

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/01

Paper 1

General Comments

There was a small increase in the entry for this examination compared with November 2013, with the standard of work broadly in line with that of last year. It was noticeable that candidates found less difficulty in scoring high marks this time.

Most candidates were able to answer the required three questions with very few rubric errors. The majority of candidates used their time well and there were few examples of them rushing the completion of their final answer. Most candidates produced answers that were relevant, focused, and addressed the questions as set. Candidates used language effectively. Examiners found that on the whole candidates were answering the question as set far more this year and had grasped the idea of supporting answers with sufficient detail applied to their answer for a supported explanation to be awarded.

Comments on Specific Questions

The most popular questions answered this year were 1, 2 and 3.

Question 1

This was a very popular and generally well answered question. In part (a), the short answer question on suttee was well answered with most candidates able to gain 3 or 4 marks.

In part (b), the question focused on the reasons why Sir Syed Ahmad Khan tried to improve relations between the Muslims and the British. The well-prepared candidates produced accurate and relevant answers often scoring maximum marks. However, for most candidates, they were able to reach Level 3 by explaining at least one reason why he tried to improve relations. On the other hand there were a number of candidates who did not answer the question as set and proceeded to describe much of Sir Syed's work, for which they frequently were unable to score a mark beyond Level 2.

In part (c) candidates were required to explain the reasons for the failure of the War of Independence. Most candidates found this relatively easy and many were able to score near maximum marks. However it was important that candidates did explain why the reason given was a reason for the War's failure rather than merely describe the reason. For many candidates this was a question whereby they were able to score high marks within Level 4 by explaining the reasons relating to the strength of the British along with other reasons, usually associated with a lack of unity, disinterest in the cause and a lack of leadership amongst the Indians. Most candidates were able to access Level 3 by explaining how the strength of the British forces resulted in the failure of the Indians to achieve success. However, there were other candidates who ignored the specific nature of the question and wrote erroneously about the causes of the war and some of the main events therein. For these candidates, few marks were scored due to the irrelevant nature of their answers.

Centres need to ensure that candidates are equipped with the skills to recognise the demands of such a question if they are to achieve the higher marks available in part (c).

Question 2

This was also a very popular question. Most candidates were able to score 3 or 4 marks in part (a) on the Swadeshi Movement.

In part (b), the question focussed on the reasons why the Muslim League was formed in 1906. This caused few or no problems for well-prepared candidates and many answers from these were accurate and relevant,

scoring up to maximum marks. Most candidates, in fact, were able to show how and why the Muslims decided to form their own party.

Part (c) on the reasons for the outbreak of violence across India in 1919 produced mixed responses. This was a very specific question that demanded equally specific arguments and those candidates who wrote narrative accounts of the period were unable to progress beyond Level 2. Many of those who did not put detail in their answer reached Level 3 by writing about the unpopularity of the role of the British in the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms. Level 4 was reached usually by way of Rowlett and Amritsar or the Khilafat. There were however, a significant number of candidates who were able to use their knowledge of the period to formulate good answers that centred on the specific aspects of the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms that helped to cause a violent reaction amongst the Indians, together with other reforms and legislation which also resulted in this reaction. For these candidates a Level 4 mark was common.

Question 3

Again this was a popular question with a good level of knowledge shown by most candidates generally achieving 3 or 4 marks on the part (a) short answer question on the Nehru Report.

In part (b), the question focussed on the reasons why Dr Allama Iqbal was an important influence on the struggle for a separate homeland for Pakistan. For those candidates who had been well prepared for the examination this caused few or no problems and many answers from these candidates were accurate and relevant. There was a significant minority of candidates who found some difficulty in being able to focus their answer on the question posed. As a result many answers were narratives of his work without any attempt to focus on his influence and so were unable to score a mark beyond Level 2. Such candidates would be well advised to take the time to read the question carefully and then answer it accordingly.

Part (c) on the reasons for the foundation of the Khilafat Movement was a very popular topic and generally caused candidates few problems. Many candidates were unable to progress beyond Level 3 as they merely addressed Muslim concerns with British policies and ignored other reasons with the wider concerns relating to the fear of the dismantling of Turkey and the related peace treaties at that time. Other candidates were only able to offer a narrative account of the foundation of the Movement without any explanation of the reasons and so could only achieve Level 2. Responses about the peace treaties and Turkey were not consistently tied into the question on British policy and often candidates just narrated the story with limited explanation, leading to the top of Level 3. Most candidates reached 9 marks either as above, or through Muslims' concern for the caliph/places of interest plus general outcries against British policies. Smaller numbers of candidates were able to explain Afghanistan/Russia and British policy.

Question 4

This was not as popular a question compared with the previous three, with very few candidates attempting it. For those candidates who did answer it, they tended to score up to 2 or 3 marks on the part (a) short answer question on the 1973 Constitution.

In part (b), the question required candidates to explain why there were so many governments between 1951 and 1958. Those candidates who answered the question had mixed fortunes since they tended to know a little about the reasons and so gained a mark at the bottom of Level 3. There was a temptation for others to write generally about the period, in the misplaced assumption that this was required. For these candidates few marks were scored.

In their responses to part (c) on Zia-ul-Haq's domestic policies, candidates' answers were largely narrative in format and few were able to explain their importance, especially related to Islamic reforms. As a result most candidates were only able to score a mark within Level 2 at best. Centres need to impress upon their candidates that in such questions an explanation is required to achieve a Level 3 or 4 mark and descriptions will only attract a Level 2 mark.

Question 5

This was also not as popular a question compared with Questions 1, 2 and 3, with very few candidates attempting it. The short answer question on the family feuds that faced Benazir Bhutto was generally well answered with 2 or 3 marks being achieved.

In part **(b)** most candidates attempted to answer the question on why Pakistan distrusted India so much between 1971 and 1988 but knowledge of this topic was weak. It is important that Centres and their candidates recognise that topics in the later part of the twentieth century will continue to be set and it is hoped that they understand the need to ensure that these are dealt with as comprehensively as earlier parts of the syllabus.

In part **(c)** there were a few good answers to the question about the relative success of Pakistan's relationship with Afghanistan between 1947 and 1999. However these were in a small minority of answers. As reported in previous years, the tendency has been for many candidates to describe in chronological order all they knew about the events that shaped such a relationship rather than attempt to explain the successes and failures of such a relationship. Few candidates were able to do this part well and most answers this year tended to be awarded Level 2 for a straightforward narrative of the relationship. It is important that candidates attempt to address both the positive and negative aspects of such a relationship in order to achieve a Level 4 mark.

In conclusion it must be reiterated that candidates should avoid falling into the trap of writing narrative answers to questions that clearly need an explanation, since they are only going to achieve a Level 2 mark when they ought to be capable of reaching marks within Levels 3 or 4. This highlights the need for Centres and their candidates to focus more clearly on how to write explanations rather than description in part **(c)** questions.

One further point of note concerns the trend in recent examinations, that very few candidates answer **Questions 4 and 5**. This may suggest that Centres are not addressing the whole of the syllabus with their students and as such many candidates could be caught out in not having enough questions from which to choose in future examinations. This could be a problem for Centres in the revised 2015 examination series that includes a compulsory question that is selected from any area of the syllabus.

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/02
Environment of Pakistan

Key Messages

- It is necessary to read questions carefully and note command and key words to give precise and accurate answers.
- Many questions require wide-ranging answers. If the question has a higher mark allocation, answers should mention more points or elaborate in greater depth. Candidates should observe the mark allocation for each section of a question and allocate time accordingly.
- In questions asking for items to be stated or named, a one-word answer is required. Extra credit will not be given for multiple answers. Where the number of elements required is given in bold in the question candidates are expected to follow this instructions.
- Answers supplying definitions should not contain the word, or the root of the word, being defined.
- Where candidates are required to evaluate or make an assessment they should be aware that limited credit is available for entirely one-sided arguments.

General Comments

Candidates were well prepared for this examination and demonstrated good understanding of the material, particularly in response to **Questions 1, 3 and 4**. Relatively few candidates used a 'bullet point' format and wrote well-structured responses instead.

Many candidates produced concise, detailed responses. Others wrote at excessive length, expending great effort but producing poorly directed answers. If candidates continue their answers elsewhere in the answer booklet they should indicate this clearly using the correct question part number.

The correct units were more commonly used in statistical answers.

In evaluation questions, opposing arguments were generally presented well. **Questions 2(d), 3(c) (ii) and 4(e)** produced the most complete answers with opposing points interspersed throughout the answer to good effect. **Question 1(e)** frequently produced only 'positive' answers.

The majority of scripts showed no evidence of hurried or incomplete final answers and most candidates completed every section of each question they chose. A small number of weaker candidates ignored the rubric and attempted more than three questions, disadvantaging themselves in the process.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) The rivers and dams were correctly identified in most responses.
- (b) There was some confusion between types of canal but most responded correctly.
- (c) Information about the Indus Water Treaty was understood. Candidates tended to focus on the importance of the water, or the rivers, rather than the treaty. Some answers lacked focus and concentrated on the historical build up and reasons for the treaty, or speculated on what would have happened if there had not been a treaty.

- (d) The type of forest was readily identified from the photograph and the reasons why such forests are being cut down were well understood. Part (iii) required an explanation of the effects of deforestation. Many responses listed effects instead of giving an explanation and some offered explanations that displayed gaps in reasoning or were incomplete.
- (e) Candidates demonstrated good understanding of the strategies needed to conserve or increase forests. The best responses gained marks for evaluation by considering problems as well as strategies.

Question 2

- (a) Definitions were detailed and usually accurate. Examples were frequently correct.
- (b) Parts (i) and (ii) were generally answered correctly. In part (iii), answers were sometimes not sufficiently precise. In questions of this type candidates should demonstrate good use of the map or data provided as well as relevant knowledge.
- (c) The elements of a formal sector of industry were clearly understood.
- (d) Some candidates were unsure how to answer this question and frequently missed one of the multiple emphases in it ('informal sector'; 'improving lives'; 'urban areas'). The best responses broke the question down into its component parts. For example, consideration was given to the effect of work on quality of life, and then to work specifically in the informal sector. A final judgement was then made about whether this type of work improved lives.

Question 3

- (a) All parts were answered well, although (iii) provided the greatest challenge. In (iv) and (v) some candidates confused causes of winter and summer rainfall.
- (b) Nearly all candidates answered part (i) correctly. In part (ii), short explanatory statements were required. Care should be taken not to repeat terms in the wording of the question, for example writing 'increases fertility' when explaining the contribution of fertilisers. There was some confusion between fertilisers and pesticides.
- (c) Part (i) required an understanding of the key concept of sustainability. The meaning of sustainable goes beyond 'sustaining' or 'continues'. In questions of this type the best responses use examples to illustrate their definition. Many candidates confused sustainability with subsistence farming. In part (ii) some answers listed the different types of livestock food products and missed the explanation and evaluation elements altogether. Some candidates discussed the use of animals in arable farming, for example in irrigation or ploughing, which was not the required focus.

Question 4

- (a) Parts (i) and (iii) were usually answered correctly. In (ii) full units for population density were required.
- (b) All four factors were used regularly but the main choices were climate and infrastructure. The best answers offered exact causes of low population density.
- (c) Parts (i) and (ii) were usually well answered, but those responses which quoted figures without a comparison in part (ii) could not be rewarded.
- (d) Punjab was chosen in most instances. Many answers were insightful, balanced in terms of advantages and problems, and considered all three age groups from Fig. 4. Weaker answers were characterised by mistaking 'age distribution' with other concepts such as 'high population', 'overpopulation', or 'high population density'. Good answers took each relevant age group and explained an advantage and a problem in a methodical way.
- (e) Many candidates received high marks for developed ideas covering such matters as education, family planning initiatives and cultural change. Problems were generally interspersed with the various possibilities in a well-argued format.

Question 5

- (a) In part (i) S was more readily recognised than R and T. Part (ii) was poorly answered, responses often giving a list of destination provinces or cities. A description of the pattern, with the use of compass directions, was more effective.
- (b) In many cases answers were not organised well into the 'people' and 'local economy' headings and were often generalised, particularly on benefits for people.
- (c) Those who were confident in their knowledge of the term 'cottage industry' produced the best responses. In (ii) a wide range of advantages were seen. Frequently answers did not follow the instruction to state an advantage and then explain it; they tended to rephrase their stated advantages in a longer way, receiving no extra credit due to repetition.
- (d) Key to success in this question was an understanding of sustainability. Some of the ideas presented by candidates for the continued economic growth of cottage industries were clearly not sustainable.