

# PAKISTAN STUDIES

---

Paper 2059/01  
History and Culture of Pakistan

## Key Messages

Successful answers:

- Pay careful attention to the question
- Base answers on the source provided
- Explain answers fully rather than just list factors

## General Comments

Most candidates were able to answer the required three questions with very few rubric errors. The majority of candidates used their time well and there were few examples of them rushing the completion of their final answer. Most candidates produced answers that were relevant, focused, and addressed the questions as set although the new styled **Question 1** caused problems for many 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, although there was a minority of candidates failed to score any marks since they ignored the source and wrote generally about the problems between Muslims and Hindus. In this question, candidates **must** refer to the source.

Good answers to this new **Question 1 (b)** used features from the source to make inferences about it. Less successful answers ignored the source completely and wrote generally about events in the 1940s, scoring no marks. Responses that described what they saw in the source without making any inferences gained a few marks. For success in answering this question, candidates **must** refer to the source. ***Close attention to this year's mark scheme should be paid by teachers in Centres to ensure they understand the demands of this question.***

Good answers to part (c) on the opposition to the Cripps Mission used sound knowledge to score near maximum marks. Weaker answers spent too much time describing the Cripps Mission rather than the reasons why Congress and the Muslim League opposed it.

Question (d) required candidates to explain the reasons why the subcontinent was partitioned in 1947. Many candidates attempted to address the question as set and did pay heed to the new Labour government gaining power in 1945. Weaker answers described the events of the 1940s with little attempt to relate these to the partition in 1947. As a result, such answers only scored in Level 2, gaining 3 or 4 marks. Equally any other factors given such as events in the 1920s or 1930s were not often related and as such tended to have little bearing on the reasons for partition in 1947.

### Question 2

This was a very popular question. Most candidates were able to score 3 or 4 marks in part (a) on Robert Clive.

In part **(b)**, the question focused on the reasons why Shah Waliullah had such a major influence on the revival of Islam in the sub-continent. There were many accurate and relevant answers, scoring up to maximum marks.

Part **(c)** on the reasons for the decline of the Mughal Empire produced mixed responses. This was a very well known topic that demanded an **explanation** of the reasons; answers which just gave descriptive accounts were unable to progress beyond Level 2. Level 4 was reached by explaining how the invasions by the Persians and Afghans **and other factors** resulted in the decline of the Empire.

### Question 3

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

In part **(b)**, the question focused on the reasons why Indians opposed the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms in 1919. Many answers were accurate and relevant, often scoring maximum marks. Less successful answers, as with **Question 1 (c)** on the Cripps Mission, spent too long describing the reforms themselves and so found little time to address the opposition to them.

Part **(c)** on the relative success of the partition of Bengal in 1905 was a popular topic and generally well known. Some less effective answers, instead of focusing on the success/failure of Partition, answered a similar but very different question on why partition was introduced and then reversed in 1911. As a result, it was very difficult for these candidates to access the higher levels and proved once again that it is essential for candidates to read the question carefully.

### Question 4

This was answered by very few candidates. They scored poorly on part **(a)** on Operation Searchlight, since few if any candidates knew anything about it.

In part **(b)** the question required candidates to explain why Pakistan supported the Palestinian cause between 1947 and 1999. Most answers showed only limited knowledge, gaining a mark in Level 3. Some candidates wrote generally about the Palestine cause, often mistaking this for another country. For these candidates, few marks were scored.

In their responses to part **(c)** on constitutional matters, candidates' answers were largely narrative in format and few were able to explain the degree of success or otherwise in establishing a new constitution. As a result most candidates were only able to score a mark within Level 2 at best. Many candidates knew little about the facts relating to the search for a new constitution.

### Question 5

This was also not as popular a question compared with **Questions 1, 2 and 3**, with smaller numbers of candidates attempting it. The short answer question on the Karakoram Highway in part **(a)** was generally well answered with 2 or 3 marks being achieved by most candidates.

In part **(b)** most candidates were successful in their attempts to answer the question on why Benazir Bhutto was dismissed from office in 1996 and knowledge of this topic was generally good. As a result, marks were mostly within Level 3 although there were some candidates who wrote about Bhutto's dismissal in 1990. Again, close reading of the question set is important.

In part **(c)** there were a few good answers to the question asking for the relative success of Pakistan and India in finding a solution to the Kashmir issue between 1947 and 1999. Less successful answers merely described in chronological order all they knew about the Kashmir issue rather than attempting to **explain the successes and failures** of attempts to solve it. These were awarded Level 2 for a straightforward narrative of Kashmir. Good answers attempted to address both the positive and negative aspects of such attempts to solve the issue, in order to achieve a Level 4 mark.

# PAKISTAN STUDIES

---

**Paper 2059/02**  
**Environment of Pakistan**

## Key Messages

- Candidates are required to answer three questions only. Candidates should attempt all parts of each of the three questions.
- Candidates need to read questions carefully and to answer in full sentences, rather than in bullet points, which often fail to give a full, developed response.
- Candidates should study charts, diagrams, graphs and tables in their entirety, paying attention to the titles, keys, the units used and the labelling of the axes as well as the graphics.
- Candidates should read through answers to ensure critical words and terms have not been omitted or used incorrectly and that any numeric values given have been written as intended.
- Candidates are approaching Part **D** questions in a more thorough way, developing and exemplifying points more. A few candidates are meeting the full requirement of the questions, which is to evaluate two points of view/two sides of an argument and reach a decision in clear favour of one of the points or state clearly to what extent something is or is not possible.

## General Comments

- Good responses were seen to all questions, with the responses that used the most precise, geographically informed language gaining the highest marks.
- The majority of candidates showed evidence of good knowledge and a high level of geographical understanding. More careful reading of the questions will lead the candidates to produce more directed responses and more accurately qualify the terms they are using, for example writing 'low rainfall' or '**increased** surface run-off'.
- Most scripts showed no evidence of hurried final answers and many candidates completed every section of each question they chose. A few candidates ignored the rubric and attempted more than three questions, which disadvantaged them. A few candidates routinely ignored questions that tested map skills, a core skill in geography.
- Many candidates, when answering questions that require the correct units, such as 'hectares', to be included, did so and gained the mark(s) for this.
- The majority of candidates observed the conventions of writing for examination purposes and responses overall were well written and in good, legible handwriting, however the use of short hand, for example 'pop' for population and 'Pak' for Pakistan needs to be discouraged.
- Candidates continuing their answers elsewhere in the answer booklet or on additional pages, need to indicate clearly that there is a continuation, where that continuation is, and use the correct question part number with their continuation.

## Comments on Specific Questions

### Question 1

A majority of candidates chose this question.

- (a) (i) Most candidates gained one mark here. A number of candidates incorrectly thought that 'water supplies' (water used by/supplied to households and industry for drinking and manufacturing etc. and by agriculture for irrigation) could be affected by pollution in the sea. A number were unspecific about how the domestic/industrial waste got into the water supplies. More careful reading of the question was needed here to gain the two marks.
- (ii) Where responses were credited it was for the idea of treating industrial waste before disposal. Few candidates gained two marks, the better candidates who did, referred to organic farming and fines for industrial polluters.
- (b) (i) A question to test map/physical geography skills. This question part was frequently omitted, suggesting that candidates need to gain more confidence in using their map skills. The candidates that read the question carefully were particularly able to locate the Diamir Bhasha dam. The location of the Warsak dam was frequently absent. A good number of the responses given were for locations outside of Pakistan.
- (ii) There was evidence of some very sound understanding here of both the locational factors (for example, a large amount of water from the melting glaciers can be stored), the economic benefits of the dam to the area (for example, possibility of tourism and fresh water fishing) as well as the function/impact of dams (for example providing HEP, electrification of the local area and controlling flooding). Most answers were directed to the question, and developed where it was appropriate to do so (for example, employment opportunities *for local people*). Most candidates gained at least two marks here.
- (iii) Responses overall were limited to the idea of unequal division of water/loss of water downstream, and most candidates gained one mark here. A very few candidates wrote about the effects on the ecosystem (for example, the mangrove forests). Responses overall needed to be more directed to the question, many candidates moved beyond the requirements of the question to talk about electricity and industrialisation.
- (c) (i) Very well answered, responses covered a wide range of uses and most candidates gained the one mark here.
- (ii) Very well answered with candidates of all abilities gaining marks here. A thorough, confident understanding of the effects of deforestation was demonstrated throughout the candidature, with very few instances of listing/bullet points, instead comprehensive and coherent explanations were provided.
- (d) Candidates were well prepared, and were able to give a number of actions that can be taken to reduce deforestation. However, often these took the form of a list, without development and so limited the candidates' response to Level 1. More able candidates that did develop their points, concentrated on the first part of the question, with some giving examples of real project actions/successes that had been taken by the government, without moving on to evaluate to what extent it was possible to reduce deforestation in Pakistan. This limited them to Level 2. The few candidates that did move on to the second part of the question often restricted their responses to why it was not possible to reduce deforestation and thus also limited them to Level 2. In general, there was a lack of distinction between actions that can be done in a general sense, and to what extent they can be done, or have been done, in Pakistan.

### Question 2

It was generally observed that this question was chosen by most candidates.

- (a) (i) Candidates omitted this question more than any other. Most candidates, who answered this question, incorrectly gave A as household/domestic usage and B as Power/electricity usage or gave an answer such as 'agriculture'.

- (ii) The vast majority of candidates answered this correctly.
- (b) (i) Required here was a full figure with correct units: 17 400 GWh/Gigawatt hours. Most candidates omitted the '0's and/or the units. A few candidates correctly used the scale for both the number and the units.
- (ii) The key word and phrase in this question was 'over the ten years' and 'similar', so details between intermediate dates or differences were not required. Many candidates noted the overall increase and gained one mark. A few candidates noted that household had increased the most/agriculture had increased the least to gain two of the three marks available.
- (iii) A very well understood topic, with many candidates gaining at least two marks. More development of responses was needed though to maximise credit, (for example, candidates often needed to qualify 'loss' to gain a mark). More attention needed to be paid to the consequences of loadshedding (for example, candidates talked about 'no lights', so needed to say what the impact on industry and business was of having 'no lights' (for example, difficult working conditions). This involves candidates reading the question more carefully, and moving beyond a definition of loadshedding and what happens when the power stops, to thinking about the impact of this. Some candidates were able to answer the question more globally, talking about loss of the country's reputation.
- (c) (i) This was a question testing the candidates' knowledge of the physical geography of Pakistan. Some candidates gained one mark, with very few candidates gaining two marks. This was answered well by the more able candidates.
- (ii) This was correctly answered by the more able candidates, most of whom gained one mark, the question building on the knowledge demonstrated in **Question 2ci**. The candidates that answered this correctly gave 'high angle of the sun' and those that gained the two marks also talked about the place 'being far from the maritime influence of the sea/or experiencing continental effect.' Many candidates talked about the place being close to the equator, but this factor does not provide an adequate reason – there are many places close to the equator that are cold day and night (because they are mountainous and have the cooling effect of altitude) or very cold at night (because they are in an area of desert). Many candidates talked about the place being 'at low altitude' but without giving any reason as to why this might be a factor.
- (iii) Most candidates got one mark here for people dying because of the heat. Those that gained two marks gave an example of a heat related death. Many candidates needed to direct their answers more carefully to the question, as there was a tendency for candidates to talk about very dry climates or the effects on agriculture (lack of irrigation, people needing to adopt nomadic lifestyles).
- (d) Some very good answers from the more able with close reference to the question and the question material, and an application of this to the physical geography of this region in Pakistan. Feasibility questions of this type, with this kind of information are rooted in specific places with specific geographical features. Many candidates responded generally, with some candidates reiterating the question material without further development. More candidates needed to develop their answers here, particularly needing to develop more than one point. Candidates often restricted their answers to 'the need for alternative energy sources in general' or 'the need to produce food for the rapidly growing population'. When discussing alternative energy sources, candidates did demonstrate a good knowledge of a variety of sources, although not always directing this knowledge to the question or not developing their knowledge adequately.

### Question 3

It was generally observed that a majority of candidates chose this question.

- (a) (i) Many candidates answered this correctly, giving the correct number of '0's and the correct units (tons).
- (ii) Many candidates gave the correct units (hectares), and more careful reading of the graph, along with giving the correct number of '0's would have given an accurate calculation.
- (iii) Candidates correctly focused on variability from year to year, with most candidates gaining one mark for talking about 'variation in rainfall'. Those that gained two marks also talked about pest attacks and disease.

- (b) (i)** Some good answers here by many candidates, giving good descriptions of the map, using points of the compass as good descriptors (Northern and Central Balochistan and South Western KPK for example). Many candidates gained two marks here. Terms used such as 'Middle', 'Upper' or 'Lower' given are not suitable descriptors ('Upper' and 'Lower' used as descriptors in conjunction with rivers).
- (ii)** Most candidates gained at least one mark, (for dates not requiring much water) with many of these gaining two marks (also referring to hot climates). A very few candidates mentioned irrigation by Karez. The more able candidates seemed to be limited to gaining two marks as candidates focused only on the ability of dates to withstand hot and dry conditions rather than also considering their need for water.
- (iii)** Many candidates that gained marks here mentioned poor roads, and the long distance to market (often confining this to a local market). More able candidates talked about the lack of quality control of mangoes and how this affected exports. Some candidates also mentioned that fruit is perishable, but did not explain why this made it difficult for almond/dates/fruit to reach markets. Overall, points made needed to have more explanation directed towards and linked to the question. For example, many candidates said that almonds and dates were grown in remote regions, but did not link this fact with the regions being far from a market, or that the transport system was poor so the products could not reach a port for export, or that the storage facilities were poor so fruit would spoil before reaching a market. In the main, most candidates who were credited gained a maximum of two marks.
- (c) (i)** The majority of candidates answered this well, with the term 'subsistence farming' being understood and only occasionally confused with 'sustainable farming'. The majority of candidates backed up their understanding with good description for the full two marks.
- (ii)** The majority of candidates expanded on their understanding of 'subsistence farming' and gave good, thoughtful explanations with development to gain the three marks. Most referred to 'poverty' and how this affected a farmer's ability to afford modern inputs, and illiteracy. A few candidates repeated their answer to the previous question.
- (d)** This was a 'to what extent' evaluation question on how feasible it is in Pakistan to develop livestock farming. The first part of the question, explaining the importance of livestock farming to the agricultural sector, was focused on more, with fewer candidates moving on to think of the extent to which it was possible to develop it. The majority of those candidates discussed only whether it was or was not possible, with very few candidates giving developed points for both. A significant number of candidates referred to 'Australian farms', 'better diets', 'little access to vets' and 'lack of funds' – so a good range of points – but without any development of these. Some candidates explained feasibility in terms of what 'should be done' rather than what 'can be done' or 'have been done'.

#### Question 4

It was generally observed that far fewer candidates answered this question.

- (a) (i)** Few candidates gained the mark here, finding GDP a difficult term to define, but most understood it in terms of production within the country. Quite a few did not include the idea that it was a monetary value rather than an amount of production/output. Very few gave the idea of it being an annual figure, but this was not included in the textbook definition, and so the mark was therefore allowed without this qualifier.
- (ii)** Most candidates gained one mark for A, some gained a mark for C, while very few gained the mark for B. More candidates would have gained more marks with a closer examination of both the charts and the key in Figure 8.

- (b) (i)** Many candidates gained the mark here, mentioning 'garments' for example as the textile product. Some candidates incorrectly gave 'cotton', which is the raw product. A significant minority mentioned 'leather' which demonstrated either that there was a need to read the question more carefully, or that these candidates were unclear as to the definition of a textile product.
- (ii)** Many more candidates would have gained credit if they had given the (correct) units, US\$ million. Candidates needed to carefully study the information given and interpret the data, giving the correct numerical protocols, in this case US\$ 8290 million.
- (iii)** In this question a description of three of the differences was needed, which involved giving a complete comparison between imports and exports i.e. a statement that included a comparative reference to both imports and exports. Most of the creditable responses referred to 'animal products' and 'vehicles and transport'. The more able candidates covered the range of points that were creditable. Some candidates directly copied the numerical data from the question paper to their answers without giving the explanation/comparative element needed, and so could not be credited.
- (iv)** Most candidates gained one mark here for mentioning 'negative balance of payments'. This question gave an opportunity for the more able candidates, and those candidates who had studied the table carefully, to demonstrate their knowledge, and when they did so they talked about the problems for Pakistan with relying on a few low value-added, usually agricultural, export items, or the drawbacks of importing goods that Pakistan itself manufactures and importing high value-added goods. There is a need for candidates to understand that the problem is not that the country imports more than it exports, but that the **value** of what is imported is greater than the **value** of exports. Some candidates took the development too far and started to discuss the need for the Pakistan government to take loans because of the negative balance of payments, which was not credited. What this demonstrated was that there was perhaps a need for learners to gain more understanding of the complex relationship between imports/exports – importers/exporters - government borrowing and alternative government strategies in the face of negative balance of payments.
- (c) (i)** This question was generally answered well, with candidates being very aware of their trading partners. Some candidates gave 'Middle East', which was not specific enough. Japan and Sri Lanka were not considered as main trading partners for exports, and were not credited.
- (ii)** Most candidates gained the mark for the method of transport and most gave a creditable benefit of this method. Far fewer instances of 'easy' as a benefit were seen, which is an improvement, as unspecific qualifiers/reasons are not credited. Apart from oil being transported by ships and perishable goods being transported by air, there were very few references to the types of goods that could be transported and apart from bulky/lightweight items few references to the weight/volume of goods were given.
- (d)** This question generated more balanced answers than the other part **d** questions on the paper, with candidates providing factors which help and hinder trade in equal measure. Since it is an evaluative question, candidates are required to state the side of the argument they agree with most, and most did not do this, and so were limited to Level 2. Many candidates also only developed one side of the argument (usually those factors which hinder trade) and so were limited to lower Level 2. A wide range of points was made that showed a good knowledge and understanding of the topic, with weaker candidates also able to demonstrate understanding of, particularly, the problems.

### Question 5

It was generally observed that most candidates answered this question.

- (a) (i)** Very well answered, with the majority of candidates gaining a mark here.
- (ii)** Candidates tended to gain one or two marks here for the locational factors, such as 'cotton growing areas', 'labour available' and 'good transport system', where the question had been read carefully. A significant number of candidates did not focus on the 'cotton textile industry', but on 'cotton growing' instead. Very few candidates mentioned the specific Centres.

- (iii) Some very good answers here for the majority of candidates, covering a wide range of the points that were creditable. Answers were, in the main, well focused with points correctly qualified (e.g. **modern** machinery) and demonstrated a good understanding of what steps need to be taken to improve the cotton textile industry.
- (b) (i) A wide variety of good answers here by most of the candidates, demonstrating a good understanding of the characteristics of employment in the informal sector and most gained two marks. Some confusion with some candidates over the definition of 'informal' and they focused on 'formal' instead.
- (ii) A wide variety of good answers here by most of the candidates, demonstrating a good understanding of the kinds of jobs that are carried out in the informal sector. A significant number referred to an example of an industry rather than a job.
- (iii) Candidates in general referred closely to Photograph C and answered this well, with most gaining two marks from correctly identifying the road transport, fewer candidates mentioned that it was heavily (over) loaded. Candidates dealt with Photograph D less well. Some candidates identified points such as 'landslides' but did not explain why this was a problem and some candidates did not refer to the photograph at all. Those candidates that did explain the problems, and used a combination of the photograph and their own knowledge, as required by the question, gained at least four of the five marks available.
- (c) (i) A wide range of answers given, usually for Punjab, but a significant number named tourist attractions in Singh or KPK, demonstrating good knowledge of the subject. A few candidates gave the names of cities as provinces (for example 'Karachi') and a few gave tourist attractions in the wrong province, neither of which gained credit.
- (ii) More careful reading of the question would have seen more marks being awarded over the candidature. The question asked for two **problems** that Pakistan must overcome in order for it to be more developed, however a significant majority of candidates gave solutions to problems, without mentioning the problems, and therefore could not be credited.
- (d) The majority of candidates favoured the development of tourism providing numerous thorough, coherent and well-developed arguments to support this. The arguments for restricting tourism were rarely seen in detail, sometimes only consisting of using the question material. As in other parts the main argument was presented in detail, but the opposing argument was given only brief, undeveloped treatment, preventing higher credit. Weaker candidates were able to give a list of points for and against, gaining credit at Level 1.