

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

Question	1 Explain why globalisation can create inequalities. (4)		
	Script A	Script B	Script C
Student Answer	Globalisation can create inequalities because the rich countries in the world have done really well out of things like outsourcing which brings in profits for TNCs. Most of these TNCs are based in the developed, rich countries such as the EU countries and the USA so it these places that do well out of globalisation whereas in developing or even emerging countries there are fewer opportunities for profit and so people remain poor.	Globalisation has led to many developed countries losing their manufacturing industry because of outsourcing to countries such as China. This has led to improvements in the environment in developed countries but much worse environments in China and India, with cities such as Hengshui. This leads to inequalities in life expectancy and general quality of life which are up to 10 years higher in the post-industrial developed world.	Globalisation has led to many inequalities as measured by the Gini coefficient. According to Oxfam 8 people have half of global wealth and although the share of the global population defined as “poor” — those making less than \$2/day — has fallen since 2001 by nearly half, to 15 percent, the rich have got richer at a much faster rate so increasing inequality. This is also true within most countries especially in emerging countries where despite a growing middle class many remain very poor.
	Commentary A	Commentary B	Commentary C
Commentary	<i>National Inequalities identified (1) outsourcing (1) profits for TNCs (1)</i>	<i>National Inequalities (1) outsourcing (1) environmental issues (1) leading to poorer quality of life (1)</i>	<i>No mechanism is identified here – has idea of global wealth gap (1) rich getting richer</i>
	Mark	Mark	Mark
Mark	3	4	1

Question	<p>2 (a) Figure 2 and Figure 3 in the Resource Booklet show data on income distribution for Singapore in 2013.</p> <p>(i) Using the data in Figure 2, calculate the percentage of income earners who earn less than the GDP per capita in Singapore.</p>
-----------------	--

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	You must show your working. (2)		
	Script A	Script B	Script C
Student Answer	13+19.4+14.4+10.5+7.6 = 64.9%	64.9%	56-63%
	Commentary A	Commentary B	Commentary C
Commentary	<i>Workings = 1 Result = 1</i>	<i>No workings shown</i>	<i>Misread of question here</i>
	Mark	Mark	Mark
Mark	2	1	0

Question	(ii) Using Figure 3, calculate the ratio of the earnings of the top 20% of income earners with the earnings of the bottom 20%. You must show your working. (2)		
	Script A	Script B	Script C
Student Answer	56:8 = 7:1	45: 7.5 = 6	7:1
	Commentary A	Commentary B	Commentary C
Commentary	<i>Right ratios and right result</i>	<i>Wrong reading of top 20% - result is correct given data so..</i>	<i>No workings but right result</i>
	Mark	Mark	Mark
Mark	2	1	1

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

Question	2 (b) Explain why using Gross Domestic Product per capita as a measure of a country's economy is unreliable. (4)		
	Script A	Script B	Script C
Student Answer	Gross Domestic Product is unreliable because it doesn't measure everyone in a country. Some people don't have jobs and so they don't have an income to be recorded. People who work abroad are not included either. For some places like Singapore there is no minimum wage so those people might be quite poor but the figures are quite high. It says on Page 3 of the booklet that migrant workers are not recorded so that is going to make a big difference to the final figure.	There are several reasons why gross domestic product is not reliable. Firstly, it might be out of date and the country might have experienced a crash or a boom since the figures came out. Secondly it doesn't show all the things that go on in a country. There is a black economy that isn't shown so, for example on many developing countries street vendors will not record all their money nor will they pay taxes. The same is true of the very rich elite who might be hiding their money in offshore accounts so that they don't have to pay tax. This is also true of big firms such as Google.	GDP measures the total amount of goods and services produced in a country. It doesn't actually measure income because the money made from selling goods and services is divided up unequally and some goes in profits and some goes to pay wages. Figure 3 shows that income is quite uneven in Singapore with a high Gini coefficient and Figure 4 shows that average salaries are way below the GDP figure. This might mean that a lot of the GDP is going to in profit which might just end up abroad or with the very rich who own shares and property and don't make so much money from their salaries.
	Commentary 1	Commentary 2	Commentary 3
	<i>The idea that not everyone is measured is a misunderstanding of GDP which is confused with average income here but there is, nonetheless credit for the basic idea that 'poorly gathered data' (1) – however the confusion between GDP per capita and average income is reasonable given the RB use of the phrase 'An average growth rate of >6% with a GDP per capita of \$55 000' Page 2 – bullet 3 which is the same figure as that quoted</i>	<i>The idea of old data is creditworthy (1) so too the black economy (1) which is extended with some detail – street vendors (1) off-shore accounts is also legitimate (1) and the Google point about corporate evasion is worthy of credit (1) so clearly a full mark answer</i>	<i>This is another unusual answer that focuses of disparities between income and GDP which isn't quite the 'intention' of the question although it is obviously a legitimate approach because it does make GDP 'misleading'. So, no marks for the AO1 definition but credit idea of profit increase (1) ending up abroad (1) as well as the point that is flagged in the MS of uneven distribution with high Gini (1)</i>

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<i>for income on Figure 2. So this candidate is credited for the idea of migrant workers not being included – a point made twice here but without detail of its impact so (1)</i>		
	Mark	Mark	Mark
	2	4	3

Question	<p>3 Study Figure 4 in the Resource Booklet, which shows data on GDP per capita and national average salaries for selected countries.</p> <p>Analyse the relationship between GDP per capita and national average salaries. (8)</p>		
	Script A	Script B	Script C
Student Answer	<p>The countries are shown in order of their GDP per capita from Luxembourg which is the highest with a GDP of about \$68 000 down to New Zealand which has an income of about \$25 000 per person. Of course, some of these countries will have higher Gini coefficients which will make some of the averages less reliable than others. The second piece of data shows the national average salary in each country which is different from GDP because it is measured differently. The highest figure is actually Norway where salaries are about \$45 000 but they go</p>	<p>The relationship is complicated with many countries having higher average salaries than they do GDP. This must mean that they are borrowing money to pay the workers and the country is getting into debt as a result. Other places like Singapore and Hong Kong not paying their workers quite so much. In Singapore there is no minimum wage and as the result the government doesn't have to pay them so much. This may also be the case in Hong Kong. Singapore also has higher paid foreign workers who are probably paid by their companies so this doesn't get included in the data. In the long run, the debt problem</p>	<p>There are 16 countries covered on Figure 4. Many of them are members of the European Union. Most of them (12) have higher average salaries than they do GDP per capita. The gap between the two figures ranges from about \$3 000 (New Zealand) to more than \$10 000 (Switzerland, Denmark and the USA). The countries with much higher salaries than GDP per capita include both Asian city-states which are probably 'special' cases, and Norway and Switzerland which are also quite unusual countries. In the case of both HK and Singapore the gap between National Average wage and GDP is very large, more than \$20</p>

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p>down to a really low figure of about \$17 000 in Hong Kong which usually seen as a pretty rich country and an emerging nation because it was one of the original Asian tiger economies that grew fast. The gap between income and GDP can go either way. In some countries like Norway they are really close but in others the GDP is much higher than the income – this is true in Hong Kong which I have already mentioned but also in Singapore. In fact, the top four countries here for GDP all have GDP being greater than income whilst for the remaining 12 countries it is the other way around. This is probably because these are mostly European countries which have fairer systems and different taxes which make poorer people better off because they have benefits like housing and a welfare state too. Not everyone gets a wage either.</p>	<p>is going to have a bad effect. In 2007 the world economy collapsed because of debt and it seems that the problem is getting worse again. The USA and the UK both have a gap of over \$10 000 between GDP per capita and average salary. This will mean that they need to have more people on zero hours contracts or the country will suffer in the long run. This is why the government wants austerity cutting back on what they spend on wages and salaries to people such as nurses and teachers. It would be interesting to know if the emerging countries such as China and India are more like Singapore than they are the USA because this could mean that the BRICS will take over as superpowers because they do not have such a huge debt problem. This might be a real problem in the long run.</p>	<p>000. These are clearly the anomalies of this data set although it is not known how the 16 countries were selected in the first place and so they may not be representative. Average salary is very low in both HK and Singapore. The booklet says that there is no minimum wage in Singapore and this might also be true of Hong Kong – we also know that there are a number of very high wage earners in both places which might pull up the average salary. However, the main factor to explain why average salaries are higher than GDP per capita is because average salary does not include people without salaries whereas GDP is the total product divided by the total population. It is also important to remember that Norway makes huge amounts out of oil sales and Luxembourg has a lot of TNCs HQ's there for tax reasons.</p>
	Commentary A	Commentary B	Commentary C
Commentary	<p><i>There are two questions on this paper which ask students to analyse Resource Booklet information. Analyse questions require candidates to use their knowledge and understanding to deconstruct and then interpret information on a resource. This answer takes the correct approach although too preoccupied with simply describing the data rather than</i></p>	<p><i>This answer begins with a basic statement about the complexity of the relationship and then proceeds to ignore the resource but offer a view that presumes that governments pay all the wages in the country and that they are getting into debt because of the 'gap'. This misreading of the 'issue' remains the focus of this answer throughout and the candidate pursues the idea through a view on 'austerity'</i></p>	<p><i>This is a well-focussed answer – in places the candidate could have been more careful in developing analysis a little more productively – the material about Norway's oil is a case in point. They adopt the view that the four countries where GDP>average salaries are 'special vases' or 'anomalies' and having correctly identified the primary reason for why the norm is for salaries to be higher than</i></p>

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p><i>deconstructing it, but tends to offer truisms (they are different because they are 'measured differently') or gets caught in 'cul-de-sacs' of their own making as in 'Hong Kong which is usually seen as a pretty rich country'. Or 'this is probably because these are mostly European countries which have fairer systems...'. These points are not developed satisfactorily. The answer has some, isolated elements of geographical knowledge and understanding although not all of it is relevant or accurate and makes 'few connections' in what is a limited 'analysis'. However the last line of the answer does show some apparent understanding which was just enough to edge the mark into the bottom of Level 2.</i></p>	<p><i>and 'the need' for 'zero hours contracts' and then some speculative material on why the BRICs might be waiting in the wings. In itself the material is quite thoughtful but it is based on a fundamental error. There is a hint of understanding (the point about no minimum wage in Singapore) but nothing else is here. This was placed in Level 1.</i></p>	<p><i>GDP per capita as a function of how they are measured the analysis concentrates on the 'four'. There is accurate knowledge and understanding offered about Hong Kong, Luxembourg and Norway and this is 'logically connected' (AO3) to the relevant geographical ideas. The answer falls short of full marks because of the limitations identified earlier but it is Level 3.</i></p>
	Mark	Mark	Mark
Mark	3	1	7

Question	<p>4 Study Figure 5 and Figure 6 in the Resource Booklet, which show the 'top ten' globalised countries according to two indices.</p> <p>Analyse the contrasting results of these measurements of globalisation. (8)</p>		
	Script A	Script B	Script C

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

<p>Student Answer</p>	<p>There are 20 countries listed here but there is a big overlap with Ireland, Netherlands, Singapore, Denmark and Switzerland appearing on both lists. These countries appear in different positions except for Netherlands which is in 3rd position on both lists. One index is scored out of a 100 with the highest being just over ninety and the lowest just under 90 so there isn't much difference between the 10 countries almost all of which are in one part of the world. On the other list, scored out of 1000, there is much more difference starting at about 1000 and reducing to about 600. This suggests that the Kearney is a more reliable way of analysing the globalisation data. It also has more categories which also helps make it more accurate and that may be why it has a wider variety of countries from more varied parts of the world. There are many less European countries on this list than the KOF index. Globalisation is not necessarily good for everyone – there are always winners and losers. We know that Singapore has many migrant workers and that some of them do really well in jobs such as banking but others are very poorly paid because there is no minimum wage. So, these figures are just averages for the countries and there may be other factors that are not</p>	<p>The text of page 6 of the RB says that 'most measurements of globalisation include political, economic and social indicators'. These are both included in these two indexes but they are probably measured in different ways. Some countries might do very well with one variable but much less well for another. For example, the USA doesn't need to trade that much because they have a larger resource base than smaller countries but they do have a lot of technology especially in places like California. Singapore pretty much has to be globalised because they don't have any natural resources at all – it even has to import its water. It also has a lot of migrant labour even though it doesn't belong to a trading bloc such as the EU. There are a large number of European countries on the two lists and these do trade with each other and have a free movement of goods, capital and sometimes people too. That is why they feature here. The UK isn't in the top 10 which might be because of Brexit which will slow down the number of both goods and people that can move across borders. There are a couple of anomalies on the list but it is interesting to note that Hong Kong is not on one list although nearly top of the list on the other list. This suggests that they are using a different set of measurements altogether as well as maybe explaining the anomalies.</p>	<p>There is no correlation between the two lists – five countries appear on both lists but there are another 10 countries mentioned too. The KOF list has less variety with all but one being European countries, most of them in the EU. The Kearney list has a wider range of countries – only half of them are in Europe. The indexes measure different sets of factors and these vary from country to country although not so much on the KOF scale where social, political and economic factors are pretty balanced. Most of these European countries are in the EU which has free movement of goods across borders and the KOF index uses trade as a major factor in measuring globalisation. It also mentions foreign workers and with free movement of labour too the EU countries are almost bound to feature high on the list. Another thing that KOF measures is the number of McDonalds you find in these countries and because they are quite rich places they have a lot of fast food restaurants. It also measures tourist numbers. It is possible that the Kearney index measures different things because it has two different categories of technological connectivity and Personal contact – it is interesting that the USA has a really bad score for Economic Integration but does really well for technology. Because that isn't really on the KOF index that might explain the difference.</p>
------------------------------	--	--	---

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	measured like health and education that are measured on the Human Development Index. Corruption is high in Singapore for example.		
	Commentary A	Commentary B	Commentary C
Commentary	<p><i>This second 'analyse' question focuses on the part of the specification concentrating on the measurement of globalisation (3.3) and students will have covered this as part of their preparation for Paper 2.</i></p> <p><i>This response, quite quickly, becomes preoccupied with the way in which the data is presented and leads the candidate into drawing conclusions about the variations in the indices that are highly speculative and the student then pursues a discussion about which is the most accurate way of measuring globalisation. There isn't much analysis here given that the answer then switches to an assessment of the benefits of globalisation rather than an analysis of the material in the resources. This answer crept into Level 2.</i></p>	<p><i>There is some high-level analysis here from the outset where the candidate is able to identify technical reasons for the different results. There are a number of reasons offered for the results, some accurate (e.g. US) and some less so but the explanation of the EU countries is good and the final point about how Hong Kong's very different league table positions suggest that the measurement of globalisation is not universally agreed is thoughtful (although in reality Hong Kong is not included in the Kearney list at all!). This answer has good logical connections and 'accurate and relevant geographical knowledge and understanding' so it is Level 3, albeit only just.</i></p>	<p><i>This is a very strong response. There are no errors here and the quality of the analysis is well argued and thoughtful. Of course there is more to say but a comprehensive answer from someone with excellent recall of both indices would take far longer than an 8 mark 'analysis' answer would justify. This is an 8 mark answer.</i></p>
	Mark	Mark	Mark
Mark	4	6	8

Question	5 Study Section C in the Resource Booklet. Evaluate the sustainability of Singapore's economic and population growth. (18)		
	Script A	Script B	Script C
Student Answer	<p>Sustainable development is development that provides the goods and services demanded today but without stopping the possibility of future generations doing the same. This is sometimes measured by using a carbon footprint or an eco-footprint which estimates how much land is needed to provide for the population of a country. If this figure is higher than a certain figure then the country is not sustainable. Most of the developed world has really high ecofootprints because we consume so much and go on expensive holidays and use so much fuel. We also eat too much and waste too much of it without thinking about the consequences. That is the problem facing Singapore but it isn't helped by the fact that there population is growing so fast as well.</p> <p>There are frequently said to be three different parts of sustainability; these are social, economic and environmental.</p>	<p>Singapore has a real problem to become more sustainable. It is a very fast-growing country and is actually planning to increase this by 2030 which suggest that they don't really take sustainability very seriously at all. It could have a one-child policy such as that used in China which has, as a result become much more sustainable recently.</p> <p>To some extent they are trying to improve things. By designing their country so that people do not have to travel very much which helps it to reduce fuel consumption and they have also kept heavy industry away from people which should improve their health and life expectancy. Building high-rise apartments saves space but they a really need to address their population problem as a priority.</p> <p>For a country such as Singapore with no natural resources it cannot be sustainable without trade. Cities everywhere never get</p>	<p>For some, Singapore is one the 20th century's great success stories. Its economy has boomed, based on trade both of goods but also services such as banking, accountancy and law. It has modernised itself very successfully but there are serious tensions within the city that might threaten its long-term future as a global city, and therefore its sustainability.</p> <p>On one level sustainability is easy to define. The classic Brundtland definition is that it is 'development that needs the need of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs'. This is sometimes known of intra-generational equity in that it suggests that we have a moral duty to be fair to future generations. However, this would make no sense at all if we were not fair to existing generations. Brundtland agreed with this and suggested that priority should be given to addressing poverty. In this respect Singapore</p>

	<p>These make up a three-legged stool and if one part is not there then the whole country is in trouble. Singapore might struggle to manage this successfully because it is growing economically but also encouraging population growth which seems to be contradictory. If they cut back on population growth then they would need fewer resources and become more sustainable.</p> <p>Many people worry more about economic growth than the environment because of the economic problems that face the world. We don't really know about future changes and there are climate sceptics who say that climate change is either a myth or even likely to do us some good. Some people prefer to put their faith in technology for changing the future and this seems to come across with Singapore and its water. They are trying to reduce imports of water using technology and recycling which would work well.</p> <p>In conclusion, many countries are trying to become more sustainable. Malthus said that the only way to do this was to control population with something like a one-child policy, as I said before. China has become an emerging country since doing that and Singapore could do the same</p>	<p>very close to being self-sufficient even if they produce some food (e.g. Havana in Cuba) or have very ecological transport systems (e.g. Curitiba) they are always dependent on rural areas to supply them with resources including food and fuel and in the case of Singapore water too. As a country Singapore has a particular problem because it is just a city with no rural area at all so whilst London can get its water and food from surrounding areas of countryside Singapore cannot do this. The land use planning map (Figure 7) shows that there is hardly any land for agriculture at all so in that sense it cannot be sustainable.</p> <p>Another example of this problem is its water supply. In order to get around its shortage it doing sustainable work in recycling water but it still imports a lot of its water from Malaysia. It could cut back on its consumption which is the same as in the UK where lots of water is wasted but it can also hope to replace its imported water with recycled water but also desalination which isn't very sustainable because it uses so much energy.</p> <p>At the moment Singapore is very crowded which makes it more sustainable in one way but not in another. The land-use pattern is good because they try to keep different uses</p>	<p>might not be quite such a good model because it relies on very poorly paid migrant labour with no minimum wage and probably little protection for human rights. This is similar to Gulf States such as Qatar and Bahrain which are generally regarded as very 'successful' but as with Singapore have huge differences between rich and poor and economic growth that relies on the immigration of cheap labour. There are serious questions whether this is sustainable or not. Countries with growing inequalities tend to have lower growth rates in the long term and are difficult to manage politically. The Arab Spring showed that very large inequalities can lead to political unrest and even civil war.</p> <p>However, it can be said that Singapore is making a serious effort to reduce its dependency on the outside world. The attempts to reduce the imports of water from Malaysia is an example although all cities import water and if high-tech and expensive desalination is one route to closing this gap then it isn't quite a sustainable as it might appear. In defence of Singapore it could be said that no city can exist independently of the outside world and so it is bound to have a large dependence on imports, even of people. London, sometimes jokingly called Singapore on Thames could not survive</p>
--	---	--	---

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p>which would also spread its wealth further. They could ask the local population to do the construction jobs instead of paying migrant labour to do these jobs and if they cut back on immigration there would be more water to go around and more resources in general. So, the future of Singapore is in the balance but it all depends on what the government wants to do. So far, they have done a bit to help the environment but they could do more as with Curitiba where they have developed a sustainable transport system that has helped the environment.</p>	<p>together which cuts down on the use of cars. This is like London where the Boris-bikes reduce the use of cars in the city centre.</p> <p>So Singapore has achieved something in terms of economic sustainability but not much on the population front.</p>	<p>economically without 'importing' almost everything for the UK, Europe and beyond.</p> <p>In conclusion, it could be argued that Singapore might become more sustainable but can never be completely so. Critics of the concept of sustainability might point out that, in a globalised world with its emphasis on greater and greater interconnectivity, more travel for business and tourism, more shifting of goods and more outsourcing with huge quantities of inter- and intra- corporate trade the whole global economy lacks sustainability and that it has become a 'mantra' without meaning.</p>
	Commentary A	Commentary B	Commentary C
Commentary	<p><i>In terms of mark tariff this paper is dominated by the two final questions – this 18 mark essay and the 24 mark Q6 that follows, making 42 marks in total of the 70 available across the whole Unit. In both Q5 and Q6 the AO's are dominated by AO2 and AO3 and the descriptors, as elsewhere remain fixed for the lifetime of the specification. Obviously the indicative content will vary from question to question. In most respects the AO2</i></p>	<p><i>This second example has a better focus on Singapore and uses the Resource Booklet on several occasions, with cross references to specific Figures (a useful but certainly not essential habit to get into).</i></p> <p><i>The introductory paragraph is brief and doesn't offer an AO1 definition of sustainability which is a significant omission. It is worth adding that the conclusion is equally weak with a simple and largely</i></p>	<p><i>This third exemplar helps underline some of the comments made about the other two. If one reads the first and final paragraphs in isolation it is very clear in which direction we are being driven; sustainability for cities is something of a chimera. It is equally clear that the candidate believes that the initial proposition is indeed correct and that he or she has provided evidence for that. They also 'sign-off' with a wider point that deserves a</i></p>

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p>descriptors involve judgements about how well the candidate applies their knowledge and understanding to the issue that they asked to explore whilst the AO3 descriptors are all about the facility (or otherwise) with which the candidate reads and interprets the information that they have available to them from the Resource Booklet. When marking student work as [art of the preparation process it is very useful to make them familiar with the language if the AOs – this will help them address any deficiencies better so a comment along the lines of ‘...some valid judgements about the reliability of quantitative and qualitative data’ but then indicate what they could do to ratchet up this ‘some’ to the next level of ‘mostly valid...’</p> <p>This first exemplar illustrates some of these points. The first two paragraphs are largely AO1 recall of ‘sustainable development’ with very little reference to Singapore whatsoever other than making the point that its growing population might make it ‘struggle’. Paragraph 3 is more AO1 with a little AO2 when applied to Singapore and its water problem. There are assertive statements here – ‘...which would work well’ but no critical investigation. The fourth and final</p>	<p>unsupported statement. In the preparation of candidates the importance of ‘topping and tailing’ essays can hardly be overstressed because it is in the introduction that sets out the structure or framework of the argument and it is the conclusion where the argument is revisited. Although, much as they have been trained to do in the past in extended writing, and particularly for those familiar with the legacy Unit 4 they can evaluate as they go along, so to speak, it is in the conclusion that one expects the assessment to be drawn together into a clear ‘view’ of the proposition set out in the title. Essays without strong introductions that point the way forward and that lack conclusions to draw together the arguments are almost bound to be deeply flawed as a consequence. To all intents and purposes this essay has no proper conclusion and a cursory introduction.</p> <p>However, there are positive elements in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th paragraphs. Paragraph 3 is also quite thoughtful about the nature of cities and their almost inevitable dependency on rural hinterland which, of course, Singapore does not have. Probably the best AO3 ‘moment’ is the mini-debate about desalination and the water debate in Singapore, found in Paragraph 4. Here the student recognises an apparent contradiction and does well to draw attention to it.</p>	<p>little more evidential support, interesting although it is.</p> <p>So, the essay has promising ‘book-ends’ which fit Level 3 AO3 criteria.</p> <p>The rest of the essay comprises two overlong paragraphs each of which any sub-editor would divide into two or even three more focussed Point, Example and Comment shorter and punchier paragraphs.</p> <p>The first of these overlong paragraphs contains a definition of sustainability in a very sophisticated version especially the comment about poverty, often omitted in textbooks, let alone student essays. The AO3 comment about reliance of cheap labour and the AO2 parallels with gulf states are impressive. This is further supported by comment about political stability and inequalities which is evidenced by the Arab Spring comment. The student is clearly drawing on material from their work on human rights.</p> <p>The penultimate paragraph is not quite so impressive and there are missed opportunities to discuss land-use issues, amongst other matters. However, it does critically evaluate the material with stronger AO3 than the less obvious AO2 focus.</p>
--	--	--	---

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p><i>paragraph is designated as a 'conclusion' by the student but it isn't any such thing as it introduces a further thread to the line that the growing population of Singapore is an 'issue' that it needs to deal with. The extension of this idea which is, of course, a fundamental misreading of the Singaporean situation as outlined in the Resource Booklet is to advocate some sort of forced labour system along with a one-child policy. Curitiba is then thrown into the mix in the final sentence but with no analysis.</i></p> <p><i>Thus, there are quite a lot of 'words' here (430 in approximately 30 minutes of writing time) but there is very little meaningful content. It was judged to be a Level 1 response and was awarded 4 marks.</i></p>	<p><i>The student would be well advised to be reminded about the importance of the start and finish of an essay. As it stands it sits in the top of Level 2.</i></p>	<p><i>It is clear enough that this essay of about 460 words is much the best of the three but it is a little too thin on Resource Booklet evidence to be at the top of Level 3. One's advice to the student would be to offer more material on Singapore and edit some of the detailed material on sustainability. The essay was awarded 16 marks.</i></p>
	Mark	Mark	Mark
Mark	4	11	16

Question	6 Evaluate the view that developing countries have much to learn from Singapore. (24)		
	Script A	Script B	Script C
Student Answer	<p>Development is a controversial topic as it is subjective and does not have an exact definition. People, especially government and politicians, may see development as the best way to be defined is economic as it always changes around us. However, is it perfect enough to describe the term of development?</p> <p>Economic development refers to improvements in a variety of indicators such as literacy rates, life expectancy, and poverty rates. The higher the statistics showed in a country, the greater the power to dominance the world trade and to influence the world's growth with the various measures of globalisation. Not only is it easy to compare between countries due to numerical figures, but also show a greater independency if a country has higher GDP, the total output of goods and services being produced in a country over a period of time.</p>	<p>There are enormous global disparities of income and although much progress had been made in recent years to close the 'development gap' these disparities are still stark. According to the Gapminder United nations data the mean per capita income in Norway is about \$60,000 whilst in the Democratic Republic of the Congo it is \$349. In general terms sub-Saharan Africa stands out in any data base as being 'poor' with income levels frequently below \$2 a day. Some countries have made rapid progress like Singapore so perhaps they can learn something from them?</p> <p>Despite a number of issues with the accuracy of GDP per capita as a measure there is no disguising this substantial gap. Historically the persistently low income levels of global regions such as sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America or South Asia were attributed to both the climate of these regions or, controversially, the 'nature' of the inhabitants. This is obviously not true because Singapore is actually on the Equator!</p>	<p>Singapore has developed very rapidly in recent years with >6% growth per annum, which is nearly as high as that achieved by China. How countries develop is very controversial so the lessons of any one country are not always easy to apply elsewhere.</p> <p>Modernisation theory was put forward by Rostow which describes the route to economic development used by some countries. It is related to how the development of a country is linked to its internal structure government and culture. It involves five stage model starting with a traditional stage involving no science and technology, subsistence agricultural economy, a hierarchy of social standing based on birth right and a fatalistic belief system that has no concept of progress. They have to modernise themselves to achieve development.</p> <p>Theoretically it is possible for all countries to become as wealthy and economically</p>

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p>When a country has higher GDP, it can produce more outputs through specialization. Therefore, cost of production and price will decrease and the trading activities will increase. As a result, people in that country will have greater purchasing power and income which means that their living standard is improved. These are possible lessons from Singapore.</p> <p>Also, the level of corruption should be another consideration too. For example, although Singapore has high GDP, it also has a high corruption rate, so maybe its statistics are unreliable. Therefore, not only GDP figures are included in economic indicator, but it also includes some political factors to make the figures more reliable and comparable. Therefore, the economic indicators can be able to reflect the true living standard and the speed of improvement in a country.</p> <p>Although GDP per capita show the figure of how much GDP a person can own in a country, it actually ignores the uneven distribution of income within a country. For example, in Singapore, the richest 5.6% earn over \$198 000 and in the USA the richest 1% are estimated to own 40-50% of the nation's wealth, more than the</p>	<p>Singapore's development is probably a good example of modernisation theory. Rostow's theory said that countries achieve rapid development and thus eventually an 'age of high mass consumption' by modernising their institutions and following the same pathway pioneered by the UK and the US as they developed manufacturing industries based on the exploitation of power alongside a banking structure, democratic systems and an increasingly 'scientific' education. Unfortunately attempts to follow this pathway have not always been successful and it has been suggested by other theories, such as Frank and Wallerstein that this is explained by the development of a core and periphery in which the core inhibits development on the 'periphery' by establishing asset of relationships that make the development of industry there almost impossible. This is well illustrated by the history of Bolivia which has been a source of raw materials for many centuries from silver in the past to its oil and gas today and yet, despite this mineral wealth, has no manufacturing industries and persistent poverty. Singapore has no natural resources which has probably proved to be a good thing for it because it hasn't had a resource curse so it has had to educate people. This is a good lesson.</p>	<p>developed as the USA although achieving this goal in the same way as the USA is not likely to be possible. Hans Rosling shows how countries develop at the expense of carbon dioxide emissions but as most developed countries are now insisting everyone cuts emissions this tactic is being rapidly closed off.</p> <p>Singapore is a very unusual state so its path to development may not be very easy for other countries to copy. It is an island situated on a very important trade route and it has strategic importance in the South China Sea. Obviously, the poor countries of sub-Saharan Africa cannot change their geography and many are 'switched off' places because they are not connected with their neighbours. Perhaps there is something to learn here about how important trade is.</p> <p>However much depends on what you trade. Countries with rich natural resources have tended also to have social structures and political systems which favour the rich land holding elite who own these resources. Singapore has no natural resources at all, just like Japan and South Korea and so is it 'cursed' by them in this way. Again, it isn't possible for the DRC or other richly resourced countries simply to forget that they have</p>
--	--	---	--

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p>combined wealth of the bottom 95%. Also, many Singaporeans are very poor earning below minimum wage. It shows a wide income gap between the rich and the poor. Therefore, the GDP per capita is not able to show the reality. It does not correlate well with HDI ranking, which also include social factors, such as literacy and life expectancy figures, into account. For example, Kuwait is 5TH richest nation by GDP but only 36th on HDI; Sweden is 6th on HDI but 21st on GDP. We do not know Singapore's HDI</p> <p>Moreover, a high income does not necessarily mean a good life. A person may not enjoy his stressful life if he is too rich as he is always afraid of losing wealth or income all the time. On the contrast, a person may enjoy his peaceful and quiet life although he is only a middle-income earner. For example, People in Bangladeshis (75% happy) are being happier than the Russian (35% happy) despite being poorer. This is part of the method to measure the living standard too. Therefore, happiness should be included in the definition of development, which has not been included in the economic indicators. Again we do not know if the people of Singapore are happy or not.</p>	<p>Gunder Frank has tried to show that the only practical route for poor countries is to break the ties that they have with richer core states and, through import substitution, develop their own industries allowing value added to accumulate. They cannot do this if they don't have tariffs which global trade rules often don't allow. Singapore relies on trade.</p> <p>The DRC, is highly resourced yet poor whilst some of the most successful states in terms of their recent growth and development have few natural resources; Singapore, South Korea and Japan are obvious examples. Richard Auty's original theory claimed that far from benefitting societies natural resources had a negative impact on development. A land-owning class who claimed these resources would profit hugely and an industry would develop around these resources, as it did in Bolivia where silver and then tin was mined and exported. The elite class would be powerful enough and certainly wealthy enough to control the remainder of the country and they would have no interest in developing fairer systems of land ownership or developing education. In fact that would have been counterproductive for their own narrow purposes. President after president was engaged in the mining business and in these circumstances a large Gini coefficient would reflect grotesque disparities between</p>	<p>these resources so there isn't much of a lesson to be learned from Singapore here.</p> <p>However, it is obvious that Singapore does have strong institutions. It is a democratic state with a very powerful government and obviously strong legal and banking institutions. A strong state has been really important for development as suggested by Rostow and the other modernisers. Here there are lessons for the world's poorest countries which are only very rarely democracies and are places where human rights are often neglected. This also underlines the complex problem of measuring 'development' which rarely includes any attention to political systems or human rights but is dominated by economic and social measures. If corruption is seen as a negative factor then Singapore scores rather badly and the lessons will be ambiguous.</p> <p>Closely connected to the corruption element is the role of Singapore as a tax-haven. If this has been a large part of its development it is much less likely that other countries could follow that path today because of the tightening up of the rules. Although the global institutions such as the IMF have yet to make 'a move' on this there are signs that they might do so closing off that quick route to economic growth</p>
--	--	--	---

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p>On the other hand, political factors are difficult to evaluate. To take Chile and Russia as an example, they have completely different views on political policies and they have different problems. So, how can you judge which country has a worsen situation or which problem is bigger? Different people have different views on different things and it is difficult to compare these two countries since they operate with different policies. Therefore, political factors may be too vague to make a convincing judgment on development to the public.</p> <p>Also, cultural variables are even more difficult, because there is no exact definition of which culture is better than the other. Globalisation has tended to promote 'western' values. Resistance by Islamic or Buddhist writers and commentators lead to questioning of cultural 'imperialism'. The Singaporean government appears to have totally adopted western values.</p> <p>Moreover, an American economic historian, W.W. Rostow defines 'high mass consumption' as the end of the state, which means that will be the highest level of development, any change of development will never be advanced</p>	<p>rich and poor in a society hidden behind a very misleading mean per capita GDP figure. Confusingly Singapore also has a very high Gini coefficient so it is hard to know what to make of this evidence.</p> <p>It's not hard to see how mineral wealth can lead to bad development. Nonetheless there are examples where raw materials have been of huge benefit, nowhere more obviously than in Iceland. This economy has relied on fish for years as its primary export and source of revenue and then, in more recent times it has developed the technology to allow access to very cheap energy in the form of HEP and geo-thermal electricity. Unlike the oil wealth of Saudi Arabia or Nigeria this wealth is owned by the people as a whole and, by and large, benefits them all to the same extent. Iceland, once the poorest corner of Europe rapidly became a very wealthy state indeed despite its isolation and its challenging environment.</p> <p>The Iceland case also emphasizes the critical role of education which is probably true of Singapore too because Asian states often do well in the league tables for maths and science. It has frequently been observed that poor countries that wish to develop but who have few natural resources are obliged to place a stress of their human resources. Iceland's population was literate and highly</p>	<p>Other trade rules might have changed too since Singapore's growth making it a poor model for other countries. The rules put that the World Trade Organisation put in place were influenced by developed countries to ensure they maintain their dominant control over the world trading system. At the moment over 80% of the value of world trade occurs from Japan, Europe and the USA. The WTO seems to block trade from other countries by insisting that borders are open to 'free trade' which means that developing countries have no way of protecting their own manufacturing industries from competition. The modernisers and the dependency theorist might disagree about most things but they do agree that manufacturing is vital for proper sustainable development. So modern trade rules make this import substitution industrialisation route to development impossible as the only way to complete this industrialisation is to protect your home industries by placing tariffs on goods from other countries or by large government subsidies. The irony here is that Japan and South Korea, both regional powers industrialised in precisely this way, as had the USA and the UK before them. It is very possible that the dominant powers in the global economy would use their</p>
--	---	--	---

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p>but drop. On the other hand, Rostow introduced the modernization theory which gives the idea that the development changes of a country is greatly caused by the internal structures, government planning and culture. However, the idea of Gunder Frank emphasized development on geo-political terms and introduced the dependency theory. These theories support the idea of measuring development in different ways instead of just focus on economic factors. So, the lessons of Singapore probably depend on which theory you 'sign-up too'.</p> <p>The lessons from Singapore are probably not all that useful for countries in very different locations. Obviously, you can't move places around like you can money and people. Singapore is in a great place to trade with important trade routes passing its door. This is not true for Bolivia are the Democratic Republic of the Congo which are both land-locked. It is also very small and has a good physical geography which you also cannot really change. So there probably aren't too many lessons to be learned.</p>	<p>educated even when it was poor. In South Korea the absence of raw materials (ironically most of these were lost to North Korea after the partition at the end of the Korean war) placed huge importance on reforming education as well as land ownership. Its path to becoming the 11th largest economy in the world having had an income level close to that of Sudan in the 1960s was a series of five-year plans driven through by a powerful state (initially a military dictatorship) in alliance with the chaebols. This might be the same in Singapore.</p> <p>Many have pointed out that the success stories of development have often achieved success by breaking the rules of the game imposed by the rich core countries. This 'kicking away the ladder' hypothesis explains global disparities in terms of a rich core establishing, through the dominant global institutions, such as the IMF and the WTO, a set of rules that benefit themselves. The rules of 'globalisation' don't allow</p>	<p>economic power and other 'soft' power methods to prevent another Singapore!</p> <p>There are other obstacles to adopting the Singapore model. To countries without resources education is vital. This helps explain the rise of Asian countries including Singapore. However education is not seen as positive in all societies, certainly not for all people. In the same way ideologically some countries may not be able to move that far into the state of high mass consumption as it is seen as morally wrong. To do so without some kind of political revolution there would be impossible as those controlling power in those countries would not allow that to happen. This is particularly true in the Muslim world where they would view Singapore's way of life disgusting. They would never agree with the Singaporean idea of development.</p> <p>In conclusion, there is no 'lesson plan' for development that fit all countries. Singapore is unusual in many respects and it is unlikely to offer much of a model to the poorest countries in the world today. What the leaders of those countries pick out as relevant messages might be more influenced by how it helps the leaders rather than their countries.</p>
--	--	---	--

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	Commentary A	Commentary B	Commentary C
Commentary	<p><i>In a 135 minute examination paper a question that commands about 1/3rd of the total marks might reasonably take 1/3rd of the time – 45 minutes. Of course, with a previously unseen resource booklet to read, note and reread during the writing process the writing speed and thus the length of essays is going to be reduced. With writing speeds ranging from a little over 20 words per minute down to less than 12, essays are likely to be anything between 900 and 600 words long.</i></p> <p><i>With those parameters in mind it is worth remarking that all three of these essays are at the top end of range; deliberately selected because short, error strewn essays are unlikely to be as helpful in a process such as this given that the most meaningful comments about them are likely to be, firstly 'it is too short' followed by 'there are too many errors of fact and understanding'.</i></p> <p><i>This first example is an essay of 9 paragraphs. There is a very clear attempt to establish links in the argument with the use of conjunctive words and phrases,</i></p>	<p><i>The second example begins with a well put together exposition of the development gap using what is slightly moth-eaten data but it does contextualise Singapore as a country that has made 'raid progress' and the title is visible in the final sentence.</i></p> <p><i>The 2nd paragraph is promising despising of environmental determinism effectively and succinctly.</i></p> <p><i>However, after that the student becomes diverted into an overlong AO1 recall of development theory with some AO2 extension but not, by and large relevant to Singapore. In fact, Singapore gets only three mentions in the very substantial paragraphs 3,4 and 5. The most effective of these is paragraph 5 with useful AO2 material on the role of education. Even here as previously the student is very poor at either editing out case-study information about Bolivia, Iceland and South Korea or failing that drawing parallels with Singapore which might make the material more pertinent to the title. As it stands it is left entirely to the reader to sort out how Singapore might fit into this picture.</i></p> <p><i>And then the essay ends, in mid- sentence as the candidate runs out of time.</i></p>	<p><i>This third and final exemplar is the best of the three. The most obvious contrasts are;</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. How central Singapore is to the essay</i> <i>2. How clear a view is taken in the introduction</i> <i>3. How much reflective on-going evaluation is present in each paragraph</i> <i>4. How the intermediate paragraphs are structured</i> <i>5. How, despite its brevity, the conclusion returns to the 'theme' introduced at the outset.</i> <p><i>There remains a tendency for this student to show-off their general knowledge and understanding of development, just as with the other two exemplars, but the difference is that in most of the essay the Singapore material is at the start of the paragraph and then that AO3 material is contextualised into a general point which show good AO2 skills. So rather than bolting on 'here is something about Singapore', this student begins with the point about Singapore. There is an interesting contrast to be drawn between the penultimate paragraphs of this essay and</i></p>

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p><i>such as 'Moreover....' and 'On the other hand'. Students have been trained to do this very much more directly in recent years although not all such linkages actually work.</i></p> <p><i>As an overview of this essay it reads like a 'mock' essay that has been recycled and only slightly modified in an attempt to make it 'fit' the title better. Singapore gets its first mention at the end of paragraph 3. Very few of the paragraphs pass the informal but useful test of judging whether one can guess the title of the essay from reading that paragraph. Only the conclusion really gets close to clearing that hurdle – a minimum expectation of a conclusion one could add.</i></p> <p><i>Much of the text is a generally accurate and occasionally very thoughtful exposition of the difficulties in measuring development – the material on the relationship between development and happiness is a good example of this. However, it is only in the final paragraph that the student gets to grips with some of the central difficulties of the 'lesson' idea that should be central. Thus, in material that is clearly not a conclusion at all but a mini-essay the student offers a view that whilst supportable and, in places, quite</i></p>	<p><i>This essay is much better written than the first exemplar and some of the material is really quite impressive but only very rarely is it relevant.</i></p> <p><i>However, the fundamental weaknesses are self-evident and although the essay is a Level 2 response it isn't close to the upper boundary.</i></p>	<p><i>Essay 2. Both make a similar point about the role of education but whilst Essay 2 wanders into interesting but marginal material about how resources were divided up on the Korean peninsula the author of Essay 3 sticks to the point about how ideological education is and how, therefore, the benefits of education may not be a lesson that all wish to 'learn'. A much more focussed point.</i></p> <p><i>This third example is not perfect. Remember that 24/24 doesn't equal perfection but a reasonable expectation of what a talented 17/18 year old student can achieve in the time allowed under the pressure that comes with all examinations.</i></p> <p><i>This example is Level 4. This essay could be improved by a wider range of the information available about Singapore and a wider range of points as a consequence. Positive feedback to the student would involve the identification of those missing elements and some advice as to how to make space for them in an essay that is already long by comparison to most.</i></p>
--	---	--	--

PAPER 3 COMMENTARIES AND MARKS

	<p><i>compelling (land-locked) doesn't follow at all from anything that precedes it.</i></p> <p><i>Students who write over 800 words are likely to be shocked if that effort doesn't translate into reasonable marks but this is a very good example of why that can happen.</i></p> <p><i>There is sufficient material here to satisfy some of the Level 2 descriptors and the essay was awarded 7 marks.</i></p>		
	Mark	Mark	Mark
Mark	7	8	21