This question is about applying the Hoyt Model to understand the location of households headed by females. Students’ answers should at least imply recognition of the fact that Zone X is likely a poor neighborhood and Zone Y is likely a rich neighborhood. They do not receive any value (points) for this. We do not want students trying to support the idea that Zone X is poor and Zone Y is rich with evidence from the map. We do want students explaining why there is a concentration of households headed by females in Zone X (a poorer zone) and Zone Y (a richer zone). 11 points total

A. 8 points

Four points are available for the discussion of Zone X and 4 points are available for the discussion of Zone Y. These 4 points are divided equally between the first two socioeconomic factors identified in the response, with 1 point for identifying an appropriate factor, and a second point for a discussion of this factor. The answer should at least imply recognition of the fact that Zone X is likely a poor neighborhood and Zone Y is likely a rich neighborhood (although the rubric does not award any points for this assumption).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification of factor</th>
<th>Discussion (what about this factor has led to concentration of households headed by females in Zone X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (individual) in place (feminization of poverty)</td>
<td>Individuals in poverty seek a supply of cheap housing, which is likely to be available in Zone X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family breakdown in place</td>
<td>Women/mothers become trapped in a cycle of poverty/deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation (institutional)</td>
<td>Redlining and other forms of discrimination have restricted the housing opportunities for some groups that have above average rates of households headed by females (e.g., some racial minorities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity and social networks</td>
<td>Groups choosing to reside in close proximity (immigrants, single mothers, etc.) leading to perpetuation of concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle factors</td>
<td>Gentrification by same-sex couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time budgets</td>
<td>Transportation/proximity: single mothers must be able to minimize travel time (juggling child rearing activities, jobs, shopping, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References to the role of husbands in affecting the decisions of households headed by women usually received zero credit.

B. 3 points

One point is given for linking Hoyt’s anticipated “pattern” of urban land use (location/characteristics) to the map (advantage) or for arguing that the map pattern is not anticipated by Hoyt (disadvantage). Two points are available for developing a process-based argument about the advantage or disadvantage of the model: a limited discussion scores 1 point.

**Advantages:** Answers should suggest how and why Hoyt’s model does aid an understanding of the location/characteristics of Zones X and Y (but not just describe Hoyt’s model “in theory”).

- Urban area has one central core (CBD) so the urban area may be organized along the principles articulated by Hoyt
- Urban area is organized into sectors and model tells that the city is divided into sectors
- Sectors based upon income/industry — non-industry
- Sectors can act as buffers between significantly different land uses
- High income drawn to amenities (physical — lakes, hills, etc.)

**Disadvantages:** Answers should suggest why the Hoyt model does not aid an understanding of the location/characteristics of Zones X and Y:

- Hoyt’s model is based upon bid rent (does not discuss gender, discrimination, cultural factors like social networks, land-use organized by government (AFB))
- The urban area exhibits a multi-nuclei organization (mall/freeway association)
A. (2 points) 1 point for population density and/or land rent decline with increasing distance from the CBD because there is less competition for less accessible land, 1 point for the profile dips at the CBD because commercial/industrial land users are willing/able to pay higher rent for a central location than residential land users are willing/able to pay.

B. (2 points) 1 point for each difference identified (see age cohorts and description in table below), 2 points maximum (not acceptable: country-scale analysis of these local-scale populations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of 0-20</th>
<th>% of 35-50</th>
<th>% of 20-30</th>
<th>%&gt;60</th>
<th>%&gt;55 Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lower at X</td>
<td>lower at X</td>
<td>higher at X</td>
<td>lower at Y</td>
<td>higher at X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher at Y</td>
<td>higher at Y</td>
<td>lower at Y</td>
<td>lower at Y</td>
<td>lower at Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. (4 points) 1 point each for explanation of two bullets related to X, 1 point each for explanation of two bullets related to Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation for population living at Y:</th>
<th>Explanation for population living at X:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 pts.</td>
<td>2 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Families with children at Y</td>
<td>• College, young workers, people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of affordable single family housing and outdoor space at Y</td>
<td>without children at X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Negative perception of neighborhood at X (e.g., crime)</td>
<td>• Distance from city amenities at Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>• Cost of transportation to jobs in CBD at Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Availability of affordable single family housing and outdoor space at Y</td>
<td>• Affordable high density housing at X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cars enable low density development at Y</td>
<td>• City amenities (museums, night life, music) at X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive perception of neighborhood at Y (e.g., safety, good schools)</td>
<td>• Peer-group attraction at X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>• Retirees, older persons without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Down-sizing from larger housing at Y after retirement</td>
<td>dependents (not acceptable: just &quot;elderly&quot;) at X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distance from city amenities at Y</td>
<td>• In-migration due to retirement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>downsizing, amenities, affordability at X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aging in place at X</td>
<td>• Female longevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable high density housing at X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group and social housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(retirement and nursing homes) at X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-migration due to retirement,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downsizing, amenities, affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Female longevity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall: 3 points possible for each of three discussions. Pick the best two elements/discussions that a student offers in a response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>Good discussion of any two major elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>Good discussion of one major element and one other element; OR good discussion of two other elements; OR limited discussion of two major elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>Discussion of one major element OR discussion of one other element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 point</td>
<td>No major elements or other elements discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. (a) Transportation
Major elements:
- Freeways and transport corridors increased accessibility to the suburbs for individuals OR freeways opened up large areas of cheap land for development of low-cost housing by developers
- Cars became more affordable, greater availability/access

Other elements:
- Decline of street car system
- Multiplier effect with commerce decentralizing (relocation outside of central business district)

2. (b) Housing
Major elements:
- Affordability due to organization of production: large developers could purchase land, materials, designs at cheaper unit costs, and they could subcontract (in 1949 70 percent of new homes were constructed by 10 percent of the companies)
- Affordability improved due to “methods”: prefab, assembled on site, division of labor into crews that cut labor costs, speed of production
- Financing easier to obtain — quick system, plus federal guarantees (FHA insured mortgage and 1944 GI Bill)

Other elements:
- Tax codes that favor construction of new buildings rather than rehab of old buildings (and loan programs that favored new construction not repairs/upgrades)

2. (c) Landscape Preferences
Major elements:
- An anti big city feeling: escape the built environment and its density, pollution, congestion; rural idyll is the opposite
- Desire for large home size — ranch style design as indicative of expansionist mood
- Desire for single family
- Suburbs as seen in popular culture (e.g., images in media, “the American way”)

Other elements:
- Desire for an ethnically homogenous and conformist landscape
- Desire for large yard/lot size

2. (d) Social and demographic trends
Major elements:
- Baby boomers provided demographic demand for housing expansion (market-led)
- Nuclear family in demographic terms
- “Model” family units (replaced extended family ideal); i.e., social construction of the family
- Male as primary bread winner norm encouraged by GI Bill (wage); accompanied by women as homemakers, placing of women in suburbs (cult of domesticity)

Other elements:
- White flight and, more generally, desire of ethnic/race groups to flock together
- Middle class value children’s education and view inner cities as providing inferior product
This question is concerned with factors that contribute to revitalization of business and residential areas of the urban center of U.S. cities in the late twentieth century.

Total: 8 points

A. **Discuss economic factors** (2 points: 1 point each for identification and discussion, OR 1 point each for two identifications)

Actions and decision-making process of businesses/entrepreneurs; also broader forces of economic restructuring

Acceptable:
- Expansion of service sector, quaternary sector, information/knowledge processing, research facilities
- Agglomeration economies/centrality (identified in context)
- Rent gap, investment opportunities, places of profit
- Importance of face-to-face interaction
- Entrepreneurship; growth in small businesses (may be in residential districts surrounding city core)
- Tourism
- Demand for housing in downtowns and inner-city neighborhoods due to economic growth

Not acceptable:
- Historic causes of urbanization (e.g., break-of-bulk point, development of transportation systems); gentrification unless linked to one of the above

B. **Discuss demographic factors** (2 points: 1 point each for identification and discussion, OR 1 point each for two identifications)

Changing patterns of household composition, age composition, and residential location, including migration/immigration

- New household forms, single-person households, households without children (DINKs, yuppies), and nontraditional households
- Aging of Baby Boomers; empty-nesters
- Recent international immigrants

C. **Discuss urban policy** (2 points: 1 point each for identification and discussion, OR 1 point each for two identifications)

Effects of government/nonprofit organizations to revitalize central cities through public policies and incentives

- City investment policies; subsidies/tax incentives, e.g., sports facilities, other attractions
- Public-private partnerships
- Zoning, urban enterprise zones, building codes
- Historic preservation (must refer to government policy/action)
- Public safety
- Replacement of older public housing with mixed-income housing
- Creation of new greenspaces/open areas

D. **Discuss sense of place** (2 points: 1 point each for identification and discussion, OR 1 point each for two identifications)

Emotional attachment to central-city locations based on cultural amenities, landscape features, lifestyle factors

Acceptable:
- Distinctiveness of inner cities; consumption of nostalgia/historic character
- Cultural amenities (theater, museums, sports venues, restaurants); leisure society
- Lifestyles; concentrations of populations with similar interests; acceptance of diversity
- Community pride, neighborhood associations

Not acceptable:
- "Sense of place" if discussed as an effect of revitalization gentrification without specific reference to character of neighborhood, OR if credit given for gentrification in part A, above.
A large proportion of urban residents in the megacities of the world system live in squatter settlements.

Part A (1 point)

Describe a typical location of squatter settlements within urban areas of megacities on the global periphery.

- Edge of city
- Elsewhere in the built area other than the edge (with explanation)
- Vacant or undesirable land, such as steep hillsides, floodplains, dumps/landfills, cemeteries, close to industries
- Land with unclear title

Part B (2 points)

Describe two factors that contribute to the formation of squatter settlements.

- Large-scale rural-to-urban migration
- Poverty (with elaboration)
- Lack of enough affordable housing (public/private)
- Lack of, or failure to enforce, land use policy (government or private)

- NOT immigration, unless clearly talking about rural-to-urban migration
- NOT refugees

Part C (3 points)

Give a detailed account of THREE consequences of the rapid growth of squatter settlements. The three consequences you discuss may be social, economic, political, or environmental.

- Unhealthy living conditions leading to high morbidity and/or mortality rates in squatter settlements
- Increase in crime
- Development of gangs or other nonlegal authority systems that use force to impose their rules
- Development of political action and/or political unrest
- Increased water pollution resulting from lack of sanitation facilities and refuse collection
- Increased soil erosion on hillsides as existing vegetation is removed
- Decreased air quality resulting from fire used for cooking and heating in settlements
- Deforestation
- Visual pollution
- Increase in the availability of cheap labor
- Increased risk of disasters, such as fires, industrial accidents, mudslides, flooding
- Strain on the already inadequate infrastructure—such as water, electricity, education, sewer, and fire protection—resulting in an increased burden on existing taxpayers