

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/01 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 are reminded to read questions carefully to ensure answers are focussed and relevant.
- It is important for candidates to avoid lengthy narratives and focus on explanation, analysis and evaluation.

General comments

Centres and candidates who managed to prepare for this examination are to be commended for their considerable efforts and the challenges they have faced with Covid-19. As such the entry was considerably higher than usual for the November series.

A revised mark scheme has been used for the first time this examination session. The changes included explicitly rewarding developed explanation and a developed evaluation/judgement at the top of the mark range enabling candidates to access marks that might not have been accessed previously. It was pleasing to note that many answers were rewarded for including these in their response.

Most candidates addressed the questions as set with an appropriate length of answer. There were very few rubric errors with many candidates answering the required three questions in the set time. Many candidates produced some excellent responses to questions that were both relevant and focused. The depth of knowledge of such answers was of a very good standard. The ability to answer the question and not simply describe events is improving. Candidates are reminded of the need to read the questions carefully and consider what is required before rushing into answers.

A concern remains that many candidates produced badly presented responses, lacking properly constructed sentences and paragraphing. There is an increasing tendency towards using initials rather than words to describe events or individuals. The use of SWU, RTC and SSAK all featured in many answers, the use of such initials is not appropriate at this level and should be avoided.

Comments on specific questions

The most popular optional questions answered were **2** and **3**, with **1** being compulsory.

Question 1

In **part (a)** most responses gained three marks. Few disregarded the source and wrote about the topic in general. In this question, candidates **must** refer to the source and extract the correct information from it. As with most of the **(a)** questions many candidates wrote far more than was necessary.

Part (b) which was about Tipu Sultan drew many strong responses with almost all managing at least one valid inference plus supporting source content and many gave two supported inferences. Those who provide contextual knowledge must remember to relate it to the inferences made rather than just stating the facts. Some responses could not go beyond what they could see in the source or wrote generic or descriptive responses. Candidates are reminded that they **MUST** refer to the source when answering this question. Weaker responses misidentified the animal as a lion or the British (although this was credited if the tiger was recognised as a metaphor) and others simply referred to the reasons of the Tipu Sultan's bravery and Anglo-

Mysore relations. Overall, candidates scored well as they successfully inferred Tipu's bravery by fighting the tiger with bare hands and scored near or full marks for the question.

Answers to **part (c)** of the impact of railways on the lives of Indian people were mixed. There were many good explanations about famine relief and troop movements which were successful in linking into an effect on the lives of Indian people. Other responses correctly related part of their answer to the negative impact on the lives of Indian people and for all these responses, maximum marks were often achieved. However, there were some irrelevant responses about the impact of railways on the subcontinent relating to the mass migration at the time of partition. Others could only identify such generic words as 'ease' and 'quickness' regarding the benefits of introducing railways in India and as a result were limited to a Level 2 mark.

Part (d) required candidates to explain the reasons why the War of Independence was short-lived. This was a very well-known topic, however, this question confused candidates as many responses focused on the reasons why the war was **caused** making only brief reference as to why it did not last long. This illustrates a very important learning point that candidates must read the question carefully and ensure that they examine the specific angle being explored in the question. Many answers achieved at least seven or eight marks by explaining such reasons as a lack of unity, etc., with specific examples, together with the modern methods of fighting by the British and/or a lack of leadership. Examples of developed explanations were in abundance here and demonstrated that candidates could answer the question effectively.

Question 2

This was the most popular question in **Section B**.

In part **(a)** the Jizya tax was generally well known and most responses scored full marks. There were some responses that incorrectly referred to Zia Ul Haq's Islamisation policy or confused the Jizya tax with the payment of Zakat.

In part **(b)**, the question focused on the reasons why Shah Waliullah was an important figure for the Muslim community during the eighteenth century. Many answers were accurate and relevant, explaining why his work was so important and which aspects were particularly so. Unfortunately, some responses also wrote about Syed Ahmad Bareilvi and Haji Shariatullah which was not necessary. There were some responses that provided a description or list of what he did without explaining why it mattered or its impact, these were limited to the lower levels. Overall there was a tendency to write too much on this question – particularly long introductions about Shah Waliullah's background which were not relevant.

In **part (c)** the question required candidates to explain the contributions, including the 'Two Nation' Theory of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan to the development of the Pakistan Movement. Candidates clearly knew a lot about the life of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan but did not necessarily always apply their knowledge to the question. Many responses struggled to provide an explanation as to how the Two Nation Theory came about. Information about; the Urdu-Hindu Controversy, the claim by Congress to represent all Indians, Hindu dominance of Muslims and education was often included but not always tied into the question and became a series of often accurate statements that ignored the effect they had for the Pakistan Movement. Other responses showed that some candidates had mis-read the question answering partly or wholly based on other largely twentieth century factors which contributed to the Pakistan Movement.

Strong responses explained and gave reasons for his contributions including the Two Nation Theory and additionally education, politics, religion and his attempts to forge a better understanding with the British achieving a Level 4 mark. Again, developed explanations were frequently seen and rewarded. A good number of responses also gave an evaluation identifying Sir Syed Ahmad Khan's main contribution to the Pakistan Movement with a valid explanation. When evaluating or coming to a judgement it is important to give new/additional information and not merely repeat or summarise of what has gone before in the answer.

Question 3

Part **(a)** was also well received. Many demonstrated excellent knowledge of the Hijrat as a migration of Muslims to Afghanistan to protect their lives. However very many responses were far longer than was necessary for this 4-mark question.

Part **(b)** required candidates to explain why there were three Round Table Conferences. The focus of this question caused problems for a significant number of the candidates. There was clearly some good knowledge about each of the three conferences, however, many responses found it difficult to explain why there were three held. Consequently, many answers did not go further than the top of Level 2 for their

description of each of the three conferences. Most commonly responses explained why the first conference was held but then just described the events of the following two.

Answers to part (c) on the factors during the 1940s that led to the creation of Pakistan, including the Direct-Action Day were mixed. Candidates generally found difficulty in focussing on the key elements of the question with too much information becoming a hindrance as description replaced explanation. Responses were sometimes confused as to which events were the most relevant especially as those in the 1930s were often irrelevantly included. Often the more important factors that led to partition were disregarded. Generally, responses found it difficult to relate how the different events contributed to the creation of Pakistan even though candidate's knowledge of the 1940s was good although a minority of responses knew little of Direct-Action Day.

Question 4

The question on the OIC in part (a) was generally well answered with most responses gaining at least two marks. Candidates knew what the acronym OIC stood for and that Pakistan is currently a member but other detail was often sketchy.

Part (b) required explanation of why Ayub Khan came to power in 1958. Many responses identified or described the relevant factors for this but most could not convert these into an explanation of why he came to power. Often the explanation was just 'to impose order'.

In part (c) there were some good responses which examined in depth the relative success of Pakistan's relationship with the UK and the Commonwealth between 1947 and 1999. Some answers demonstrated excellent knowledge which was related to the question posed and used this knowledge to assess the degree of success of the various relationships thus achieving a Level 4 mark. Weaker responses described in chronological order all they knew about the relationships rather than attempting to explain the degree of their success and were awarded Level 2 for their straightforward narrative/list of activities of the relationships.

Question 5

Part (a) on the security of tenure scheme was effectively identified as part of Bhutto's agricultural reforms but in many responses the rest of the part was confused with Ayub Khan's agricultural reforms. Those who knew this topic well gave good clear responses scoring three or four marks.

In part (b), most candidates knew the main points relating to the challenges that faced Zia-ul-Haq in the late 1980s but were not always able to explain them in relation to his ability to govern.

In part (c) many candidates clearly knew a great deal about the events of this period and the challenges facing Benazir Bhutto that contributed to her government being replaced in 1996. There was good knowledge of Benazir's family problems, but her policy of privatisation and the impact this had on the economy of Pakistan and thereby her government's reputation/support base in the period 1993–96 was not widely understood. Linking these aspects back to the effects this had on Bhutto's ability to govern Pakistan proved challenging with an inevitable impact on the range of marks which these answers achieved. It is essential that candidates are taught how to relate their clear knowledge to the question using explanation rather than description for the part (c) questions.

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/02 Environment of Pakistan
--

Key messages

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

- Ensure that the examination rubric is followed correctly, answering 3 of the 5 questions only; it was pleasing to see that most candidates did follow the rubric in this exam session.
- Answer all parts of the chosen questions as questions requiring the completion of a map or graph were omitted by some candidates e.g. **Questions 1(a)(i), 3(a)(ii) and 4(a)(i), 5(b)(ii)**.
- 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. Too many candidates misinterpret what the question is asking them to do.
- Know the meaning of, and respond correctly to, command words used in questions, e.g. know the difference between ‘describe’ and ‘explain’.
- Identify the correct focus specified in the question stem: e.g. natural or human factors – e.g. **Questions 1(c)(i), 5(c)**; impacts/effects, advantages or disadvantages – e.g. **Questions 2(a)(iii), 4(c), 5(a)(iii), 5(b)(iv)**.
- Learn the meanings of key words in order to be able to define and accurately use terminology e.g. ‘refined’ **Question 3(b)(i)**, and ‘migration’ **Question 5(a)(i)**, and the difference between ‘emigration and immigration’ **Question 5(d)**. When defining words or phrases candidates should not simply repeat a word or words as part of their definition.
- Describe a pattern or trend from a map or graph as in **Question 5(b)(i)**.
- Complete a map using their own knowledge as in **Question 1(a)(i)**.
- Add information to diagrams/graphs such as **Question 3(a)(i)**.
- Use/interpret a diagram to answer the question such as in **Questions 1(b)(ii) and 4(b)(iii)**.
- Use the mark allocations and answer space provided in the 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 such as ‘proper’, ‘better’, ‘no’, etc. Candidates must be advised that they will not gain marks for using imprecise language such as this.
- Avoid the use of vague language such as ‘better quality of life, infrastructure, pollution, facilities/services, technology, adequate, communications’ all of which need further clarification to be awarded a mark.
- Write developed ideas wherever possible where extended writing is required in the 4 and 6 mark answers. Avoid using long lists of basic ideas at the expense of developing one or two ideas fully. Developing ideas is still an issue for some candidates although some excellent developed answers were seen.
- In the final **(d)** part of each question, candidates should ensure that their ideas are developed with the correct focus giving different points of view and stating which view they agree with more with an evaluative comment. It is pleasing to see that some candidates have been taught to do this and many start and end with an evaluative statement. Far too many still only develop one point of view or one side of an argument, often including several well-developed points at the expense of providing a developed idea for the other viewpoint. Few candidates can provide examples which limits their response to a maximum of five marks.
- Perform basic skills such as describing photographs such as in **Questions 2(b)(i) and 3(b)(ii)** by identifying what they can see in the image.

- Avoid direct lifts from resource materials when a question asks for interpretation of ideas especially in the part **(d)** questions where material is all too frequently copied from the stem or actual question, wasting time and taking up half of the answer space provided.
- Include place specific information or examples in part **(d)** questions.
- When using the extra space at the back of the question and answer booklet candidates should make clear which answers have been continued by indicating the number of the question accurately at the bottom of the answer space and also clearly number the continued response in the Additional Pages part of the booklet. Candidates should try to avoid continuing to the back pages to write just one or two words which could have fitted onto the original space provided.

General comments

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. Some weaker responses showed difficulty in interpreting tasks and writing effective responses to some or all questions. Many candidates have a good understanding of the needs and stage of development that their country is at and write sympathetically about its needs and the challenges faced.

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 weak. Nevertheless some stronger responses crossed out several lengthy answers, meaning time which could have been spent working on their chosen answers was lost.

Some candidates are choosing to shorten some words by using abbreviations e.g. 'Pak, b/w', which hinders understanding and is discouraged.

Overall, candidates engaged with the questions and most of them 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. Greater planning of responses for the **(d)** questions was seen, spending a little time producing a brief plan of what they want to include which helps candidates to better structure their response. The additional pages at the end of the question and answer booklet could be used for this.

Questions 2 and 5 were the most popular but not always the best answered. There did not appear to be a least popular choice as a similar number of candidates attempted each of the other three questions. There were good attempts at all the part **(d)** questions, the final part of each question particularly 'land reforms versus the use of chemicals' and 'evaluating whether building new infrastructure projects was a good idea' or 'whether new oil and gas reserves should be developed'. Stronger responses to these questions were characterised by a range of developed ideas from different points of view and occasionally some examples with some 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 others were characterised using simple statements. In some cases, the detail provided was largely irrelevant to the question being asked, or included an overlong introduction, occupying 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. Some candidates did not carefully consider their response. The mark was limited by choosing a viewpoint that they claim not to support but their response shows clear support for that viewpoint and does not provide arguments against it giving a one-sided view. Examples should be given which highlight a view or idea being made. Evaluations are evident in the best responses giving a justification either for or against a viewpoint or idea and consolidating their response fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) (i) This question was not well-answered. Some responses shaded areas that were far too large such as a whole province or they shaded more than one area. Many answers missed out this part of the question completely. Usually it is worth having a go even if candidates are unsure about the answer.
- (ii) Virtually all responses gained the mark for the use of apples often stating as part of a healthy diet. Fewer responses gained the mark for the reason they were grown in the area, possibly due to being unsure about where apples are grown. Some vague responses were given such as 'there is an adequate climate' which did not gain any credit.
- (b) (i) Most responses gained the mark. The most commonly seen incorrect response was 'buffalo'. Some responses included a list of possible answers. This should be discouraged as the first answer **only** will be taken. Some candidates misread the question and wrote 'transhumance or subsistence'.
- (ii) Many excellent answers were seen to this question. Responses which identified the type of irrigation shown in the diagram gained full marks. Weaker responses usually stated that this was a Persian wheel and gained a mark but some did not understand how the wheels operated.
- (iii) This question was also well-answered. Some responses gave two different products e.g. 'for meat and milk' which was on the same line of the mark scheme, so did not gain a mark for each. Some candidates stated for 'draught power for irrigation' even though the question instructed otherwise.
- (c) (i) Mixed responses were seen to this question with some excellent answers gaining full marks. The answer space was set out to help candidates structure their response and many response made good use of this. Some responses gave the same factor in both 1 and 2. Other responses mixed up temperature ranges for sowing, growing and harvesting but many gained at least one mark for temperature. It was rare for answers to gain two marks for rainfall as vague responses such as 'water is needed' were given. 'Flat land' and 'fertile soil' were credited but these points were rarely developed to gain a second mark. This question was a good differentiator as the full range of marks were seen.
- (ii) This question was very well answered with most candidates understanding the differences in wheat production on a subsistence and cash crop farm. All mark scheme points were seen.
- (iii) Many responses correctly identified that waterlogging is when 'the water table rises to the surface'. The omission rate on the question was quite high. Again it is worth attempting a question like this as candidates have a 1 in 4 chance of getting the answer correct.
- (d) This question was a good differentiator with the full range of marks seen. It was, however, less common to see five and six marks. Most responses favoured view B for the use of chemical fertiliser. Development centred on fertilisers such as nitrogen or potash overcoming soil deficiencies to increase crop yield or pesticides/insecticides to overcome examples such as leaf curl virus to prevent damage/loss and therefore increase yield. However, many answers misunderstood view A about land reforms, mistakenly thinking that it meant improving the land rather than land ownership and thus referred to mechanisation, education and general agricultural improvements. Better responses did relate to Ayub Khan setting a maximum size for holdings and that the redistribution of land amongst small farmers increased the use of land and crop yield. There was some good development explaining why reforms were not always effective e.g. that landowners divided the land amongst extended family. Strong responses referred to both views, and included examples and evaluated for full Level 3 marks. It was common to see answers develop one point of view only, which limited responses to level 2.

Question 2

- (a) (i) This question was not well-answered. The most common errors were for responses to state 'near to' or 'away from' named features or mix compass directions and give the wrong direction. Candidates must use their map skills accurately and give compass directions or actual distance

using the scale provided on the map to gain marks. Few responses gained full marks, with many scoring zero and some gaining one mark for 'connected to the Kashmir Highway'.

- (ii) Most responses gained marks for one or more ideas typically from 'flat area for building runways, near industry for imports and exports, near roads for transport to and from the airport, near large cities for workforce/customers', etc. There was some misunderstanding of the question as some responses gave reasons why airports are needed such as 'for faster transport'.
- (iii) This question was a good differentiator as the full range of marks were seen. Most mark scheme points were seen. Weaker responses tended to focus on the expense of air transport without stating what was expensive. Lots of reference was made to fear of flying or dangers such as crashing which were not given any credit. Most common correct responses referred to people: 'can't afford the tickets'; 'noise or air pollution for people living nearby'; Goods: 'expensive to transport goods internally or internationally'; 'difficult to transport bulky goods' and 'fragile goods could be damaged when loading or due to turbulence'. Some misread the question providing advantages rather than disadvantages.
- (b) (i) This question was very well answered with many responses gaining the full three marks. Most common correct answers included 'large ships, containers and trucks', but all other mark scheme ideas were seen. Some responses did not demonstrate the required simple skill of describing the features shown in the photograph instead concentrating on the development of sea ports.
- (ii) This was generally well-answered with most responses gaining at least two marks with many gaining full marks.
- (c) This question was a good differentiator with the full range of marks awarded. Most commonly responses included ideas such as 'increased trade/increased imports and exports which increases the GDP/boosts the economy' etc. Some good developed points were seen through the links with Afghanistan using the port and thus providing an income to Pakistan. Many responses stated that employment opportunities are provided but did not develop this any further. A development mark could have been gained by giving an example of the types of jobs created.
- (d) A wide spread of marks was seen on this question and it differentiated well amongst candidates. Weaker responses did not get beyond simple statements referring to the benefits of building a new infrastructure project such as an airport or that Pakistan could not always afford to build such infrastructure projects.

The vast majority of responses scored level 2, three marks as they were rather one-sided focussing only on advantages of a new airport in particular. Many responses were vague and generalised and were not specific about the sort of project being described and lacked examples. Where responses were more specific they explored airport development, occasionally seaports, e.g. Gwadar. Other infrastructure projects, such as roads/motorway building, were mentioned but were rarely developed. Disadvantages were better developed usually along the lines of the high cost of investment needed for these projects, lack of funding and the need to take loans/increase debt. These often formed a list of single sentence points. Most responses gave an evaluation either at the beginning or end to say whether or not building new infrastructure projects was the best way of encouraging further economic development. The best responses included a detailed example for the full six marks.

Question 3

- (a) (i) Most responses accurately completed two of the three labels on the diagram, usually 'pipe' and 'refinery'. The most common mistake was to label 'drill' instead of 'derrick'.
- (ii) Most responses accurately plotted 410 000 barrels and completed the line. However, some responses were either inaccurate with the point, joined the line up without the plot, or only partially joined the line.
- (iii) Knowing this information is a requirement of the syllabus, thus it was pleasing to see that many candidates answered this correctly.
- (iv) Most responses gained full marks here from stating 'via pipelines/by road or by rail'. A handful of candidates did not read the question carefully enough and said 'by sea'.

- (b)(i) Most candidates understood what refined means and could provide a correct definition, referring to purification or cleansing. Some responses referred to manufacturing or processing further which was incorrect.
- (ii) Many responses gained at least one or two marks. The most common correct responses seen were 'built on flat land, chimneys and pipelines'. Some responses did not demonstrate the required skill of describing the photograph of the oil refinery and instead stating why it was developed there or how it operated.
- (iii) Mixed responses were seen to this question. Most often the location provided was incorrect. Some answers gave the same name for the refinery and the location. The most common responses were 'Attock, Pak-Arab/PARCO and Pakistan refinery'. Some candidates named provinces as the location which did not gain any credit. If the name of the refinery was incorrect then the location mark could not be awarded either.
- (c) Some impressive knowledge was seen here with many responses gaining all four marks usually within the first two sentences. However, other answers incorrectly referred to oil being boiled or failed to make the link between oil being burnt to boil water to produce steam (described occasionally as smoke). Some weaker responses referred to oil being used for the lubrication of machinery or oil being used to turn the turbine which could not gain any credit.
- (d) This question was a good differentiator with many responses recognising the advantages and disadvantages of developing new oil and gas reserves. Candidates tended to be better at developing the positive side of the argument and either ignored the negative side or provided simple ideas. There were some good responses containing developed statements with examples and evaluation. These tended to focus around generating more electricity and solving the energy crisis/shortage, thus reducing imports of oil with the Middle East or Saudi Arabia often specified as the example, which would improve the balance of payments. When the negative side of the argument was developed it often focussed on the theme of cost/investment/lack of funding/need to take loans/getting in debt. Some strong responses dealt with developing non-renewable energy sources and the benefits of solar and/or wind power and Pakistan's potential for this as opposed to developing more oil and gas which would run out eventually anyway.

Question 4

- (a)(i) Most responses accurately completed the pie graph and used the correct shading from the key although some did not draw the line accurately enough. Some responses drew the line in the grey shaded area for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa rather than the area which been left blank for completion, suggesting that the key had not been read carefully.
- (ii) This question was generally well-answered with most responses awarded full marks. Where errors were made it was mostly for stating 'altitude' instead of 'climate' or 'recreation' instead of 'cultivation'.
- (b)(i) Again, this question was very well-answered with most responses gaining full marks. All mark scheme answers were seen. Responses that did not score full marks mostly had provided similar ideas from the same line of the mark scheme e.g. 'for furniture/paper' or 'lowers temperature/ provides shade' or gave a vague response such as 'control the climate' or 'for raw materials' which could not be credited.
- (ii) A range of answers were given with many scoring two marks. Natural vs man-made was most commonly credited answer. Most mark scheme points were seen. For productive forests, examples of products were most common e.g. wood/firewood or fruit was seen a lot. Protection forests were most often stated to be for shade or of low commercial value. Errors were focussed on 'protection' and statements such as 'to protect the environment', 'protection from natural hazards', 'protected from being cut down', or referred incorrectly to flood protection.
- (iii) A wide variation was seen with some responses gaining full marks by simply using the diagram or describing a simple relationship between altitude and forest amount/variety. Some answers mistakenly interpreted the diagram as a map of Pakistan with 5000 metres being in the north and sea level being the Arabian Sea and used the names of province-level areas rather than altitude

which did not gain any credit. All mark scheme ideas were seen and most responses were awarded at least one mark.

- (c) Many responses gained three or four marks for this question. Most answers referred to soil erosion and developed this from soil exposure or the idea of lack of roots to hold the soil in place. Landslides was another common development and many made a good developed point around loss of habitat and death/extinction of animals. The link between increased surface runoff was often not developed quite so well. Some answers either missed, or did not take heed of the term 'natural' in the question stem and described the effects on people, e.g. the loss of scenic beauty leading to a lack of tourism, or siltation in reservoirs and lower HEP production. Along with breathing problems (resulting from the increase in CO₂ which was credited as a simple point), the reduction in the amount of oxygen produced was also a common response which was not given credit.
- (d) This question was a good differentiator with the full range of marks being awarded. Ideas ranged from simple level one statements giving reasons why or how preventing deforestation was a good idea for Pakistan to more developed examples of how to reduce deforestation and the sustainable benefits it would bring. There were however, many responses that did not understand what was meant by 'initiatives' and did not refer to any. Also, many responses either did not include the idea of sustainability or only vaguely mentioned it. Many responses developed one side of the argument only, either stating that initiatives on forests can encourage sustainable development or not and were limited to level 2, three marks. Candidates need to ensure that they give a balanced argument/discussion rather than giving several developed ideas for one side of the argument but providing a simple statement only for the opposing view or idea at the end of their response. Most commonly seen responses referred to the idea of supplying gas to areas relying on fuelwood thereby reducing the need for deforestation or the opposing view that deforestation could not be reduced in the Northern areas because it was impossible to supply gas to those areas due to the terrain. Some answers made good points around illegal cutting but these often lacked development. Examples from the mark scheme were provided and an evaluation was given in stronger responses.

Question 5

- (a) (i) This question was well-answered by most candidates. Most responses knew and understood what the term 'migration' meant. There were some answers that stated migration was about 'travelling from one place to another', this was not credited as 'travelling' suggests that people are not staying or settling there but rather just passing through or even going on holiday.
- (ii) Answers most often either scored the full four marks here or zero. Many candidates knew and understood what push factors are and all mark scheme points were seen. A minority of responses were confused citing pull factors which did not gain any marks. Some responses began with push factors but then switched to writing about pull factors and this could only gain one or two marks. Candidates should be encouraged to read the command words and key words in the questions carefully.
- (ii) This question was well-answered by most candidates. Marks were awarded for ideas such as 'low population, reduced production of farms, imbalance in population as men tend to move away and less unemployment'. Both negative and positive impacts were credited. Some responses examined the impacts on the urban areas which was incorrect.
- (b) (i) This question was not well-answered and it was rare to see responses credited more than one mark. Responses ignored the command to use Fig. 5.1 only tending to use knowledge of where the population is distributed across Pakistan discussing each province-level area without referring to the map or using the resource. No marks were awarded for named province-level areas, towns or cities as they were not labelled on the map. In a question describing distribution the best place to start is to decide whether the distribution is even or not, the strongest responses did this. Relatively few responses used compass directions or the actual boundaries/names provided on the map. Most commonly, marks were awarded for 'most is in the east, least is in the south-west/west or far north'.
- (ii) Most responses completed the bar graph accurately gaining the mark available. Very few responses drew the bar inaccurately, but those that did so did not draw the line neatly or use a ruler as the line is more likely to be inaccurate if drawn free-hand or with a blunt pencil. A few candidates omitted this question entirely.

- (iii) The majority of responses correctly rank ordered the province-level areas from highest to lowest by the percentage of their population living in urban centres. Only a small proportion of responses were incorrect.
- (iv) Again, most responses gained the full two marks here. The most common responses gaining credit were 'pressure on school or healthcare, not enough housing/shanty towns develop, unemployment and traffic congestion'. However, all mark scheme points were seen. Some vague responses were seen such as 'pollution, overpopulation, deforestation, pressure on services or infrastructure', which did not gain any credit.
- (c) This question was a good differentiator as the full range of marks were seen. The strongest responses gave a point, developed it and linked it to either high or low population. These referred to climate and topography and made the connection to whether few or many people lived there e.g. 'in areas of flat land it is easier to build settlements so many people live there'. The best answers referred to climate and topography and made the connection to whether few or many people lived there, e.g. 'in areas of flat land it is easier to build settlements so many people live there'. Weaker responses either did not understand the term 'physical factors' or ignored it instead citing human factors which did not gain any credit. Many answers gave vague statements such as 'people prefer to live there', 'people move there' or 'people will migrate out of that area ...' which again, could not gain any credit.
- (d) Generally, this question was well answered, and was a good differentiator as the full range of marks were awarded. Most responses gave both viewpoints, often with for and against, for both views. There were good developments seen, particularly for view B with the idea of skills, technology improving products/output and raising skill level within Pakistan being regularly used. View A was less well developed in responses. These often mentioned remittances being sent back and rarely developed the point beyond a simple level 1 statement such as 'it increases foreign exchange'. Some responses assumed that in view A, it was skilled workers that would emigrate. This may well be the case, but the statement referred to working age people who may or may not be skilled. Several responses identified that sometimes working age emigrants became taxi drivers in some countries such as UAE. Some answers confused emigration and immigration mixing up the viewpoints thus rarely achieving more than level 1. It is important that candidates read the questions and viewpoints carefully and know their key terms and definitions. Producing a simple plan would help candidates to stay on track with questions such as these. Despite there being some good evaluative points there were few examples limiting responses to level 3, five marks.