

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/01
History and Culture of Pakistan

General Comments

There was a small increase in the entry for this examination compared with November 2015 with the standard of work broadly in line with that of last year. 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 their final answer being rushed. Most candidates produced answers that were relevant, focused, and addressed the questions as set, although the new style **Question 1** continued to present challenges for some candidates.

Comments on Specific Questions

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

Question 1

In part **(a)**, most candidates were able to score 2 or 3 marks on this new style question, although some candidates scored no marks as they wrote generally about the Simon Commission without using the source. In this question candidates must refer to the source.

There were some very good answers to **Question 1(b)** from candidates who were able to use features from the source to make inferences about it. This was an improvement upon last year. However, some candidates overlooked the source completely and wrote generally about the Round Table Conferences, scoring no marks. Other candidates described what they saw in the source without making any inferences and gained few marks. In this question, candidates must refer to the source, and it is essential that candidates are able to interrogate the sources.

Answers to part **(c)** on the importance of the Government of India Act of 1935 were generally good with sound knowledge being used. Candidates need to study the question carefully, noting the exact requirements of the question. Candidates who described the Act rather than explaining its importance were restricted to lower marks

Answers to part **(d)** were good. The question required candidates to explain the degree of success achieved by the 1937 provincial elections. Many candidates attempted to address the question as set and achieved high marks. However, some candidates concentrated on describing the events of 1937. These answers only scored in Level 2, gaining 3 or 4 marks. To achieve a high level it is important for candidates to fully explain their answers rather than describe.

Question 2

This was a very popular question and well answered. Most candidates were able to score 3 or 4 marks in part **(a)** on Nana Sahib.

In part **(b)**, the question focused on the reasons why Britain was successful in expanding its control of the subcontinent. Well-prepared candidates were able to respond very well and many of their answers were accurate and relevant, scoring up to maximum marks.

Part (c) on the achievements of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was generally very well answered. This was a well-known topic that demanded **explanation** of his achievements. Most candidates reached Level 4 and responses generally attracted good marks. Those candidates who wrote descriptive accounts of these achievements were unable to progress beyond Level 2.

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 what happened at Lucknow in 1916.

In part (b), the question focused on the reasons why the Khilafat Movement emerged. Many candidates produced answers which were accurate and relevant, often scoring maximum marks. However, a minority of candidates misinterpreted the question and wrote a narrative of the events of that period or included the reasons why the Khilafat Movement did not succeed.

Part (c) on the reasons for the formation of the Muslim League was a popular topic and generally well known by candidates. However, some misread the question and wrote about the partition of Bengal, rather than the formation of the Muslim League. As a result, it was very difficult for these candidates to access higher marks.

Question 4

A small numbers of candidates attempted **Question 4** compared with **Questions 1, 2 and 3**. For those candidates who did answer it, the majority of candidates achieved a mark of 2 or 3 on the part (a) question, which was about the 3 June Plan.

In part (b), the question required candidates to explain why the All India Muslim Conference rejected the Nehru Report. Many of the candidates who answered the question were able to gain a mark in Level 3. However some candidates wrote generally about the Nehru Report and Jinnah's 14 Points. For these candidates, few marks were scored.

In their responses to part (c) on Allama Iqbal and Rahmat Ali, many candidates' answers were narrative in format, describing the careers of each individual. As a result, many candidates scored a mark within Level 2. However, there were some excellent answers from a number of candidates who were able to explain the contributions of each to the Pakistan Movement, these achieved high marks within Level 4.

Question 5

A smaller numbers of candidates attempted **Question 5** compared with **Questions 1, 2 and 3**. The part (a) question on the rise to power of General Pervez Musharraf in 1999 was generally well answered.

In part (b), most candidates successfully answered the question on why there was a constitutional crisis between 1954 and 1955, and their knowledge of this topic was good. As a result, marks were generally within Level 3 although there were some candidates who wrote about events before and after these dates without directly linking these events to the question. Again, close reading of the question is important.

In part (c), there were some good answers to the question asking about the success of Pakistan's relationship with the UK and the Commonwealth between 1947 and 1999. Candidates who explained the degree of success were able to achieve a mark in Level 4. The tendency for some candidates was to describe in chronological order all they knew about this relationship rather than explain the degree of success. Candidates who gave a straightforward narrative of the relationship were limited to Level 2.

PAKISTAN STUDIES

| |
|--|
| <p>Paper 2059/02 The Environment of Pakistan</p> |
|--|

Key Messages

- Most candidates answered every part of each question attempted. However, often the responses needed more specific detail, or the use of more precise and subject specific language and skills to gain the maximum marks. For example, questions which required the candidate to assess change, whether social, economic or environmental etc., should be answered with careful thought about the process of change and careful attention to the qualifiers that usually need to be used. For example, when large numbers of people migrate to an urban area, higher/greater/increased levels of unemployment are seen. This is because a level of unemployment will already exist.
- Words such as ‘transport’ and ‘infrastructure’ should be qualified as they are often too general. For example, if a candidate wants to make a point about how governments can support farmers, then answering ‘governments can provide or maintain large-scale irrigation schemes’ reflects the purpose of government. Responses such as ‘governments can give farmers irrigation’ could mean the digging of small irrigation canals from a small water source, which is the responsibility of the farmer and would not be credited.
- Many candidates are checking graph labels and giving the correct units in their answers. This is very good practice. Greater attention needs to be given to what is being represented in a graph or table and the question that is being asked. Graphs and tables often represent changes or trends that are taking place over time and answers need to reflect this as well as demonstrate candidates’ ability to apply their data reading skills.
- Candidates should read through the whole of each question they are answering carefully and thoroughly, and note command and key words, and any words which are written in bold, to give precise and accurate answers. The glossary of terms for Paper 2 in the syllabus helps with this. The examination paper uses a variety of command words and candidates should be familiar with them.
- Questions that have a higher allocation of marks require a wider range of answers and/or points that develop those answers.
- Copying out the question material used in the question as part of the response wastes time and is not credited.
- Answers to part **(d)** questions need more development of the points made. For example, every point made needs an explanation to provide detail of the reason why it is being included and candidates should back up each point with an example where appropriate. Examples should be rooted in the physical and/or human geography of Pakistan. Limited marks are available for entirely one-sided arguments or arguments where only one side of the argument is developed.
- Candidates should ensure that an evaluation/judgement/clear support of a view is included and is clear in responses to the part **(d)** questions. The evaluation/judgement/support of a view that is given must reflect the content of the response.

General Comments

- The majority of candidates observed the conventions of writing for examination purposes. However, the use of short hand, for example 'temp' for temperature and 'bus' for business, is discouraged.
- Candidates are advised not to use bullet points when answering questions which require developed answers. Development of points is rarely seen and is rarely possible when bullet points are used.
- Most candidates completed every section of each question they chose, which demonstrated that they were managing their time across the examination. Some candidates ignored the rubric and attempted more than three questions, which disadvantaged them. A significant minority of candidates left parts of questions unanswered.
- The use of additional sheets was sensible and appropriate.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

This, along with **Question 4**, was the most popular of the five questions.

- (a) (i) **A** Well answered, although many candidates gave '6 months' here, omitting the month of May.
- B** Very well answered. The vast majority of candidates gave responses within 171–175 mm range and included the units.
- (ii) This question was answered correctly by the majority of candidates.
- (iii) Many candidates correctly gave monsoon, but very few candidates correctly named the direction. Candidates need to be more familiar with this geographical term and how it is used.
- (iv) The majority of candidates gave excellent answers about the effects of a cyclone on an urban area such as Karachi, with most of these gaining at least 3 marks. A minority wrote about impacts on rural areas.
- (b) Most candidates referred to 'flat land', 'river nearby' and 'fertile soil' but these points were not always developed. The idea of increasing crop yields due to fertile soils was rarely seen. There was no mention of 'flooding regularly', or 'every 1–8 years'. A number of candidates referred incorrectly to climate/markets/transport.
- (c) (i) There was good recognition of the areas on the map, although a few candidates named tropical forests. Virtually all scored one mark and some candidates gained two.
- (ii) Well answered in both parts. A sizeable number of candidates knew all about the trees. Most answers referred to mangroves/coniferous (alpine). Very few candidates referred to irrigated forests, and reference to Riverain/Bela was very rarely seen. There was some confusion about leaves and shape of coniferous trees and on height generally, with some candidates confusing the altitude at which coniferous/alpine forests could be found and the height of the trees, some estimating heights of 4000 metres.
- (d) The content seen usually consisted of simple points. Developed points mentioned the possibility of employment for the local people, beaches or historical buildings for supporting tourism whilst pollution, destruction of mangroves, and social and cultural issues were the points given against tourism. Beyond knowing about port activities, few candidates gave examples or details of the Sindh coast. Many candidates wrote out the information in the question material in their responses.

Question 2

This, along with **Question 5**, was the second most popular choice of question.

- (a) (i) This question was well answered with many candidates gaining full marks. Most were able to give the correct locations for rock salt and limestone. Candidates were more familiar with the uses for limestone. Some of the uses given for rock salt needed to be more precise, for example to give 'flavouring for food' or 'used in cooking' rather than just 'food' which could not be credited. Likewise, 'industry' was given as a use for 'limestone', which was too general to be credited.
- (ii) Candidates most frequently said that the minerals were 'heavy/bulky' and were credited for this. 'Mountainous/rugged terrain', 'far away from ports/markets' and sometimes the idea of 'poor/non metalled roads' were given and credited. Relatively few noted the long distance to get minerals to the markets. A sizeable number gave 'no roads', or 'no proper roads', or 'poor transport', which could not be credited as they were too imprecise/untrue.
- 'Proper' is rarely a qualifier which conveys precise meaning. A number of candidates, who needed to read the question more carefully, wrote about the problems of mining minerals and dealt with the difficulties of, and lack of money for extraction or the use of traditional methods and 'because minerals not of good quality', which could not be credited.
- (b) (i) 'Goat(s)' was the creditable answer for this question. Nomadic or subsistence livestock was often seen as was buffaloes, sheep and cows.
- (ii) Generally very well answered, with most candidates gaining three marks, mainly for milk, meat, income and hides. Many gained maximum marks, even where **2(b)(i)** had been answered incorrectly.
- (iii) 'Overgrazing' and 'soil erosion' were the most frequently seen responses and were credited. Other responses focused on the amount of dung, smell and diseases from goats, etc., which were not credited.
- (c) (i) 'Rice' and 'sports goods' gained credit for most candidates and some gave 'raw cotton', 'cotton products/yarn', 'textiles', etc., which also gained credit. However, few candidates gained two marks, as a sizeable number gave 'cotton', which was too general and could not be credited. 'Wheat' was also a popular response which could not be credited.
- (ii) Many candidates gained two marks for points made about 'poor quality' and 'competing with foreign producers'. However, fewer candidates developed the initial point and gained credit for development.
- (d) The creditable points made were mainly around the importance of reducing imports of chemical fertilisers. The idea around the cost of importing was often developed with 'imports greater than exports' or 'problems with the Balance of Payments'. A number of candidates made points about chemical fertilisers causing 'water pollution' and sometimes developed this with 'eutrophication'. Little of the indicative content on the mark scheme was seen.

There were references to 'cow dung' but candidates needed to provide accurate development to gain Level 2 marks, either by saying that it was used as fuel, or that there is potentially an ample amount available from a large livestock sector, for example. Examples of development points for natural alternatives included the idea of 'multi-cropping' and for Pakistan producing its own chemical fertilisers development points included the availability of raw materials, including natural gas at Sui.

Question 3

This question was the least popular choice.

- (a) (i) Many candidates labelled 'shaft' and 'cage' correctly and gained maximum credit, although some candidates gave the type of mining as 'adit' rather than 'shaft' and confused 'tunnel' with 'shaft'. Most candidates labelled more than the two terms that were asked for in the question.
- (ii) Overall this was well answered. Credit was mainly given for seams being 'deep below the surface' and where 'the seam does not appear on/near the surface'. 'Greater risk of accidents' was usually well understood as a disadvantage, and most candidates wrote about 'gas' and 'explosions' or 'tunnels collapsing'.
- (iii) Some candidates gave 'anthracite' and gained credit for the type of coal imported. 'Black coal' and 'steam coal' were very often seen, as well as 'lignite', as the type of coal imported, which could not be credited. Only a few correctly gave the 'steel industry' for the use of the imported coal and gained credit.
- (b) Some very good answers were seen here. 'Compressed natural gas' was often quoted; 'vehicles', 'rickshaws' and 'cylinders' were mentioned by many candidates, but a much smaller number used comparative words such as cleaner or cheaper, which was essential when giving a main reason for using this fuel – 'it's cheaper/cleaner than petrol and diesel'. 'Transported in pipes' was a response seen from a sizeable number of candidates, which was not credited.
- (c) (i) The majority of candidates were able to give an example of a non-renewable fuel. A few candidates gave a definition of non-renewable fuel that could be credited, many candidates wrote about fuel which 'couldn't be recycled' or 'couldn't be used again'. Non-renewable fuels are those which are 'finite', i.e. they run out and are 'not being replaced'.
- (ii) This question was answered correctly by the vast majority of candidates.
- (iii) A great number of candidates correctly looked at the graph in terms of the overall changes in oil and gas. Some of these candidates gave the correct start and end figures for oil and gas and used the units and thus gained a second mark. Many candidates needed to read the question more carefully to give 'the main difference between the change in gas used... and the change in oil used...' as they tended to describe the graph using interim dates for both oil and gas, or gave an overall change for gas/oil and interim figures for the other fuel.
- (iv) Many excellent responses were seen with many candidates gaining the maximum three marks. Some candidates could have gained credit if they had given more detail, such as 'large amount of ash', 'high emissions of smoke/CO₂'. Others could have gained more credit with a wider range of points, for example, by not just focusing on the fact that the coal in Pakistan is low heat producing and giving a number of points which illustrated this. Many candidates wrote that coal is imported even though it is expensive (the opposite of which is true). Very few commented on international pressures/agreements to reduce usage due to environmental concerns.
- (d) Candidates gave better responses to this part (d) question. Good answers seen here used examples of renewable schemes and large scale plants. How successful measures could be was often exemplified by wind and solar examples, with points made about 'lack of funds', 'skills' or 'level of government interest/priorities' for evaluating how unsuccessful measures could be. Level 3 responses were seen on this question.

Question 4

This, along with **Question 1**, was the most popular choice of question.

- (a) (i) This was well answered by most candidates, who gave the correct named inputs and gained maximum marks. Some candidates repeated the word 'human' in their answers from the question material rather than giving the human input, which is 'labour', so were not credited. Few candidates mentioned 'government loans', 'knowledge' or 'traditions'.
- (ii) **A** Some candidates did as the question asked and looked at the graph with a view to describing the main changes between 1982 and 2014, and gave 'overall increase' and/or 'overall fluctuation'. More candidates gained credit by noting the significant rises and falls and giving statistics. Many candidates concentrated on giving a year-by-year change, which did not describe the main changes and was not credited. Some candidates could have gained marks when quoting figures, but because they gave figures which were inaccurate through rounding up too loosely, answers could not be credited.
- B** The vast majority of candidates gave answers such as 'use of HYV' or 'use of fertiliser'. However, farmers use these every year to produce cotton. Candidates needed to give greater thought to the changes that would have resulted in increased production levels such as 'greater use of fertilisers'. Likewise with rainfall, 'ample' rainfall would see production figures for cotton which were significantly higher in specific years. Many candidates mentioned 'more demand for cotton', but demand for an agricultural product such as cotton takes time to be fulfilled and would be part of a longer term sustained pattern of higher production.
- (b) Most candidates gained at least one or two marks for points related to 'loans' and 'education/training' of farmers. Some candidates gained a development point for the ways in which farmers could spend their loans.
- (c) (i) Most candidates identified the relationship between the labour force and the cropped area and gained a mark. Fewer candidates gave statistics for the second mark.
- (ii) Where candidates chose the change in labour force, they generally scored marks, sometimes gaining all three. Where candidates chose the change in cropped area fewer gained credit. Many candidates mentioned 'greater demand for food crops', with few references to the other points on the mark scheme.
- (d) Most candidates argued for cash crops with many promoting the income/BOP/trade deficit element, whilst food crops were chosen usually for the simple point of a fast growing population with little development. Marks for the planting of more cash crops were awarded for mentioning exports, income, rice/cotton. When arguing against using more land to grow food crops, candidates sometimes went off topic, writing about birth rates and early marriages, and were too vague in talking about population growth or demand for food. Candidates rarely mentioned valid points against food crops, or noted the expense of cash crops or the issues of monoculture. Candidates tended to divert to the need to use land for other things altogether.

Question 5

This along with **Question 2** was the second most popular choice of question.

- (a) (i) **A** Some candidates gained two marks here, giving a definition of infrastructure, with the vast majority of candidates gaining one mark for an example of infrastructure, usually giving 'roads'.
- B** Some candidates gained the maximum of three marks, using accurate data from the graph. Many candidates gained one mark for 'limited funds', more gaining two marks for also mentioning 'lots of on-going/new projects' or 'limited foreign assistance'.
- (ii) Candidates mentioned 'limited funds', 'size of debt', 'change of government/ government policy', 'other priorities', so a wide spread of responses was seen, with maximum marks being gained by some candidates. Other candidates talked about the reasons why spending was higher in some years than others, for which there was no credit.
- (b) (i) Many candidates needed to think more carefully about their responses. Marks were gained for responses which were precise and more accurately reflected the real life situation. So the pull factors are 'higher paid jobs', 'better/higher quality/greater access to healthcare', 'an expectation of/perceived better quality of life'. Many candidates gained two marks here, but others gained one. Some examples of 'push' factors were given, which were not credited.
- (ii) The full range of marks was seen as well as the full range of points on the mark scheme. It should be noted that where credit was not given, it was often for the lack of qualifying words, for example 'increase in' (unemployment, crime, etc.), 'greater pressure on' (schools and hospitals, etc.). A few candidates described the effects on rural areas which could not be credited. Others lost marks by being vague, for example writing about 'more pollution', 'not enough schools', 'people turn to crime', etc.
- (c) (i) A minority of candidates correctly named Port of Karachi. Most candidates gave 'Keamari' as the fishing port on the Sindh coast, while 'Gwadar' and other fishing ports on the coast of Balochistan were often named, all of which were not creditable.
- (ii) Most candidates were able to name the activities involved and gained two marks, some linked the process to why the activity was carried out and thus gained the full four marks.
- (d) Many candidates wrote about developing the fishing industry at sea rather than the fish processing industry and so could not be credited. When responses were focused on the fish processing industry, they tended to mention the need for refrigeration, the expense of development, more money needed, more training needed, no government support, etc. Few candidates mentioned details of ports such as Gwadar and the potential for development there.