

Name:

Paper 2: Part A, SL and HL (Prescribed text)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is little relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text.• The explanation is minimal.• Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy, relevance and detail.• The explanation is basic and in need of development.• Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is mostly accurate and relevant, but lacking in detail.• There is a satisfactory explanation.• Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.
7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text.• The explanation is clear, although may be in need of further development.• Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.
9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text.• The explanation is clear and well developed.• There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.

Knowledge of concept
and explanation (10):

Evaluation, criticism and
contextualization (15):

Class grade:

Comments:

Paper 2: Part B, SL and HL (Prescribed text)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is little relevant knowledge of the text.• Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.• The response is mostly descriptive with very little analysis.• There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.
4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some knowledge of the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy and relevance.• Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.• There is some limited analysis, but the response is more descriptive than analytical.• There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.• Some of the main points are justified.
7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge of the text is mostly accurate and relevant.• Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.• The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development.• There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.• Many of the main points are justified.
10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the text.• Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.• The response contains clear critical analysis.• There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view.• Most of the main points are justified.
13–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the text.• There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.• The response contains clear and well-developed critical analysis.• There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view.• All, or nearly all, of the main points are justified.