

# Markscheme

**May 2019**

**Philosophy**

**Higher level**

**Paper 3**

No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the IB.

Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits commercial use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, is not permitted and is subject to the IB's prior written consent via a license. More information on how to request a license can be obtained from <http://www.ibo.org/contact-the-ib/media-inquiries/for-publishers/guidance-for-third-party-publishers-and-providers/how-to-apply-for-a-license>.

Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite de l'IB.

De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation commerciale de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, n'est pas autorisée et est soumise au consentement écrit préalable de l'IB par l'intermédiaire d'une licence. Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour demander une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <http://www.ibo.org/fr/contact-the-ib/media-inquiries/for-publishers/guidance-for-third-party-publishers-and-providers/how-to-apply-for-a-license>.

No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin que medie la autorización escrita del IB.

Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso con fines comerciales de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales— no está permitido y estará sujeto al otorgamiento previo de una licencia escrita por parte del IB. En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una licencia: <http://www.ibo.org/es/contact-the-ib/media-inquiries/for-publishers/guidance-for-third-party-publishers-and-providers/how-to-apply-for-a-license>.

## How to use the Diploma Programme Philosophy markscheme

The assessment markbands constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment markbands examiners can see the skills being assessed in the examinations. The markschemes are designed to assist examiners in possible routes taken by candidates in terms of the content of their answers when demonstrating their skills of doing philosophy through their responses. The points listed are not compulsory points, and not necessarily the best possible points. They are a framework to help examiners contextualize the requirements of the question, and to facilitate the application of marks according to the assessment markbands listed on pages 6 and 7.

It is important that examiners understand that the main idea of the course is to promote *doing* philosophy, and this involves activity and engagement throughout a two-year programme, as opposed to emphasizing the chance to display knowledge in a terminal set of examination papers. Even in the examinations, responses should not be assessed on how much candidates *know* as much as how they are able to use their knowledge in support of an argument, using the skills referred to in the various assessment markbands published in the subject guide, reflecting an engagement with philosophical activity throughout the course. As a tool intended to help examiners in assessing responses, the following points should be kept in mind when using a markscheme:

- The Diploma Programme Philosophy course is designed to encourage the skills of *doing* philosophy in the candidates. These skills can be accessed through reading the assessment markbands in the subject guide
- The markscheme does not intend to outline a model/correct answer
- The markscheme has an introductory paragraph which contextualizes the emphasis of the question being asked
- The bullet points below the paragraph are suggested possible points of development that should *not* be considered a prescriptive list but rather an indicative list where they might appear in the answer
- If there are names of philosophers and references to their work incorporated into the markscheme, this should help to give context for the examiners and does *not* reflect a requirement that such philosophers and references should appear in an answer: They are possible lines of development.
- Candidates can legitimately select from a wide range of ideas, arguments and concepts in service of the question they are answering, and it is possible that candidates will use material effectively that is *not* mentioned in the markscheme
- Examiners should be aware of the command terms for Philosophy as published on page 54 of the Philosophy subject guide when assessing responses
- In markschemes for Paper 3, there are suggested pertinent points found in the text extract relating to philosophical activity. The markschemes include suggested questions that might stimulate analysis of those points. It is not intended that all possible points raised by the text are to be covered by the candidates. The markbands direct examiners to rewarding the responses accordingly
- The markscheme bullet points cannot and are not intended to predict how a candidate will relate his or her personal experience of the DP HL Philosophy course to the text extract, so the examiner must be aware that much of the response of the candidate will *not* be covered by material in the markscheme, but the candidate's response must relate to the text extract.

## Paper 3 markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The essay is descriptive and lacking in analysis. Few of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• There is some evidence that the student has drawn on their personal experience of philosophical activity.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The response contains some analysis but is more descriptive than analytical. Some of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>
11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• There is a satisfactory understanding of the view(s) of philosophical activity raised by the text. Some references are made to the text.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The response contains critical analysis rather than just description. Many of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>
16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response is well organized and can be easily followed. Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately.</li> <li>• There is clear identification of the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the unseen text. Some references are made to the text.</li> <li>• The student draws on their personal experience of philosophical activity, using examples or illustrations to support their points.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The response contains critical analysis rather than just description. Most of the main points are justified. The response argues to a reasoned conclusion.</li> </ul>
21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response is well structured, focused and effectively organized. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is clear identification of the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the unseen text. Effective references are made to the text.</li><li>• The student draws explicitly on their personal experience of philosophical activity, using well-chosen examples or illustrations to support their points.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• The response contains well developed critical analysis. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues to a reasoned conclusion.</li></ul>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Unseen text – exploring philosophical activity

When responding to this extract, candidates should focus on the activity of philosophy. In the course of analysing and evaluating the ideas in the extract candidates should reflect on their own experience of doing philosophy, and should therefore make explicit comparisons/contrasts between their experience of studying the HL Philosophy course and what the extract is saying about doing philosophy. Candidates should make explicit reference to the ideas and arguments in the text in their response. **[25]**

Candidates might consider the following:

- “No shallow end”; in what sense is “doing philosophy” something that requires an immediately challenging process like diving straight into the deep end of a pool? What are the “struggles” referred to that a philosopher might have to experience?
  - Why is reading “the works of great philosophers” the “best way to learn philosophy”? Candidates may use their experience of studying a philosophical text as part of the HL programme. Candidates may also refer to the works of philosophers they have come across in their coverage of the Core Theme and Optional Themes
  - “Topics” of philosophy and “methods” – what is the difference? Examples from personal study of the HL course
  - The role played by the method of a philosopher in reaching a conclusion – the shape and type of reasoning and philosophical argumentation encountered in the HL course by different philosophers
  - The pitfalls of “parroting” a philosopher’s text/ideas for true understanding; see, for example, the dialogic method for uncovering ideas and their implications
  - Examples of doing “battle” with philosophers in an attempt to understand, criticize and learn; critically explore the metaphor of “battling” with someone’s thought as a way of doing philosophy and critical evaluation
  - “[L]earn from strengths and weaknesses” – is this the best or only way to evaluate philosophical argumentation; examples of different ways to read and evaluate philosophical work
  - “Philosophy is...the broadest of disciplines”; how is this? In what way is this “exciting”?
  - What makes a concept “basic”? Examples of the level of conceptual understanding offered by experience of the HL course
  - Why can philosophy (considered a difficult subject by many) be “undertaken without any special preliminary training or instruction”? See the counter to this in Plato’s programme as envisaged in *Republic*. What might the role of the teacher be in the HL programme?
  - Philosophy and its relationship to “information”, “knowledge” and “understanding”; see in comparison to science and the social sciences
  - See the methodologies of different fields of human enquiry; what is distinctive about the methodology of philosophy? Candidates might reflect on their experience through the completion of their IA piece in their coverage of the HL programme
  - The difficulty of articulating a “complete and coherent vision” of questions including “the language we use to think our simplest thoughts” eg neuroscience *versus* philosophy of mind, language philosophy, attempts to draw a metaphysical explanation of the universe, rationalism
  - Whether a complete and coherent vision is possible, or incoherent in itself
  - Philosophy as a revealer of ignorance, or as a revealer of questions rather than answers
  - The particular history of the development of thought, from religious roots, through philosophical speculation, to a coverage by empirical science, meaning the range of philosophy diminishes as it gives way to fresh scientific discovery
  - “The drawing of relevant distinctions” as a philosophical contribution to understanding
  - See examples of conceptual problems arising in philosophy that can only be solved, clarified or approached by the philosophical method. What is it about these areas that make the questions unsusceptible to non-philosophical methods?
-