**Paper 2 (SL and HL) IB Rubric**

**Duration: 1 hour 30 minutes**

**Weighting: 45% SL, 25% HL**

Paper 2 is an essay paper based on the 12 world history topics. The paper consists of two questions for each of the 12 topics. Students must answer **two** questions, each selected from a **different** topic. Some comparative questions on this paper require that examples be drawn from more than one region. When the word “region” is used in a paper 2 question, it refers to one of the four regional options defined by the world map in the introduction to the world history topics in the “World history topics” section.

The maximum mark for this paper is 30. The paper is marked using generic markbands and a paper-specific markscheme.

**External markbands—paper 2 (SL and HL)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **Level descriptor** |
| **0** | Answers do not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. |
| **1–3** | * There is little understanding of the demands of the question. The response is poorly structured or, where there is a recognizable essay structure, there is minimal focus on the task. * Little knowledge of the world history topic is present. * The student identifies examples to discuss, but these examples are factually incorrect, irrelevant or vague. * The response contains little or no critical analysis. The response may consist mostly of generalizations and poorly substantiated assertions. |
| **4–6** | * The response indicates some understanding of the demands of the question. While there may be an attempt to follow a structured approach, the response lacks clarity and coherence. * Knowledge of the world history topic is demonstrated, but lacks accuracy and relevance. There is a superficial understanding of historical context. * The student identifies specific examples to discuss, but these examples are vague or lack relevance. * There is some limited analysis, but the response is primarily narrative/ descriptive in nature rather than analytical. |
| **7–9** | * The response indicates an understanding of the demands of the question, but these demands are only partially addressed. There is an attempt to follow a structured approach. * Knowledge of the world history topic is mostly accurate and relevant. Events are generally placed in their historical context. * The examples that the student chooses to discuss are appropriate and relevant. The response makes links and/or comparisons (as appropriate to the question). * The response moves beyond description to include some analysis or critical commentary, but this is not sustained. |
| **10–12** | * The demands of the question are understood and addressed. Responses are generally well structured and organized, although there is some repetition or lack of clarity in places. * Knowledge of the world history topic is mostly accurate and relevant. Events are placed in their historical context, and there is some understanding of historical concepts. * The examples that the student chooses to discuss are appropriate and relevant, and are used to support the analysis/evaluation. The response makes effective links and/or comparisons (as appropriate to the question). * The response contains critical analysis, which is mainly clear and coherent. There is some awareness and evaluation of different perspectives. Most of the main points are substantiated and the response argues to a consistent conclusion. |
| **13–15** | * Responses are clearly focused, showing a high degree of awareness of the demands and implications of the question. Responses are well structured and effectively organized. * Knowledge of the world history topic is accurate and relevant. Events are placed in their historical context, and there is a clear understanding of historical concepts. * The examples that the student chooses to discuss are appropriate and relevant, and are used effectively to support the analysis/evaluation. The response makes effective links and/or comparisons (as appropriate to the question). * The response contains clear and coherent critical analysis. There is evaluation of different perspectives, and this evaluation is integrated effectively into the answer. All, or nearly all, of the main points are substantiated, and the response argues to a consistent conclusion. |