

## Paper 2 Section C markbands

Marks	Level descriptor		
	<b>AO1: Knowledge and understanding of specified content</b>  <b>AO2: Application and analysis of knowledge and understanding</b>	<b>AO3: Synthesis and evaluation</b>	<b>AO4: Selection, use and application of a variety of appropriate skills and techniques</b>
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.		
1–2	<b>The response is too brief, lists unconnected information, is not focused on the question and lacks structure.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response is very brief or descriptive, <b>listing</b> a series of unconnected comments or largely irrelevant information. The knowledge and understanding presented is very general with large gaps or errors in interpretation. Examples or case studies are not included or only <b>listed</b>.</li> <li>There is no evidence of analysis.</li> <li>Terminology is missing, not defined, irrelevant or used incorrectly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of evaluation or conclusion is expected at this level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information presented is not grouped logically (in paragraphs or sections).</li> <li>Maps, graphs or diagrams are not included, are irrelevant or difficult to decipher (only if appropriate to the question).</li> </ul>
3–4	<b>The response is too general, lacks detail, is not focused on the question and is largely unstructured.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response is very general. The knowledge and understanding presented <b>outlines</b> examples, statistics, and facts that are both relevant and irrelevant. Links to the question are <b>listed</b>.</li> <li>The argument or analysis presented is not relevant to the question.</li> <li>Basic terminology is defined and used but with errors in understanding or used inconsistently.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If appropriate to the question, the conclusion is irrelevant.</li> <li>There is no evidence of critical evaluation of evidence (examples, statistics and case studies).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the information is not grouped logically (in paragraphs or sections).</li> <li>Maps, graphs or diagrams included lack detail, are incorrectly or only partially interpreted without explicit connections to the question (only if appropriate to the question).</li> </ul>
5–6	<b>The response partially addresses the question, but with a narrow argument, an unsubstantiated conclusion, and limited evaluation.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response <b>describes</b> relevant supporting evidence (information, examples, case studies et cetera), <b>outlining</b> appropriate link(s) to the question.</li> <li>The argument or analysis partially addresses the question or elaborates one point repeatedly.</li> <li>Relevant terminology is defined and used with only minor errors in understanding or is used inconsistently.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If appropriate to the question, the conclusions are general, not aligned with the evidence presented and/or based on an incorrect interpretation of the evidence.</li> <li>Other perspectives on evidence (examples, statistics and case studies) and/or strengths and weaknesses of evidence are <b>listed</b>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Logically related information is grouped together (in sections or paragraphs) but not consistently.</li> <li>Maps, graphs or diagrams included do not follow conventions, and include relevant and irrelevant interpretations in the text (only if appropriate to the question).</li> </ul>

7–8	<p><b>The response addresses the whole question, the analysis is evaluated and the conclusion is relevant but lacks balance.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response <b>describes</b> relevant supporting evidence correctly (information, examples and case studies) that covers all the main points of the question, <b>describing</b> appropriate links to the question.</li> <li>• The argument or analysis is clear and relevant to the question but one-sided or unbalanced.</li> <li>• Complex terminology is defined and used correctly but not consistently.</li> </ul>
9–10	<p><b>The response is in-depth and question-specific (topic and command term); analysis and conclusion are justified through well-developed evaluation of evidence and perspectives.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response <b>explains</b> correct and relevant examples, statistics and details that are integrated in the response, <b>explaining</b> the appropriate link to the question.</li> <li>• The argument or analysis is balanced, presenting evidence that is <b>discussed, explaining</b> complexity, exceptions and comparisons.</li> <li>• Complex and relevant terminology is used correctly throughout the response.</li> </ul>