

PAKISTAN STUDIES

Paper 2059/01

Paper 1

General Comments

There was a similar entry for this examination compared with November 2011. The standard of work broadly in line with that of last year, although it was noticeable that many of the candidates found some difficulty in scoring high marks.

Whilst most candidates were able to answer the required three questions, there were a small number of rubric errors. The majority of candidates used their time well and, as in previous examinations, most candidates produced answers that were relevant, focused, and addressed the questions as set.

However, many candidates were clearly unprepared for this examination and produced largely descriptive answers, which did not fully address the question set. This was especially noticeable in answers to **Questions 1 (c), 3(c) and 4(c)**. Such answers will only attract a Level 2 mark and achieve no more than half the available marks. Centres should note that examination questions are very specific and require a focused approach to **explaining** answers rather than candidates simply writing all they know.

One further point of note is that very few candidates answered **Questions 4 and 5** in either of the 2012 examinations. This may suggest that Centres are not addressing the whole of the syllabus, which could disadvantage candidates by restricting their choice of topics in future examinations. It could pose serious problems for Centres if the 2015 examination series does include, as expected, a compulsory question that is selected from any area of the syllabus.

Comments on Specific Questions

The most popular questions answered this year appeared to be 1, 2 and 3.

Question 1

This was a very popular and generally well answered question apart from part (c). In part (a), the short answer question on the Hindu-Urdu Controversy was well answered with most candidates able to gain 3 or 4 marks.

Part (b) caused few problems. The question focused on the reasons why the British were attracted to the Indian sub-continent. Most candidates were able to explain why the British got involved in the sub-continent and as a result many scored a Level 3 mark, often reaching the maximum allowable.

In part (c) candidates were required to explain how successful Indian resistance to British attempts to take control of lands in the sub-continent was. Many candidates knew a large number of facts about the battles fought by which the British conquered the sub-continent, but this was not the point of the question. A mere description of these events only resulted in a Level 2 mark. The point of the question was to enable candidates to explain either **how** the Indians were **successful or otherwise** in resisting British control of the lands of the sub-continent. Most candidates failed to see the point of the question and merely described all they knew about the events and personalities of the period. As a result most candidates failed to achieve a mark beyond Level 2. At best candidates reached a low Level 3 mark by making the point that the Indians were unable to resist Britain taking control because of British superior strength, etc. This often came at the end of a long description of the various battles that took place during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, often seemingly as a throwaway comment. Centres **MUST** ensure that candidates are equipped with the skills to recognise the demands of such a question if they are to achieve the higher marks available in part (c). This type of question in various forms has frequently been set over the past few years and unfortunately little improvement in the quality of answers has been seen. Centres should attempt to address this issue.

Question 2

This was also a very popular question. Most candidates were able to score 3 or 4 marks in part **(a)** on the regional language of Punjabi.

Part **(b)** caused few problems for candidates who generally focused on the reasons why Bengal was partitioned in 1905 and produced well-argued answers that often reached Level 3. Many candidates achieved maximum marks.

Part **(c)** was generally very well answered by most candidates who were knowledgeable about the political developments of 1909 to 1919. Candidates were required to explain the attempts to solve the problems in the sub-continent between these years. Although many candidates knew their facts about Morley-Minto, Lucknow and the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, they also needed to explain how these attempted to solve the political situation in the sub-continent. Refreshingly, many candidates attempted to answer the question as set and so were able to score a mark within Level 4. They were able to demonstrate good focus on the topic, rather than simply giving a narrative account of each of the reforms, for which only a Level 2 mark would have resulted.

Question 3

Again this was a popular question with a good level of knowledge shown by most candidates, who generally achieved 3 or 4 marks on the part **(a)** short answer question on the Chauri-Chaura incident.

In part **(b)** the question required candidates to explain why there was much opposition to the Government of India Act of 1935. This was a well known topic although many candidates struggled to reach Level 3. Many candidates focused too much on the terms of the Act and then considered briefly why some of these were disliked, rather than explaining why there was opposition to the Act. Nevertheless there were some good attempts at answering the question.

Part **(c)** was similar to that of **Question 1 (c)** in that it was usually answered in narrative form rather than an explanation of Jinnah's achievements between 1929 and 1947. Although there was a small minority of candidates who focused clearly on the question and were able to access the higher levels of marks, most candidates produced a description of events that Jinnah was associated with and made little or no attempt to address the achievements with which he was so clearly associated. As a result most marks were depressed and half marks or more were an uncommon sight. As with **Question 1(c)**, candidates need to recognise the demands of the question and Centres have a responsibility to prepare their charges for such topics properly. In order to gain a Level 3 or 4 mark in this question, the candidates needed to **explain** Jinnah's achievements. Often their knowledge base of Jinnah was surprisingly poor, so there is a lot of work needed in this area of the syllabus, if high marks are to be achieved.

Question 4

This was not a popular question compared with the previous three with few candidates attempting it. For those candidates who did answer it, they tended to score up to 3 marks on the part **(a)** short answer question on the refugee problem.

In part **(b)** the question required candidates to explain why Martial Law was declared by Ayub Khan in 1958. Many candidates who were well prepared found little difficulty in their answers and were able to achieve a good Level 3 mark with ease. However there was a temptation for other candidates to write about Ayub Khan, in the misplaced assumption that this was required. For these candidates few marks were scored.

In part **(c)** there were a few good answers to the question asking for the relative success of Pakistan's relationship with the USSR between 1947 and 1999. However, as reported in previous years, the tendency has been for many candidates to describe in chronological order all they knew about the events that shaped such a relationship rather than attempt to **explain the successes and failures** of such a relationship. Few candidates were able to do this part well and most answers this year tended to be awarded Level 2 for a straightforward narrative of the relationship. It is important that candidates attempt to address both the positive and negative aspects of such a relationship in order to achieve a Level 4 mark.

Question 5

This was the least popular question choice of candidates. The short answer question on Bhutto's downfall was generally well answered with 3 or 4 marks being achieved.

In part **(b)** most candidates attempted to answer the question on why Benazir Bhutto fell from office in 1996 but knowledge of this topic was weak. It is important that Centres recognise that topics in the later part of the twentieth century will continue to be set and it is hoped that these are dealt with as comprehensively as others set in earlier times. Good time management in teaching Pakistan Studies is a key factor here.

Part **(c)** depended on candidates' ability to **explain** their answers rather than adopt a narrative approach. The question focused on the domestic reforms of Zia-ul-Haq between 1977 and 1988 and required candidates to explain the importance of these, including economic reforms that were introduced. Again most candidates adopted a narrative approach to this question and there were few attempts to explain their answers and there were many long descriptions, especially of the Islamisation reforms introduced by Zia-ul-Haq. Again, candidates must understand that good marks will be unattainable if such answers are produced in the examination.

Candidates must try not to fall into the trap of writing narrative answers to questions that clearly signal the need for an explanation since they are only going to achieve a Level 2 mark when they should be capable of reaching marks within Levels 3 or 4. Yet again this highlights the need for Centres and their candidates to focus more clearly on **how to write explanations** rather than description in part **(c)** questions.

