drainage is to do with surface water: streams, tributaries, rivers.
- (c) (i)** Many candidates do not understand that each grid square on an OS map represents 1 km² so all that is required is to count the grid squares to establish the total area. There is no need for complicated calculations.

- (ii) A crop is a plant that is grown and harvested. The key shows that the shaded area A is 'cultivation and plantation (c–coconut)' so the answer is coconuts.
 - (iii) Almost all candidates correctly identified the symbols shown in **Fig. 1.1** as cliffs and line of trees.
 - (iv) Most candidates attempted this demanding question but those who simply used the six figure grid reference to locate the reservoir on **Fig. 1.1** often located it away from the river. Those who referred to the map extract as well correctly positioned the reservoir on the river.
- (d)(i) This question required candidates to know what a capital city is. Many stated general services rather than evidence that Roseau is the capital city of Dominica, such as Government Headquarters and Government Offices.
- (ii) Agricultural products are plants or animals grown for food. The correct answer bananas was given by the majority of candidates. Gasoline and wood are not agricultural products.
 - (iii) Candidates are getting much better at measuring accurately six figure grid references. It is essential to use a ruler for this skill. Unfortunately, a number of candidates gave an accurate grid reference for the wrong jetty.
 - (iv) Queen's River was easily identified as the name of the river flowing through Roseau.
 - (v) Candidates need to know the points of the compass. The river flows to the SW (from the NE). If in doubt candidates should state 'from' or 'to'. Those who merely put NE did not get the mark.
 - (e) Weak responses merely described the location of the power station with points such as: there is a river, the land is flat, it is near factories, it is far from the city, but did not suggest why this is a good location. Stronger responses got credit for points such as: it is near a river for water to generate electricity or for cooling, the flat land makes it easy for construction of the power station, it can supply electricity to the nearby factories. The number of answer lines is an indication of how much the candidates should write, consequently, short one or two word answers such as: flat land, a river, factories, near sea, are rarely sufficient where there are six answer lines.

Question 2

This question as a whole was done well, apart from (c)(ii) where only a few candidates referred to the gap between births and deaths being wider. Particularly impressive were responses to (b)(iv) and (c)(i). In the latter comparatives were used well. In (b)(iv) a good number of candidates referred to the large independent population moving up in the pyramid. It seems that population pyramids are well understood.

- (a) (i) and (ii)(iii) Candidates were able to correctly extract information from the population pyramid.
- (iv) Explaining why the old dependent population will increase in the future was more challenging, but there were many good responses. Answers could focus on the current shape of the pyramid, whereby a large independent population would become older in time, or they could write about longer life expectancy due to better healthcare, better nutrition and other factors.
- (b) (i) Comparison requires the use of words such as: most, largest, bigger, higher, more, smaller, lower least. In general, these comparative terms were well used. There was no credit for merely stating the density figure for each country.
- (ii) This task was completed well by the majority of candidates. It is essential to use a ruler to accurately replicate the shading shown in the key.
- (c) (i) Candidates needed to calculate natural population growth per 1000 and then divide this answer by 10 to calculate the percentage for one mark. Not all candidates were aware that per cent means per 100 and therefore needed to divide the per 1000 answer by 10 to calculate the per cent.
- (ii) Natural population growth is determined by the difference between birth rate and death rate. Brunei has the lowest death rate, but it also has the lowest birth rate. Despite this it has the biggest gap between birth rate and death rate. This was a very difficult concept for candidates to grasp from the data presented in **Table 2.1**.

Question 3

This question was well answered overall. **Part (c)** had a high omit rate which suggested that some candidates were not familiar with the term ecotourism.

- (a) Good location descriptions referred to compass directions and distances from nearby places. Candidates who only wrote two points because there were two marks available ran the risk of not scoring full marks whereas candidates who wrote a full description easily gained both marks. Unspecific comments such as near Bangar or near the airport did not score marks.
- (b) The best answers used candidates' knowledge of mangroves to describe the actual mangroves shown in **Fig. 3.2**. There was no credit for details that were not evident in the photograph. Detailed descriptions that filled the answer lines available tended to score maximum marks, compared to those who merely wrote three short points. There was no credit for general descriptions of the area as the question was about the appearance of the mangroves. Candidates must answer the question set.
- (c) A few candidates confused their arguments for and against the development of ecotourism at Pulau Selirong and some gave advantages and disadvantages for the tourists themselves. Candidates who developed their arguments for and against tourism rather than giving a single or two word answer scored better marks.
- (d)(i) The standard of graph completion is getting better, with fewer candidates omitting this type of question. Candidates needed to use a sharp HB pencil and a ruler to accurately draw and shade the bar for Brunei. Care was also needed to ensure that the resultant shading was the same as the key.
 - (ii) Candidates who wrote several points about what **Fig. 3.3** showed soon gained the two marks available for this question.

Question 4

The map questions in **part (a)** were very challenging but the scatter graph in **part (b)** was dealt with confidently.

- (a)(i) This question required the name of one continent, not all the continents, which had more than 90 per cent access to safe water. Quite a number of candidates appeared to not know the names of the continents. This is basic geographical knowledge which is required for any Geography examination. When a candidate does not know the answer, they should not leave the answer space blank or write a long list of possible answers. Only the first answer of a list will be considered. Candidates should attempt an answer, even if they are unsure.
 - (ii) Describe the pattern is a common question in Geography examinations and one which is often not done well. This question required candidates to describe where the different categories of access to safe water shown on the key were within Africa. To do this they needed to use directions including north, south, east, west and central and/or refer to the lines of latitude shown on **Fig. 4.1**. The best answers took each of the four categories in turn. As there were only 3 marks available, this gave them a good opportunity to score full marks for this question. Candidates who tried to explain rather than describe the pattern gained no marks. It is essential that candidates understand the difference between describe and explain.
- (b)(i), (ii) and (iii) Most candidates were able to accurately plot the data for Tanzania onto **Fig. 4.2** and add a suitable line of best fit which enabled them to correctly identify the relationship as 'positive'.
- (iv) Candidates who used two named examples from **Fig. 4.2**, to illustrate that as GDP increases access to safe water increases, gained both the marks available for this question, provided that they used accurate figures from the scatter graph.
 - (v) A few candidates did not know that an anomaly is an odd one out, an exception, one that deviates from the norm.

Question 5

Overall this question was well answered. The pie chart was completed reasonably well, though not always shaded very accurately. The remainder of **Question 5**, based on the multiple line graph, **Fig. 5.2**, was generally well answered, including the three mark **5(b)(iii)**.

- (a) In order to complete the pie graph correctly a pencil, ruler and protractor were required. Care was also needed to replicate the shading shown in the key. Shading the methane section in particular proved to be difficult for some, possibly because of transferring diagonal lines from a rectangle in the key to the radial angle they needed in the pie segment.
 - (b)(i) The use of a ruler to read data from the line graph in **Fig. 5.2** was the best way to ensure the correct answer 2005 was given.
 - (ii) To calculate the overall increase candidates had to compare the start and end figures of the four countries shown in **Fig. 5.2**. Despite not being straightforward, the vast majority of candidates correctly identified Japan as having the smallest overall increase.
 - (iii) The best descriptions of the changes in China's CO₂ emissions referred to overall changes and then divided the dates covered by the line graph into two periods, one with a slow increase and then another with a rapid increase. Accurate data included correct units of measurement. Weaker responses adopted a year by year approach and data was not always provided to support the changes presented by the line graph.
 - (iv) Almost all candidates were able to produce a correct rank list.
- (c) It is important to write a full answer not a one word answer when asked for a description. Single words such as: cars, people, burning, factories were too vague to get credit.