

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

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