

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**0447 INDIA STUDIES**

**0447/03**

Paper 3 (Research Portfolio), maximum raw mark 30

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2012</b>	<b>0447</b>	<b>03</b>

### Investigation

- All marking will be positive. The full mark range will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners are looking for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit', in applying the Levels. Examiners should provisionally start at the top mark of a Level and then moderate up/down according to the specific qualities of the individual Investigation.
- If quoted material is not acknowledged in footnotes, the top mark of the Level awarded may not be given.

<b>Level 6</b>	The Investigation is fully relevant. The range of stimuli/materials is excellent. Evaluation is thorough and sustained. Explanations are thorough. Judgements are perceptive and well developed. A personal view emerges which is fully justified from the considered evidence.	20–17
<b>Level 5</b>	The Investigation is mostly relevant. The range of stimuli/materials is good. Evaluation predominates but its quality varies. Explanations are fairly well developed. Judgements are clear but variable in quality. A personal view emerges which is consistent with the considered evidence but limited in scope.	16–13
<b>Level 4</b>	The Investigation is mostly relevant. The range of stimuli/materials is good. There is some evaluation but it is limited and/or weak. Explanations are limited and there is much description. Judgement is limited and not well supported. A personal view emerges which is limited and not entirely consistent with the considered evidence.	12–9
<b>Level 3</b>	The Investigation has some relevance. The range of stimuli/materials is limited. There is no evaluation. There is some explanation but it is very basic and description predominates. Any judgements are only assertions. There is a sense of alternative viewpoints but this is very basic. Any personal view is very simplistic and/or inconsistent with the considered evidence. The impression is of indiscriminating description and/or fragmented commentary.	8–5
<b>Level 2</b>	The Investigation has very little of relevance. The range of stimuli/materials is very poor. There is no evaluation. There is no explanation. There is no judgement. There is no personal view. Information is offered but there is only description and/or unsupported assertions.	4–1
<b>Level 1</b>	None of the assessment criteria has been met in any way. There is no creditworthy material.	0

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2012</b>	<b>0447</b>	<b>03</b>

## Report

<b>Plan</b>	
The Plan is well-formulated and relevant.	2
The Plan is simplistic and/or has some irrelevance.	1
There is no Plan.	0

<b>Reflection</b>	
The Investigation's conclusions and limitations are evaluated carefully to identify specific issues/ questions that warrant further research. How and/ or why such specified further research would advance our understanding of the subject is explained carefully.	6–5
Conclusions and limitations are evaluated but this is limited and not well linked to further research possibilities. How and/or why such specified further research would advance our understanding of the subject is explained to some extent.	4–3
Conclusions and/or limitations are described but there is no linkage to further research possibilities. How and/or why any specified further research would advance our understanding of the subject is not addressed.	2–1
There is no reflection.	0

<b>Bibliography</b>	
There is a full bibliography.	2
There is a bibliography but there are some errors and/or omissions.	1
There is no bibliography.	0

Total: 10 marks