

Paper 3 part (a) 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.		
1–3	<b>The response is general, not focused on the question, and lacks detail and structure.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response is very brief or general, <b>listing</b> a series of unconnected comments or largely irrelevant information. Evidence is general or relevant to the topic, but not to the question.</li> <li>• Evidence (that is, facts, statistics, examples or theories) is <b>listed</b>, lacks detail, and the relevance to the question is unclear.</li> <li>• Evidence is not used to formulate an argument or an analysis.</li> <li>• Everyday language is used; there is little use of geographical terminology or it is used with errors in understanding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of synthesis or evaluation is expected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information is <b>listed</b> but is not grouped together in paragraphs, or paragraphing is erratic.</li> <li>• If present, the conclusion is brief, does not summarize the argument and/or does not address the question.</li> </ul>
4–6	<b>The response only partially addresses the question; evidence is both relevant and irrelevant and is largely unstructured.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response partially addresses the question and/or does not meet the requirements of the command term. Key evidence is not included.</li> <li>• A mix of relevant and irrelevant evidence is <b>outlined</b> (that is, facts, statistics, examples or theories) and any links to the question are only <b>listed</b>.</li> <li>• The evidence presented supports only one element or interpretation of the question.</li> <li>• Key geographical terms are defined briefly. The terminology used is both relevant and irrelevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of synthesis or evaluation is expected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraphs do not reflect grouping of information that addresses a specific element of the question.</li> <li>• If present, the conclusion is one-sided, addressing only part of the question.</li> </ul>
7–9	<b>The response addresses most parts of the question and outlines an analysis supported by relevant evidence but may lack clear links between paragraphs.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question is broken down into parts and most parts of the question are addressed in the response, with supporting evidence for each aspect of the question. The response meets the requirements of the command term.</li> <li>• Relevant evidence (that is, facts, statistics, examples or theories) is <b>described</b>, focused on the question and mostly correct. Links with the question are <b>described</b>.</li> <li>• The analysis <b>outlines</b> a two-sided argument briefly (if appropriate) and is mostly descriptive, using examples as explanation.</li> <li>• Correct definitions are given, and relevant and irrelevant specialist geographical terms are used with occasional errors; or everyday language is used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of synthesis or evaluation is expected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A series of standalone paragraphs each addressing a specific element of the question but lacking clear links connecting them all into a coherent whole.</li> <li>• The conclusion repeats and summarizes the analysis or argument, but may contain new information as well.</li> </ul>

<p>10–12</p>	<p><b>The response addresses all aspects of the question; the analysis is explained using evidence integrated in the paragraphs, and it is well structured.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All aspects of the question are addressed and the response meets the requirements of the command term.</li> <li>• Detailed evidence (that is, facts, statistics, examples or theories) are integrated in sentences and paragraphs, and links made between evidence and the question are <b>explained</b> and relevant.</li> <li>• The response <b>explains</b> how the two sides of the argument (if appropriate) are supported by detailed evidence that is integrated in sentences.</li> <li>• Clear, correct definitions and use of geographical language is integrated in the sentences and throughout the response.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of synthesis or evaluation is expected.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraphs focus on a relevant point of the argument and integrate the supporting evidence. Paragraphs are linked and support the logical flow of the argument and response.</li> <li>• The conclusion summarizes the evidence and argument, and links all back to the question.</li> </ul>
--------------	---

Paper 3 part (b) 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.		
1–4	<b>The response is general, not focused on the question, and lacks detail and structure.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response is very brief or general, <b>listing</b> a series of unconnected comments or largely irrelevant information. Evidence is general or relevant to the topic, but not the question.</li> <li>• Evidence (that is, facts, statistics, examples or theories) is <b>listed</b>, lacks detail, and the relevance to the question is unclear.</li> <li>• Evidence is not used to formulate an argument or an analysis.</li> <li>• Everyday language is used; there is little use of geographical terminology or it is used with errors in understanding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No synthesis or evaluation is expected at this level.</li> <li>• No links are presented between the response and (sub)topics in the guide.</li> <li>• No valid opinion or perspective on the issue is formulated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information is <b>listed</b> but is not grouped together in paragraphs, or paragraphing is erratic.</li> <li>• If present, the conclusion is brief, does not summarize the argument and/or does not address the question.</li> </ul>
5–8	<b>The response only partially addresses the question with limited links to the guide; evidence is both relevant and irrelevant and is largely unstructured.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response partially addresses the question and/or does not meet the requirements of the command term. Key evidence is not included.</li> <li>• A mix of relevant and irrelevant evidence is <b>outlined</b> (that is, facts, statistics, examples or theories) and any links to the question are only <b>listed</b>.</li> <li>• The evidence presented supports only one element or interpretation of the question.</li> <li>• Key geographical terms are defined briefly. Terminology used is both relevant and irrelevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No synthesis or evaluation is expected at this level.</li> <li>• The link(s) between the response and the guide focus on one topic; other potential links are <b>listed</b>.</li> <li>• A valid but limited opinion or perspective on the issue is formulated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraphs do not reflect grouping of information that addresses a specific element of the question.</li> <li>• If present, the conclusion is one-sided, addressing only part of the question.</li> </ul>
9–12	<b>The response addresses most parts of the question with developed links to the guide and outlines an analysis supported by relevant evidence but may lack clear links between paragraphs.</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question is broken down into parts and most parts of the question are addressed in the response, with supporting evidence for each aspect of the question. The response meets the requirements of the command term.</li> <li>• Relevant evidence (that is, facts, statistics, examples or theories) is <b>described</b>, focused on the question and mostly correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synthesis <b>or</b> evaluation is required at this level.</li> <li>• Links between the response and the guide refer to multiple topics and are <b>described</b>.</li> <li>• Opinion or perspective presented is aligned with the response but the links are not made explicit or the link is a general statement. Other perspectives or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A series of standalone paragraphs each addressing a specific element of the question but lacking clear links connecting them all into a coherent whole.</li> <li>• The conclusion repeats and summarizes the analysis or argument, but may contain new information as well.</li> </ul>

	<p>Links with the question are <b>described</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis <b>outlines</b> a two-sided argument briefly (if appropriate) and is mostly descriptive, using examples as explanation.</li> <li>• Correct definitions are given, and relevant and irrelevant specialist geographical terms are used with occasional errors; or everyday language is used.</li> </ul>	<p>interpretations are <b>listed</b> without details.</p>	
<p>13-16</p>	<p><b>The response addresses all aspects of the question; the analysis is explained and evaluated using evidence integrated in the paragraphs, and it is well structured.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All aspects of the question are addressed and the response meets the requirements of the command term.</li> <li>• Detailed evidence (that is, facts, statistics, examples or theories) are integrated in sentences and paragraphs, and links made between evidence and the question are <b>explained</b> and relevant.</li> <li>• The response <b>explains</b> how the two sides of the argument (if appropriate) are supported by detailed evidence that is integrated in sentences.</li> <li>• Clear, correct definitions and use of geographical language is integrated in the sentences and throughout the response.</li> </ul>	<p>Synthesis <b>and</b> evaluation is required at this level. Links between the response and (sub)topics from the guide are <b>explained</b> and supported by the evidence in the response. The opinion or perspective presented is explicitly linked to the range of evidence included in the response, including critical analysis of the relative certainty of evidence used, describing other perspectives or interpretations of evidence.</p>	<p>Paragraphs focus on a relevant point of the argument and integrate the supporting evidence. Paragraphs are linked and support the logical flow of the argument and response. The conclusion summarizes the evidence and argument, and links all back to the question.</p>