



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

www.XtremePapers.com

INDIA STUDIES

0447/02

Paper 2 Case Studies

For Examination from 2012

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 45 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

This document consists of **12** printed pages.



Notes

- The full mark range will be used as a matter of course. Marking must be positive. Marks will not be deducted for inaccurate or irrelevant material. Half-marks will not be used.
- Levels of response criteria are used for questions where a hierarchy of answers is possible. Each answer is to be placed in the level that best reflects its qualities. It is not necessary to work through the levels.

In levels with three marks, provisionally award the middle mark and then moderate according to the qualities of the individual answer.

In levels with two marks, provisionally award the upper mark and then moderate according to the qualities of the individual answer.

Overlaps in the marks available for some levels are deliberate.

- Arguments need to be supported with evidence, but lots of facts are not required.
- No set answer is looked for. The examples in the marking scheme are indicative only and are neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. They are given only as examples of some responses/ approaches that may be seen.

Section A

1 This question is about environmental sustainability.

(a) A variety of problems threaten the environment of India. Identify any two. [2 × 1]

[1 mark per problem.]

e.g. land degradation; loss of biodiversity; stress on water resources; water pollution; air pollution; industrial pollution; massive population growth; harmful agricultural practices; soil erosion; rising temperatures; etc.

(b) For each problem you identified in (a), explain why it creates an environmental threat. [6]

LEVEL 1: Describes reasons [2 × 1]
[1 mark per problem.]

e.g. land is damaged; forests are cut down; animals die out; not enough water; people become ill; too many people; not enough food produced; etc.

LEVEL 2: Explains reasons [2 × 2–3]
[Award marks for the quality of the explanation – max 3 per problem] e.g.

- Land degradation: poor land use practices cause soil erosion. The use of fertilizers and pesticides cuts land fertility and pollutes the ground and the water supply. At least 4 billion tons of soil are lost each year through erosion.
- Loss of biodiversity: the destruction of habitats weakens species and perhaps causes their extinction. Forests loss in the North East caused by expanding agriculture and logging has especially serious consequences for the regional climate as well as animal species.
- Water pollution: urban/agricultural/industrial growth threaten water supplies and contaminate rivers/groundwater, causing major health risks, especially as few towns have full waste water treatment facilities. Over-exploitation of water is especially serious in Haryana, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh.
- Air pollution: Industrial and vehicle emissions damage air quality, peoples' health as well as contributing to climate change. India's heavy use of diesel engines is especially harmful to air quality. Such pollution also damages historic buildings, damaging the nation's heritage and tourism.
- Industrial pollution: emissions and spillages contaminate the ground/the air/water supplies, which makes people ill (e.g. rising rate of asthma among children in cities like Mumbai). Emissions contribute to global warming.
- Massive population growth (absolute numbers and rate of increase): sustainable living becomes more difficult; heavy pressure is put on resources; rising demand for energy causes air pollution and global warming.
- Temperature rise: agricultural output will decline (+3 °C would cause wheat yields to fall by 15%, rice by 40%). +2 °C would displace 7 million people due to sea level rise. Himalayan glacier retreat will cause serious water shortage in the heavily populated Gangetic Plain. Economic growth will suffer, GDP falling by up to 9%.

- (c) 'It is essential for India that the greatest possible diversity of plants and animals is maintained.' Is conservation more important than protection? Give reasons for your answer. [7]

LEVEL 1: Unsupported assertions [1]

States one is more important, but makes neither comparison nor judgement.

LEVEL 2: Explains ONE option and ignores the other [2–3]

LEVEL 3: Explains BOTH options [3–5]

Considers the alternatives, but there is no judgement between them.

Among the considerations discussed might be:

Protection: advantages, e.g.

- preserves natural habitats/ecosystems (e.g. Ranthambore National Park).
- preserves core populations of species (e.g. asiatic lions in Gir National Park).
- protects mammals threatened by hunting.
- especially suitable where land is unproductive/of little economic value.
- encourages economic benefits of tourism (income, employment).
- encourages education/public awareness of the importance of biodiversity.

Protection: disadvantages, e.g.

- has limited impact as only delimits areas where forestry, farming, mining, etc. may not take place. Unrealistic to set aside most of the country in such a way.
- can restrict the lifestyle/rights of tribal peoples and the poor who are dependent on such areas for their daily life. At worst, reserves/parks cause local poverty and even depopulation.
- may not prevent illegal/detrimental activity. Serious losses to reserves and parks have taken place, with state governments unable to counter the political and financial power of industrial and agricultural interests.
- Can restrict economic activity/growth in areas rich in mineral resources/perfect for agriculture, building a dam, etc.
- can be expensive, requiring large areas of land to be bought and managed.

Conservation: advantages, e.g.

- encourages all human activity everywhere to be sustainable.
- encourages active management of wild life stocks of far more species, not just a few specially selected.
- counters loss of/fragmentation of habitats due to agricultural/industrial/urban expansion that is often unstoppable due to political influence/financial power.
- captive breeding programmes (to reintroduce into the wild at later point) help genetic diversity in species and allows gene banks to be created.
- encourages research into requirements of species/reasons for decline.
- encourages education/public awareness of the importance of biodiversity.

Conservation: disadvantages, e.g.

- can take the emphasis off preserving natural environments/ecosystems/biodiversity which are essential for a healthy planet.
- promoting sustainable human activity (industry, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism) everywhere is very difficult.
- can be expensive, requiring special research and breeding centers.

LEVEL 4: Balanced consideration with evaluative judgement [4–7]

Weighs advantages and disadvantages of each, with a supported judgement between the alternatives. Strong answers may note the two are not incompatible, citing laws/international agreements that do both (e.g. Biodiversity Act 2002; Convention on Biological Diversity 1992).

- (d) **‘A major cause of poor quality air is the increasing number of vehicles on India’s roads.’ Which would be the better way to improve the environment, better public transport or restrictions on private vehicles? Give reasons for your answer.** [7]

LEVEL 1: Unsupported assertions [1]

States one would be better, but makes no comparison and no judgement.

LEVEL 2: Explains ONE option and ignores the other [2–3]**LEVEL 3: Explains BOTH options** [3–5]

Considers the alternatives, but there is no judgement between them.

Among the considerations discussed might be:

Better public transport: advantages, e.g.

- fewer vehicles on the road so helps to solve massive congestion problems.
- public transport required to have reduced or zero polluting emissions (use of CNG; no diesel or 2-stroke engines) brings much better air quality for everyone.
- public transport has cheap fares, which makes easy transport accessible to the whole population.
- efficient public transport will save energy when fuel prices are rising and supplies are limited.
- bus rapid transit systems (BRT, now operating in more and more towns/cities, e.g. Ahmedabad, Hyderabad, Pune), light railways (e.g. Delhi Metro, Chennai MRTS) and monorails (being built in Mumbai) bring benefits like these.

Restrictions on private vehicles: advantages, e.g.

India has one of the fastest-growing private car markets in the world, with car ownership doubling between 2000 and 2010, but its roads are already badly congested. Restrictions on private vehicles

- would improve air quality, especially if the restrictions included incentives/requirements for cleaner engines (e.g. CNG, pro-LPG/propane/electric; anti-diesel and 2-stroke).
- would improve journey times as roads would be less congested.

while

- restrictions on heavy lorries/transport of goods by road would reduce not just congestion and air quality but the noise stress on towns/villages and the people living by busy roads.

Restrictions on private vehicles: disadvantages, e.g.

- carpooling schemes (e.g. in Bengaluru) only have a limited appeal and impact.
- leads to the loss of personal mobility/convenience/individual freedom.
- restrictions might damage the Indian car and truck industry.

LEVEL 4: Balanced consideration with evaluative judgement. [4–7]

Weighs advantages and disadvantages of each, with a well-supported judgement between the alternatives. Strong answers might show awareness that restrictions can mean different things and so have different impacts (e.g. restrictions on taking vehicles into certain areas/streets or restrictions on engine emissions). Strong answers might point out that the two are not incompatible and argue they complement each other in the drive to improve the environment.

2 This question is about improving human development.**(a) Identify two reasons for poverty among women in rural India.** [2 × 1]

[1 mark per reason.]

e.g. Few women own or are in control of land; inheritance laws discriminate against women; women have lower-paid jobs; women are not so well educated; etc.

(b) Explain why India's family planning programmes have not gained wider acceptance. [6]**LEVEL 1: Identifies factors** [1–2]

e.g. programmes not well publicised; programmes don't fit local situation; many women marry young (average age 18); peasants want larger families; etc.

LEVEL 2: Describes factors [3–4]**LEVEL 3: Explains factors** [4–6]

[Award marks for the quality of the explanation as well as for the number of reasons explained.]

e.g. A big change like this takes time because people are being asked to alter the way they think. Even well-supported programmes (e.g. Jamkhed Project, Maharashtra) say they need four years to educate people in one small area, but government programmes have often been too centralized, ignored local attitudes to have much impact on individuals and not been given enough time to work. Traditional ideas are very strong and take a long time to change, especially among more conservative groups/areas. Many still see large families as important to success (helping with farm labour, increasing family income, looking after the elderly). While so many still want sons, family planning will never get too far. Most couples will not adopt it until they have at least two sons and about four children in all. If couples are to think seriously about having smaller families, they must see that employment opportunities, wages, health services and educational opportunities will all be good.

(c) 'Sanitation improvement schemes are playing a significant role in increasing the quality of life.' Where is the greater need: urban or rural India? Give reasons for your answer. [7]**LEVEL 1: Unsupported assertions** [1]

e.g. Villages have few latrines; disease spreads more rapidly in towns; sanitation stops spread of disease; clean water is needed; etc.

LEVEL 2: Explains ONE option and ignores the other [2–3]

LEVEL 3: Explains BOTH options

[3–5]

Considers the alternatives, but there is no judgement between them.

India faces a greater sanitation problem than any other South Asian country while globally only China has a worse problem.

Urban need, e.g.

- two-thirds of urban homes have lavatories, but solving urban sanitation problems is the major public health need of India. The density of urban populations makes the health risk of inadequate sanitation very great (e.g. half of Mumbai's population lives without toilets and sewers). Many towns have no 24/7 water supply; no city does. Open drains are common. Very few towns/cities have a full waste treatment system.
- the urban need is the greater because of rapid urbanization. By 2030, c.40% of India's population will be urban, but existing sanitation systems already cannot cope. This is especially serious because of the c.40 million who live in urban slums.

Rural need, e.g.

- access to good rural sanitation is the major public health need of India because 72% of India's population is rural, yet around only 26% of the rural population has access to sanitation.
- the success of 'community-led total sanitation' and 'demand-driven water supply' schemes shows that effective sanitation is achievable far more easily in rural than urban India, so the priority should be there.
- the Swajaldhara Programme (launched 2002) shows this is the priority of the Indian government.

LEVEL 4: Balanced consideration with evaluative judgement

[4–7]

Weighs advantages and disadvantages of each, with a well-supported judgement between the alternatives. Strong answers might argue that the need is very great in each so both need strong promotion – e.g. because of urban slums, the real figures for access to sanitation is actually about 50:50 urban/rural.

They might also point out that good sanitation everywhere will also help to improve the quality of life for over 1 million people, mostly women, by ending manual scavenging (made illegal in 1993) and weakening the caste-based prejudice that goes with it. Most sanitation legislation to date has had this, rather than public health, as its prime goal.

- (d) **'Access to quality education for the poor and disadvantaged must be a higher priority in India.'** Identify what you consider to be the two most important obstacles to achieving universal education in India. Suggest the best ways in these two problems might be overcome. [7]

LEVEL 1: Identifies obstacles

[2 × 1]

[1 mark per obstacle.]

costs too much; many children have to work; not enough teachers; there aren't enough schools; fewer girls go to school; compulsory education only goes to age 14.

LEVEL 2: Describes obstacles

[2–3]

LEVEL 3: Explains obstacles

[3–5]

[If only one obstacle is explained, award 4 marks max.]

Considers two obstacles, but offers no analysis of ways to overcome them.

LEVEL 4: Explains obstacles AND analyses how to overcome them

[4–7]

Assesses two obstacles and gives a well-supported analysis of ways in which they could be tackled, e.g.

Building on earlier schemes, the Sarva Shi-ksha Abhiyan (Elementary Education Project) of 2001 has achieved much, but 10 million children do not attend primary school. Significant problems remain to be overcome. The two most important are

- universal access: The law says that children must have a primary school within 1km of their home. That is still not true for 2% of children so more schools have to be provided. The Education Guarantee Scheme of Madhya Pradesh is a good example of the way universal access can be achieved. State governments have to find the money, and some will not find that easy.
- 100% enrolment: Quite a few states have failed to achieve this. In part, this is a gender problem: 93 girls were enrolled for every 100 boys in primary school in 2008 (compared to 90 in 2000). This remains a hard problem to solve, despite major efforts by the District Primary Education Programme since the 1990s. Some parents still see educating their daughters as less important than their sons. The provision of a free mid-day meal at school had had impact on achieving regular attendance, and must be kept going for 100% enrolment to be possible. Most of all, 100% enrolment will only be achieved by on-going campaigns to educate parents about the vital importance of education for all their children. The same is true of 100% enrolment problems among scheduled caste and tribes.
- child labour: Many parents still send their children to work rather than school. India has 165 million child labourers aged 5–14, and the law allows children to be employed in cottage industries, restaurants and agriculture, but not factories. This is a problem of law enforcement (attending school and not working in factories), but it is also a problem caused by poverty with many parents needing the income their children can earn to help sustain the whole family, or to help on the family farm to keep it going. This problem will only be solved slowly as India becomes a richer country and rising wealth spreads to the whole population.
- annual drop-out rates: Getting children to school is only the first part of the problem. Keeping them there is equally important. Drop-out rates are falling, but were still 9% in 2008. This is partly a problem of law enforcement, but also one of states ending problems of teacher absenteeism and seeing that the quality of teaching is good so parents see that sending their children to school is worthwhile.
- progression: Many children never go on to higher levels of education. In 2007, 16% of those completing primary school did not go on to upper-primary school (25% in 2002). The proportion going on further is tiny. India has no universal programme for secondary education to age 16 or 18. There can be no successful secondary programme until universal primary education has actually been achieved. The cost will be vast and require major debate about how it will be funded.

Section B: problem-solving exercise

- 3 (a) Use Source A to help you to explain three problems faced by people living in Indian-administered Kashmir. [6]

[problems not referred to in the source score 0.]

Level 1: Identifies problems with reference to the Source [3 × 1]
[1 mark per problem.]

e.g. tourists have stopped coming; there is violence; people have lost their homes.

Level 2: Explains problems with reference to the Source. [3 × 2]
[max 2 marks per problem.]

e.g. The political troubles and violence have caused the economy to suffer because many tourists have stayed away. This makes earning a living much harder for many people as tourism was very important to the local economy.

The political troubles and violence mean that the people of Jammu and Kashmir live in an unstable place, divided by rivalries and conflict. As a result, they have no sense of security and cannot get on with their ordinary lives. They cannot always trust their neighbours.

The troubles have forced some people to escape danger by leaving their homes and land and businesses, and become refugees. They now have to live in very unsatisfactory conditions with no sign of being able to go home and take up their old life again.

- (b) In 2005, a bus route crossing the Line of Control was opened along the Jhelum highway for the first time since Partition.

- (i) Use Source B to help you to explain why such cross-border transport links might benefit people living in Jammu and Kashmir. [6]

[benefits not referred to in the source score 0.]

Level 1: Identifies benefits with reference to the Source. [1–2]
[1 mark per benefit.]

e.g. Helps trade; helps families see each other; helps peace.

Level 2: Describes benefits with reference to the Source. [2–4]

Level 3: Explains benefits with reference to the Source. [4–6]
[Award marks for the quality of the explanation.]

e.g. Cross-border transport links will help business and the economy to develop, bringing greater wealth to the people. Before, the only way to cross was to fly, which most people could not afford. Opening the Jhelum highway has opened the only year-round road in and out of Srinagar. These links open the way for Kashmir to develop business links outside Kashmir itself, e.g. fruit from the Kashmir Valley takes three days to reach Delhi, but markets in Pakistan like Rawalpindi are now only six hours away.

Regular cross-border links will also reduce local tensions and help to bring peace to Kashmir. Being able to cross the Line allows families and friends their regular contact with each other after so many years being kept apart. This is good for everyone and reduced tensions will help to keep Jammu and Kashmir more peaceful.

(ii) Explain why such cross-border contacts have been blocked in the past. [6]

Level 1: Identifies reasons. [1–2]

e.g. There was a war; Pakistan and India didn't like each other.

Level 2: Describes reasons. [2–4]

Level 3: Explains reasons. [4–6]

[Award marks for the quality of the explanation.]

e.g. When the Line of Control could not be crossed, each side thought the barrier made its position in Kashmir stronger and safer. To allow crossings, it was thought, would make the Line look like an international border. The fear was that that would make the occupation of the other part of Jammu-Kashmir by the other state (India/Pakistan) look permanent, part of the sovereign territory of the rival state. Each side thought that that would weaken their claim to all of Jammu and Kashmir.

India and Pakistan also wanted a closed border because they thought that it made terrorist activity more difficult. A heavily guarded border would mean, they thought, that rebel groups would find it much harder to cross into the other part of Jammu-Kashmir and cause trouble.

Closed borders also suited militants on both sides because it focussed attention on the unsolved dispute and the on-going struggle with the 'enemy'.

(c) Look at the three scenarios in the Resource Booklet. Using the information there and your own knowledge, explain which scenario you consider would be best for the entire population of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh and for stability in the region.

To do this you must

- give reasoned arguments to justify your choice;
- explain with reasons why you rejected each of the alternative scenarios;
- explain with reasons one disadvantage of the scenario you chose;
- explain how this disadvantage might be overcome. [20]

5 marks for the answer to each of the four parts:

Identifies [1]

Describes [2–3]

Explains [3–5]

[Sustained explanations and judgements throughout must be awarded 20 marks.]

Scenario 1: Line of Control becomes India-Pakistan border

Advantages

- Would probably be accepted by India. Governments in Delhi have been willing to make such a formula the basis for negotiation with Pakistan.
- Would be supported internationally (especially by the USA and the UK) because it would recognise the *status quo* in the region.
- Most of Ladakh would support this because they would remain in India.

Disadvantages

- Would probably be rejected by Pakistan. Its governments have never been willing to make this the basis of negotiations, especially as it would leave the predominantly Muslim Kashmir Valley as part of India.
- Would disregard the aspirations of those in Kashmir who since 1989 (some before that) have campaigned for independence (*azadi*). They would campaign strongly against it.

- Would be rejected by the Hindu Right in India. They would see the loss of any part of Kashmir as a loss of an essential part of the motherland. The resulting campaign against such an agreement would be violent and might destabilise India.

Scenario 2: Jammu-Kashmir becomes part of Pakistan

Advantages

- Self-determination would have been allowed its way. Jammu and Kashmir is a majority Muslim area, the only state in India that is, so the majority of the population would be likely to support union with Pakistan.
- Would be supported by the government of Pakistan – it's ideal outcome.

Disadvantages

- The dispute over Jammu-Kashmir is not just about land. Religion is involved too. Becoming part of Pakistan would probably create disaffected minorities (the majority Hindu population of Jammu and the mostly Buddhists population of Ladakh, neither of which has shown any desire to join Pakistan). The fear would be that the interests of important minorities would not be protected.
- Would disregard the aspirations of those in Kashmir who since 1989 (some before that) have campaigned for independence (*azadi*).
- Most of the population of Ladakh would oppose this because they would become part of Muslim Pakistan, which they do not want.
- Would be rejected by India because it would mean the loss of Jammu, the Kashmir Valley and Ladakh.
- Would make relations between India and Pakistan much worse because Pakistan would have gained everything while India gained nothing. This would make worse the already bad relationship between these two nuclear powers, destabilising the region.
- China would probably support this, calculating that a favourable (to Beijing) deal over its disputed southern border was more likely to be negotiated with Islamabad than Delhi. One reason India would oppose this outcome would be because control of Ladakh gives control of a major section of the critical border with China.
- Would probably be opposed by the USA because it would upset the *status quo* in the region, leaving India with a major grievance.
- Would be rejected by the Hindu Right in India. They would see the loss of Jammu and Kashmir as a terrible wound inflicted on the motherland. They would also argue that such a move would help Islamic fundamentalism and threaten India. The resulting campaign against such an agreement would be violent and might destabilise India.

Scenario 3: Jammu-Kashmir becomes an independent country

Advantages

- Would require sacrifice of land and claims by both India and Pakistan, maintaining the political balance and helping to settle the deep dispute between India and Pakistan.
- Would meet the aspirations of the many in Kashmir who since 1989 (some before that) have campaigned for independence (*azadi*), arguing that Jammu and Kashmir was independent before 1947 and should be allowed to regain its freedom, with the occupying forces of both India and Pakistan going home.
- Most of the population of Ladakh would probably support this, as long as guaranteed were made about religious freedom.
- Would give Kashmir the autonomy long promised by Delhi. To be successful, any settlement must have the strong backing of the local population, not just Delhi and Islamabad (and Washington and Beijing).
- Would be welcomed by the USA because the agreement between Indian and Pakistan needed to bring it about would also produce a fundamental improvement in relations between these two states. Washington would see that as not just the removal of the world's most likely cause of a nuclear war. The USA would see Pakistan then being able

to play a much stronger role in helping to stabilise Afghanistan and in defeating Islamic-inspired terrorism.

Disadvantages

- Would be rejected by Pakistan, mainly because it does not want to surrender territory, but also because Pakistan relies on water from Mangla Reservoir (in Pakistani-administered Kashmir) which it would not want to lose control of. Above all, Pakistan might oppose this because an independent Kashmir, an Islamic country, would challenge the rationale for Pakistan's existence.
- Would probably be rejected by India because the status of Jammu and Kashmir has become such a symbol of national unity. India would also fear a 'domino effect' of pro-independence calls, on ethnic and/or linguistic lines, from other former princely states, threatening the Indian Union itself. (Pakistan would fear such moves on its side of the frontier too).
- Would be rejected by the Hindu Right in India. They would see loss of any part of Kashmir as a loss of an essential part of the motherland. They would also argue that creating an Islamic state of Jammu and Kashmir would betray the Hindu population of Jammu, would help Islamic fundamentalism and would threaten India. The resulting campaign against such an agreement would be violent and might destabilise India.