DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

> **Paper 0453/01**
> **Paper 1**

Key messages

- The command word is very important and candidates need to consider more carefully what the question requires before beginning to answer. They must also consider the number of marks allocated for each part of a question to ensure they write enough different or developed ideas to gain full marks.
- Responses which consist of a series of bulleted points rarely access the higher mark ranges as the points made are undeveloped and usually unrelated to each other, meaning that causes and effects are rarely described and thus, linked and explained, and interrelationships between different aspects are never made apparent.

General comments

Candidates are now appreciating, more fully, the interrelationship between the different aspects of development and answers for the longer questions are being drawn from various parts of the syllabus. For example, the links between the different elements were apparent in answers relating to the construction project in **Question 1**.

Case studies are also becoming more apparent and this is a positive change. One of the aims of the subject is to give candidates knowledge so that they may make informed decisions in future. By studying examples of projects/industries in their own country they will be more able to consider the issues that are relevant to their own situations.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a)   **Parts (i)** and **(ii)** were answered correctly by the majority of candidates. However **part (iii)** was not well answered. There were weak answers about differences in population or level of development, many of which were not comparing the two countries. Many candidates wrote that the difference was because one country was developed and one was developing. These terms are insufficient in themselves as a response to a question.

(b)   Weaker attempts confused 'socialist' with 'social' and wrote about harmony/treating everyone fairly etc. Candidates often gave characteristics of a 'democracy', which also relate to capitalist systems. Many confused 'socialist' with 'dictatorship' and there was much crossover of answers with **Question 1(c)**. Better students showed good understanding and commonly referred to state ownership, wealth equality and control of prices as well as socialist governments providing for peoples' needs.

(c)   Good answers showed understanding of elections, freedoms and parliament vs. absolute rule. They also appreciated the distinction between a parliament and a government and between an elected leader and an absolute leader. Candidates now generally understand that if they are asked to describe differences then they have to make the comparison clear. Attempts to explain the difference in terms of how decisions were made or who held the power were not always clear. There was also some confusion over the meaning of the term 'presidency' in statements that suggested a democracy had a president but a dictatorship did not.

(d)   Some candidates tried to answer this without mentioning any specific effect of conflicts and began with an outcome, e.g. 'there are no schools,' 'people aren't working,' etc. but, generally, this was answered quite well, with effects clearly linked to a social or economic outcome. Displacement of people/emigration featured more prominently than expected.

(e)   Of the 6-mark questions, this one was noticeably answered the best and choices of project were usually appropriate, with good answers using real examples effectively. Advantages and disadvantages both tended to be largely economic, although explanations of environmental impacts probably got candidates to Level 3 most frequently. There were very interesting case studies used here by many candidates and that is always encouraging to see. The Jwaneng mine in Botswana and the Lusip dam in Swaziland featured in many answers. The use of case studies enables candidates to give details, which help them to achieve the developed answers needed for marks in the higher levels, and the responses are more cohesive and comprehensive.

Answers were also balanced in terms of the advantages and disadvantages. There were, however, many answers that failed to gain more marks in Level 2 as they merely stated all the different advantages and disadvantages without going into any of them in any detail. For example, the provision of a reliable water supply for farmers was worth a mark in Level 1 but those who considered the benefits that follow on from that gained marks in Level 2.

Question 2

(a)   Few candidates were able to identify four land uses. Interpretation of photographs is a useful skill: although most candidates picked out the dump site and the housing/shelters they then gave further land uses that could not actually be seen but were inferred instead, such as businesses and shopping. Few picked out the large pipe, pathway or the trees.

(b)   Good answers in the main, although many candidates gave pull factors for all three points.

(c)   Another well answered question. Characteristics of work in the informal sector have been well taught and many candidates scored full marks

(d)   Most scored well, although weaker answers did not give enough information about *how* living conditions etc. lead to poor health, i.e. candidates did not go far enough in linking the poor living condition or lack of service with the type of poor health and just stated that damp housing caused people to be ill, rather than it could lead to respiratory problems. Often it is the lack of weatherproof housing that makes people cold and this makes them more vulnerable to catching illnesses such as colds and flu.

Repetition of 'sick' and 'poor health' was common but many did show good knowledge of specific diseases resulting from a particular problem (e.g. cholera from unclean water, malaria from standing water, tuberculosis from poor/overcrowded housing conditions etc.).

There were some excellent answers concerning the lack of services such as the absence of a clean water supply leading to water-borne diseases and a lack of clinics, meaning diseases could not be treated. Many candidates are aware that overcrowded living conditions leads to the rapid spread of disease.

(e)   Although candidates knew this topic well, they often underperformed in this question because they spent too long either describing the *problems* in squatter settlements, or in outlining the *benefits of improvements* to them. The required practical details of the solutions were frequently absent, so many answers ended up being little more than wish-lists of what could be done e.g. better education, better water supply, build new homes, reduce crime etc.

A few good candidates managed to give fuller descriptions, usually by mentioning real examples of such things as, self-help schemes linked to particular authorities/businesses/NGOs etc.

The idea of making improvements in rural areas of out-migration to stem the flow of migrants was a frequent solution – and often covered in more depth. Some of the better answers described how solutions were organised such as by the government providing materials for new housing with the community providing the labour. Other self-help schemes included women setting up their own businesses and members of the community providing nursery care. Also, NGOs teaching girls how to sew and set up businesses with start-up funds provided by the government, was another good

answer. Another way of gaining marks in the higher levels was to take one problem such as the spread of diseases and describe the various ways this could be prevented such as waste collection and recycling initiatives, installation of good sanitation with community involvement in digging the trenches and health education provided by clinics in better hygiene methods.

Question 3

(a) (i)   Most candidates scored one mark here by recognising the increase in population. Candidates could have gained the second mark by identifying that the increase is set to be more gradual after 2050. Some attempted to consider the rate of change but did not look carefully enough at the years for which the data was given. Data in tabulated form needs careful scrutiny.

(ii)   This answer was usually correct.

(b)   Interpretation of Fig. 3 was generally good.

(c)   The main weakness was to describe farming methods and ways to improve output or what to do with the wasted food ('give to the poor' etc.). This question did not ask how farmers could produce more crops by using fertilisers and pesticides. It was about how to prevent food that had been produced from going to waste before it reached the market. However, there were many good answers covering a variety of different methods from refrigerated transport to methods of preservation and GM crops that stay fresher for longer. Some candidates suggested either moving the markets nearer to the farms or moving the farms nearer to the markets. Clearly this is not practically possible and so the idea was not well expressed. However, 'farmers need to sell their products in more local markets to reduce journey times' was a good answer. Food that is thrown away as farmers know it is not up to the required standard expected by markets was another issue raised, with the solution being to price it more cheaply so it would be acceptable to consumers.

(d)   This was generally quite well answered, though few candidates scored full marks as many focussed on reiterating the fact that families did not have a balanced diet rather than explaining why this was so. The question did not ask why people are malnourished (i.e. not enough food or lack of a balanced diet). It was specific to the families of traditional, subsistence farmers so the characteristics of this type of farming which lead to not enough/insufficient variety of food were needed.

(e)   Again, there were examples of wish-lists of methods to be used e.g. more land/give loans/more machinery/use fertiliser, without much development. The second part of the question (on sustainability) was also often not addressed. Many who did try to assess sustainability limited it to economic reasons, such as 'being affordable', while better answers gave detailed examples of environmental disadvantages, such as the effect of chemical fertilisers on water bodies and aquatic wildlife.

There were some excellent answers relating to the unsustainability of many commercial farming practices. Effects of deforestation on ecosystems in order to create more farmland and impacts of fertiliser runoff on water courses were well developed. Increased use of water for irrigation was also well described in terms of its unsustainability in regard to lowering river levels and increasing water shortages for people with consequent effects.

A significant number wasted time by interpreting the task as 'how to encourage subsistence farmers to produce more for sale'.

Question 4

(a)   Most candidates answered **part (i)** correctly. **Part (ii)** was quite weakly answered – with the idea of 'distribution' often poorly interpreted. There were many very vague descriptions, such as 'northern hemisphere/above the equator/east side of world' and some which focused on single continents or countries. Although it was hoped candidates would categorise emission levels into high, medium and low, very few got beyond high and low and it was often spoiled by terms like 'higher' and 'lower'.

If asked to describe a global distribution it is important not to focus on specific countries. Continents are the best areas used in this respect. Many candidates are not clear as to the location of Europe, as they failed to pick out the predominant emissions of this area and others classed it as mainly

NICs. A comparison of hemispheres is also not appropriate. Many answers described the difference between developed and developing countries and this was expressed using a variety of terminology. Reasons for particular distribution patterns are not required.

(b)(i) There was a clear split between weak answers such as 'to slow down global warming' etc. – often repeating the question in terms of countries need to work together to reduce global warming – and strong answers such as 'it affects everybody/global problem' etc. recognising the fact that climate change will affect everyone, irrespective of the levels of emissions of different countries.

(ii) Answers often scored 1 mark as candidates misread the task and described what individual governments could do. Very few answers looked at an international response. The purpose of this question was to generate ideas of how governments could work together to address the problem, not what they could do in their own particular countries. An excellent answer seen was 'they should all contribute to a fund so all countries can introduce greener alternatives to fossil fuels through greater research.' Some answers were rather too radical to be possible such as 'stop industries burning fossil fuels'. There were, however, some descriptions of good individual government actions such as encouraging the use of public transport or promoting afforestation which were worth some partial credit.

(c) These parts were generally answered correctly.

(d) The 'deforestation' part of answers did not present too many difficulties i.e. CO_2 taken in/released/increasing. Most candidates know that trees absorb CO_2 and so by removing them, more of the gas will be present in the atmosphere. However, linking the increasing levels of CO_2 to the greenhouse effect proved beyond most candidates, who showed little understanding of solar radiation and heating of the atmosphere. Many seem to think, erroneously, that the ozone layer, and even acid rain are integral to the process. However, the idea of reduced rainfall locally, due to reduced transpiration, a consequence of deforestation, often allowed them to gain an additional mark.

(e) There were some good answers here, with the effects of flooding and drought described well. Reference to real locations added to the quality of developed answers.

However, weaker answers tended either to list impacts or be very non-specific about the effect, referring only to 'climate change will cause crops to fail' etc.

There was clearly indication in some answers that candidates were already experiencing some effects of climate change in their countries and these statements are very acceptable. To reach Level 3 candidates' answers need to be comprehensive, so it was important not to focus just on the impacts of seawater flooding for example, but to consider at least one other effect.

DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Key messages

- Candidates should read the questions carefully and take their time answering them and studying resources so they can understand fully what they have to do.
- Candidates need to be confident in how to respond to each command word. Underlining command words on the examination paper can be a helpful aid in order to avoid including irrelevant detail at the expense of the correct focus.
- The mark allocations, given at the end of each question, along with the number of answer lines provided, are a useful guide to the length of answers required. Time is wasted if too much detail is included when a question is only worth a small number of marks, however marks are lost if insufficient detail is included when questions are worth more marks.
- In questions involving extended writing, typically worth 6 marks or more, candidates should aim to develop the points which they make rather than making simple lists of points such as bullet points. These answers are assessed using levels of response marking, where the focus is on the quality of the response rather than just the number of points listed. Developing answers and linking ideas enables candidates to show the depth of knowledge and understanding required for higher levels.
- Candidates need to learn key terms so that they can not only define them but also use them with confidence in an appropriate context. It may help candidates if they complete and learn a glossary of such terms during the course.
- Candidates need to be confident in using various different types of graph, maps and other presentation methods (e.g. tables, written extracts). Examples of each should be routinely used during the course and the required skills practised regularly. When using graphs candidates should take time and care as they are expected to be accurate within a small tolerance.
- If statistical evidence from graphs is used in answers it is more effective when that data is interpreted and used to back up points made, rather than simply listed.
- For success in this paper it is important for candidates to experience first-hand the different stages of an enquiry or investigation. They should plan and carry out small investigations – this could involve deciding on research questions or hypotheses, collecting data and the presenting the results, along with an analysis of the findings. They should finally be able to draw conclusions based on their results and evaluate their work. This is likely to give candidates more confidence when answering questions on this paper than if all their preparation has been from textbooks or classroom based.

General comments

The paper differentiated well between candidates and the full range of marks was seen. Most candidates made a genuine attempt at all questions, many showing sound understanding of a range of development issues and demonstrating appropriate subject related skills. As always the extent to which candidates did this varied immensely, however for the majority of candidates this examination was a positive experience, enabling them to show what they know, understand and can do.

There was no evidence of candidates being short of time and good use was made of the combined question and answer booklet, such that the length of answers was appropriate in most cases.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) (i) Most candidates gave the correct answer though some used the word 'indicator' rather than 'index'.

(ii) Both answers were usually correct, though a minority did not select 'Cameroon' as the country where the lowest percentage can read and write, presumably as they were not familiar with the word 'literacy'.

(iii) Whilst some candidates gave a good definition, many wrongly considered it to be the average income/wage or spending of each individual. A further error was to define GDP but not to consider 'per person'.

(iv) Usually this was well answered with Tunisia, Algeria and Botswana being answers which could be justified. There was no mark for the choice of country, as the marks awarded were for justification.

(b)(i) Whilst some candidates could complete the triangular graph many encountered problems, suggesting that this skill was not too familiar to them.

(ii) Generally this was well answered and most candidates were able to compare the two countries. Others simply quoted statistics without any interpretation (e.g. more/higher) and some gave wrong answers as they could not read the figures correctly from the triangular graph.

(c)(i) Most candidates answered this well, especially the changes in the primary and tertiary sectors, however a number were confused by the compound graph, suggesting for example that tertiary employment was reducing, whilst others described the trends as 'fluctuating' rather than describing the overall changes as required.

(ii) Some excellent, detailed answers were seen here, clearly explaining a number of reasons why employment structure changes with development. Others gave brief responses, many focussing on a single issue, such as technology or education, rather than considering the wider picture. Few for example considered the exhaustion of raw materials, investment in manufacturing by the government or the change from subsistence to commercial agriculture. Some candidates did little more than describing the changes or referred only to the benefits of a changing employment structure without attempting to explain these changes.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates answered **parts (i)** and **(ii)** correctly and appeared familiar with the type of map used. **Part (iii)** differentiated well with some high quality answers considering sophisticated ideas, including the ability to specialise and allow a country to exploit its comparative advantage. Many others considered the idea of a greater variety of goods being available or foreign exchange being earned but did not consider other advantages such as imports being cheaper/better quality or a larger market being available for home producers.

(b) Generally this was not well answered. Many candidates mentioned the idea of worldwide links, but did not add any further detail, such as reference to the location of the main suppliers (in LEDCs) or the headquarters (in an MEDC).

(c)(i) Usually correctly answered, with axes labelled and bars accurately drawn, although some candidates did not use an appropriate scale.

(ii) Many candidates correctly identified ideas such as more profit or access to a larger market but did not consider other advantages such as cheap labour, the availability of raw materials or economies of scale.

(iii) Assuming that they were familiar with 'formal' employment candidates answered this well and showed good knowledge. Some candidates clearly were not familiar and either focussed incorrectly on informal employment or simply listed various job roles. A common misconception was that formal employment offers higher rates of pay, which is not always the case.

Question 3

(a)(i) Usually well answered, with the correct focus on damage to the natural environment.

(ii) Whilst there were some high quality answers relatively few candidates stated problems simply without any attempt to explain them. A direct copy of information from such a resource will not be credited as explanation.

(b) Usually this was correctly answered with all three problems correctly identified from the resource. The command word 'identify' requires the answer to be derived from the resource and in this case no further explanation was required.

(c) (i) It was surprising that, having been told that a random sample was used, many candidates proceeded to write about another sampling technique. Many of those who did focus on the correct type of sampling attempted to describe random sampling by using the word 'random' which did not show their understanding of it. The better answers referred to using random number tables or selecting 50 names from a hat.

(ii) Relatively few candidates described the scoring system and explained how it was used by people answering the questionnaire to indicate their level of concern. Many answers were not relevant as they focussed on other issues, such as the fact that room was given for other answers, whilst others referred to sampling or generally to the use of the questionnaire.

(iii) This was generally well answered with roughly equal numbers of candidates agreeing and disagreeing that this was a good questionnaire. A whole variety of different and valid reasons was given. Either viewpoint was possible and marks were awarded for justification.

(iv) Most candidates scored something here with many suggesting that that either people living closer would be more affected or those with young children would be more concerned. More perceptive candidates also considered factors such as the age or health of the respondent or where they worked, correctly speculating for example that workers at the factory would be less worried about its adverse effects than those who worked elsewhere.

(d) Candidates chose all four schemes with a fairly even balance. The question differentiated well. Almost all candidates were able to choose a recommendation and, to some extent, explain their choice. The most perceptive candidates justified their choice well, writing well developed ideas which explained the advantages of their recommendation along with the disadvantages of the three recommendations they had rejected. The disadvantages of the other schemes were however not always developed fully enough, or simple reasons, such as cost, were repeated as simple disadvantages for several schemes.

Question 4

(a) All enquiries were equally popular. Whilst there were some excellent responses, particularly relating to data collection, many candidates did not fully develop their answers in terms of hypothesis formulation, pilot study or data analysis and presentation. Some candidates also gave simplistic answers which repeated the information provided in the earlier study.

(b) Candidates were able to give a good range of difficulties of carrying out the chosen research, and many scored well on this question, recognising that collecting information about pollution of the environment is not straightforward, explaining a number of practical difficulties. Whilst there was a whole range of valid ideas some candidates did little more than state that the study is expensive, data collection is difficult or answers given are not valid, not explaining why.