PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/01
The History and Culture of Pakistan

Key messages

- When answering questions using source material, candidates should refer to the source, draw inferences from it and support these, either with detail from the source or with contextual knowledge.
- Candidates should make sure that they read questions carefully to understand the requirements of the question.
- It is important for candidates to avoid lengthy narrative description and focus on explanation, analysis, and evaluation.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered the required three questions with few rubric errors. Most candidates used their time well and answers were relevant, focused, and addressed the questions as set. There were some responses that demonstrated limited knowledge and understanding of topics and of what was required by some of the questions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

In **part (a)**, focused on the speech of Fatima Jinnah, the majority of candidates were awarded maximum marks. Very occasionally some responses focused on their own thoughts rather than what was in the extract. In this question, candidates must refer to the source and not describe the topic being examined. Candidates should ensure that they do not directly copy out the entire source word for word.

Part (b) focused on a photograph of President Muhammad Ayub Khan standing in the White House Oval Office with President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson. There were a range of responses seen that generally included good and accurate inferences from the photograph that often scored four marks. '*Relations were good between Pakistan and the US as Muhammad Ayub Khan and the others were smiling*' was a typical answer that scored four marks. For this question, candidates need to ensure that they referred to the source.

Many candidates misunderstood **part (c)** on the reasons why General Muhammad Ayub Khan came to power in 1958, referring to the instability under Iskander Mirza in general terms without going any further. Other candidates misunderstood the question and wrote about Muhammad Ayub Khan's achievements once in office. As a result, many responses scored zero marks due to misunderstanding the question or not attempting to answer it.

Part (d) was generally a well-answered question, which produced good responses overall. The question required candidates to explain the extent to which the years 1958 to 1968 were considered 'A Decade of Development.' A number of candidates addressed the question as set and achieved highly in Level 4. Some responses demonstrated good knowledge of Muhammad Ayub Khan's agricultural reforms but less knowledge about other achievements in the time period. Few candidates addressed any negative side of reforms, so many responses remained in Level 3. Weaker responses were those that were mainly narrative. It is important for candidates to ensure they read the question carefully and explain their answers rather than focus on describing factors.

Section B

The most popular questions answered this year in **Section B** were **2** and **4**.

Question 2

This was a very popular and well-answered question.

Part (a) saw many candidates gain near maximum marks. Most candidates were able to identify Nana Sahib's military actions and demonstrated good knowledge of these. Some candidates appeared to have confused Nana Sahib with other military figures and so scored few marks.

Part (b) on how Britain extended its control across the subcontinent produced mixed responses. This was a very well-known topic, with the question requiring an explanation of the ways the British achieved their control. Responses which gave descriptive accounts of various battles during this era including the Battle of Plassey and Battle of Buxar were unable to progress beyond Level 2. However, there were a good number of stronger responses which used references to these battles in order to explain how these British victories enabled them to extend their control of Bengal, for example.

Part (c) required candidates to explain how educational reforms and other factors introduced by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan contributed to improving the lives of Muslim people. There were some strong answers which demonstrated good understanding and knowledge, where candidates were able to explain how his contributions improved the lives of Muslim people, thus scoring highly within Level 4. However, there were many responses which did not score more than seven marks. Weaker answers did not relate their points to improving the lives of Muslim people, focusing on other knowledge related to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. Though these responses often demonstrated good knowledge of his achievements, these were presented as narrative. Candidates needed to ensure that they explained why the factors they discussed improved the lives of Muslim people. It is important that candidates read the question carefully before beginning their answer.

Question 3

In **part (a)** most candidates were awarded near maximum marks, and many candidates demonstrated good knowledge about Lord Curzon and his role in the partition of Bengal.

P**art (b)** related to the reasons why the Simon Commission of 1927 was unpopular and the majority of candidates were able to explain the unpopularity of the Simon Commission in terms of its all-British composition.

Part (c) related to the extent to which the Morley-Minto reforms were the most important political development in India between 1909 and 1919. There was much description seen, with many candidates able to describe the terms of the Morley-Minto reforms and those of others up to 1919. These responses, however, often did not then explain the impact of such reforms and how important they were in finding a solution to the political situation in India. Candidates needed to be able to comment on the importance of the reforms to achieve a Level 4 answer. In stronger responses, where Level 3 or 4 was awarded, it was usually for a consideration of the Lucknow Pact of 1916.

Question 4

In **part (a)**, there were many candidates who scored near maximum marks. Most candidates had good knowledge of the terms of the Nehru Report and scored highly. It should be noted that the question referred to the terms of the report and not the reaction of the Muslim community which was not relevant to answer this question.

Answers to **part (b)** on the reasons why people joined the Khilafat Movement were generally good with sound knowledge being used to score near maximum marks. Candidates should ensure that they study the question carefully, noting its exact requirements as it appeared many candidates spent a lot of time describing the reasons, whilst others appeared to misunderstand and focused on reasons for the Khilafat Movement's failure.

In **part (c)** candidates were required to explain the extent to which the Round Table Conferences held between 1930 and 1932 provided a solution to the government of India. This question was generally well-answered and candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the various conferences held and what

happened at them. Many responses explained why the conferences failed and so achieved a mark within Level 3 but fewer explained fully the successes of the negotiations required in order to access Level 4. The focus of weaker answers was not always on the wording of the question, instead focusing on describing what happened at the conferences.

Question 5

There were significantly fewer candidates who chose to answer this question.

Generally, most candidates were able to get close to maximum marks on **part (a)**, focused on the Canal Water Dispute.

In **part (b)** candidates were required to explain the reasons why Benazir Bhutto's government was dismissed in 1990. Many responses did not move beyond Level 2. Responses tended to give a narrative of factors involved in Benazir Bhutto's dismissal, though a small number of stronger responses were able provide a chain of causation and explanation. Few candidates dealt with policy failures and loss of support from other political individuals and parties.

Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge of details of the relationship between Pakistan and the USSR in **part (c)**, but this was largely presented as narrative. Most candidates identified changes in Pakistan's relationship with the USSR at different points in time, though answers needed to provide coherent, focused explanations sitting behind that relationship. It was insufficient to state that '*the President of Pakistan visited the USSR and so relations must have been good*' without explaining why.

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Key messages

For candidates to perform well on this paper they needed to be able to:

- Ensure that the rubric is followed, selecting and answering three of the five questions.
- Attempt all parts of the chosen questions; completion of the pie chart **Question 2(c)(i)** was left blank by many candidates, as was **5(a)(iii)** to a lesser extent.
- Read the questions carefully. If it helps, underline the command words and the words that indicate the context.
- Know the meaning of key command words such as '*describe*', '*explain*', '*evaluate*'.
- Understand the meaning of key terms such as '*natural features'* and '*human activities*'. For example, some candidates were confused between **Questions 1(b)(i)** and **1(b)(ii)**.
- Identify the focus of a question by understanding the question stem, for example, **Question 2(a)(ii)** '*Using Fig. 2.1 only, describe three features*' means that the description provided in the response should refer to what is shown in Fig. 2.1, a photograph.
- Learn the meanings of key words. Most candidates gave correct definitions in **Question 2(b)(i)** and **3(a)(i)**. Fewer candidates could define '*balance of trade*' in **Question 4(b)(i)**.
- Use evidence that is shown in a photograph or provided on a map, for example in **Question 4 (a)(ii)**. Candidates must ensure the features they use to describe location on a map are in the key or are labelled on the map provided. Reference to features not shown on the map cannot be credited.
- Read the context of questions carefully, for example in **Question 5(b)(ii)** some candidates wrote about what could or should be done, rather than describing what is being done.
- Use the mark allocations and answer space provided as a guide to the length of response required. Some candidates wrote long responses in the earlier parts of the paper and hence had too little time for the third question they chose.
- Use language as precisely as possible, avoiding vague remarks such as '*poor services*' or '*good infrastructure*'. Including an example of a service etc. demonstrates specific knowledge. Statements such as '*there are no…*' are also less likely to be awarded credit.
- Write developed ideas wherever '*you should develop your answer'* is stated in the question. Answers should take a simple idea and extend it by mentioning why something happens or mention the consequences of something. Extending detail in each idea will allow access to the development marks.
- In the final **(d)** part of each question, avoid copying sections of the question out as this will not be credited.
- In the final **(d)** part of each question, candidates should ensure that their ideas are developed with the correct focus. It is also important to consider both points of view or both sides of an argument. Many candidates provided several developed points for only one side of the argument and therefore limit the number of marks credited. Most candidates stated which view they agreed with or gave an evaluative statement explaining which side of the argument is stronger. Examples should ideally be developed to include detail which supports the point being made.
- When using the additional space at the back of the booklet candidates must ensure they clearly label the parts they write to show which question/s they have continued.

General comments

Some candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge, understanding and skills on this paper. More candidates than in previous series did not follow the rubric. Candidates should make sure that they allow enough time to answer each question and that they read each question carefully before beginning their answer.

Question 4 and 5 were the most popularly answered questions, followed by **Question 3**. **Question 2** was less commonly answered, and **Question 1** was the least popular choice. A minority of candidates left question parts unanswered in the three questions they chose and there were almost no examples of blank scripts or those only attempting one or two questions.

Candidates were able to show sound subject knowledge and understanding of contemporary issues in Pakistan throughout this paper. Candidates' knowledge of industrial sectors, development of industry and trade and of population management was sound. Key areas to improve include knowledge of river floodplains and aspects of farming. Overall, most candidates showed understanding of current issues and were able to suggest both many positive points and potential opportunities for the future of Pakistan.

Candidates can improve upon their answers which state, '*you should develop your answer*' and ensure that they develop a simple point. For example:

Question 1 (b) (ii) ways that floodplains influence human activity:

'*Floodplains have fertile soil and are wide areas of flat land*' gives two simple points which would gain two marks.

Candidates could take each floodplain feature and develop an idea about how that influences human activity:

1. '*Floodplains have fertile soil which makes them suitable for growing crops in arable farming.*' gives one simple point and a development of it. This response would gain two marks.
2. '*Floodplains have wide areas of flat land which makes them suitable for using large farm machinery such as combine harvesters.*' gives one simple point and a development of it. This response would gain two marks.

Question 5 (b) (i) Reasons why birth rates are high:

'*In some families people get married at a young age and there is a strong desire to have a son.*' gives two simple points and would be credited two marks.

'*Some people marry at a young age which extends their period of reproductivity. They also have a strong desire for sons who will be able to support them in their old age.*' gives two simple points, each developed with a consequence or a reason for it. This response would be credited four marks.

Part (d) questions

Part (d) responses could be improved upon, with some weaker answers for **part (d)** questions seen when compared with previous years. These weaker responses often lacked development and scored in Level 1. However, a large proportion of candidates gained marks in Level 2 and successfully developed a point on at least one of the views. Some also gave a relevant example to support their point and were awarded four marks, at the top of Level 2. Stronger responses achieved a Level 3 answer in the time available by providing a balanced and concise answer. In **part (d)** responses candidates are required to include a developed explanation on both sides of the issue or from both viewpoints, whilst also including an element of evaluation and an example.

<u>**Comments on specific questions**</u>

Question 1

(a) (i) Candidates needed to read the question carefully as only information taken from the map could be used in the response. Many candidates referred to named provinces or characteristics of the land in certain regions in their description, which could not be credited. Most commonly one or two marks were awarded for the amount of rainfall, with more in the north and less in the south.

(ii) Some sound knowledge was shown here, most commonly correct was the Indus River. The Dasht River was the least well-known river.

(b) (i) There were some excellent responses and a wide variety of the natural features were seen. However, a large number of candidates described human features such as irrigation or agriculture. Some candidates mistook '*floodplain*' for flooding and thereby did not score any marks. Other candidates appeared to move to an alternative question part-way through completing this question.

(ii) Stronger answers confidently mentioned a floodplain feature and linked it with a suitable or unsuitable human activity. Most commonly seen were points about fertile soil leading to successful arable farming or the flat land which is therefore suitable (or unsuitable) for building on. However, those candidates who had mistaken a floodplain with flooding were not able to provide simple points for credit in this question.

(c) (i) This question was attempted by most candidates. The majority were awarded a mark for at least one tick, with a lot of candidates scoring two or three marks.

(ii) Some candidates forgot to use the photograph in Fig. 1.2 for this question and instead used their own knowledge which could not be credited. Stronger answers used evidence of cyclone impacts from the photo provided.

(d) This question was less well-answered when compared with the other part **(d)** questions. When evaluating the influence of storms, weaker responses discussed influences that were general in nature, or referred to primary industry such as damaged crops, rather than identifying the influence on secondary or tertiary industries as the question requires. The first point of view, that influences will be severe and/or negative, dominated most responses and the alternate perspective, mitigation measures, was not mentioned or was restricted to a sentence or two. Unbalanced responses were thereby restricted to Levels 1 or 2. Case study examples were not often seen, although stronger responses referred to named secondary or tertiary industries and described the impacts on them caused by a cyclone in some detail. It is important in this question that candidates develop the points that they make. For example, for the points *'the power supply may be cut off…'* and *'the roads will be flooded…'*, candidates need to say why that would be a problem. Adding consequences for secondary or tertiary industry such as '*no power supply will halt production and mean there is less product to sell'* or '*will mean there is no internet access and companies cannot contact customers to sell to'*, or '*if the roads are flooded it means deliveries would not be able to reach the ports*' can lift simple points in Level 1 in to Level 2.

Question 2

(a) (i) Most candidates were able to correctly identify the livestock in the photo as chicken/hens or poultry.

(ii) Many responses for part **(ii)** did not refer to the photograph evidence and instead described features of commercial/livestock farming generically. As a result, there were many responses which were awarded zero marks. Stronger responses described the features they could see in Fig. 2.1, mentioning the large size of the hen house, the crowded conditions, use of cages/nesting boxes and artificial feeders. It was important that candidates used only the photograph evidence in this question.

(iii) This question was well-answered. Most candidates were able to identify a product and suggest a use for it.

(b) (i) Subsistence farming was well-understood and explained. Candidates understood its key features and could define it concisely.

(ii) The subsistence farm system was generally well-understood. Most candidates were able to suggest inputs, processes and outputs relevant to a subsistence farm. A small minority of responses appeared to get confused and wrote about a chicken farm, as shown in Fig. 2.1.

(c) (i) Responses to this question part were mixed. Some candidates filled in the pie chart neatly and accurately. Candidates should ensure that they check their shading matches that of the key, and use of a ruler would be useful to make completion of pie charts both quicker and neater.

(ii) Some candidates answered this question well and were able to explain how the karez system is operated. However, this question part was generally not well-answered, with many responses demonstrating little understanding of karez irrigation. Responses often showed confusion with irrigation canals and with other more modern irrigation methods, such as tubewells.

(iii) This question part was well-answered by those who had a good understanding of the karez system. Weaker responses were those that included vague statements, such as '*too expensive*' or '*time consuming*'.

(d) This question was generally well-answered. Lots of responses included good detail about methods for improving waterlogging and salinity problems such as installing tubewells to lower the water table and cement-lining irrigation canals to avoid water seepage. Education for farmers was a common suggestion and a lot of candidates were able to suggest better water management systems such as dams and afforestation, including examples of these already in operation in Pakistan. The other side of the argument was also seen, with the issues of finance, lack of technology, skilled labour or literacy levels for some farmers most commonly given as inhibiting factors. Some good answers were seen and a lot of responses were awarded Level 2, three or four marks, or reached Level 3.

Question 3

(a) (i) Most candidates gave an accurate meaning for '*tertiary occupation*'. Some did copy the word tertiary from the question, which was not credited.

(ii) This question was successfully answered, with candidates able to suggest jobs in the tertiary sector. The most common answers given were teachers and doctors, though a wide variety were seen and credited. The most common error was to name a sector of industry such as '*education*', '*banking*' or '*tourism*' instead of specific occupations within the sector.

(iii) Candidates appeared to find this question quite difficult, though the majority attempted an answer. Weaker responses were quite vague and gave advantages and disadvantages of either the informal sector or of tourism, rather than linking them both together. Many candidates focused on the advantages or disadvantages to the informal sector employee rather than the industry. Stronger answers tended to identify flexible working agreements and low wages as advantages for the industry and poor relations with customers or unreliability of workers as disadvantages.

(b) (i) By using the map/Fig. 3.1, candidates were required to provide evidence as to why X was a good location for a hotel. The question required more than identifying features on the map that could be of interest to or of use to tourists. Stronger responses located the features near to the hotel on the map, or measured the distance from X, and suggested a potential use by tourists. Candidates could choose features labelled on the map or shown in the key but needed to ensure the features they chose were then linked to the question; it was not enough to simply list map features.

(ii) This question required use of a photograph, Fig. 3.2, and was generally better answered than **Question 2(a)(ii)**. Most candidates were able to name at least one natural attraction of the coastal environment shown. A common error was to name the cliffs as hills or mountains, showing some confusion with coastal landform terminology. A small minority of candidates mentioned things not visible in the photo; human features such as hotels or other tourist attractions. Credit was given for natural features which were visible in the photograph.

(iii) This was well-answered, and most candidates were able to suggest at least one reason for visiting a beach for tourism or leisure purposes. Many responses scored two or three marks. Candidates understanding of tourism as a growing tertiary industry and one with a lot of potential in Pakistan was evident in this question and in **Question 3(d)**.

(c) Most responses explained a simple approach to promote industrial growth. Some provided detail to develop their point, such as suggesting that reducing imports or adding tariffs to imported goods could help increase demand for local industrial products. Other development points given included improving roads and power supply to enable industry to faster transport goods for export and to have a reliable power supply for continuous operation. Two developed points were rarely seen. A lot of candidates wrote two similar ideas and thereby scored only two marks for this question.

(d) In this **part (d)**, a lot of candidates focused on only one view. There was an even split between responses that favoured focusing on manufacturing and those that favoured promoting tourism. Some good arguments were put forward for either view, such as the potential for improvement in quality standards in manufacturing and the prospects of better developing the ports of Pakistan to benefit manufacturers. Candidates were keen to describe the tourist potential in Pakistan and wrote about a variety of appealing landscapes. However, the second view included in responses often

lacked detail, limiting a lot of responses to a maximum of four marks in Level 2 (a developed point on one view and a supporting example). Those that did debate both views equally produced excellent, well-supported assessments. A good range of examples were seen, and many candidates displayed thorough knowledge of different regions of Pakistan, writing enthusiastically about their industrial potential. Candidates' responses focused mainly on potential, although inhibiting factors were equally admissible.

Question 4

(a) (i) Most candidates were able to name both province-level areas correctly. A minority wrote North-West Frontier Province/NWFP rather than Khyber Pakhtunkhwa/KPK.

(ii) Most responses to this part question scored at least one mark, demonstrating the ability to describe location on a map. Candidates used compass directions, referred to borders and longitude and latitude. Some references to features not on the map were seen and could not be credited, but these were smaller in number than in past years.

(iii) This question was well-answered and knowledge of estimating area from a map was evident.

(b) (i) Some precise definitions were seen, though this definition question was generally not well-answered. A significant number of candidates thought that balance of trade referred to an equal amount of imports and exports. Another common error was to not refer to the values of imports or exports.

(ii) Many candidates did well on this question showing sound knowledge of Pakistan's main trading partners and the goods imported and exported. China, the USA, and countries in the Middle East were most often given. The named imports and exports were sometimes given the wrong way around and some responses referred to the use of '*oil*' without any specification.

(iii) This question part was generally correctly answered.

(iv) Many candidates appeared to misunderstand the terms '*changes*', '*types*' and '*amounts*' in this question. A frequently observed error was for responses to list the yearly amounts of imports from Fig. 4.2. Although the graph was often used accurately, responses rarely used it to answer the question set. Many candidates were able to give examples of increasing or decreasing imports, however the question asked for types of good, such as capital goods, rather than named examples of imported goods.

(c) Responses to this question were mixed. Most candidates identified a point related to trade but did not always provide a detailed explanation of how factors improve or promote trade. Most responses scored two marks for simple suggestions such as strengthening relations with other countries, without further development. Stronger responses were those that confidently discussed the benefits of joining a trading bloc or of improving goods through education, mechanisation of industry or by maintaining international quality standards.

(d) Some excellent responses to this question were seen that included detail on a variety of relevant issues. Both the potential for increased trade or the factors that hinder trade were equally credit worthy. A wide range of factors were discussed such as investment decisions, trade barriers, literacy and education in the workforce, the importance of efficient transport and communications infrastructure and the hinderances caused by load-shedding. Weaker responses were those that didn't fully formulate developed points about how trade could be increased. Stronger responses suggested lots of potential strategies for growth.

Question 5

(a) (i) Most candidates read the demographic transition model in Fig. 5.1 correctly and gained at least two marks. The most common error was reading from the incorrect axis for birth rates.

(ii) Responses to this part question were mixed, but most candidates identified the features of stage 3 accurately.

(iii) Most candidates were able to identify either stage 2 or 3 correctly. The most frequent error was shading stage 4, though some candidates did not shade any part of Fig. 5.1.

(iv) Candidates engaged well with this question, though often wrote more than was necessary about their chosen reasons. Common responses included better healthcare, better trained doctors, advanced medications, and improved sanitation. A substantial number also wrote about healthier lifestyle choices and improved diet and nutrition. Where the question asks for comment on change, candidates need to use language such as '*improved*' '*developed*' '*more*' or '*better*' in order to access the marks. Weaker responses were often single word answers such as '*hospitals*'.

(b)(i) The reasons for a high birth rate were well-known, and this was a very well-answered question. A large proportion of candidates were awarded three or four marks, developing at least one of their points. A minority listed four simple points and therefore only scored two marks. A wide variety of ideas were seen with religious beliefs, a desire for sons and early marriages the most frequent starting points.

(ii) Marks awarded to responses to this question were generally high. A lot of very good understanding was demonstrated. Many candidates confidently described a multitude of reasons why people in Pakistan are having fewer children and birth rates are falling. The most common error, although only seen in a minority of cases, was writing hypotically about what could or should be done. Weaker responses sometimes described polices the government might adopt such as fines or laws restricting births. However, this was rarely seen as most candidates were able to select from the number of changes already happening in society to reduce births.

(c) Few candidates scored more than one mark on this question part. Many responses focused on increasing and decreasing birth rates or death rates, rather than on the future structure of the population. For example, '*the future population will contain fewer children and more older people'*.

(d) A wide range of marks were awarded for this question part. The issues were complex but candidates clearly understood the need to slow population growth and for education about reducing family sizes in Pakistan. Most responses evaluated in favour of view B, however either view was equally plausible. Some responses were limited in their success due to misunderstanding view A, reducing infant mortality. Stronger responses assessed the potential for reducing infant mortality through healthcare investment and the education of women as a strategy. Some candidates argued that it would work but would be the catalyst for a gradual change in attitude rather than a policy with fast results. Other candidates recognised that with the introduction of further family planning, as suggested in view B, infant mortality would naturally reduce as a consequence of women giving birth to fewer children. The majority of candidates were able to develop their point arguing that family planning was the way forward, or by giving detail as to why family planning would be unsuccessful as a policy. However, examples to support responses were rarely seen. Only a small number of responses named NGOs or family planning programmes that are working in Pakistan.