

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/01
History and Culture of Pakistan

General Comments

This was the third 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 again very few rubric errors with the majority of candidates able to answer the required three questions in the set time. Most 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 focussed. The depth of knowledge of such answers was of a very good standard.

However there were some issues regarding candidate performance. One of these was the number of generalised answers demonstrating limited knowledge of the topic being responded to. There were also 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 part **(a)** most candidates were able to interpret source A, although some interpreted it inaccurately or did not refer to the source at all. In this question, candidates must refer to the source and extract the correct statement from it to score marks.

Many candidates found part **(b)** challenging. The question directed candidates to use source B to make valid inferences of Indian concerns about the building of the railways. Some candidates could do this but many did not address the question effectively. Some responses described what they saw in source B without any inference and were limited to 1 mark. Other responses made valid inferences that were unsupported by Source B and therefore limited to a mark in the Level 2 range. Some candidates made an invalid inference connected to source B, other responses overlooked the source completely, instead referring to general facts on the building of the railways. In both situations marks could not be awarded as the question had not been addressed. Candidates should be encouraged to use previous mark schemes to ensure they understand the demands of this type of question.

Answers to part **(c)** were good but could benefit from more supporting detail to enhance the explanation, such as the type of goods transported. There was some misunderstanding of the extent of the railway system with some candidates implying that railways took/brought goods to or from Britain itself.

In **part (d)** candidates were asked to explain why the War of Independence of 1857 failed. Many candidates knew a range of reasons for the War's failure and were able to reach Level 4 or 5. Some responses described the reasons or background to the War in detail which was not required. Another common flaw was the blurring of leadership and unity as issues for the Indians. Often responses were restricted to Level 3 as only one line of reasoning was developed or the explanations needed more specific evidence.

Section B

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

Question 2

This was the most popular question with some high scoring responses.

In part (a) zamindars were generally well known and many candidates gained 3 or maximum marks of 4. However, some candidates muddled landlords with peasants and Hindus with Muslims.

In part (b) many candidates were able to refer to the work of Clive and link this information to why he was appointed Governor of Bengal. Some answers were more descriptive, recalling the battles of Plassey and Buxar in detail and therefore limited within Level 3. To achieve the higher levels candidates should explain why Clive's actions led to his appointment. A few responses confused this question with the Partition of Bengal, gaining zero marks.

Part (c) required candidates to explain the reasons why the infighting between Aurangzeb's successors and other factors led to the decline of the Mughal Empire. This was a well-known topic, with plenty of description of the deficiencies of the Emperors and the problems of the Empire, but not always tied in to the decline of the Empire. Therefore many responses were capped in Level 2. Candidates who were able to explain why their chosen factors led to the decline of the Empire were able to reach Levels 4 or 5.

Question 3

This was also a very popular question and answered well by most candidates who chose it.

In part (a), most responses were able to score 3 or 4 marks on the origin of the name Pakistan as the subject was well known.

In part (b) many candidates had a good understanding of why the Second Round Table Conference was unsuccessful achieving marks in Level 3. However some responses contained excess background detail describing the events of the first Round Table Conference with limited explanation of why the second was unsuccessful. Such answers were restricted to Level 2.

Part (c) required candidates to explain why the withdrawal of Gandhi's support and other factors were the cause of the decline of the Khilafat Movement. This topic was well known with many candidates reaching at least Level 4 because they were able to link their facts to the Movement's decline and give well explained and argued responses to the question. Some candidates presented plenty of detail of the events surrounding the withdrawal of Gandhi's support but they could not always link these to a clear explanation of why the movement declined and were limited to Level 3. Other responses focused on the factors leading to the development of the Khilafat Movement and were therefore unable to gain any credit.

Question 4

Although answers on this question were not as prevalent as **Questions 2 and 3**, the topics contained in this question seemed more popular with candidates than in previous examinations.

Basic Democracies in part (a) was generally well answered with candidates displaying sound knowledge of the topic.

Part (b) required responses on why Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's rule ended in 1977. Answers were usually constructed and answered well. Most candidates could make two valid explanations, though many concluded with comments on the killing of opponents and his execution, which was beyond the date given in the question.

Responses to part (c) were knowledgeable but largely descriptive of the 'contribution' aspect of the question on the work of Nazimuddin, Ghulam Muhammad and Mirza and restricted to the Level 2 mark range as candidates knew what these leaders had done, but found it challenging to evaluate which individual had contributed the most to Pakistan's domestic policies. The most successful responses assessed the value of two of Mirza's contributions to domestic policy; the One Unit Policy and the new Constitution.

Question 5

As with **Question 4**, the topics contained in this question were more popular than previously. It was encouraging to see an increased number and quality of responses by candidates to this topic.

Responses to part (a) on SEATO were generally good, most candidates achieving 3 or 4 marks.

Responses to part **(b)** demonstrated that many candidates found this a challenging question. Candidates knew about the withdrawal of aid or sanctions but struggled to explain the impact of this on Pakistan or other difficulties of becoming a nuclear power. Most responses were within the Level 2 mark range.

In part **(c)** most candidates had a good factual knowledge of the relationship between Afghanistan and Pakistan and there were some explanations that achieved Level 4 or 5. Answers naturally focused on the relationship as it affected Pakistan and the success or challenges brought by the relationship. Responses demonstrated good reference to the border dispute but further specific examples for successful aspects of the relationship were sometimes needed to reach Level 4. Some responses described the nature of the relationship well but found it demanding to explain the effect it had on relations between the two countries beyond stating that they had improved or worsened. Such answers were limited to either Level 2 or the bottom of Level 3 of the mark range.

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/02
Environment of Pakistan

Key messages

In order for candidates to perform well on this paper they should:

Follow the examination rubric correctly, answering 3 of the 5 questions only.

Read the question carefully – it is important to spend time doing this. If it helps underline command words and words which indicate the context of the question.

Know the meaning of, and respond correctly to, command words used in questions. In particular know the difference between ‘describe’ and ‘explain’.

Identify the correct focus specified in the question stem – e.g. benefits or problems, imports or exports.

Learn the meanings of key words in order to be able to define and accurately use terminology e.g. ‘balance of trade’, ‘natural environment’. When defining words or phrases candidates should not simply repeat a word or words as part of their definition.

Use the mark allocations and answer space provided in the combined question and answer booklet as a guide to the length of answer required and the number of points to be made. Some candidates write over long answers to questions worth few marks at the expense of including detail in those requiring extended writing.

Write as clearly and precisely as possible avoiding vague, general statements and language such as ‘easy/easier, infrastructure, pollution, standard of living, quality of life’ all of which need further clarification to be awarded a mark.

Answer all parts of the chosen questions. Sometimes questions that required the completion of a graph using data were omitted by candidates.

Perform basic skills such as interpreting graphs (by describing a pattern or trend), photographs and maps of various types, using accurate statistics or referring to specific features as appropriate to support ideas.

Approach questions which ask for comparison by writing comparative statements rather than writing discrete comments about each item being compared.

Write developed ideas wherever possible where extended writing is required in the 4 and 6 mark answers.

Avoid direct lifts from resource materials when a question asks for interpretation of ideas especially in the **(d)** questions where material is often copied.

Make sure that in part **(d)** questions that their ideas are developed with the correct focus giving different points of view, state which view they agree with more and make an evaluative comment.

Include place specific information or examples in part **(d)** questions, whilst avoiding writing a long introduction to the question with place detail or repetition of the stem of the question at the expense of answering the actual question.

Have a range of case studies or examples to use in part **(d)** answers so that appropriate ideas can be chosen for the topics tested and ensure that they are aware of the scale of the question – e.g. rural or urban area, local or national.

When using the extra space on the additional pages at the back of the combined question and answer booklet make it clear that the answer is continued, and indicate the number of the question accurately.

Avoid using the extra pages at the back of the question paper for one or two words which could have easily been written in the space provided for the response.

Only use an additional answer booklet if all of the space on the additional pages in the combined question and answer booklet has already been used. (If this is the case it is fair to suggest that candidates are writing too much).

General comments

The examination differentiated effectively between candidates of all ability levels. The most able and well prepared candidates performed very well across the paper and some excellent answers were seen. Most candidates were able to make a genuine attempt at their chosen questions; however weaker candidates found it difficult to interpret tasks and write effective responses to some or all questions.

Question 1 was the most popular and **Question 3** was the least popular choice.

Some candidates disregarded the rubric by answering four or more questions. However it was rare to encounter papers where all five questions had been attempted. Usually if all questions had been answered they were all very weak. However some stronger candidates crossed out several lengthy answers, wasting time which could have been spent working on their chosen answers.

Many observed the conventions of writing for examination purposes and responses overall were well written and in good legible handwriting, this should be sustained. However some candidates are choosing to shorten some words by using abbreviations e.g. 'Pak, b/w, bcz, bus and mvt' which hinders understanding and this should be discouraged completely. When coupled with illegible handwriting this interferes with the clear communication of responses as answers which cannot be read cannot earn marks.

Overall, candidates engaged with the questions and most clearly understood the material needed for focused answers. Most candidates have an excellent level of English and subject knowledge and were able to express most of their opinions and ideas clearly, which was shown through their lengthy and thorough responses. However, very little evidence of planning a response for the **(d)** questions was seen. Some candidates may benefit by spending a little time producing a brief plan of what they want to include which will help them to better structure their response. (The additional pages at the end of the combined question and answer booklet could be used for this.)

There were many good attempts at all the part **(d)** questions, the final part of each question. Level 3 answers in these questions were characterised by a range of developed ideas from different points of view, sometimes with examples and/or very good evaluations clearly siding with one viewpoint. Weaker responses tended to be generic developments of ideas with little or no evaluation or examples to support them whilst other answers were characterised by the use of simple statements. In some cases the detail provided was largely irrelevant to the question being asked, including long and unnecessary introductions, some of which occupied almost all the answer space or a copy of or re-wording of the original question stem or speech bubbles.

The **(d)** part questions require both sides of the argument or different points of view to allow access to the highest level. The focus of the requirement can vary between questions e.g. the scale can be a local area (**Question 2**) or on a national scale for the country as a whole as in (**Questions 1, 3, 4 and 5**) despite this some candidates referred to benefits for the country instead of local people in **Question 2** and vice versa for the other questions. Some candidates limited their mark by making inappropriate choices, for example choosing a viewpoint that they stated they did not support and then giving a response that showed clear support for that viewpoint and did not provide arguments against it giving a one sided view. In all part **(d)** questions candidate answers should refer to examples that may be local to them or that they have studied which may highlight a view or idea that they are trying to make. Evaluations are evident in the best responses which give a clear justification either for or against a viewpoint or idea and consolidate their ideas fully.

The following comments on individual questions will focus upon candidates' strengths and weaknesses and are intended to help them better prepare for future examinations.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) (i)** This was generally well answered with virtually all candidates knowing what each term 'subsistence farming' and 'cash crop farming' meant. There were only a few vague responses such as **A** – 'for the farmers' or for **B** that repeated the word from the question e.g. 'for cash'.

- (ii) The vast majority gained two marks here for correctly identifying a subsistence crop and a cash crop. However, some candidates incorrectly identified a cash crop for a subsistence crop e.g. oilseeds, cotton or sugar cane. Others wrote more than one crop on the line in which case their first response was taken. Candidates should be discouraged from doing this.
- (iii) On the whole some good responses were seen to this question, candidates were able to give many advantages of using High Yielding Varieties of crops and they could identify some disadvantages too. However, fewer disadvantages were identified as compared to advantages. Some vague, irrelevant or sweeping responses were also seen which did not gain any credit e.g. 'high yields', 'increases GDP', 'do not get eaten by pests'.
- (b)(i) **A** This question was mostly answered correctly. However, despite a tolerance of 26–28% being allowed too many responses gave 25% as the answer. Candidates are advised to be as accurate as they can when reading data from a graph and the use of a ruler would help in achieving this level of accuracy rather than simply guessing by eye.
- B** The majority correctly identified 'Sindh' but there were a large proportion that incorrectly identified 'Balochistan'.
- (ii) This question seemed to cause some confusion amongst candidates. Too many answers did not write quite enough to show the difference e.g. 'Balochistan is higher', or 'as one increases the other decreases'. Candidates should consider whether their answer is clear enough i.e. higher than what and when? Or which place do they mean? Many candidates wrote far too much for one mark and as a consequence spent too long on this question.
- (iii) This question was well answered. Most scored at least two marks with many gaining three or four marks for developing their ideas too. All mark scheme ideas were seen with some appropriate development. Only a small proportion of candidates did not manage to develop their ideas and gave a list of four separate points which limited them to two marks. A small number gave responses about reduced birth rates which did not answer the question.
- (c)(i) Again this question was well answered with the vast majority of candidates gaining the full two marks. The most common responses were 'nomadic' and 'livestock' although all mark scheme ideas were seen. A few candidates wrongly identified farming type as 'subsistence' or simply gave a list of animals which meant they either scored zero or one mark for a correctly identified animal.
- (ii) This question was not as well answered. Most responses showed that candidates knew that buffalo need a lot of water and correctly identified this need. Fewer knew that they are kept in sheds or on farms or are 'settled livestock'. Candidates should be encouraged to avoid giving negative responses or the opposite to a previous response e.g. 'cannot walk long distances like sheep or goats', 'are not sure footed' or they 'are not nomadic'.
- (d) This question differentiated well. The full range of marks was awarded. The best responses gave a developed point of view as to why livestock or crop production would be the best way of increasing food supply in Pakistan. This may have included ideas for improving crop production such as 'developing more irrigation canals, using HYV's and increased access to fertilisers and or pesticides'. The next developed idea would have been against the other viewpoint e.g. 'livestock would prove more problematic for increasing food supply as overgrazing occurs causing soil erosion' etc. The answer would then state which view the candidate agreed with most and evaluate why that is the best method/idea. To gain full marks an example also had to be included e.g. Punjab and Sindh for increasing cultivable area.

However, many responses referred to increasing the cultivable area but did not offer any ideas as to how this may be done. Too many responses focused on increasing food production so that Pakistan could increase their exports and improve the GDP/GNP or balance of payments and reduce foreign debt all of which was irrelevant because the focus of the question was on increasing food supply in Pakistan not food for export.

Many candidates limited their marks to level 1 as they provided a series of simple statements whilst some gained level 2–3 marks for developing one idea.

Question 2

- (a) (i) The majority of responses completed the pie chart accurately and drew the lines in the correct places and completed the shading according to the specified key. Candidates are well advised to use a ruler for the completion of graphs so as to aid with their accuracy and presentation as in some cases it was not clear whether the lines drawn were within tolerance or not. It is also good practice to draw the largest percentage first in a pie chart.
- (ii) This question was generally well answered with the vast majority able to work out the increase in metalled roads. A tolerance of 14–20% was allowed and it was pleasing to see candidates also writing the % sign in their answer. In most cases responses gave the correct answer of 17%.
- (iii) This question did not see a large success rate mostly due to the use of vague terminology such as 'easier or easy to travel'. The most frequent responses seen that gained marks were 'provides a faster or more direct route', 'promotes industrial growth', 'relieves pressure on existing roads' and 'helps to develop tourism'. In their responses many candidates felt that it would be 'safer' or 'cheaper' to travel that way which is not the case or that trade and transport would be 'better' or 'improved' which again, is too vague.
- (iv) This question differentiated well. The majority of responses scored at least one or two marks for the simple points as candidates tended to have a good idea of the difficulties faced in constructing roads in desert areas. The best responses were able to develop their ideas and score three or four marks. Candidates should ensure that they give their general point and then develop it e.g. 'it is difficult because the terrain is rugged' (1 mark), 'so this will increase the construction cost' (1 mark for development). Or 'desert areas have extremely high temperatures' (1 mark), 'so workers may find it difficult to work in the heat due to heat exhaustion' (1 mark for development). Candidates should practice developing their ideas rather than listing four or five separate points which will immediately limit their score to a maximum of two marks.
- (b) (i) This question was well answered with very few responses scoring no marks. Most knew the general methodology or sequence involved in making bricks. The vast majority scored marks for 'mixing clay and water', 'shaping in rectangular moulds', 'leaving out to dry in the sunlight' and if needed 'baking in kilns'. Some included cement or sand which was not relevant or started the process too early by stating that they 'dig for clay'. Some wrote about child labour or manual labour or transporting the bricks to where they are needed which was not a valid response. Candidates are reminded that they should read each question carefully and ensure they know what they have to do so as not to waste time writing irrelevant information.
- (ii) Most candidates could recognise that the wheat is being 'harvested or cut' and gained a mark for that. Some then went on to score their second mark for ideas such as 'collecting/bundles' or 'carrying/picking up'. Very few recognised that this was 'labour intensive' or 'manual work'. Many answers mentioned threshing the wheat which is not evident in the photograph, or what the wheat might be used for, or transporting it which was irrelevant to the question being asked.
- (c) (i) Many candidates scored at least one mark here and some scored two. Most commonly marks were awarded for 'higher salaries', 'better working conditions' or 'wider variety of jobs available' but all mark scheme ideas were seen. A number of responses focused on why it was less attractive to work in rural areas and gave negative responses which should be avoided. Instead answers should have focused on the positives of working in urban areas. Also many vague ideas were seen such as 'the standard of jobs are better/is good' or 'more facilities are provided'. These ideas need further clarification for credit e.g. why are the standard of jobs better? Or what facilities are provided?
- (ii) This question was well answered with most responses gaining at least two out of the possible three marks. Virtually all candidates understood what a pull factor was but a small minority talked about push factors instead which did not gain any credit. Candidates should practice qualifying their response rather than providing a list e.g. 'education, healthcare, housing' are all vague and need qualification e.g. 'there are more schools available', 'greater access to healthcare'. It is worth pointing out that although 'better' was allowed as qualification for some responses e.g. 'better housing/healthcare/education' it would be best to state why it is better, e.g. 'brick built housing' or 'wider range of medicines or healthcare centres are available', 'access to higher education such as colleges and universities' etc. Again all mark scheme ideas were seen.

- (d) This question differentiated well. Most responses were able to achieve level 2 for developing at least one idea. The most common developed ideas included for negative: 'air pollution from the steel mill negatively affecting the health of local people e.g. increase in asthma cases', and for positive: 'job opportunities would be increased due to employment being created in the steel mill where engineers/drivers/furnace operators/accountants etc., are required'. There were also a wide variety of other ideas given with varying levels of development. Few responses reached Level 3 because the majority failed to give developed answers to both benefits and problems. The bulk of responses failed to identify a specific example and very few actually made an evaluation.

Many answers drifted into discussing benefits to the national economy e.g. 'raising of GDP, increase in exports' etc. but these descriptions did not pick up marks as they were not specifically aimed at 'affecting the local people', as asked for in the question. A number of candidates referred to the information in the text box provided in the question without any further development, so gained no marks.

Question 3

- (a) (i) This question was generally well answered with most identifying 'China' or 'UAE', a small minority incorrectly identified USA.
- (ii) This question was less well answered; relatively few responses showed a real understanding of what was required. The question was often misinterpreted by putting a country name in the 'choice' heading rather than 'imports' or 'exports'. This then limited the credit available for information relevant to that country for either imports or exports (the best material being credited). Candidates were reluctant to give country specific information but rather tried to provide generic answers that encompassed all the countries listed. The most commonly seen responses that gained credit were for 'imports of manufactured goods from China', 'oil from Kuwait/Saudi Arabia' or for exports 'sports goods to USA/Germany or UK'.
- (b) (i) This was well answered with most gaining at least one mark. However, too many responses gave too large an area e.g. Balochistan or Sindh rather than being more specific to the region e.g. 'north or north west Balochistan' or 'lower or southern Sindh'.
- (ii) Many responses did not complete the bar as required for part **A**. For those that did complete the bar it was usually drawn to the correct height but it was a very curvy bar so again the use of a ruler should be encouraged for skills such as these. For part **B** the vast majority gained the mark for identifying '2005' but a small minority incorrectly identified '2004'. For part **C** the majority responded correctly identifying 'decreased' but again a minority incorrectly identified 'increased' as the answer.
- (iii) Mixed responses were seen as to why the amount of coal being extracted in Pakistan had changed since its peak. Responses that incorrectly identified an increase in the previous question could not score highly on this question, although some did manage to gain marks as they apparently had disregarded their previous response. All mark scheme ideas were seen and again candidates should develop their ideas rather than listing a range of simple points. For example: 'Pakistani coal is poor quality' (1 mark), 'so it has to be imported' (1 mark for development). Or; 'coalfields are running out' (1 mark), 'so it is expensive to continue to extract the coal' (1 mark for development).
- (c) (i) The majority of candidates did not know the accurate definition for 'balance of trade' and as a result simply stated 'number of exports minus imports'. Candidates should learn the accurate definition of key terminology such as this e.g. 'the value of goods imported minus the value of goods exported'.
- (ii) Many responses repeated their answer from (c)(i), as their first idea and then gave some examples. Marks were awarded for ideas such as 'poor quality exports', 'have to import high value manufactured goods or examples', 'trade embargoes from other countries', with child labour often being cited as the reason for this.
- (iii) This was answered well by many candidates who gained marks for ideas such as 'development projects (or examples) cancelled', 'rise in taxes', 'currency depreciates'. Some responses gave vague responses such as 'debt', 'economy is lowered', 'more loans' which did not gain any credit.
- (d) As there were no defined points of view in the question wording candidates were required to give different points of view ascertained from the focus of the question. The implied views were that employment opportunities were greatly improved or only improved to a small extent or not

improved at all. The twin foci of the question were specifically the global telecommunications industry and employment opportunities. Those candidates who focused on these themes did very well reaching level 3. Stronger responses tended to support the 'greatly improved' view with information about Pakistani companies, recruitment ideas or types of media with a great level of detail and place-specific information demonstrating good use of their own knowledge. There were some 'one-sided' responses without corresponding developed points about 'little' or 'no improvement', which could only reach a mark within level 2.

Weaker responses, which were the majority, were unfocused and considered the use of the internet in secondary industry generally or even for personal use, and/or referred to its advantages in the success or the functioning of industry or trade. Opposing points of view were generally based on the fact that lack of education or illiteracy prevented access to employment in the global telecommunications industry. Level 1 responses tended to focus on the disadvantages of the internet or labour replacement in industry generally, or even agriculture making simple points with no development.

Question 4

- (a) (i) This question was not well answered with many responses getting at least one label incorrect. In many cases candidates attempted to complete all the labels when they only had to complete three and still got all of them wrong. This suggests that few candidates are familiar with the Karez system of irrigation.
- (ii) Most could name a barrage but quite often either named the wrong river that it was located on or missed out the river name altogether. The most common response was 'Sukkur' on the 'river Indus'.
- (iii) Most answers scored at least one mark for stating why barrages are needed. Some incorrectly stated for 'storing water' but then quite often went on to give further reasons which did score the marks, most commonly responding; 'for irrigation', 'for flood control' or 'to provide water to canals'. The last two points of the mark scheme were rarely seen.
- (b) (i) Mixed responses were seen to this question with many candidates gaining just one mark. Mostly because their first answer would be about air pollution but then the second idea would refer to a different type of pollution e.g. 'water pollution'. The most common responses gaining credit were; 'gases from factories', 'fumes from vehicles' and 'burning fossil fuels'. Many responses referred to deforestation but did not state 'by burning'.
- (ii) As for all the four mark 'explain' questions this provided good differentiation. Many responses gained full marks for explaining how chemical fertilisers damage the natural environment. However, it is clear that some candidates do not understand the term 'natural environment' as their answers referred to impacts on people. Some only scored one mark which was mostly for recognising that 'chemicals from farmland washes/runs-off into rivers' or 'causes water pollution in rivers or lakes'. Many responses went into great detail about 'eutrophication' but could only gain a maximum of two marks on this idea. All mark scheme ideas were seen.
- (c) (i) This question was generally well answered by the vast majority who were able to correctly identify that the 'domestic' sector used the least amount of water in part **A** and for part **B** that 94% was used by 'livestock/irrigation'.
- (ii) This question was also well answered with most providing a relevant type of industry that uses large amounts of water. The most common response was 'steel'.
- (iii) Most candidate responses were able to give at least two correct ideas as to why irrigation water is lost before it reaches crops. The most common answers were 'seepage from beds of canals', 'evaporation' and 'theft of water'.
- (d) Some very good responses were seen that scored into level 3 but these were not typical and many did not go beyond simple level 1 statements. Most responses began by stating which view they agreed with more which was a positive start. The best answers then went onto explain why either building dams and other infrastructure projects is the best way of preventing water shortages or that educating the people about water saving techniques was best, followed by a counter argument against the other view backed up with examples or place specific detail. For example: 'I support

View B more because dams are expensive and disruptive as thousands of people were evacuated for the Mangla project whereas NGOs send teams into schools educating the children about water conservation and encouraging people to save water through the celebration of Water Day'. Alternatively examples of ways of saving water could be developed. Many responses gave a series of simple statements e.g. 'people can line canals', 'dams are expensive' or 'dams can store more water' etc. which were limited to level 1. Some candidates were able to gain level 2 for developing at least one idea.

Question 5

- (a) (i) Responses suggested that candidates found this question challenging. Rather than naming a location which the question asked for in their responses many candidates named a refinery with the most common incorrect answer being 'Attock'. Some candidates answered accurately and gained both available marks. All mark scheme ideas were seen.
- (ii) The majority of responses completed the bar graph accurately and applied the key specified thereby gaining the mark. Some answers were not particularly accurate and drew the bars too big or too small. Again, the use of a ruler for accuracy would help candidates with questions such as this.
- (iii) Some candidates wrote far too much for this answer and got into all sorts of difficulties in trying to work out the changes in figures when 'the amount of oil imported increased' and 'the amount of oil produced decreased' would have sufficed. Common errors included; misreading the number of barrels and confusing the imported figures with the produced figures for the different years.
- (iv) This question was well answered with most being able to identify reasons for the large amounts of oil being imported such as 'there are only small reserves in Pakistan', 'lack of funding for oil exploration', 'large amounts needed for use in vehicles' etc. All mark scheme ideas were seen and most responses scored at least one mark here.
- (b) (i) Part **A** was generally well answered with most responses describing the relationship between electricity production and population as 'a positive correlation'. However, candidates were less successful at identifying the changes in population and electricity production since 2008 in part **B** as many stated that electricity had decreased but the graph shows a slight increase. Responses should have identified that 'population increases and electricity remained the same or very slightly increased'.
- (ii) As with all the four mark questions it differentiated well. Candidates were asked to explain why electricity production does not meet the demand for electricity in many parts of Pakistan. Many candidates were able to develop their ideas and gained full marks. However, weaker responses made simple statements which were not developed, so consequently gained only one or two marks. Most mark scheme ideas were seen but the most common responses referred to; 'population is increasing' (1 mark) 'so there is greater use of electricity in homes' (1 mark for development), 'power theft' (1 mark) 'as people divert electricity for their own use and don't pay for it' (1 mark for development).
- (c) (i) Considering that this word fill exercise type question was new to this paper it achieved a good response with the vast majority scoring at least two marks. The third mark was often missed due to answers stating 'heat' instead of 'light' and 'east' instead of 'south'.
- (ii) Most candidates were able to provide at least one or two disadvantages of generating electricity by wave and tidal power. The most common responses seen were 'it's expensive to set up', 'only generates a small amount of electricity' and 'shortage of expertise to set up', but all mark scheme ideas were seen. Some answers confused wave power with wind power discussing wind turbines instead, providing an example of where candidates need to read the question more carefully before they start writing.
- (d) Some well-developed responses were seen for this question with some named examples included. However, this was not the norm as many candidates, (as with the previous **(d)** questions), did not develop their answers fully. It was clear from the answers seen that most candidates knew a lot of facts on the methods of energy production. However, especially for smaller projects, a series of simple statements were often given e.g. one advantage for each method of production of renewable energy without sufficient development for level 2. The majority of responses made

simple comments about energy, both large scale and small scale. These were usually about cost, expertise, renewable/non-renewable, pollution and output. Very few answers concentrated on biogas and those that did had limited knowledge of the topic.

Developed points for large scale energy production were usually about nuclear power and the amount of electricity that can be generated from a small amount of uranium or HEPs being multipurpose. Developed points for small scale energy production usually referred to solar power and wind rather than tidal power and some responses provided detailed points about suitable locations for these in Pakistan. Some thoughtful answers elaborated on how smaller scale projects can be used by individual families or villages in remote areas for power generation. Named examples were usually names of dams or the Makran Coast. It was encouraging to see that regardless of ability, the majority of candidates were able to decide if they agreed with View A or B and many gave a limited evaluation too.