

Paper 1A: Core Theme	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. ● The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is minimal or no explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. ● There is little relevant knowledge demonstrated, and the explanation is superficial. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. ● The essay is descriptive and lacking in analysis.
6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The response is structured and generally organized, and can be easily followed. ● The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is good justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. ● The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge. There is a good explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. ● The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is a clear attempt to structure the response, although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. ● The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a basic explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. ● Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant, and there is a satisfactory explanation of the issue. 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.
16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The response is well organized and can be easily followed. Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. ● There is clear identification of the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the unseen text. Some references are made to the text. ● The student draws on their personal experience of philosophical activity, using examples or illustrations to support their points. ● There is clear analysis of both similarities and differences between the student's personal experience of philosophical activity and the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the text, although this analysis needs further development. ● The response contains critical analysis rather than just description. Most of the main points are justified. The response argues to a reasoned conclusion.
21-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The response is well structured, focused and effectively organized. ● The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a well-developed justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. ● The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge. There is a well-developed explanation of the issue. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. ● The response contains 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. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.

Paper 1B: Optional Theme	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. The response lacks coherence and is often unclear. • The student demonstrates little relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The essay is mostly descriptive. There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some attempt to follow a structured approach, although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The student demonstrates knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, but this knowledge lacks accuracy and relevance. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is 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.
11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear attempt to structure the response, although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. • Knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme 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.
16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is structured and generally organized, and can be easily followed. • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
21-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is well structured, focused and effectively organized. • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains 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. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.

	Paper 2A:	Paper 2B
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<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.
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. 	<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
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. 	<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.
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. 	<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.
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. 	<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.

Paper 3	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable structure there is minimal focus on the task. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • There is a very basic understanding of the view of philosophical activity raised by the unseen text. Few, if any, references are made to the text. • There is limited reference to the student's personal experience of philosophical activity but no comparison or contrast of this experience with the view(s) raised by the text. • The essay is descriptive and lacking in analysis. Few of the main points are justified.
6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some attempt to follow a structured approach, although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • There is a limited understanding of the view(s) of philosophical activity raised by the text. Few, if any, references are made to the text. • There is some evidence that the student has drawn on their personal experience of philosophical activity. • The response identifies similarities and differences between the student's personal experience of philosophical activity and the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the text, although the analysis of these similarities and differences is superficial • The response contains some analysis but is more descriptive than analytical. Some of the main points are justified.
11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear attempt to structure the response, although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is a satisfactory understanding of the view(s) of philosophical activity raised by the text. Some references are made to the text. • There is some evidence that the student has drawn on their personal experience of philosophical activity, with examples or illustrations used to support their points. • There is some analysis of the similarities and differences between the student's personal experience of philosophical activity and the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the text, although this analysis needs further development. • The response contains critical analysis rather than just description. Many of the main points are justified.
16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is well organized and can be easily followed. Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. • There is clear identification of the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the unseen text. Some references are made to the text. • The student draws on their personal experience of philosophical activity, using examples or illustrations to support their points • There is clear analysis of both similarities and differences between the student's personal experience of philosophical activity and the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the text, although this analysis needs further development • The response contains critical analysis rather than just description. Most of the main points are justified. The response argues to a reasoned conclusion.
21-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is well structured, focused and effectively organized. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • There is clear identification of the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the unseen text. Effective references are made to the text. • The student draws explicitly on their personal experience of philosophical activity, using well-chosen examples or illustrations to support their points. • There is clear analysis of both similarities and differences between the student's personal experience of philosophical activity and the view(s) of philosophical activity presented. • The response contains well-developed critical analysis. All, or nearly all, of the main points are justified. The response argues to a reasoned conclusion.

Internal Assessment

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

- 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)

- 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)

- 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)

- 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)

- 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.**