JC1 H1 Geography MYE (2023)
Mark Scheme

Marking Approaches

(a) **Point marking** is used for marking all sub-parts of the structured question.
- For point marking, the general rule is that each creditworthy response is awarded one mark. More detailed guidance is provided in the marking guide for each question.

(b) **Generic level descriptors** are used for marking 13-mark essays.
- Possible approaches are provided for questions marked using generic level descriptors. They provide guidance on how the questions could be approached. The possible approaches provided are neither exhaustive nor should they be treated as model approach to questions.

Section A

Cluster 1.1 Cities in a Sustainable Future

1 Resource 1 shows the share of people living in urban areas in 1960 and in 2020. Resource 2 shows a photograph of the Kibera Slum located in Nairobi, Kenya. Resource 3 is an excerpt form an article 'Why residents of Kibera Slum are rejecting new housing plans'.

(a) **Cite data to describe the changes in the share of people living in urban areas from 1960 to 2020 as shown in Resource 1.** [4]

Award 1 mark for each description using data from Resource 1 on the changes in share of people living in urban areas from 1960 to 2020. Award a maximum of 1 additional mark for further development of each description, where applicable.

Possible responses include:
- Generally, there has been an increase in the share of people living in urban areas for all continents with the exception of Australia that remained at 80-90% urban across the years.
- Highest increase:
  - Significant increase in regions of South America, Africa and East Asia, which increased from around majority 0-40% urban to majority 20-90% urban
  - China, that increased from being 10-20% urbanised in 1960 to 50-60% urbanised in 2020
  - Brazil, that increased from being 40-50% urban to 80-90% urban
  - Southeast Asia: Increased from mostly 10-20% urban to mostly 50-60% urban
- Lowest increase:

    - Russia, that increased from 50-60% urban to 70-80% urban
    - North America (USA, Canada), that increased from 60-70% urban to 80-90% urban
- Moderate increase:
    - Eastern Europe: Increased from mostly 50-80% urban to mostly 70-90% urban
    - Western Europe: Increased from mostly 30-50% urban to mostly 50-80% urban

AO2

(b) **Explain how the increase in urban population may affect the environment negatively.** [4]

Award 1 mark for an explanation of how the increase in urban population may affect the environment negatively, to a maximum of 4 marks. Award a maximum of 1 additional mark for further development of each explanation, where applicable.

Possible responses include:

- Increase in urban population may result in higher consumption levels due to growing affluence levels, causing higher generation of waste.
    - If waste is improperly disposed, this could result in pollution of water supply as toxic leachates may contaminate groundwater sources and rivers.
- Increase in urban population may result in an increased need for energy consumption, causing higher levels of greenhouse gas emissions through the burning of fossil fuels. This may contribute to the enhanced greenhouse effect, resulting in global warming.
- Increase in urban population may result in an increased in economic activities such as industrialisation, causing higher levels of industrial pollution in the air.
    - Industrial waste may also contaminate rivers and seas, resulting in the loss of aquatic life.
- Increase in urban population may also result in large ecological footprints, as vast quantities of resources are used by city dwellers such as the demand for water, fossil fuels, land and building materials.
    - These resources may also be drawn from places beyond the city, appropriating the carrying capacity of not just the city itself, but of other nations as well.

AO1

(c) **With reference to Resource 2, describe the deprivations faced by slum dwellers living in the Kibera slums.** [4]

Award 1 mark for each description of deprivations faced by slum dwellers living in the Kibera slums, to a maximum of 4 marks. Award a maximum of 1 additional mark for further development of each description, where applicable.

Possible responses include:

- Slum dwellers in Kibera face deprivations such as poor structural quality of housing due to poor quality of construction materials.
    - As seen in Resource 2, the slums are constructed with sheets of metal on its walls and roofs, which are not durable in the long run and may be susceptible to damage during heavy rainfall.
- They may also face deprivations such as inadequate access to safe and clean water supply.
    - Improper disposal of waste will contaminate rivers as seen in Resource 2, where waste is dumped out in the open and polluting the river flowing through the slum.
- They are also vulnerable to infections diseases spread by insects.
    - Stagnant water in the river may be a breeding ground from mosquitoes that transmit diseases such as dengue and malaria.
- Their living condition may be overcrowded, which could result in the spread of contagious diseases as well.
    - There is a high density of slums in Kibera with the slums built in very close proximity with each other, with little ventilation due to the lack of windows.
- Their living condition is dirty and unhygienic with huge piles of unbagged waste dumped openly.
    - Improper disposal of waste may result in toxic leachates seeping into groundwater supply, contaminating water sources.
    - As waste as piled up, they may form steep slopes which are susceptible to landslides during heavy rainfall.

AO2

(d) **With reference to Resources 2 and 3, suggest ways to improve the lives of the slum dwellers living in Kibera.** [5]

Award 1 mark for each suggestion of how to improve the lives of slum dwellers living in Kibera, to a maximum of 5 marks. Award a maximum of 1 additional mark for further development of each suggestion, where applicable. Award a maximum of 3 marks if only one resource is referenced in the response.

Possible responses include:

- Improvements in waste management in slums such as better waste collection systems and cleaning up / minimising the disposal of waste on open dumps.

    - This could be done through formalising the waste management systems by providing job opportunities for slum dwllers to work as waste collectors, imposing stricter regulations / raise awareness on waste collection to ensure that slum dwellers abide by waste collection rules.
- Slum upgrading projects to improve construction material of houses
    - This can be done by replacing the metal sheets currently used to construct slums with more durable materials such as concrete, and in upgrading the homes to have better ventilation by building windows.
- Slum upgrading projects to improve provision of basic amenities such as better sanitation and clean water supply.
    - This can be done through construction of public toilet amenities, or having the infrastructure for clean piped water supply.
- Stricter enforcement of government regulations of house ownership in the new housing
    - Stricter laws and monitoring to reduce corruption and prevent problems of bribery in relocation projects.
    - Impose regulations on reselling / renting out flats to prevent influx of middle class and rising rents (e.g. price cap on rental, minimum occupancy duration before rental / reselling of flat)
- Improve service provisions in new apartments in order to make it more attractive for slum dwellers to remain in the housing.
    - Ensure regular and quality access to water, sanitation and electricity supply in new housing

AO2

(e) **Explain why liveability assessments of cities are subjective.** [5]

Award 1 mark for an explanation of why liveability assessments of cities are subjective, to a maximum of 5 marks. Award a maximum of 2 additional marks for further development of each explanation, where applicable.

Possible responses include:

- Subjective due to the purpose of assessment
    - EIU and Mercer's liveability assessments measures liveability from the perspective of expatriates who have relocated overseas for work, hence prioritising indicators such as quality of private education and healthcare
    - In contrast, liveability assessments such as the LKYSPP Global Liveable and Smart Cities index measures liveability from the perspectives of an average resident, hence prioritising indicators relevant to the needs of an ordinary resident such as availability of broadband connections and employment levels.

- Subjective due to the time of assessment
    - The COVID-19 pandemic affected liveability rankings globally. According to the EIU's Global Liveability Index, the overall global average liveability score fell by seven points, as compared with the average pre-pandemic score.
    - The extent to which cities were sheltered by strong border closures, their ability to handle the health crisis and the pace at which they rolled out vaccination campaigns drove significant changes in the rankings due to the shift of perceptions of well-being.
- Subjective due to the place of assessment
    - Differences in standards of data collection and analysis (e.g. different reliability and timeliness of published data, different methodology of data collection and classifcation) may result in variations of data integrity across different places.

AO1

Section B
Cluster 1.1

2 To what extent do you agree that urban reimaging will always bring benefits to those living in cities? [13]

Possible Approaches:

Candidates could approach the question by making a judgement on whether urban reimaging will always bring benefits to those living in cities through a consideration of the different impacts that urban reimaging could result in. Candidates could analyse the benefits and negative consequences related to the economic, social, and environmental impacts of urban reimaging on those living in cities.

Candidates could also approach the question by making a judgement on whether urban reimaging may be more beneficial to some social groups at the expense of others. Candidates could analyse the contextual factors that may affect the extent to which urban reimaging is beneficial, such as the nature of government policies (e.g. top-down or bottom-up approach), resources available, and the suitability of the strategies in meeting the needs of the locals.

Levels marked using Generic Level Descriptors for 13m H1 essays

AO3

Generic Level Descriptors for H1 Essays		
Level	**Marks**	**Descriptors**

4	11–13	Evaluation is analytical and coherent. Response is mostly well-supported by relevant material, including the appropriate use of examples. Response features accurate geographical knowledge and reflects adequate understanding of the subject content relevant to the question.
3	8–10	Evaluation is broadly analytical and generally coherent. Response is moderately well- supported by relevant material, including some appropriate use of examples. Response features accurate geographical knowledge and reflects adequate understanding of the subject content relevant to the question.
2	5–7	Response is largely descriptive with limited analysis and evaluation. Response is partly coherent and may lack clarity in parts. Response is poorly supported by relevant materials, including the limited use of examples. Response features inaccurate geographical knowledge and poor understanding of the subject content relevant to the question.
1	1–4	Response is descriptive with no analysis or evaluation. Response is fragmented and lacks clarity. Response consists of unsupported assertions. Response features largely inaccurate geographical knowledge and a lack of understanding of the subject content relevant to the question.
0	0	No creditworthy response

Note:

- Assessment using generic level descriptors involves qualitative rather than quantitative evaluation. Judgements on the level to be awarded to an answer will be based on the principle of ‘best fit’ determined by the descriptors within each level.
- As a general guideline, responses deemed to have fulfilled all the descriptors within a level may be awarded the top mark in that level.