Paper 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. They are intended to assist marking, but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate’s work please contact your team leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0:</th>
<th>Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–2:</td>
<td>Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There is little more than unsupported generalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–4:</td>
<td>There is little understanding of the question. Historical knowledge is present but the detail is insufficient. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there are little more than poorly substantiated assertions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6:</td>
<td>Answers indicate some understanding of the question, but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Understanding of historical processes may be present but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–8:</td>
<td>The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, in-depth, historical knowledge is present but is unevenly applied. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. An attempt to place events in historical context and show an understanding of historical processes. An attempt at a structured approach, either chronological or thematic has been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–11:</td>
<td>Answers indicate that the question is understood, but not all implications considered. Knowledge is largely accurate. Critical commentary may be present. Events are generally placed in context, and historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are understood. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach. Focus on AO1, AO2 and AO4. Responses that simply summarize the views of historians cannot reach the top of this markband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14:</td>
<td>Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary is used to indicate some in-depth understanding, but is not consistent throughout. Events are placed in context and there is sound understanding of historical processes and comparison and contrast. Evaluation of different approaches may be used to substantiate arguments presented. Synthesis is present, but not always consistently integrated. Focus on AO3 and AO4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17:</td>
<td>Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Accurate and detailed historical knowledge is used convincingly to support critical commentary. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively. Answers are well-structured and balanced and synthesis is well-developed and supported with knowledge and critical commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20:</td>
<td>Answers are clearly focused with a high degree of the awareness of the question and may challenge it successfully. Knowledge is extensive, accurately applied and there may be a high level of conceptual ability. Evaluation of different approaches may be present as may be understanding of historical processes as well as comparison and contrast where relevant. Evaluation is integrated into the answer. The answer is well-structured and well-focused. Synthesis is highly developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>