**IB History – Paper 3 Mark Scheme**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Focus on the question | Structure | knowledge | Relevant examples and effective links | Critical Analysis and conclusion | Perspectives |
| 15-13 | Responses are clearly focused, showing a high degree of awareness of the demands and implications of the question. | Responses are well structured and effectively organized. | Knowledge is detailed, 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 effectively to support the analysis/evaluation. | Arguments are clear and coherent. 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. | There is evaluation of different perspectives, and this evaluation is integrated effectively into the answer. |
| 10-12 | The demands of the question are understood and addressed. | Responses are generally well structured and organized, although there is some repetition or lack of clarity in places. | 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. | Arguments are mainly clear and coherent. The response contains critical analysis. Most of the main points are substantiated, and the response argues to a consistent conclusion. | There is some awareness and evaluation of different perspectives. |
| 7-9 | 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. | Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant. Events are generally placed in their historical context. | Examples used are appropriate and relevant. | The response moves beyond description to include some analysis or critical commentary, but this is not sustained. | Perspectives are named but not understood or used effectively. |
| 4-6 | 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. | 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. | There is some limited analysis, but the response is primarily narrative/ descriptive in nature, rather than analytical. | There is no reference to historical perspectives. |
| 1-3 | 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. | Little knowledge is present. | Where specific examples are referred to, they are factually incorrect, irrelevant or vague. | The response contains little or no critical analysis. It may consist mostly of generalizations and poorly substantiated assertions. | There is no reference to historical perspectives. |
| 0 | Answers do not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. | | | | | |