

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/01

History and Culture of Pakistan

General Comments

There was a slight decrease in number of candidates entered for this examination compared with November 2007, although the entry was still the second highest for a November examination in this subject. The standard of work was somewhat similar to that of last year.

Most candidates were able to answer the required three questions with only a small number of rubric errors. The vast majority used their time well, although there were some examples where a few seemed to have run out of time with their final answer and reverted to writing notes. Some failed to attempt a third question. As in previous examinations, however, most answers were relevant, focused, and addressed the questions as set.

Scripts show that there is still one key problem. Many still produce largely descriptive answers which do not fully address the question set. Candidates need to realise that such answers will only attract a Level 2 mark and, as such, only achieve about half-marks at best. Examination questions on this paper require a focused approach to answers, never 'write all you know' (which is too low-order a skill for O level). No **(b)** or **(c)** question asks for description, ever. Students need to be shown how to apply what they know. **Centres need to seek ways to ensure their candidates are equipped with the necessary confidence to identify such questions and the necessary skills to answer them appropriately. This is something that only teaching can correct.**

Comments on Individual Questions

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

Question 1. This was a very popular and generally well answered question. Many candidates who answered the question appropriately scored highly especially in **part (c)**. In **part (a)**, the short answer questions were well answered with most able to gain 3 or 4 marks.

Part (b) did cause a few problems. The question focused on the reasons why the successors of Aurangzeb failed to prevent the decline of the Mughal Empire. On the surface, this should have been a straightforward question and there were many who recognised the demands of the question, answered it well and gained near or maximum marks. Others, however, failed to see what the question asked for. If candidates merely **identify** the reasons why (e.g. corrupt, weak successors, no law of succession, the rise of the Marathas, the rise of the British, etc.), then they could only ever achieve a Level 2 mark. The art of a good answer to such a question, whether set as a **part (b)** or **(c)**, is to **explain why** these reasons failed to prevent the decline of the Empire. The question did **NOT** ask candidates to identify the reasons. And it certainly didn't ask them to describe how ineffective or corrupt various successors were.

Part (c) focused on the causes of the War of Independence. This should have offered many candidates the opportunity of achieving a near maximum mark which, together with a relatively mainstream topic in **part (b)** of this question, should have resulted in a total mark of approaching 23 or 24. However, the same principles applied to **part (c)** as **part (b)**: to achieve Level 4, a candidate needed to **explain why the reasons offered were causes** of the War and **NOT** merely identify them or describe what each one was. For example, the description of the way English was introduced was insufficient to achieve high marks unless it was linked to **why** this might have caused offence. This was a common problem for many candidates.

Question 2. This was also very popular. Most were able to score 2 or 3 marks in **part (a)**.

In **part (b)**, candidates were required to explain why Congress opposed the Morley-Minto Reforms. Many responses were good and candidates clearly knew their facts. However, some candidates struggled to *explain the importance* of separate electorates and self-rule to opposition. As a result, many struggled to reach a good Level 3 mark.

Part (c), like **Question 1 (c)** saw many fail to explain their answers sufficiently. This question focused on the reasons why the Khilafat Movement failed. For those who had adequately prepared for the examination, this question caused few problems. Answers from these candidates were focused, accurate and relevant - and many scored high Level 4. However, as in **Question 1 (c)**, many merely described the Movement from beginning to end. Merely describing the Hijrat was **NOT** answering the question – only identifying/describing a reason met the requirements. In order to gain a Level 3 or 4 mark, a candidate needed to *explain why* the failure of the Hijrat helped to bring about the failure of the Khilafat Movement.

Question 3. This too was a popular question, although not as well answered as 1 and 2. **Part (a)** questions were quite well answered, with most generally achieving 2 or 3 marks.

In **part (b)**, the question required candidates to explain reasons why there was opposition to the Government of India Act of 1935. Most candidates were unable to go beyond describing the terms of the Act which, of course, was not what was required. There were many irrelevant answers to this question. As a result, few were able to score highly (at best being placed at the bottom of Level 3).

Part (c) depended on candidates' ability to explain their answers rather than adopt a narrative approach. The question focused on political developments relating to partition and required candidates to explain the importance of these. This type of question does not require a narrative approach, but often seems to draw one. Candidates must not fall into the trap of narrative answers. This highlights the need for Centres and their candidates to focus more clearly on *how to write explanations* rather than description especially with regard to questions that are set on political matters. Candidates need to be shown that no **(b)** or **(c)** question on this paper asks for description, ever.

Question 4. This was not a popular question. Those who answered it tended to score only 1 or 2 marks on **part (a)**.

In **part (b)**, candidates had to explain why East Pakistan wished to become independent. Most answers tended to include at least some explanation so many were able to reach Level 3.

Answers to **part (c)** were not substantive. Most were able to *describe* some of Bhutto's domestic reforms but, as with **Question 3(c)**, marks tended to be limited to Level 2 with a maximum of six. Again, it has to be repeated that in order to access the higher marks in Levels 3 and 4, candidates were required to *explain and make comments on how important such attempts were, rather than merely describe them*. Answers to this question highlight again the need of Centres and their candidates to focus much more clearly on explanation (not description).

Question 5. This was also a less popular choice. **Part (a)** was not well answered, with generally only 1 or 2 marks being achieved.

In **part (b)**, there was generally a good attempt to answer the question which asked for the reasons why Pakistan has supported the Palestinian cause. Most answers were able to explain a number of reasons why this happened. Candidates appeared confident and well prepared for answering this question.

In **part (c)**, candidates were required to explain and make comments on how successful was Pakistan's relationship with India. Again, the temptation was that candidates merely described the relationship, but they did tend to have a knowledge that was generally good, with some answers attempting to explain the successes and failures in this relationship. However, most candidates found difficulty in explaining this relationship. Instead, they provided a narrative answer, thus failing to score marks in Levels 3 or 4. Equally, many others in describing the relationship tried to say it was (un)successful, but failed to *explain why*. Centres need to seek ways to ensure their candidates are equipped with the necessary confidence to identify such questions and the necessary skills to answer such questions appropriately.

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/02

Environment of Pakistan

The number of candidates for the October/November papers is always much lower than that in May, but has nevertheless now reached over 1600. The standard of achievement is generally good to very good, but the ability range is very broad.

Most candidates present their work neatly in the booklets provided, their handwriting and standard of English is good, and written in well-constructed sentences. However, there are those whose answers create problems for Examiners. A good candidate will write a sufficient answer containing relevant ideas in some detail, but should others should avoid vague and repetitive ramblings which, if anything obscure anything of merit.' One Examiner wrote 'those who write too much often have not read the question carefully enough, or have not done the preparatory work in class'. Another Examiner wrote 'some of the best answers are not over-long, being clear and concise.

It is vital that candidates read the whole of each question properly before they start their answer. Much time is wasted on details that cannot gain marks. This was particularly common on **Q1(b)(i)** and **(ii)**, **Q2(a)(ii)**, **(c)(ii)** and **(iii)**, and **Q4(b)(i)**.

In the examination room, candidates should be reminded to leave space between questions for the Examiner to mark, and to list the questions answered on the front of the answer booklet. It is not necessary for the candidate to re-write the question before they answer it.

Teachers are encouraged to keep every INSERT so photographs can be used as a teaching aid.

Teachers must be aware that a revised syllabus for examination in 2010 should now be taught. Although much remains unchanged, teachers will need to have prepared their candidates with better skills to analyse resources such as graphs and magazine extracts, as well as maps and photographs. Questions will ask candidates to express their opinions, make evaluations and consider the sustainability of developmental issues in an environmental context.

QUESTIONS

NB: Command words from questions are written here in *italics*.

Question 1

- (a) Most named these features correctly.
- (b) Most described patterns of precipitation correctly, referring to the months where it was increasing and decreasing, and months of maximum and minimum precipitation. However, explanations were sometimes incorrectly given in **(i)** and **(ii)** instead of **(ii)** and **(iv)**. Please refer to my comments in the introduction to this report. Few achieved marks for (ii) because they simply stated the path of the monsoon wind, instead of explaining *how it caused precipitation*. Little reference was made to moisture in the air, which cools, condenses and falls as rain from clouds as air rises over the land.
- (c) Most estimated that the distance from Peshawar to Chitral was about half as much again as the distance to Dir that is about 200 kms. They correctly stated the most suitable forms of transport, although I was surprised that none mentioned pack animals for the transport of wool and hides.

Part (iii) rarely achieved full marks. Many candidates wrote about the problems of building infrastructure instead of its *maintenance*. A good answer would have referred to the blockage of roads by snow and mudflows, damage to infrastructure by avalanches and landslides, the problems of steep slopes, inaccessibility and isolation, and the shortage of manpower and good machinery in these areas. There was credit for examples in this part of the question.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates correctly named the areas affected by deforestation, although some failed to notice that most of The Northern Areas was not shaded on the map. They also stated the causes of deforestation, but some wasted time stating more than three, and giving explanation.
- (b)(i) The scale of this photograph was uncertain, as it was an oblique shot taken from an aeroplane. However, it clearly showed mountains in the distance and an eroded landscape (badland) in the foreground. Candidates were expected to state that there was barren land with only scattered vegetation. Better answers referred to steep slopes and gulleying, and the red colour of the landscape. Candidates should be reminded that there are no marks in the examination for stating what is not on the photograph, for example farming and roads.

In (ii), some repeated their answer to (a)(ii) instead of explaining *why scenes like this are caused*. Good answers would have referred to the lack of tree roots, causing soil to loosen and become prone to the destructive forces of wind and water, and the lack of branches and leaves which reduce these forces and increase infiltration. A good candidate would have made reference to the loss of soil fertility due to the loss of annual leaf-fall and decomposition, and leaching of nutrients.

- (c) Most candidates named these areas correctly, and were able to gain some credit in (ii) for stating that industries 'produce untreated waste', but not for the route they travelled – from drainage channels, to rivers and then the sea. Better answers would have differentiated between liquid and solid waste such as plastics, also hot water from power stations and nutrients from fertiliser factories that increase algal growth and deplete oxygen in the water. Oil spillages also gained marks, and there were marks for examples of both pollutants and polluting industries. There was credit available in this part for examples of pollutants and pollution industries.

For **part (iii)** candidates were expected to be aware of the damage caused by pollutants, but the question did not ask for the effects on humans. Candidates should be instructed that the term 'affects' needs further explanation, for example crops are affected as 'their yield is reduced', or 'they may wither and die.' There are well-documented examples of the loss of fish feeding and breeding grounds due to poisoning of the mangrove forests and loss of other fish stocks in the rivers, also the effects on crop yields and farm animals due to polluted canal and river water, and the loss of wildlife in industrial areas. All these will reduce business and income of those affected.

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates correctly answered (i) and (ii), but (iii) required candidates to *explain* the *pull* factors attracting people from the rural areas. Again some candidates did not read this part properly before they started, giving only lists of factors without sufficient explanation, or push factors such as agricultural unemployment, starvation and lack of security in rural areas.
- (b) **Part (i)** was answered well, with candidates explaining the problems of illiteracy and lack of skills as well as the shortage of jobs available to a large urban population. In (ii), however, not all candidates understood the meaning of 'the informal sector of employment', referring to unskilled work, and work for women instead of knowing that this is unregistered work with little regulation or legal protection, often temporary and poorly paid.

However, there were some good answers to (iii) referring first to the advantages that this can provide. These are some occupation and income, giving respect and some skills for future employment. It can also be advantageous to the more prosperous citizens in providing cheaper services, often at all hours. Some examples of disadvantages are that the work is poorly paid and uncertain, and products or services are often poor quality or even illegal. Many referred to examples of informal employment, which gained them credit.

- (c) Most correctly named NWFP and Peshawar and had a good understanding of the reasons for little urban development in this province. Good answers referred to the mountainous topography and cold climate which causes isolation, and prevents the development of good roads, power supplies, water supplies etc. and discourages human activity. This leads to a lack of industrial development hence jobs, and good facilities such as colleges and universities, clinics and hospitals. In addition the hostility of the local population to governmental efforts for development is another factor.

Question 4

- (a) Most answered these parts correctly. The most common error was for candidates to state that rice is a variety of rice because that is not a variety of rice.
- (b) Good candidates answered (i) well and achieved maximum marks, but any reference to machinery or work before planting and after harvest, for example 'threshing', was not in the question. However, some wasted time referring to the climatic and soil requirements for rice. This was irrelevant to a question on *labour*. In (ii), 'thresher' was incorrect as a *machine for cultivation*. The advantages and disadvantages of farm mechanisation were well known.
- (c) Most were able to choose correctly two physical and human factors, although they should be taught that when a specific number is stated in a question, there is no credit for others.

Knowledge of how yields can be increased was not good. A good candidate would have named two physical inputs such as soils, that should be clayey to retain water and alluvial to provide nutrients to crops, and rain, that should not only amount to a minimum of 1270 mms, but should fall at the time of year when crops are cultivated, and in gentle showers rather than heavy downpours.

Naming two human inputs they might have firstly chosen fertiliser, and explained that chemical fertilisers are better than animal manure because they provide nitrogen and other chemical nutrients, and that they are needed every year because rice exhausts the soil. Secondly knowledge, explaining in this case that the farmer would know what are the best fertilisers to use, which pesticides are needed, and at what stage of the crop growth they should be applied, and then added that knowledge enabled them to work and repair machinery or read literature telling them of new seed varieties and cultivation methods.

Question 5

- (a) **Parts (i) and (ii)** were generally answered correctly. There were also some good answers to **part (iii)**, but some wrote in too general terms about raw materials, labour supply and market without relating it to this area of the upper Punjab. A good answer would have explained that there are traditional skills in this area combined with good infrastructure of roads and railways, dry ports at Sialkot and Lahore, power and water supplies, and telecommunications in this well developed area. In addition the government has supported the growth of these industries with the PSIC (Punjab Small Industries Corporation). This organisation is establishing industrial estates including EPZs, industrial development centres, counselling and guidance to entrepreneurs and loans on easy instalments.
- (b) This was answered well by many. They showed a good understanding of the reasons for export of sports goods, the excess produced in Pakistan, their good quality and demand in world markets and the need to improve the balance of payments, reduce national debt and increase foreign exchange. Also in (iv), good answers explained how quality should be maintained and even improved, production processes can be mechanised, new products developed and the skill of the workforce increased. All this, together with better marketing, might increase exports in future.
- (c) Candidates were encouraged to write about air, sea and road transport although some chose rail. This probably indicated that they had not read the question. Most answers referred to the cost, speed and reliability of transport, as well as the possibility of 'door-to-door' delivery only by road. There was too little use of examples.