

Apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given and **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**. If an answer indicates that the demands of the question are understood and addressed but that **not all implications are considered (for example, compare or contrast; reasons or significance; methods or success)**, then examiners should not be afraid of using the full range of marks allowed for by the markscheme. Responses that offer good coverage of some of the criteria should be rewarded accordingly. **If you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate’s work please contact your team leader.**

Marks	Level descriptor
13–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses are clearly focused, showing a high degree of awareness of the demands and implications of the question. Answers are well structured, balanced and effectively organized.</li> <li>• Knowledge is detailed, accurate and relevant. Events are placed in their historical context, and there is a clear understanding of historical concepts.</li> <li>• Examples used are appropriate and relevant, and are used effectively to support the analysis/evaluation.</li> <li>• Arguments are clear and coherent. There is evaluation of different perspectives, and this evaluation is integrated effectively into the answer.</li> <li>• The answer contains well-developed critical analysis. All, or nearly all, of the main points are substantiated, and the response argues to a reasoned conclusion.</li> </ul>
10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The demands of the question are understood and addressed. Answers are generally well structured and organized, although there may be some repetition or lack of clarity in places.</li> <li>• Knowledge is accurate and relevant. Events are placed in their historical context, and there is a clear understanding of historical concepts. Examples used are appropriate and relevant, and are used to support the analysis/evaluation.</li> <li>• Arguments are mainly clear and coherent. There is some awareness and evaluation of different perspectives.</li> <li>• The response contains critical analysis. Most of the main points are substantiated, and the response argues to a consistent conclusion.</li> </ul>
7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response indicates an understanding of the demands of the question, but these demands are only partially addressed. There is an attempt to follow a structured approach.</li> <li>• Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant. Events are generally placed in their historical context. Examples used are appropriate and relevant.</li> <li>• The response moves beyond description to include some analysis or critical commentary, but this is not sustained.</li> </ul>
4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response indicates some understanding of the demands of the question. While there may be an attempt to follow a structured approach, the response lacks clarity and coherence.</li> <li>• Knowledge is demonstrated but lacks accuracy and relevance. There is a superficial understanding of historical context. The answer makes use of specific examples, although these may be vague or lack relevance.</li> <li>• There is some limited analysis, but the response is primarily narrative/descriptive in nature, rather than analytical.</li> </ul>

1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is little understanding of the demands of the question. The response is poorly structured or, where there is a recognizable essay structure, there is minimal focus on the task.</li><li>• Little knowledge is present. Where specific examples are referred to, they are factually incorrect, irrelevant or vague.</li><li>• The response contains little or no critical analysis. It may consist mostly of generalizations and poorly substantiated assertions.</li></ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.</li></ul>