

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/01 History and Culture of Pakistan
--

General comments

This was the second year of the newly styled question paper, with a compulsory **Question 1** and a Section B that contained a choice of answering a further two questions from four.

There were very few rubric errors this year with the majority of candidates able to answer the required three questions in the set time. In the main, the majority of candidates attempted to address the questions as set with an appropriate length of answer. Many candidates produced excellent responses to questions that were both relevant and focused. The depth of knowledge of such answers was of a very good standard. It was evident to Examiners that many candidates had been well prepared.

There were a number of issues regarding the performance of candidates this year. One of these was the number of candidates who gave generalised answers demonstrating limited knowledge of facts related to the topics they chose to answer upon. There were also a number of candidates who did not answer questions in the correct sequence and answered all part **(c)** questions first, followed by part **(b)** and then part **(a)**. Candidates should be encouraged to answer the questions in the correct sequence and write their answers clearly.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

In parts **(a)** and **(b)** there were some good answers from candidates who were able to use features from the sources to make inferences. However, there were candidates who found these questions difficult. Some candidates wrote a generic response scoring no marks. Other candidates gave a wholly descriptive response which gained few marks.

Answers to part **(c)** were generally good with sound knowledge being used to score near maximum marks.

Answers to part **(d)** demonstrated that many candidates knew the facts about the relationship between Pakistan and Bangladesh and were able to explain both aspects of this relationship enabling them to score high marks.

Section B

The most popular questions answered this year in Section B were **Questions 2** and **3**.

Question 2

This was the most popular and best answered question with some very high scoring answers.

In part **(a)**, the events of Cawnpore in 1857 were generally well known and many candidates had few problems with gaining 3 or, maximum marks of 4. However, there was a significant minority of candidates who knew little about the topic and wrote about other events elsewhere.

In part **(b)**, the appeal of India to the East India Company was a very well known topic and was generally well explained. Candidates were able to write at length on this topic and high scoring answers were in evidence. However, there were candidates who could not explain the reasons for this appeal and were unable to score beyond 3 or 4 marks on this question.

Part (c) required candidates to explain the contribution of Shah Waliullah and others to the spread of Islam in the subcontinent. This was consistently the highest scoring question on the examination paper with some very well explained answers. This topic was generally well known and candidates were often able to articulate these contributions at some considerable length, often scoring near maximum marks. There were few candidates who failed to reach a Level 4 mark in their answers to this question.

Question 3

This was also a very popular question and was again well answered by a large proportion of the candidates who chose it.

In part (a), most candidates were able to score 3 or 4 marks for this question on the Indian Councils Act of 1909 as the subject was well known.

In part (b), candidates had a good understanding of why the British partitioned Bengal in 1905 and there were some very good responses to this question. However, there were some candidates who misread the question and as well as writing about the reasons for partition also wrote about its reversal, which was largely irrelevant to the answer. It is important that candidates read the question carefully before starting their answer.

Candidates tended to answer part (c) by describing the events that took place rather than explaining why the Rowlatt Act caused violence, with examples of this violence. As a consequence, candidates did not score highly in Level 3 or 4 because they described the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms or the Rowlatt Act in detail rather than concentrating on the resultant violence or the reasons for the outbreak.

Question 4

Although not as popular as Questions 2 and 3, this seemed to be answered by a larger proportion of candidates than in previous examinations.

The 'One Unit' Scheme in part (a) was generally answered well and scores of 3 or 4 marks were often achieved.

Part (b) required responses on why Ayub Khan introduced Martial Law in 1958. Answers were varied but often well-constructed and the question was answered well by a majority of candidates.

Answers to part (c) were largely descriptive of the 'how successful' aspect of the question on the solving of the challenges of Partition during 1947 and 1948 and although some good knowledge was displayed, answers tended to be in the Level 2 range of 3 to 6 marks. It was insufficient to describe either the challenges or the solutions to achieve the higher levels. Candidates needed to explain **why** the solutions demonstrated success or failure for high marks.

Question 5

This question appeared to be answered by a larger proportion of candidates than in previous years.

Answers to part (a) were generally comprehensive with most candidates able to score 3 or 4 marks.

In part (b), many candidates achieved a mark in Level 3.

In part (c), candidates had a good knowledge of why Nawaz Sharif left office in 1993 and there were many high scoring explanations. Some candidates described the reasons rather than explaining them, limiting them to the Level 2 range. Nevertheless, many of the answers to this question were very pleasing.

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/02 The Environment of Pakistan
--

Key messages

- Almost all the candidates answered every question attempted, and put a great deal of effort into their responses. However, the responses often needed more direction, more specific detail, or the use of the precise and subject specific language and skills that are used in geography to gain the maximum marks.
- A greater awareness and knowledge of 'place' and what that can mean in terms of physical features, population density, industrial activity, etc. is needed.
- Care should be taken by candidates when using terms such as 'facilities', 'resources' and 'infrastructure', as in general these terms need qualification. For example, '(health) facilities' should not be used where the correct answer is 'medical centres' and/or 'hospitals'. Likewise, 'infrastructure' should not be used if the correct answer is 'roads' and/or 'schools' and/or 'railways'. 'Resources' can mean 'capital' or 'books for school' or 'employees'; it is a word which can mean many things.
- Many candidates addressed both sides of the arguments required in the part **(d)** questions. More development of the points that support and oppose a point of view is needed. More attention also needs to be given by candidates to ensuring that evaluation is included, that it is clear and reflects the content of the response. This will assist candidates in accessing the highest marks. Limited marks are available for entirely one-sided arguments or arguments where only one side of the argument is developed or where evaluation is omitted.
- The use of paragraphs, particularly when giving responses in part **(d)**, will assist greatly in clearly organising and presenting the content of the response.
- To help them give precise and accurate answers, candidates should read the questions carefully and note command words and any words which are written in bold. The 'Glossary of Terms' for Paper 2 in the syllabus helps with the command words. Candidates should be familiar with using the full range of terms in the glossary.
- When reading graphs, candidates should always check the labels and give the answer in correct units.

General comments

- Good responses were seen to all questions. Many candidates produced concise, detailed responses, using subject specific language and skills that addressed the questions directly to gain higher marks. Other candidates gave responses that were lengthy, much less concise and which needed to contain more directed content informed by the Paper 2 syllabus.
- Many candidates, when answering questions that required the correct units such as percentages to be included, did so and gained the mark(s) for this.
- Many observed the conventions of writing for examination purposes and responses overall were well written and in good, legible handwriting, which should be sustained. However, the use of shorthand, for example 'b/c' for because and 'bus' for business, needs to be discouraged. Both illegible handwriting and the use of shorthand interfere with the clear communication of responses.

- Where candidates are continuing their answers elsewhere in the answer booklet or on additional pages, they need to indicate clearly that there is a continuation, where that continuation is, and use the correct question part number with the continuation.
- Most candidates completed every section of each question they chose, which demonstrated that they were managing their time across the examination well. A small number of weaker candidates ignored the rubric and attempted more than three questions, which disadvantaged them.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

A popular question choice. Almost two thirds of candidates attempted this question.

- (a) (i) Most candidates correctly identified the Himalayas, with Hindu Kush or Karakoram often incorrectly named. River Jhelum was correctly identified, whereas Murree was rarely named with many choosing Islamabad/Rawalpindi instead. Only a small number correctly identified all of them. This suggests that candidates need to gain more accurate knowledge of the location of settlements, rivers and mountains, etc. in Pakistan.
- (ii) This was usually well answered by most candidates, either by naming all four causes of high rainfall, or using developed points. Good understanding was shown, even though few candidates had correctly named the city as Murree. However, some mentioned altitude without actually going on to name relief rainfall, and quite a few misunderstood the question and described the consequences of high rainfall at city B.
- (b) (i) There was a wide variation in answers, with many candidates giving very precise answers using per unit area or square km/mile and so on, while other candidates just wrote about the 'number of people in an area'.
- (ii) Most candidates named 'Punjab' correctly, although a substantial number chose 'Sindh'.
- (iii) Some very good answers were seen that explained how the physical features of the area were exploited by people to create dense populations. Weaker candidates listed physical features without linking them to the impact on population density. For example, fertile soils and moderate climate were often stated without going on to link them to crop growing or tolerable living conditions. Weaker candidates often wrote about human factors instead, which was not required, discussing population policy and family planning. Sometimes answers could be repetitive with comments about farming but not mentioning settlement. A significant minority were unaware of what the phrase 'physical factors' means, or what the difference is between physical and human factors.
- (c) (i) Many candidates described what was on the diagram rather than giving a response that included the defining characteristics of a population pyramid, which was what was required. So, while most recognised that males and females are shown separately, fewer candidates were able to say that population pyramids showed 'amount of population in different age groups'.
- A substantial number discussed (incorrectly) birth and death rates or dependency ratios, or gave answers that would have gained credit for **Question 1(c)(ii)**, which suggested that more attention needed to be paid to reading the question.
- (ii) There were some good responses that recognised the changing structure as shown in the population pyramid, and these gained credit. Quite a large number of candidates, however, mentioned birth/death rates, differences between male/female and references to dependent/independent groups, or used very wide age ranges, e.g. 20–80, which gained no credit. A significant minority looked outside the population pyramid to provide answers to this question, and gave *reasons* for the forecasted change (asked for in part **(c)(iii)**) rather than identifying the changes themselves, as was required.
- (iii) The majority of candidates answered this part of the question very well, and the full range of possible reasons given in the mark scheme was seen.

(d) General points

The skills being tested in the part **(d)** questions are those of explanation and evaluation. Statements given in this type of part **(d)** question represent two different points of view that relate to the same issue. This question looks at ways to solve the problem of overpopulation. One statement says that the best way to solve the problems associated with overpopulation is to increase resources. The other statement says that the best way to solve these problems is to control population. Candidates are being asked to argue for (support) a particular viewpoint, and, while doing so, to address both points of view. They can do this by arguing for one view and against another, for example. Whichever way they choose to conduct their argument, they must make sure that the evidence they give clearly supports their argument. They will then make an evaluation in support of their judgement: 'I agree with statement A or B more because ...' and give their reasons. The evaluation and the reasons they give must be supported by the content they have already given in their response.

The evaluation can be made from the outset of the response and then be backed up by developed argument. However, both sides of the argument must be addressed with developed points.

Part **(d)** questions require 'developed' points. This means that every fact or opinion or statement given should be supported by a reason, some evidence and, where possible, an example, i.e. it must be explained why this point is being made as part of the argument. Simple statements are not enough to give candidates more than Level 1, 2 marks, no matter how many simple statements are made. Simple statements are just facts or opinions or statements made without any reasons to say why they are being included in the argument, or why or how relevant they are to the argument.

To gain the full six marks, examples must be given. The examination is testing knowledge of the environment of Pakistan, and so responses given in part **(d)** should be rooted in the physical and human geography of the country. Case studies should be used to gain knowledge of suitable examples.

Specific points for this paper

For **Question 1(d)**, controlling population growth was the most frequent choice but many candidates found it difficult to develop their simple statements. Where candidates did develop their answer satisfactorily, they often did not look at both sides of the argument and so were unable to progress beyond Level 2, 3 marks.

There were some good points made, both about methods of controlling the population or why resources could not be increased, but many just repeated the information in the question. Examples were seen of family planning programmes that are operational in Pakistan; often though, examples were not given and very few examples of ways in which resources were being increased in Pakistan were seen.

Question 2

A popular question choice. Just over sixty percent of candidates attempted this question.

- (a) (i)** On the whole, this was well answered and responses were seen that covered the full range of marks. However, there were a number of references to 'flat land = fertile land'.
- (ii)** A range of answers were seen, with most candidates gaining at least one mark. The most common error was to put 'flooding' and 'transplanting' the wrong way round. A few candidates lacked knowledge of the entire process and added words to the list with little logic to the order.
- (iii)** The majority of candidates described the process of ploughing. While it was possible to award credit for common factors for all choices of process, for example, 'manual labour and draft animals' was frequently given, the more specific comments were lacking.
- (iv)** Many candidates were able to gain three marks here, giving full, accurate answers using subject specific vocabulary and the correct ranges for rainfall and temperature. Often, however, vague statements were made such as 'good temperatures/climate', 'lots of rain'. A substantial number of candidates did not read the question carefully and gave responses which included HYV seeds and chemical fertilisers.

- (b)(i) A: Few candidates gained credit here for 'livestock', with 'agriculture' being the most frequent response seen.
- B: Most candidates gave a correct example here.
- (ii) This question focused on the changes that need to be made in the different sectors to *increase* its contribution to GDP. For example, in the primary sector farmers are already using modern methods, such as HYVs and mechanisation. So to increase contribution, improvements/developments in HYVs and mechanisation would need to be seen – or an increase in the use of the modern methods. Few candidates gained full credit for this question because, although their basic ideas were correct, they lacked development, or an understanding that to make changes, improvements are needed – or more of something needs to be used/done. 'Make more for export' was a common idea, but without any indication of *how* more could be made for export. Many candidates gave definitions of secondary industry without explaining how it could be improved. Some candidates were unsure of what the term 'sector' meant.
- (c)(i) A: The vast majority of candidates answered this correctly.
- B: This was very well done. The majority of candidates answered correctly and, very importantly, gave the units in their answers.
- (ii) While many candidates had some knowledge of the terrain in KPK, often this was not applied to the question, which asked them to explain the problems for agriculture in KPK. Candidates wrote about the terrain being rugged rather than 'the terrain is too rugged for agriculture'. Similarly, that it was cold in KPK, rather than it being 'too cold in winter for agriculture/crops to grow'. Responses to this question saw a number of vague statements being made, for example, 'less flat land' where 'too rugged' was the answer, 'less fertile soil' where 'infertile' soil was the answer, and extreme statements being made, for example, 'no water available/no rivers/no flat land'. No credit could be awarded for statements that are inaccurate representations of the geography of the region. Use of the word 'proper', which is not a geographical term and is often seen used in 'no proper roads', should be discouraged.
- (d) Where an idea was followed through logically and at length, there were some good developed points, for example, those responses around cottage industry and how the tunnel would enable people to get their products to market all year round. However, lack of detailed knowledge limited access to the highest marks. For instance, few candidates referred to the amount of time cut by the building of the tunnel, or referred to named cities or the services made accessible there. Candidates had a restricted number of points to make on the whole, mainly saying that the tunnel 'made it easier to get to other areas', 'more tourism' and 'damaging the landscape', which suggested that candidates were not familiar with either this tunnel or any tunnel. Many candidates referred to the benefits to the national economy, which was not what the question demanded. Many candidates wrote about the problems of construction and even whether the tunnel should be built, which were not relevant to the question. This made it difficult for Examiners to award L3. However, on the whole, this was the better of the responses to the part (d) questions on this paper.

Question 3

The most popular question choice. Over eighty percent of candidates attempted this question.

- (a)(i) A and B: The majority of candidates answered these questions correctly, using the correct units.
- (ii) When this question was well answered, care had been given to reading the question carefully, gaining an understanding of what was required before answering. Responses were then seen that covered the range in the mark scheme. The concept of change is the focus of this question and most candidates overlooked the link between the change in tertiary employment and the reasons for it. If tertiary industry employment has increased, it has to be because of '*larger* population needing *more* hospitals', '*improved* education leading to *higher* numbers in *banking*', etc. Many candidates discussed why people had left primary or secondary industries rather than focusing on why they had chosen to enter the tertiary sector, or why tertiary employment was needed.

- (b)(i) This was very well understood and answered by the majority of candidates. There was occasional confusion with unemployment in rural areas and references to agriculture, but there were some very good answers overall covering the range of points in the mark scheme. Increasing population/overpopulation seemed the most popular answer, followed by reference to lack of skills/mechanisation replacing workers. However, many referred to rural to urban migration in a general way rather than linking it to increased rural-urban migration being the problem.
- (ii) Those candidates who answered correctly mainly responded with disguised unemployment and unregistered workers. This was a question which required a degree of reflection before answering. It seemed to be either understood or not understood, in the latter case reproducing similar sorts of answers to those for part (b)(i). Many thought the sheer number of people in Pakistan would make the unemployment total difficult to measure, a factor not considered to be significant. Only a few mentioned informal or self-employment as being reasons why it was difficult to measure.
- (c)(i) A: Most candidates answered this correctly. Candidates needed to distinguish between cottage industry (required) and small-scale industry (not required). The most common correct answers were carpets and rugs. Common incorrect answers were sports goods and surgical instruments.
- B: Stronger candidates compared the provincial similarities and differences for cottage industry and engineering industry and the cities where both were present, which was what the question required. Many candidates found difficulty in comparing the two industries: they counted or listed locations over the whole country without comparing and gained no credit. Most candidates who gained credit did so for cities where both industries were present, or only one of the industries was present.
- (ii) Where the question had been read carefully and understood, the majority of the responses were correct. Note only 'cottage' or 'engineering' were acceptable in the answer space, with credit coming from a correctly circled method of transport. A significant minority gave examples of engineering or cottage industry and as a result could not be credited. Most of the candidates who put 'cottage' circled 'road' and most who put 'engineering' circled 'rail'.
- (iii) This question required the specific advantages for the respective methods of transport and a substantial number of candidates gave these. References to speed, convenience, safety and cost appeared frequently, which are too general to be credited.
- (iv) Where candidates clearly understood the term 'small-scale industry' and recognised that there were differences between this and cottage industry, some responses were seen that gained three marks. Where there was confusion, marks were gained for 'family labour' and the named example, usually 'carpets' or 'surgical goods'. Too many candidates referred to 'less capital' and 'less workers' which could not be credited, as 'less' does not mean 'small amount' or 'small number'.
- (d) Generally, most candidates performed reasonably well in this levelled question and addressed both views. The views A and B were readily understood and responses remained focused on the topic in the question: industrial development. Responses were generally full with a good understanding in particular of the characteristics of the market each industry would cater for, and the size, type and source of inputs. Most candidates achieving Level 2 or 3 were more knowledgeable about small-scale industries and a common development point mentioned women in work or less need for imports. Steel industry was also mentioned when needed. There were few responses gaining Level 3 overall, the majority gaining Level 1, 2 marks, or Level 2, 3 marks. Candidates did not receive higher marks for one of two reasons: only presenting detailed argument for **one** view, or not providing a clear evaluative statement indicating the view that they agreed with more. Few examples were given throughout. Weaker candidates listed points for and against a particular view without attempts at explanation and development of the points.

Question 4

A popular question attempted by just under two thirds of candidates.

- (a)(i) A and B: These were answered well by all but the very weakest candidates.
- (ii) Almost all candidates were able to name a multi-purpose dam correctly.

- (iii) This was well answered. Almost all candidates managed to give two uses for the dam. A small number of candidates gave vague answers such as 'used to conserve water'.
- (b)(i) Few correct answers to this question were seen. Responses mostly consisted of: rakh, bela, riverain, mangroves, tropical thorn or sub-tropical forest.
- (ii) This was generally well answered. Some candidates referred to deforestation, thus giving a reason for the trends on the graph and not the actual trend itself. Very few mentioned the species aspect.
- (iii) Most candidates answered this correctly, usually naturally grown/manmade. Incorrect answers referred to density or open and closed canopies rather than unplanned/planned or linear. Some talked about irrigated forest when referring to plantations.
- (iv) This was generally well answered with many candidates scoring all five marks. A very wide range of responses was seen covering nearly all lines of the mark scheme. A few candidates referred to the problems caused as a result of deforestation for all or, more frequently, for part of their response and could not be credited for this.
- (c)(i) Naming two fishing ports on the Makran Coast was accomplished by almost all candidates. A few gave Port Qasim, Keamari or Karachi.
- (ii) Responses were very variable. Good responses often gave more than the three required points, gaining maximum marks. 'Trawlers', 'up to 60 km from coast' and the length of time at sea were probably the most common points given. They also frequently referred to storage/refrigeration on the boat and GPS/Sonar, etc. Many referred to refrigeration facilities, but it was not clear if this was on the boat and so could not be credited. There was some confusion between gill netters and gill nets. Other quotes are: 'a longer time at sea', 'far from coast' and 'boats with radios' which were too vague for credit.
- (d) Generally this question was answered. Evaluation was quite rare as candidates mostly just said it is possible/not possible without any 'to what extent' or 'how much it was possible'. Responses tended to be on the possible aspect without dealing with the other point of view, or giving converse simple statements on the same ideas. The majority of candidates made one or two developed points, usually about not fishing in the breeding season and not destroying mangroves as breeding grounds for fish. Nets that do not catch baby fish was also a popular idea but not always well explained in terms of mesh size. Other good responses referred to the problem of foreign boats entering Pakistani waters leading to overfishing and the need to curb the various sources of water pollution.

However, many of the creditable responses were given within a wider text that demonstrated that candidates do not have a clear idea of the concept of sustainability; of the need for steps to be taken so that thriving fish stocks of all species are in our oceans for future generations (not necessarily for catching and eating) and that if these steps are not taken, fish stocks will be lost completely. Rather their idea of sustainability is about taking steps to make sure that the fishing industry can be sustained for further/expanded commercial development. There were a significant number of responses that did not deal with sustainable fishing at all, but only described the development of the fishing industry. These responses often referred to improving the quantity of fish catch and exports, although some of these candidates did manage Level 1 as they stated the need to avoid overfishing. A very small minority of candidates ignored the word 'marine' and wrote about fish farming and fishing in inland areas.

In questions requiring feasibility (e.g. **Question 4(d)**), candidates should be aware that they are assessing why a development is possible or not possible, rather than why a development 'should' or 'must' be done.

Question 5

Only about a quarter of candidates attempted this question.

- (a)(i) Very few responses achieved full marks. Most candidates correctly labelled Karachi and/or Dasht. However, almost all candidates were unable or unsure about how to complete the longitude label, or omitted the 'E'.

- (ii) Many candidates gained credit by giving general points in this question; very few candidates, however, gained full marks. The map, which should have prompted candidates, was not used well. There was a lack of area specific knowledge and many candidates did not refer to place, for example, Karachi. Where Karachi was mentioned, this was mainly with reference to Karachi port and imports/exports and to the proximity to Karachi, but without mentioning the ways this could help. It appears that many candidates overall lacked knowledge of the fundamental principles of industrial location. There was limited use of a range of geographical vocabulary.
- (b)(i) A very small number of candidates gained credit for this question and gave the necessary reference to finance/support. The vast majority defined an Export Processing Zone as 'a special place where exports are done'. Lack of knowledge was evident.
- (ii) Candidates gained credit for mentioning 'tax holidays', 'exemption of duties' and 'quality control'. However, as with the responses to (a)(ii), many were general and vaguely worded. Very few candidates gave an example of an EPZ. Some candidates repeated elements of their response for 5(a)(ii) and 5(b)(i). There was limited understanding of tax incentives and what the purpose of an EPZ is, and EPZs were often confused with dry ports.
- (c)(i) Many candidates gained credit here. However, there were many responses seen that ranged from 27 up to a figure of 290 000. Many candidates omitted the '000' in their response.
- (ii) Most candidates gained credit for A, correctly saying that internet use increases and the number of telephone lines decreases. For B, most candidates cited the reasons for change as 'more people using the internet'. Some candidates mentioned increased use of mobiles phones; few candidates mentioned examples of social media apparatus.
- (iii) Candidates mainly answered this question well and high marks were awarded for clearly worded problems that covered the whole range in the mark scheme. Most candidates focused on the human factors rather than the physical factors. Weaker candidates focused on the negative aspects IT has on young people, making them lazy, overweight, etc., little of which could be credited.
- (d) In general, this question was answered quite well, although, as with responses to the other part (d) questions, very few candidates gave examples and little indicative content was seen. Very few addressed the core of the question, which was about how best to reduce unemployment levels, and most gave similar answers to those seen in **Question 3(d)**. Again, many candidates limited themselves by giving only simple points, or addressing only one point of view. Clear evaluative comment is needed to access the highest marks.