

## PA General Comments

- Your argument is your thesis. If you only preview two theories, there is no thesis. It is good to formulate a question, but the question is not your thesis, rather the answer to the question is your thesis. Your introduction must take your argument explicit and clear. Remember, your argument and the argument suggested by the stimulus are two different things (even if your argument agrees with that contained in the stimulus.)
- Your introduction should connect the area of philosophy you are writing about to the stimulus. Avoid summarizing the stimulus in your introduction.
- Include the stimulus, or a 200 word summary of it, after the title page and before the essay begins. The stimulus does not count toward the word count
- Proofread for clarity
- Try very hard to explore the implications of the philosophy you discuss using real world examples.
- If you quote an author when they are using a specific concept or term, make sure you explain what that term/concept means in the context of your overall argument.
- Focus on your argument. Use a rifle not a shotgun.
- Don't feel like you have to summarize every theory we discussed. Focus only on those theories relevant to your argument
- Most people that have a hard time making word count are not dealing specifically with the theory they are discussing. Explore the philosophical concepts you are examining in greater detail.
- Use the texts we have read in class. Explore and analyze them in depth to construct your arguments. Avoid superficiality.

## Internal assessment criteria—SL and HL

### Philosophical analysis of a non-philosophical stimulus

#### Criterion A: Identification of issue and justification (3 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus is implied but not explicitly identified. There is no justification of the connection between the stimulus and the philosophical issue identified.
2	The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus is clearly identified. There is some justification of the connection between the stimulus and the philosophical issue identified.
3	The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus is clearly and explicitly identified. There is a clear justification of the connection between the stimulus and the philosophical issue identified.

#### Criterion B: Clarity (4 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable structure there is minimal focus on the task.
2	There is some attempt to follow a structured approach, although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey.
3	The response is structured and generally organized, and can be easily followed.
4	The response is well structured, focused and effectively organized. The response is clear and coherent.

#### Criterion C: Knowledge and understanding (4 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1	There is little relevant knowledge. The explanation of the philosophical issue is minimal. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
2	Some knowledge is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy and relevance. There is a basic explanation of the philosophical issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.
3	Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant. There is a satisfactory explanation of the philosophical issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.
4	The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge. There is a well-developed explanation of the philosophical issue. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.

#### Criterion D: Analysis (8 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The response is mostly descriptive. There is little analysis, and few or no examples are given.
3–4	There is limited analysis, but the response is more descriptive than analytical. Some appropriate examples are used.
5–6	The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. Appropriate examples are used in support of the argument. Counter-arguments are identified.
7–8	The response contains well-developed critical analysis. The examples used are well chosen and lend support to the argument. Counter-arguments are identified and analysed in a convincing way.

#### Criterion E: Evaluation (6 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	There is little evaluation of alternative interpretations or points of view. Some of the main points are justified. There is no conclusion, or the conclusion is not relevant.
3–4	There is some evaluation of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified. The conclusion is stated but may not be entirely consistent with the argument.
5–6	There is clear evaluation of alternative interpretations or points of view. All, or nearly all, of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position. The conclusion is clearly stated and consistent with the argument.