

MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR PHILOSOPHY

Mark %	
80 and above	• Highly intelligent perceptive and sensitive response to philosophical texts • Consistently original and/or subtle and independent critical thought, insight and power of analysis • Exceptional grasp of appropriate philosophical terms, concepts and/or dimensions of the subject. • Consistent and coherent use of a relevant and well-developed critical methodology. • Sustained evidence of wide and thorough reading and discriminating use of secondary material. • Exceptional appreciation of textual and/or historical context and relationship to other arts or disciplines. • A highly developed sense of relevance. • Acute focus on the question or task. • Exceptional ability to understand and solve problems (raised by the question and/or texts). • Exceptional and highly intelligent use of quotation or other illustrative material. • Exceptional ability to present well-structured and developed, articulate and persuasive argument, which adjudicates between critical views and arguments. • An exceptional command of language, fluent writing and clarity of expression. • Complete mastery of appropriate presentation skills.
75 -79	• Intelligent perceptive and sensitive response to philosophical texts • Original and/or subtle and independent critical thought, insight and power of analysis. • Excellent grasp of appropriate philosophical terms, concepts and/or dimensions of the subject. • Use of a relevant and well-developed critical methodology. • Sustained evidence of wide and thorough reading and discriminating use of secondary material. • Thorough appreciation of textual and/or historical context and relationship to other arts or disciplines. • A developed sense of relevance. • Acute focus on the question or task • High level ability to understand and solve problems (raised by the question and/or texts). • Illuminating and intelligent use of quotation or other illustrative material. • Ability to present well-structured and developed, articulate and persuasive argument that may adjudicate between critical views and arguments. • A superior command of language, fluent writing and clarity of expression. • Mastery of appropriate presentation and scholarly skills
70-74	• Evidence of intelligent perceptive and sensitive response to philosophical texts • Evidence of original and/or subtle and independent critical thought, insight and power of analysis. • Excellent grasp of appropriate philosophical terms, concepts and/or dimensions of the subject. • Use of a relevant and well-developed critical methodology. • Evidence of wide and thorough reading and discriminating use of secondary material. • Thorough appreciation of textual and/or historical context and relationship to other arts or disciplines. • A firm sense of relevance. • Some evidence of an acute focus on the question or task. • Some evidence of a high level ability to understand and solve problems (raised by the question and/or texts). • Some evidence of an illuminating and intelligent use of quotation or other illustrative material. • Ability to present well-structured and developed, articulate and persuasive argument that may adjudicate between critical views and arguments. • Evidence of a superior command of language, fluent writing and clarity of expression. • Mastery of appropriate presentation and scholarly skills
65-69	• Alert and sensitive response to texts or intelligent understanding of formal features.

	• Independent and/or thoughtful analysis, some of which may be perceptive or insightful • Good understanding of appropriate philosophical terms, concepts and/or dimensions of the subject. • Use of a relevant critical methodology. • Evidence of thorough reading and preparation and ability to distinguish and deploy relevant material. • First-hand knowledge of a varied range of texts appropriate to the subject under discussion. • A clear sense of relevance • Sound focus on the question or task. • Ability to understand and solve problems (raised by the question and/or texts). • Effective use of quotation or other illustrative material. • Orderly presentation of structured and developed argument that may involve adjudication between critical views and arguments. • Clear and effective expression and coherent writing. • Clear and careful presentation which is well documented and referenced.
60-64	• Some evidence of alert and sensitive response to texts or intelligent understanding of formal features. • Evidence of independent and/or thoughtful analysis, some of which may be perceptive or insightful • Some demonstration of a good understanding of appropriate philosophical terms, concepts and/or dimensions of the subject. • Use of a relevant critical methodology • Some evidence of evidence of thorough reading and preparation and ability to distinguish and deploy relevant material. • First-hand knowledge of a varied range of texts appropriate to the subject under discussion. • A clear sense of relevance • Sound focus on the question or task. • Some evidence of an ability to understand and solve problems (raised by the question and/or texts). • Effective use of quotation or other illustrative material. • Orderly presentation of structured and developed argument that may involve adjudication between critical views and arguments. • Clear and effective expression and coherent writing. • Clear and careful presentation which is well documented and referenced.
55-59	• Appreciative response to texts or sound understanding of formal features. • A consistent measure of analysis • Knowledge of philosophical terms, concepts and/or dimensions of the subject. • Awareness of relevant critical methodology • Evidence of a range of reading • Knowledge of a sufficient number of texts (or evidence) to substantiate general statements. • Solid level of argument, though occasionally not always (equally) relevant. • Ability to recognise what a question is asking for and to construct a coherent answer keeping this in view. • Relevant and appropriate use of secondary material and apposite use of quotation or other illustrative material. • Some ability to engage in critical debate. • Effective expression and satisfactory written style, though there may be some disjointed arguments and spelling and grammatical errors. • Sound presentation, with limited use of references.
50-54	• Evidence of an appreciative response to texts or sound understanding of formal features. • A measure of analysis • Some knowledge of ethical, critical, formal, theoretical, philosophical terms, concepts and/or dimensions of the subject. • Awareness of relevant critical methodology • Some evidence of a range of reading • Knowledge of a sufficient number of texts (or evidence) to substantiate general statements. • Solid level of argument, though not always (equally) relevant. • Ability to recognise what a question is asking for and to construct a largely coherent answer keeping this in view. • Relevant and appropriate use of secondary material and apposite use of quotation or other illustrative material. • Evidence of some ability to engage in critical debate.

	• Effective expression and satisfactory written style, though there may be some disjointed arguments and spelling and grammatical errors. • Sound presentation, with limited use of references.
45-49	• Some knowledge of a restricted range of texts. • A tendency to descriptive work. • Limited understanding of philosophical, formal or technical issues. • Limited range of reading. • Presentation of material which can be seen as relevant. • An argument which in some measure lacks structure and/or relevance. • Discernible focus on the question or task. • Some attempt at identifying and solving problems (raised by the question and/or texts). • Some references and examples. • Some weaknesses in language, with a need for attention to writing and presentation, which may be poor with spelling and grammatical errors, but no major faults or serious discontinuities of thought
40-44	• Some (limited) knowledge of a (restricted) range of texts. • Largely descriptive work. • A very limited understanding of philosophical, formal or technical issues. • A very limited range of reading. • Presentation of material which can be seen as relevant. • An argument which in some considerable measure lacks structure and/or relevance. • A limited but discernible focus on the question or task. • Some limited attempt at identifying and solving problems (raised by the question and/or texts). • Some limited references and examples. • Some serious weaknesses in language, with a need for attention to writing and presentation, which may be poor with spelling and grammatical errors, but no major faults or serious discontinuities of thought
35-39	• Very restricted knowledge of texts. • Very limited understanding of philosophical, or technical terms and concepts. • Insufficient reading. • Little focus on the question. • Lack of ability to identify and solve problems (raised by the question and/or texts). • Limited references or examples. • Serious weaknesses in language and expression and poor presentation with many spelling and grammatical errors.
30-35	• Extremely restricted knowledge of texts. • Extremely limited understanding of philosophical, or technical terms and concepts. • Insufficient reading. • Little focus on the question. • Lack of ability to identify and solve problems (raised by the question and/or texts). • Extremely limited references or examples. • Very serious weaknesses in language and expression and poor presentation with many spelling and grammatical errors.
20-29	• Little attempt at an answer. • Little evidence of coherent thinking and organisation. • Apparent ignorance of the texts under discussion, or of appropriate critical evidence. • Little or no focus on the question. • Very serious faults in expression; bad presentation with many spelling and grammatical errors (sometimes making the answer barely intelligible).
0-19	• No or virtually no attempt at an answer. • No or virtually no evidence of coherent thinking and organisation. • Ignorance of the texts under discussion, or of appropriate critical evidence. • Extremely serious faults in expression.
0	• All plagiarised work/cases of unfair practice