



GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**GCE (LEGACY)
WORLD DEVELOPMENT
AS/Advanced**

SUMMER 2017

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?!=en>

Online Results Analysis

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

Annual Statistical Report

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

Unit	Page
WD1	1
WD2	6
WD3	9
WD4	12

GCE WORLD DEVELOPMENT (LEGACY)

Summer 2017

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

WD1: INTRODUCTION TO WORLD DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

General Comments

The paper proved to be accessible for candidates and we saw much evidence of engagement with complex development issues. Most candidates attempted all four questions. The facility factors showed that the questions were accessible and no obvious difference between Theme A and B. The overall mean was higher than the previous sitting. Relevant case study material was evident in many answers with some candidates displaying confidence in applying their knowledge to the questions set. The paper provided stretch and challenge and provided all candidates with the opportunity to describe and explain the content they had learned.

Reports on previous sitting have commented on the use of older case studies and candidates using case study material fit several different questions. These comments are applicable to the 2017 sitting. Development is dynamic and changing so there is room for refreshing the choices that centres make for class teaching. Another approach to updating case studies may be to encourage candidates to use examples of development practice in the WD1 examination they have read about for their coursework portfolio. The holistic approach of the Specification is a reflection of the nature of the discipline, so it is possible to use one or two case studies across a variety of questions. Where such case studies were learned in outline and applied to different questions the answers lacked detail and depth of understanding. The quality of written communication (QWC) was generally pleasing, allowing candidates to express their ideas satisfactorily or better. Fewer candidates planned their answers this year; a brief plan for responses to part c questions can help candidates to address the command, give some structure to their answers.

There were many different strategies used by candidates when answering the questions, for instance answering all the part (c) sections first. They must remember that Examiners do need to see the question number and part clearly in the left hand margin. Only the whole question numbers (1, 2, 3, and 4) need to be written on the front cover. Candidates could be encouraged to plan the use of time carefully and be guided by the marks available as some wrote extensively on part b responses and this appeared to disrupt their ability to address later questions. There are some candidates with poor handwriting.

The paper revealed some gaps in knowledge and examination preparation, namely knowledge of poverty indicators; reasons why sustainable development projects are needed; international debt.

Resources

Responses to the part 'a' questions need to develop ideas present in the resources provided. The Assessment Objectives for the part 'a' questions are Application and Skills, with the emphasis on the latter.

Question 1

Part 1(a) was an accessible resource based on the Eco-School programme. Some weaker candidates lifted and listed from the resources with better answers making the connection to sustainable development and going beyond cycling to school and recycling paper. Most candidates wrote about environmental sustainability. Below is an example of an answer that achieved level 3 because it develops two points and links explicitly to sustainable development.

1(a) A school can contribute to sustainable development by putting recycling bins around the school, therefore allowing resource use reduction as waste products like plastics won't go into landfill sites. Therefore, preventing environmental pollution. Schools can contribute to sustainable development by using renewable energy sources such as solar panels, which doesn't release greenhouse gases. Therefore, they don't contribute to climate change thereby protecting the environment. [5/5 marks]

Candidates named a variety of sustainable development projects in part (b). The Kitui sunflowers and bees project was commonly used and applied well to the question; BedZed was another well used example. There were many generic answers that inaccurately described the work of Send a Cow in Africa. Some examples were not so clearly specifically sustainable and their sustainability needed explain, for example the Three Gorges Dam. The main issue was establishing the need for the chosen project. Assessing success needs to go beyond describing a project and stating how good it has been for people and the environment.

Part (c) posed a challenge as candidates tended not to be so secure in their understanding of approaches to managing the environment to preserve it for the future. Answers could have compared top down and bottom up approaches, total protection versus sustainable development or local and global for example. Weaker answers described two schemes with no link to managing the environment for the future. The command word 'compare' invites an answer that discusses similarities as well as differences. Commonly used examples were Curitiba's approach to sustainable development compared with local park and ride or recycling schemes and Three Gorges Dam compared with Water Aid projects or Excellent Development's sand dams. Below is an example that contrasts approaches well without explicitly linking to managing the environment.

1(c) A top down approach to managing the environment would promote that big problems require big solutions. Top down development is usually large scale, high cost and funded by governments or international organisations. For example, the Three Gorges Dam on the Yangtze River in China cost the Chinese government \$37 billion although some reports guess \$88 billion), but the impacts were very large. HEP generated by the dam provides 3% of China's electricity and saves burning 30 million tonnes of coal a year, a significant step to help China achieve its target of 16% less CO₂ emissions. A contrasting approach would be bottom up, funded by local communities or NGOs, who would promote small scale, low cost projects utilising intermediate technology and participatory development. For example, Practical Action, a UK NGO built a micro-hydro system in Ghandruk, rural Nepal, which only cost \$51,000, and has alleviated pressure on biomass resources, as it provides the village with electricity. In conclusion, bottom up approaches would argue that numerous small scale, sustainable projects are better than large scale one whose effects are harder to control, whilst top down approaches would argue the big problem require big solutions. [8/10 marks]

Question 2

2(a) was generally well answered with candidates taking and developing ideas from the resource. A common issue was candidates misreading the question and presenting arguments *against* China ending its one-child policy.

2(b) There were some very detailed and lengthy answers to parts (b)(i) and (b)(ii). For (b)(i) candidates did not need to name a country, although some did and this supported their answers. Reasons given for countries having difficulty in meeting basic human needs included debt; population increase, population pressure and over population; climate change and government corruption impacting on the distribution of resources. Below is an example of an answer that achieved full marks as it gave two developed reasons.

2(b)(i) Some countries such as Nepal have very difficult terrain, so moving resources or building infrastructure is difficult. Only 10% of Nepal has access to its national grid. Geographical barriers such as being landlocked and so having little trade or having few natural resources also means it is difficult for a country to acquire basic human needs, let alone supply them to its population.

2(b)(ii) was generally less well answered as candidates tended to write about how a named natural resource is used rather than the impacts of its use varying between places. There were strong answers on water and oil use.

2(c) posed a challenge. Candidates need to be prepared for questions that go beyond describing different views on the management of a named natural resource. Some weak answers used the same case study as in the previous question and produced poorly focused answers. Commonly well used examples were oil on the North Slope of Alaska; Athabasca Tar Sands; dam building on the Tigris-Euphrates and the management of the Colorado River. Below is an answer that achieved Level 3.

2(c) The water of the Colorado river in south western USA has many different stakeholders including the USA government and the Cucapa tribe of north Mexico.

Due to population increase (Nevada grew 600% from 1960 to 2000) domestic use of water has soared, and as the Colorado flows through a wealthy part of USA, leisure use is also high. Its water is also used to irrigate 15% of US crops. Therefore the USA government have built 16 dams in the 7 US states it flows through and move water through man-made systems to cities.

In contrast, the Cucapa tribe are a native tribe who have always lived on the Colorado River delta. Their main livelihood is fishing, yet they are having to travel further upstream to catch commercially popular fish, which lose freshness and value.

Therefore, due to these contrasting views and needs, USA and Mexico have entered in hydro-politics, negotiating over the use of the Colorado's water. This has resulted in 'Minute 319', and the 'Law of the River' water treaties attempting to distribute the water evenly. Also, if farmers don't use their allotted water, their quotas are reduced in future.

They have improved the situation, but dialogue will need to continue if all parties are going to be satisfied. [9/10 marks]

Question 3

Inequality is a topic that candidates engage with, generally allowing them to write knowledgeable answers. It was a little surprising that part a was done poorly by many with candidates either rewriting the resource or misinterpreting it as a move to a new job away from the plantation. Below is an answer that achieved full marks.

3(a) Tamil tea pickers lack education and suffer poor working conditions. By providing them with identity documents they can open a bank account, which will allow them to enrol in school. Having a better education might mean they can start to speak the local language and so will reduce their isolation. It will also empower them, giving them confidence to speak out against unfair working conditions. By bringing together workers and plantation management with unions to oversee negotiations relationships can be improved to make their conditions better and improve their happiness and quality of life. [5/5 marks]

Vulnerability is well understood on 3(b) and well used examples included the Dalits in India, the homeless in UK, women in Bangladesh and the idea of elderly people not keeping up with technology and therefore losing control over personal finances. Candidates have generally grasped how society creates and reinforces inequality and gave answers that included the role of the media, stereotypes and structural features such as the caste system.

3(c) was answered competently with the best concluding with a discussion. Answers covered a wide range of strategies including legislation, positive discrimination, fair trade, health care systems. Weaker candidates wrote about the inequality faced by groups rather than strategies to reduce inequality.

Question 4

There was a mix of responses to part (a). Some candidates lifted the data indiscriminately and did not attempt an over view; some candidates did not use data at all in their answer and the best answers used data to support points and gave an overview or identified anomalies. Centres should make candidates aware that the Brandt Line in development terms is dated.

Many candidates wrote about allocating aid in (b)(i) and the best answers had precise detail. There were some very general answers to this question such as finding out about level of development, quality of life or finding how many people in poverty. Below is an example of an answer that achieved **full marks** as it has two developed points with some precision.

*4(b)(i) Giving a **quantifiable** measure of poverty allows countries to assess their situation and set targets for improvement. For example the UN MDGs wouldn't have been possible without countries **measuring the level of poverty.** **It also allows comparisons to be made, which means countries can be held accountable** for a lack of progress tackling poverty and motivates them to make improvements. [4/4 marks]*

Candidates need to be accurate when identifying and describing indicators of poverty on (b)(ii). Most were clear and precise about HPI-1 and HPI-2 countries and included per capita where appropriate. The question asked for a named country and candidates had to ensure that the indicator was appropriate to that country. Adult literacy rate is not an appropriate poverty indicator for the UK, for example.

Answers to 4(c) needed to refer to both donor and recipient countries, although not necessarily to the same depth or extent. This question is clearly drawn from the Specification and revealed more knowledge about the impact of international debt on recipient countries. It was possible to write an unbalanced answer between recipient and donor countries and achieve a top level mark. There were some very detailed answers that fully engaged with the question. Some answers addressed the question by moving more into aid, which was acceptable. HIPC case studies were common and yielded good answers. Below is an example of a well expressed answer that achieved full marks.

4(c) Bangladesh has \$23.6 billion of external debt, 28% of its GDP. Therefore, the government can only spend 0.7% of its GDP on education and 3.9% on healthcare, which severely limits the country's development. Also, Dhaka, the capital of Bangladesh, is the fastest growing city in the world, adding 400,000 people a year, yet it cannot provide infrastructure to support this massive population which leads to poverty. Politically, it means that the World Bank can enforce unfair policies in the country. Bangladesh is not considered poor enough to be a HIPC and have its debt cancelled because of the efforts the government put in to reduce its level of debt, for which the government is being unfairly blamed. In terms of economic impacts, the country is desperate for FDI, which leaves it vulnerable to exploitation and leakage from MNCs so it is having to take further loans and fall into a cycle of debt. Environmentally it puts massive pressure on resources, especially as Bangladesh's population is still growing at 1.5%, so there is massive demand for farm land to ensure food security, which has led to high levels of deforestation. This debt also impacts on donor countries as well. Much of the debt is from multilateral loans from the World Bank and so originally came from Western governments, a form of neo-imperialism, and that we shouldn't be taking away another country's sovereignty so quickly. Also keeping Bangladesh in such a poor state means western companies can exploit them and bring money back through leakage, although it could be argued that it would be morally right to help Bangladesh develop and build mutually beneficial trade links. In conclusion the high level of debt facing Bangladesh has severely limited its development, yet also has mixed impacts on the donor countries. [9/10 marks]

GCE WORLD DEVELOPMENT (LEGACY)

Summer 2017

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

WD2: PORTFOLIO

It is evident, once again, that time and care has been taken over the organisation and annotation of portfolios, this eases the moderation process and is appreciated. There have been some interesting, current and controversial articles in this year's selection, there has been a plethora of articles hinting at an upcoming water shortage, it does make for interesting, if daunting reading. As usual this has been an intriguing and informative process, it does feel that some of the recent trends covered by our student cohort are a genuine glimpse into the global future. Many candidates present well researched and articulate opinions of their own, demonstrating the enthusiasm of candidates for the subject matter. In general the moderators are more inclined to agree with the essay marking, it is evident that this is mostly consistent with specification requirements. There are still some rubric and misapplied criteria being used when marking article analysis.

The quality of portfolios remains high with some outstanding submissions at the top end, especially in the essays. The marks provided by most centres were agreed but they do tend to be at the generous end of what is acceptable.

Administration

The moderation team wish to thank those centres who submitted their work early, as this allowed a prompt start to the moderation process. Most work did arrive by the 15th May but some centres still needed prompting to submit the samples. There were issues with some samples being up to 3 weeks late this is unfair on the majority who submit on time and in future if the sample is late moderation could be denied so results will not be verified. Again the majority of portfolios were well organised and secure, however there are still issues with paper clipped submissions becoming loose and the articles being mixed up, some were not attached with anything and were mixed up. Occasionally articles were missing which held up the process by moderators having to search the internet to find the relevant article. Most annotation was helpful with comprehensive summative remarks, however, some annotation addressed the candidate with comments on how to improve. Electronic marking made an appearance for the first time this year, this is acceptable if handled correctly, but it was confusing and in some instances looked like 'peer marking' or students own comments on how to improve. Others lacked any annotation other than scores on a mark sheet. This makes the moderating process more complex as we are trying to determine where marks have been awarded so that we can verify this. Our job is to agree with teacher marking and we can't do this if we have to remark the work. This penalises your students.

There were fewer issues with lack of authentication and when requested centres were mainly prompt to respond. However there were many instances where the candidate number was not included on the cover sheet, this means that if work gets mixed up and names are difficult to read the candidate cannot be identified. Some centres also neglected to include a teacher signature to authenticate the work.

Word count is still an issue, more so with the article analysis than the essay. Some centres are accepting article analyses of up to 900 words. Centres are reminded that work that does not comply with the rules should not be accepted, this must be dealt with at the centre. Any sections that do not comply with the rubric can result in marks being deducted for the entire centre. This will be discussed in more detail in the relevant sections and you are advised to read the individual centre report for further information.

Articles

Most candidates found their own varied and interesting articles, again though it must be stressed that bland factual submissions do penalise the candidate as there is little of interest to point out. Centres are advised to monitor the choice of article and provide guidance. As mentioned in last year's report there is still a number web site information for various charities or NGO's being used for analysis. These were consistently too short for comprehensive analysis and consequently prohibited candidates from attaining higher marks. The web site information is always based on the 'good' the charity is doing and so candidates tend to focus analysis of bias on what is not being said, this is superficial and limiting. Please encourage students to find actual articles that will further their wider appreciation of global issues, this, after all is the purpose of the activity.

Other rubric infringements exist around word count, as mentioned some centres were accepting analysis submissions of over 800 words without deducting marks, analysis of this length will certainly not contain a 'concise and succinct' summary so cannot possibly receive more than 2 marks for that section. These also tend to ramble in the author section, at times almost repeating the entire article, especially when the article was mainly web site information. Consistently at the top end of the mark band the articles have been biased and interesting.

The Author View section should avoid becoming an extended a description of what author narrates but rather an analysis of how the point is put across- really address the values, how the article inspires an emotion, candidates must be encouraged to stress the anticipated audience response. Again this is difficult with web site information pages. The section on candidates view is related to the *topic not just the article* and as such should avoid the basic 'rant' and be supported by evidence of further research into the topic. This is evident in all high achieving submissions.

Comparative Essay

Generally the view from the moderating team is that there are many intelligent and articulate essays. There were fewer rubric infringements of word count and most titles were tightly focused to enable detailed comparison of like for like. Again there is evidence of sound referencing, bibliographies and some interesting in text data presentation. Most focus on relevant and very current issues that clearly cement case study examples for theme 2, centres are to be congratulated on these perceptive and stimulating accounts.

Some titles still caused concern this year for instance 'Women in Saudi Arabia compared to men' there is really no comparison as this is just a description of the inequality faced by women. Similar titles in the vein compared 'Black and White' in various countries or 'Indigenous and Non Indigenous'. Others to be avoided are comparisons of lifestyles in 'London and Nepal' and 'Angola and Manhattan' where there was an attempt to compare two very different situations. Similarly 'HIV in Malawi and the USA'. It would be better to compare HIV in two countries in similar situations, but possibly tackling the issue differently, or compare two similar groups like Dalits in India and Aboriginal Australians.

Some centres provided general titles – compare inequality in two social groups/countries- and students chose, other centres had candidates all submitting the same title. This is not really in the spirit of the specification where candidates should be encouraged to choose individual topics from the theme.

Centres are reminded that there is support for WD2 to be found on the WJEC website in the Teachers' Guide and in the secure part of the website – WD CPD, where portfolio exemplars at Grades A, C and E can be found

1. Analysis of the three Articles - should involve:

- articles from 3 different sources e.g. a newspaper (Metro), magazine (the Ecologist) and an NGO/Pressure Group (Water Aid/Greenpeace)
- if using newspapers, a maximum of 2; these 2 must be 2 different newspapers e.g. not 2 from the Times or Guardian. Also note that on-line versions are regarded as the same source as printed versions.
- using Key Ideas in Theme 1
- article length 500 - 1000 words
- analysis length 500 words, 3 distinct sections, own view on topic not article

2. Comparative Essay - should involve:

- using Key Ideas in Theme 2
- a maximum of 1000 words in length
- a comparison must be made
- essay style – not with sub headings but can include data sets, graphs and tables.

This said, the standard remains high and it is clear that teachers are doing an excellent job. I have received some heart-warming letters from you regarding the ending of the course and I share the general consensus that this has been an enlightening and informative A level that really inspires our young people. A fellow teacher expressed this perfectly when he said 'teaching World Development has made me more human.' Thank you to all teachers and everyone involved in the organisation, administration and moderation of the WD2 portfolios.

GCE WORLD DEVELOPMENT (LEGACY)

Summer 2017

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

WD3: CONCEPTS AND PROCESSES OF DEVELOPMENT

It continues to be a pleasure to examine a cohort of students who have developed a real interest in, and understanding of, development issues. There were some very able students who have offered intelligent, thoughtful and critical responses to this paper. One examiner described some exceptional scripts, from several different centres, as “the best I have ever seen”.

One of the strengths, and also challenges, of this subject is its current validity, the need to review teaching materials and to ‘modernise’ the range of exemplification. Some centres appeared to study a limited range of examples within their responses. Many were very similar to those seen in previous years with little or no updating of details. It was clear from some responses that candidates were tempted to repeat a set format of information, regardless of the precise questions set, which anticipate some ‘individual thinking’ and application of knowledge.

Some centres advised their candidates to answer Section B first. This may be a good strategy if the questions suit, but there is a risk that towards in the latter part of the exam candidates lose the analytical ‘edge’ necessary for Section A. In a few cases this also affected the time management of candidates as sections 1b or 1c were rushed or incomplete. Overall however there were few time management issues.

Quality of written communication was adequate although the use of emotive words, such as ‘drastic’, ‘monumental’ or ‘amazing’ should be discouraged. Most answers have some sense of structure although rather too many lacked paragraphs. Handwriting and legibility continue to be a concern, and inevitably impact on performance. Examiners try their best, but will not do the candidate’s thinking for them. Centres are encouraged to refer to the detailed mark scheme as a teaching tool.

SECTION A

Question 1

This was accessible and straightforward, but differentiated in terms of critical interpretation of resources. The best answers used the recommended reading time to plan answers to make full use of resources. The data was analysed, developed and synthesised well and links between the resources were recognised and explained. While most students used the resources quite well, there was a tendency amongst the weaker scripts for the resources to be overlooked and/or rather vague or imprecise, and unsupported interpretations to be offered. Candidates should avoid an elegant rewrite of the resources.

- (a) This was straightforward for those who planned, grouped and linked the economic social and political problems and understood the post-independence chronology. The best responses were carefully crafted and clearly defined in respect of economic/political/social challenges, and were supported by evidence from the

resource material. Some candidates offered a more generalised approach and integrated each of the topics into one, though still managed to define the inter-relationship between the economic/political/social aspects. A few scripts tended to describe rather than explain and a limited few failed to really utilise the resources in any way within their response. It is vital that students respond to the precise requirements of the questions set, in this case problems facing farmers, rather than generic problems facing the nation.

- (b) This question required details of how farm incomes had improved, and required an interpretation of the various measures of improvement. Many candidates utilised the full range of resource material to support their ideas and demonstrated an appropriate understanding of the income improvements in the Honde Valley. Weaker scripts were somewhat descriptive with a very limited and uncritical use of the resources.
- (c) This is intentionally a more challenging question which draws candidates from a local scale in the Honde Valley, to a national perspective. The best candidates concluded that the future prospects for Zimbabwean farmers were not all leading to a rosy future. Issues such as political uncertainty, impacts of climate change, financial crises were significant hurdles. Many responses were of a good standard offering a balanced perspective and supported ideas with references to the resource material. Weaker responses gave a generalised answer with limited analysis of the examples offered in the resource material and limited focus on 'future'. There was some tendency to discuss matters elsewhere in the world rather than in Zimbabwe and therefore tended to deviate from the focus of the question.

Question 2

This was a fairly popular question but the question was frequently misread. Candidates assumed they could offer a rehearsed answer about how understanding of development has changed over time. The demand to consider specifically *sustainable* development was ignored until that point in the chronology. Other answers discussed sustainable development but overlooked the required reference to changes over a period of time.

Question 3

This was the most popular of the 'pair' of questions. The responses ranged from basic top-down / bottom-up answers through to erudite discussions on a variety of development theories with few links to strategies or detailed exemplars. The best answers were exceptional - effortlessly combining development theory translated into strategies, and practical considerations of effectiveness and weaknesses with appropriate exemplar support.

The word 'strategy' caused a problem for some candidates. There were many descriptions of top-down/bottom-up projects such as the Three Gorges Dam and Send a Cow/Water Aid but little or no reference to the context of these being part of an overall strategy and with limited evaluation of effectiveness or weaknesses. A disappointing number of candidates spent time discussing dependency theory which could not be manipulated into a strategy.

SECTION B

In the second section of the paper there was a tendency among weaker candidates for more descriptive responses with a lack of in-depth analysis or development of the topic demonstrated. There were also some impressive, well-structured answers in which knowledge and understanding of impacts on development were both explicit and detailed.

Question 4

This was a very popular question with some very good responses that demonstrated a solid understanding of what the question required. The best answers gave a balanced analysis and were specific about particular impacts, social and economic, of IT, energy or mobile phones. There was a limited range of examples e.g. mobile phones, One Laptop per Child, GM rice to support their arguments. Some candidates discussed modern technology in a predominantly negative way, for instance describing the detrimental impacts of Monsanto on farming and farmers in India rather than undertaking any discussion and/or analysis. The weakest answers merely described the use of mobile phones in Africa with little or no reference to the effects on particular communities/economies and/or development.

Question 5

There were some very good responses to this question, where good, detailed case study knowledge was applied to the precise question. The weaker candidates offered a general discussion of TNC activities in specific areas with limited links to development and/or impacts, and did not offer any balance in terms of either positive or negative impacts.

Question 6

There were few of these answers and often poorly done. Good governance was not well understood as a concept. The majority of answers offered a discussion of human rights and the respective government's role either positively or negatively with very little reference to the actual role of good governance as the question required.

Question 7

This theme is not popular with centres, but there were several responses, some with the feel of 'last resort' in them. There were top quality accounts of Syria or Rwanda as well as weaker references to older conflicts in northern Sri Lanka and Northern Ireland (often written in the present!), and even a recycled Colombia from a former paper. There was some tendency to describe the examples with very restricted subsequent analysis and/or explanation of how the conflict impacted at either local or national levels.

Question 8

This was a popular question that presented some very good attempts at analysis but also many disappointing and superficial responses. Insufficient care was taken to explain how migration affected development and case studies were short on precise facts. Many answers relied on two predominant examples, Polish immigrants to the UK and internal migration in China. Although there was some knowledge and understanding of the impacts of migration, much appeared to be acquired through 'media influence'. Here there was more subjective commentary than an objective examination supported by accurate detail and analysis. In weaker answers national and local impacts were blurred and ill-informed.

Question 9

Although this is a popular topic, there was a disappointing level of accurate, detailed knowledge in answers. Many of the disease studies, usually malaria or HIV/AIDS, were very generic and could have been anywhere in Africa. Considerable time was taken explaining the medical characteristics of diseases but an alarming number of case studies of HIV failed to acknowledge its critical association with TB. Insufficient care was taken to explain how disease affected development and case studies were short on precise facts. Impacts were restricted to reducing the capacity of a workforce, and diverting money from other development needs. The best answers discussed the impact on gender, on community and family relationships, migration and on food security.

GCE WORLD DEVELOPMENT (LEGACY)

Summer 2017

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

WD4: INDIVIDUAL REPORT

It was disappointing to find that many of the principal complaints of previous years are still to be addressed. Sadly, some messages failed to bear fruit from last year. There were several centres this year whose report in June 2015 or 2016 seemed to bear considerable resemblance to products of the current cohort, despite advice.

A key issue this year is the disjuncture between title and content. It is entirely understandable that research may take a student in a slightly different direction. Examiners are not slavishly glued to a title we have seen briefly in December. It behoves the student to reflect on the completed report and consider whether its title matches the contents. If not, tweak the title so that it does so. There is no point in having a report which does not deliver what it says on the front. Some titles were poorly chosen and clearly needed to make use of the facility, offered by WJEC, to have the titles from their centre approved.

In terms of general administration it was very positive to see the quality of annotations on some of the reports. Some teachers had included brief annotations using the language of the mark scheme and identified specific skills on the work itself. This was extremely helpful.

Aims, Terms of reference

ToR were absent from many or, by centre, often wrapped up in long introductions setting out the context of the report. It would be much simpler if Aims, ToR, Key Idea links and context were separated. The former could be short, pithy statements of fact. A worrying number of students referred to 'my essay...'. Several wrote in first person - often by centre, suggesting poor advice and sloppy practice.

A number of students didn't have a specific audience for their report, in which case the report tended to be more unwieldy as a result, losing its' sense of purpose.

Collection of Evidence

This is a section where 5 marks can be obtained fairly easily but a number of students made little reference to methodology or any systematic collection of evidence, or left it out completely. Too many had a short paragraph about where evidence came from but fell short of evaluating quality – date, provenance etc. It was good to see an increased awareness of the need to check and detail the provenance of sources. This should be expected given experience from WD2 but was nevertheless pleasing. Unfortunately, sometimes evidence was just added on to the introduction; this engendered a lack of clarity and tended to be symptomatic of a large state of disorganisation. The bibliography should be in alphabetical order and a list of web links is no use without the title of the resource accessed. However, in fairness this has really improved over the years and is a diminishing issue. There remains some confusion over footnotes and bibliographies - either one style or the other is advisable, not both!

Presentation, analysis, interpretation

Best reports did actually analyse evidence. Others tried to do so, but found it difficult to avoid a narrative. If there is very little evidence presented then analysis is very challenging. This is particularly difficult with topics based on qualitative evidence such as inequality of women. Do students know the difference between narrative and analysis? Many students are uncritical of their evidence and simply set out to prove or reinforce what they started with. Some reports were analytical and evaluative others were simply descriptive, over descriptive in some cases with a range of material, photos and graphs which were added to consolidate the argument being made. On the plus side, lots of presentation techniques were used and many students had clearly worked very hard in compiling and presenting the information they had found.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Few students separate recommendations from conclusions and many seem to think it acceptable to include new material in a conclusion. Teachers seemed to ignore the lack of recommendations in their assessment of this section. The most worrying issue involved an established centre who appeared to regard recommendations as those personal improvements the student would recommend to themselves in order to do better next time! When suggesting the recommendations the students that achieved well in this section described how the target groups might carry out the recommendations, and any potential barriers that they may face in doing this.

General presentation

On the whole the word count is better enforced now; teachers really have taken this on board.

Some outstanding reports achieved well-deserved full marks. There are clearly some very highly motivated and well-schooled students. WD4 is a really good opportunity for students to engage with a topic that they are interested in and many do this enthusiastically and very well. I learned a lot from some of the reports I read.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk