

INDIA STUDIES

Paper 0447/01

Core Themes

Key Messages

- **Sub-Question (a):** Only short responses are required because a candidate just has to identify four relevant points.
- **Sub-Question (b):** To do well, a candidate must explain relevant reasons (Level 3). Middle-quality answers will identify but not explain relevant reasons (Level 2). Weak answers will just write generally on the topic (Level 1).
- **Sub-Question (c):** A balanced judgement is the key to high marks. The best answers (Level 4) will (i) give clearly argued explanations which (ii) are supported by relevant evidence (specific examples) and (iii) give a clear judgement on how far a particular factor is the most important and (iv) explain clearly why.

General Comments

The quality of answers was encouraging for the very first examination. A small number of candidates produced exceptional responses. All candidates completed, or attempted to complete, all parts of the three questions they chose.

Most candidates displayed a reasonable level of knowledge, but knowledge on its own will not score many marks and some responses did not reach beyond the level of description. Against that, well-prepared candidates not only provided relevant explanations in their answers, but also showed ability to evaluate issues, making judgements based on evidence selected. This was very pleasing because the ability to make evaluative judgements is the highest level core skill of not just Paper 1 but the whole syllabus.

Comments on Specific Questions

Sub-Question (a): Knowledge

The key word in the question is 'identify'. Candidates should not write very much - identifying four relevant points can be done quickly. Some answered their (a) sub-question in bullet points. This worked very well and we recommend that teachers tell their students to do this in future [but just for sub-question (a)].

- 1(a)** Most were able to attain at least one mark. Many scored three or four marks.
- 2(a)** The pattern in answers was similar to that in **1(a)**, although some candidates tended to make several points over several sentences without accurately identifying even a single problem.
- 3(a)** **Question 3** was the least popular question of the four, but those who chose it answered part **(a)** well. Most had knowledge of features of the electoral system.
- 4(a)** Knowledge was good, but several candidates limited their answers to only two issues affecting India-Pakistan relations, rather than the required four. Some good candidates answered in bullet points - a very appropriate structure for the part **(a)** sub-question.



Sub-Question (b): Understanding

The key word in the question is 'explain'.

- 1(b)** Many showed little specific knowledge of the growth of Hindu nationalism, relying instead on general details concerning positive or negative element of Indian nationalism. Also, most tended to identify reasons without providing any specific examples which could then be used to explain a particular aspect (which is what would be necessary for a Level 3 mark).
- 2(b)** Some candidates wrote reasonably good answers. They displayed knowledge with developed explanation, thereby gaining a Level 3 mark. Many, however, only mentioned a range of economic points in a very general way.
- 3(b)** There were some encouraging answers with candidates identifying relevant reasons and providing supporting examples that justified the reasons that they gave. As in answers to **2(b)**, however, many candidates never went beyond identifying reasons, offering no explanation at all.
- 4(b)** This was not answered well. Many candidates gave only general responses without any specific examples.

Sub-Question (c): Judgement

Few were able to give more than one reason, but some provided at least two sound explanations with examples, thereby earning a Level 4 mark.

The ability to make evaluative judgements is the highest level core skill of the syllabus. Part **(c)** questions are the most demanding of the three sub-question types on Paper 1 so teachers are encouraged to practice them with their candidates in class.

- 1(c)** Encouragingly, many candidates were able to gain Level 3 for explaining with examples, which is highly commendable. On the other hand, there were many responses that relied only on description and general commentary.
- 2(c)** Similar comments apply here as with **1(c)**: most answers only identified or described, and so were limited to a mark in Level 2. On the other hand, a small minority of candidates displayed judgement and evaluation as well – and, therefore, gained a good Level 4 mark.
- 3(c)** Some excellent responses were seen. This type of question (having to judge between two claims) requires the candidate to give their verdict in a clear and balanced way. Too many candidates relied, however, on general comments. This is a question-type that teachers are encouraged to practice with their candidates in class.
- 4(c)** A reasonable number attempted this question and quite a range of responses were seen. Some never went beyond general comments. Some offered reasons. The best used relevant examples to support clear explanation, although few reached the very highest level because they did not then go on to offer evaluative judgements as well.

INDIA STUDIES

Paper 0447/02
Case Studies

Key Messages

- To improve performance, many candidates should give much greater attention to the number of marks awarded for each part of a question and then write an answer whose length fits its value.
- To score even fairly well, candidates must go beyond very general answers. They need to support their ideas with reference to precise examples from India. General, unsupported assertions are not convincing.
- In **Section B sub-Question (c)**, candidates should follow the four-part structure outlined in the question itself. This will ensure that all aspects of the question are addressed. Equal weight needs to be given to each part because each is worth five marks.

General Comments

This was the first year of the examination and the overall performance was encouraging. A significant number of candidates displayed both the skills and depth of knowledge appropriate for the demands of the paper. It was encouraging that all candidates were able to follow the instructions on the paper, answering the required number of questions. Most were able to finish with little indication of being rushed at the end. Candidates were able to respond appropriately to different types of question and most were able to recognise the important differences between the requirement to identify, the requirement to describe and the requirement to explain – which allowed many to access the higher levels in the mark scheme. A number of candidates were able to go beyond very general answers and support their ideas with reference to precise examples from across India. This is practice to be encouraged as it helps candidates to show that they know what they are talking about and can support their ideas; general, unsupported assertions are not convincing.

Most of the advice offered here for improving candidate's performance relates to improving examination technique.

In order to improve their performance, many candidates should give much greater attention to the number of marks awarded for each part of a question and then write an answer whose length fits its value. In **Section A sub-Question (a)**, a significant number of candidates wrote at great length when this question-type only required them to identify difficulties or issues for just 2 marks. This should have been done in a couple of sentences or even in bullet points, not half a page or even a whole page. There is also no need for a candidate to go on and explain the difficulty or issue that they have identified. The question does not ask for it. They will not be able to score any further marks and they will only waste precious time.

In **Section A sub-Question (b)**, candidates need to be aware of the difference between 'describe' and 'explain'. In no question are they simply asked to describe issues, but in a significant number of answers this is all that a candidate offered.

In **Section A sub-Question (c)**, candidates need to ensure that they write balanced answers and consider both sides of the debate. Then, they need to go on to write a justified conclusion that follows on from the arguments that they have just made. Only such an answer can access the high mark levels.

Section B: In many ways similar advice applies to this as to **Section A**. Candidates need to pay attention to the number of marks awarded and use that as a clear guide to how much they should write. In answering **sub-Question (a)**, they should explain only three problems because they cannot score more than the six marks available. In answering **sub-Question (b)**, they must use both the Source and their own knowledge if they want to reach the higher marks within a level.

For **Section B sub-Question (c)**, candidates will benefit greatly if they follow the structure that is outlined in the question itself because this will ensure that all aspects of the question are addressed. Equal weight needs to be given to all four parts of that sub-question as there are five marks for each one.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) To answer well an **(a)** sub-question, the command word tells a candidate to 'identify' a given number of things (e.g. issues, difficulties). All candidates who tackled this question understood the phrase 'gender equality' and most were able to identify two difficulties, although in some instances there was very clear overlap between the difficulties they identified (which could not be credited). Candidates need to identify two distinct difficulties, e.g. social expectations, the provision of education for women, limitations in the health care available to women.
- (b) To answer well a **(b)** sub-question, the command word tells a candidate to 'explain why ...' something. If that is done, the answer will gain a mark in Level 3. If a candidate only describes why, their answer will be marked in Level 2. For just identifying reasons, the mark will be Level 1.

A number of answers did not get beyond basic generalisations and made no specific references to the situation in India. At the lower levels, these answers often went no further than describing reasons in very broad terms. Better answers were characterised by precise examples about literacy rates, attendance at school or improvements in health care – i.e. relevant examples that helped to support the argument ('explain why') that was being advanced.

Some answers suggested that candidates had carried out some detailed regional studies. This was excellent because this type of classroom approach allows candidates to support their ideas with precise details. At the lower levels, however, candidates simply described the social and economic position of women whereas what they needed to do was to explain how education and health care programmes can improve the situation. In such cases, the use of the word 'because' in an answer will help to make that vital transition from description to explanation.

- (c) A top (Level 4) answer will give a balanced consideration of both sides and on the basis of that reach an evaluative judgement between those alternatives. A middle-range answer will only explain factors (Level 3 if both sides are explained; Level 2 if only one side is explained). A general, unfocused answer will score Level 1.

As with answers to sub **Question (b)**, a number of candidates failed to give the precise detailed support of relevant examples that are needed to score well, relying instead only on generalisations. At the lower levels, answers showed little awareness of specific programmes or their impact. Some even failed to acknowledge the difference between rural and urban areas.

Candidates needed to consider both sides of the argument before they reach a judgement about 'how successful ...?' In a significant number of responses, candidates wrote only about success or failure. Instead, what they should have done was write one good paragraph on success and then one good paragraph on failure before reaching an overall verdict in paragraph 3 based on what had just been argued in the previous two paragraphs.

At the higher levels, candidates were able to make reference to various regional differences. There was mention of the success of education and literacy programmes in Kerala. This was excellent, and top candidates might have developed their answers further by comparing these figures with those for India as a whole, which would have highlighted the considerable success in that state. By contrast, candidates were unable to give precise examples of where there has been little success, such as Punjab or Haryana. Candidates were also unable to suggest reasons for such variations.

Question 2

- (a) To answer well an **(a)** sub-question, the command word tells a candidate to 'identify' a given number of things (e.g. issues, difficulties). Candidates were successful in identifying two issues that have faced Indian governments in dealing with the Jammu and Kashmir conflict. Responses were wide ranging, although candidates should be encouraged to ensure that the issues they choose do not overlap. Most focused on terrorism and insurgency, although others recognised the long term problem created by Partition or the religious divisions of the region.
- (b) To answer well a **(b)** sub-question, the command word tells a candidate to 'explain why ...' something. If that is done, the answer will gain a mark in Level 3. If a candidate only describes why, their answer will be marked in Level 2. For just identifying reasons, the mark will be Level 1.

There were some very good answers to this question, with candidates displaying a wide range of knowledge and supporting examples. Many were able to place the conflict in a wider context, making clear references to Indo-Pakistan relations. Some showed how China was relevant too. Many were able to link the conflict to the wider issue of terrorism and used recent examples, such as the attacks on Mumbai, to support their argument. That too was excellent. When using such examples, however, some candidates did not link terrorism back specifically to the Jammu and Kashmir conflict, which is what the question was about.

Most candidates wrote about both the desires of the people of the region and the difficulties this created in trying to resolve the conflict. Some candidates also considered the difficulty for Pakistan in giving up any of the area, particularly in light of the amount of money that has been spent on defence. Some answers were able to link this to the problem of credibility for the Pakistan government.

- (c) A top (Level 4) answer will give a balanced consideration of both sides and on the basis of that reach an evaluative judgement between those alternatives. A middle-range answer will only explain factors (Level 3 if both sides are explained; Level 2 if only one side is explained. A general, unfocused answer will score Level 1.

A number of responses address both of the given statements but, unfortunately, a significant number addressed only one. Also, very few answers were unable to support the claims they were making with precise examples. Consideration of the opening of the bus service often drew some encouraging answers. Candidates were able to explain how the bus service had allowed families to be reunited and to make friends. However, few were able to place the opening of the service in the wider context, e.g. the co-operation needed between soldiers from the two sides in clearing mines and rebuilding the damaged bridge over the Jhelum.

Some were able to link the opening to the development of the local economy. In dealing with economic progress, however, many answers concentrated solely on problems of developing the local economy and argued that this was difficult. By contrast, better answers argued that the growth in the Indian economy, compared with the much weaker economy in Pakistan, might encourage many living in Jammu and Kashmir to recognise that remaining with India may offer better opportunities for economic investment.

At the very highest level, some sophisticated answers suggested that any of these concerns had little impact while the population was still fearful of insurgent activity on a daily basis.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) To answer well the **(a)** sub-question of **Section B**, the command word tells a candidate to 'explain' a given number of things from a given Source in the Resource Booklet (in this case, three problems in Source A). If that is done, the answer will gain a mark in Level 2. If, however, a candidate only identifies things, they will be marked in Level 1.

Most candidates were able to identify three problems from Source A and most were able to explain the problems in solving the drinking water supply. Some candidates, however, threw marks away by not following the instruction in the question: instead of making full use of Source A, they brought in other problems from outside the Source; these could not be credited.

- (b) To answer well the **(b)** sub-question of **Section B**, the command word tells a candidate to ‘explain’ and judge something using their own knowledge as well as a given Source in the accompanying Resource Booklet. In this case, the task was to ‘explain how successful’ something has been. The best answers (Level 6) need to examine successes and failures and make a judgement between them. If there is no judgement, the answer will be awarded Level 5. If there is no judgement and only successes or failures are examined, the answer will be gain Level 4. Description will earn Level 3 or Level 2, while very general answers will be marked in Level 1.

Unfortunately, many candidates ignored the question command and brought no own knowledge into their answer. Quite a few candidates failed to write a balanced answer dealing with both successes and failures, even though Source B itself provided candidates with evidence of both. Whether candidates examined both sides or only one, many did not go beyond description, confining their mark to Level 3. Instead of, for example, simply stating that Rs1105 billion had been spent on providing safe drinking water, these answers should have gone on to explain that this is a long term programme and that although it might appear to be having only limited success at the moment, there is likely to be greater success when it reaches all parts of India.

The question asked ‘how successful?’ and, therefore, at the highest level candidates needed to reach a conclusion. For that, explaining the evidence of success and failure is not enough. The answer had to go on to judge between success and failure in order to be able to decide how successful the programme has been.

- (c) Many candidates scored well on this question but, very often, the number of marks that they scored declined as they went through the four parts that make up an answer to this final question in the problem-solving exercise. Candidates must structure their answer according to the four bullet points that are given.

Although at the lower end, some of the responses were very generalised or relied on unlikely scenarios, most were able to provide some detailed supporting examples to justify their choices.

Candidates must also focus on any emboldened words in the question because these flag up specific requirements. So, some candidates did not explain why they had rejected both of the other choices while some explained more than one disadvantage, but did not provide more than one reason for any of the disadvantages. In addressing the second and third bullet points, candidates are asked to explain the relevant point with reasons (plural), not just one. In all such case, these candidates limited their mark to the lower end of the level.

INDIA STUDIES

Paper 0447/03
Research Portfolio

Key Messages

- The questions set in the syllabus each year must not be altered in any way.
- Research needs to go beyond the general topic and be well-focused on the specific question.
- An Investigation and a Report should each be presented in clear sections with separate headings, not with everything run together.
- An Investigation does not need lots of background setting the scene.
- A high-scoring Investigation will offer some sustained analysis as well as lots of explanation. Each point will be well supported with relevant examples.
- The Report needs to include some reflection. This reflection should link to the conclusion of the Investigation.

General Comments

The Pilot Centres are to be commended for having the confidence to be pioneers and for helping candidates to pursue an independent study which involved selecting evidence, devising a plan, organizing material and reflecting on conclusions and further research. These very valuable skills are essential in later study as well as in professional life. For learners to have begun to develop them at IGCSE Level will be of considerable advantage to them in the future.

The remarks which follow are intended as a guide to teachers and should be read in the context of a very encouraging 'first go'.

There was a very wide spread of marks and the major discriminating factor between the Research Portfolios submitted was the extent to which each candidate attempted to answer their chosen question. Sometimes the actual question was incorrectly given on the work. In several cases, the published question had even been altered. Candidates may only answer the set question and must be assessed against it, not their own question. This is a basic requirement in any examination.

Weaker responses investigated the general topic rather than the actual question. This was particularly evident in answers on the cinema question. It is vital for selected material to be applied to the question and not just used for its own sake.

In both the film question and the question on heritage sites, the intrinsic interest of the material tended to divert some candidates from the task in hand - answering the question set. Some candidates wrote descriptions of films such as *Swades* and often reviews of the film were quoted and paraphrased. Candidates had researched well, but had allowed their findings - film reviews - to dominate what they wrote, regardless of the actual question. Film reviewers were not generally focused on how accurately the film depicted rural life, but on the artistic merits of the film, or its general significance. In repeating such material, some candidates missed out a stage. They collected material, but they did not sift through it to decide whether it was relevant to the question.

Often, the research itself should have focused more on the rural problems than the films themselves. If a film showed a rural suicide, did it show a typical feature of rural life or was it merely sensationalist? If caste problems were shown in *Swades*, are these problems common and was the depiction of them in the film believable? Sometimes research had been done on problems, but this was summarised discretely rather than being related directly to what was/was not in the film. Learners do need quite a lot of support in linking contextual knowledge to findings about films because the application of knowledge is a demanding if very necessary skill. While teachers may not offer direct help, it would be permissible to do some practice - looking at, say, a historical film and then doing some research to see if that historical film were accurate, and helping with the skill of breaking down the elements of the film and linking each element with some knowledge.

There was also some tendency to describe in the question about UNESCO sites. The selected sites had obviously been interesting to candidates, but the intrinsic interest of the sites should not have led to excessive description of their beauty or importance or cultural significance at the expense of considering the actual question – the benefits v the disadvantages of developing them for tourism. Here again, the fruits of research were dictating the agenda. Sometimes, too, research on tourism generally was not sufficiently processed by candidates so general information about tourism in India was inserted without making it relevant to the chosen site. Thus a discussion about the Taj Mahal might suddenly feature information about the preservation of forests or eco-tourism, neither of which was relevant. Perhaps some general lessons with a class about the selection of relevant material from evidence would help to develop this skill. On the whole, though, this question did produce more focused responses than the other two. In this question much more than the questions on space or film and rural poverty, candidates did attempt to explain advantages and disadvantages.

The next step up that was needed was for a candidate to support the points that they made more fully with cited material. What actually tended to happen was that they offered valid but relatively unsupported points. Perhaps this could be a target in future. It may be valid, for instance, to say that mass tourism does help employment in Agra, but it would be good to use some research to indicate how much, of what type and to assess its importance. Also, candidates must have found the information on this from a specific source. If that source had been quoted and referenced in a footnote, the argument being made would have been stronger.

Better answers offered points that were specific to their site and did not spend too much time setting the scene by describing the site itself. Where there were advantages and disadvantages, better responses offered a personal view. Generally, this tended to be rather underdeveloped in most answers – so it would be helpful if learners are encouraged to offer a sustained conclusion which followed from the findings. This is a distinct skill and could be the subject of some specific lessons, again taking care to ensure that the teaching was not focused on the actual coursework questions but on another topic chosen for practice purposes (including, perhaps, questions from a previous year). The skill itself would be the focus of this teaching.

The best answers seen were on the question about the benefits of India's space programme. There was no excessive description of the programme but there was lots of good specific explanation. At the top end, there was some sustained analysis which showed well-focused research. Some impressive analysis and discussion were seen, with the issues were well set out, although more judgement and more direct reference to evidence would both have been welcome. Candidates answering this question seemed to be more on top of their material than in the others. They seemed less dominated by the wish to impart the content of their research for its own sake.

This Report has dealt with the findings first because an understanding of the requirements of the question is the key to success. All candidates produced a plan but some candidates failed to relate their plan to their chosen question. "I will use the Internet" is not really a plan. The starting point must be to think what the question is about and then how to go about answering it. Also, it is quite likely that a plan will be modified. If one element of a plan is to look at film reviews and those reviews do not help at all with the question, then the plan needs to be changed. Better plans will focus on the issues and how to tackle them. The same is true for the bibliography. This should be related to actual sources used and should not be a massive list of websites.

Reflection is a demanding skill and it was pleasing that most candidates did attempt it. The reflection should be linked to the conclusion. If the conclusion is that, by and large, the space programme benefits India, then are there further areas which might need to be considered before that conclusion can be fully justified? Or, might further research modify that conclusion? If there are further areas, then they should be identified as precisely as possible. Thus it is no good just saying that 'I need to look at the topic in more depth'. It is very much to candidates' credit that a lot of quite specific areas were identified. To progress, however, these need to be linked far more to conclusions.

Finally, it is important that the work is presented in clear sections and that these are not run together. If work is not word-processed, would teachers please see that it is written in ink, not pencil. Thank you.

This first Report must end where it started: congratulating teachers and candidates for embarking on this very worthwhile paper. The work produced showed how much learners had enjoyed and benefitted from the opportunity to carry out research of their own.