

Markscheme

November 2022

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2022

All rights reserved. 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 the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits 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, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

More information on how to request written permission in the form of a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2022

Tous droits réservés. 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 préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation 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, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour obtenir une autorisation écrite sous la forme d'une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2022

Todos los derechos reservados. 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 la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso 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—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-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 page 6 for the core theme.

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 Paper 1, examiners must be aware that a variety of types of answers and approaches, as well as a freedom to choose a variety of themes, is expected. Thus, examiners should not penalize different styles of answers or different selections of content when candidates develop their response to the questions. The markscheme should not imply that a uniform response is expected
- In markschemes for the core theme questions in Paper 1 the bullet points suggest possible routes of response to the stimulus, but it is critical for examiners to understand that the selection of the philosophical issue raised by the stimulus is *entirely at the choice of the candidate* so it is possible for material to gain credit from the examiner even if none of the material features in the markscheme.

Note to examiners

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the core theme.

Paper 1 core theme 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"> • 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"> • There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is some limited explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. • Knowledge is demonstrated but lacks accuracy and relevance, and there is a basic explanation of the issue. 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. Few 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 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.
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.

Core Theme: Being human

1. Excerpt

With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, discuss a philosophical issue related to the question of what it means to be human.

[25]

The following paragraphs provide only a framework to help examiners in their assessment of responses to this question. Examiners should be responsive to a variety of philosophical perspectives and approaches. Examiners should be aware that candidates might respond to this passage in a variety of ways including ones not mentioned in the summary below.

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the stimulus related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human; the passage allows responses to engage with key concepts of the core theme including identity, the mind/body dichotomy and personhood. Candidates might engage in a discussion of the nature of “the self” for example, what do we mean when we refer to “I” when we make claims about ourselves? What do we mean by the term “person”? Candidates might explore aspects of being conscious, rational, emotional, self-aware *etc* in relation to “self”. Responses might explore physiological identity and Hume’s contribution to the debate; psychological continuity with reference to Parfit or Noonan. Questions might be addressed such as, what is it about us that endures over time? Some might argue that our persistence over time is determined by brute physical facts and psychology is irrelevant. Some responses might engage with perspectives from Locke, Rowlands and Nietzsche to make the case for an existentialist perspective on the role that memory plays in personal identity. Responses might explore the distinction between numerical and qualitative identity. Mind-body issues such as the role of the “soul”, bodily resurrection, and psycho-physical interaction might be explored. Some candidates might argue that personal identity is an illusion.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The nature of “the self”
- What would it mean for any of “us” to have an identity?
- Physical identity
- Psychological continuity
- The criteria for the persistence of personal identity
- Under what circumstances is a person existing at one time identical to a person existing at another time?
- Hume’s “bundle theory” and his rejection of the notion of personal identity over time because Hume thinks that the “self” as a concept that persists through time is an illusion.
- Gradual replacement principle (the ship of Theseus)
- Qualitative identity
- Numerical identity
- Dualist claims that a human being is a mental substance, and the persistence of this mental substance is what personal identity consists of
- Damasio’s criticism of Descartes’s theory of mind and body; Damasio contends that there is no disembodied mind (mind is not a separate distinct substance from the body); Damasio identifies the mind as the activity of neural circuits
- Materialism: there is only matter - does this mean that I persist as long as my body does?
- Dissociative-identity disorder, *eg*: multiple personalities
- Should we demand continuity of consciousness as the criterion for continued identity?
- Strawson’s views that the concept of “person” is a concept we must have prior to body and mind; we cannot analyse a “person” in terms of a body and a mind and we can ascribe physical and mental characteristics to a person
- Necessary and sufficient conditions for being numerically the same person over time
- Spatiotemporal continuity

- John Locke's memory theory; Thomas Reid's objection to Locke; Sidney Shoemaker's revision of Locke's criterion by appealing to causal dependence
- Parfit's brain-hemisphere thought experiment
- Rowland's argument that there is a specific type of interaction between memory and the physical body (Rilkean memory)
- Nietzsche's argument in *The Genealogy of Morals* that personal identity manifests itself in the promises we make, remember and still feel bound by, and that, when we forget our promises, we change our personal identity.

2. Image

With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, discuss a philosophical issue related to the question of what it means to be human. [25]

The following paragraphs provide only a framework to help examiners in their assessment of responses to this question. Examiners should be responsive to a variety of philosophical perspectives and approaches. Examiners should be aware that candidates might respond to this passage in a variety of ways including ones not mentioned in the summary below.

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the stimulus related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human, identity, mind/body dichotomy and personhood. The fact that a programmed robot and a human being are depicted in a way that reflects a potential “personal” relationship might lead candidates to explore artificial intelligence (AI) along with the concepts of the mind-body problem, personhood, consciousness and thus questions such as can a non-human be human? What makes a human an individual being and what are the differences with a pre-programmed robot? Can a robot know what it is to make friends, express love, or other emotions? Can machines have minds? What is a mind? Could AI know the minds of others especially humans? Relationships and social interaction: could AI replicate these? Candidates might discuss Turing’s argument that machines could eventually think for themselves. The contribution of philosophers such as Descartes, Offray de la Mettrie, Searle, Nagel, Chalmers, Churchland and Warren to the ongoing debate about AI consciousness, and debates about personhood. Candidates might assert that artificial intelligence is definitely possible and discuss the possible qualities such an intelligence might possess. Equally some candidates might argue that artificial intelligence is not possible because robots cannot demonstrate “real” emotion; that robots are programmed and are neither unique nor capable of freewill, they are simply hardwired; equally robots cannot evolve naturally but only through the production of new software.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Artificial Intelligence
- Searle’s distinction between strong AI and weak AI
- The Turing Test and Turing’s belief that machines may eventually be able to think for themselves
- The fact that AI has already been developed to the extent that computers can defeat a world champion in chess (Deep Blue’s victory over Gary Kasparov)
- Searle’s Chinese room experiment
- Dualist and monist theories and whether machines have minds? What is a mind?
- Descartes’s *res cogitans* (thinking thing) and the issues of extended and non-extended mind
- Can non-human beings become human?
- Offray de la Mettrie’s “man is a machine” argument
- Discussion surrounding physicalism versus idealism
- The philosophical issue of who or what can be defined as a person?
- Criteria for personhood *eg*: Warren’s account
- Necessary and sufficient conditions for personhood
- Potentiality in terms of machines becoming persons
- The concept of machines making friends, experiencing emotion and expressing these emotions towards others; intentionality
- If AI obtains emotions will they understand these in the same way humans do?
- Will robots be able to respond to the emotions detected from another human being or “conscious” AI?
- Could AI one day allow a robot to be so developed that they could replicate and establish social and personal relationships?
- Could robots one day demonstrate the emotion of love?

- Will humans ever be able to program AI to the level that machines will be able to obtain consciousness, understand “others” and be able to communicate and reply like normal human beings?
 - Nagel and the issue of qualia (no one can experience what you experience)
 - The dangers of being able to program AI with their own consciousness: will they eventually dominate humans?
 - Chalmers’s opinion about “easy” consciousness (behaviour and appearance) and the hard problem (feelings and experience)
 - Should humans fear AI? What should we do to prepare for their existence? Will AI have identities or legal rights?
 - Human characteristics and attributes being attributed to non-human entities raises issues surrounding personification similar to those of anthropomorphism; issues of similarities and human likeness, eg: Mori’s “uncanny valley”.
-