

---

**INDIA STUDIES****0447/03**

Paper 3 Research Portfolio

**May/June 2019**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

---

**Published**

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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**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     |

**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