

Markscheme

November 2016

Philosophy

Higher level

Paper 3

This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Assessment Centre.

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 4 and 5.

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.

Note to examiners

This markscheme outlines what members of the paper setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The topics listed in the bullet points indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Examiners should be responsive to any other valid points or any other valid approaches.

Candidates at Higher Level answer the only question on the paper.

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"> • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.
--	---

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.

Candidates might consider the following:

- The “nature of philosophy” and its possible relations with human nature. The passage considers it, eg, when stating that “Intellectual and spiritual activity is never a solitary affair” and “I learn to think for myself by thinking with others”. Accordingly, examples or illustrations might be drawn from the experience of doing philosophy during the course when dealing with issues related to the self and the other in the Core theme
 - The “nature of philosophy” is presented in the text as being more than a body of information, and even more than a skill, philosophy is a spiritual exercise; “spiritual because it was more than merely moral or intellectual exercise, but consisted of a total transformation of one’s existence”; accordingly, nowadays we tend to think of “philosophy as an academic discipline that you study”, but this view is challenged in the text when considering the history of philosophy, particularly the ancient philosophy
 - In ancient philosophy “what mattered was not the discourse of philosophy in itself (being knowledgeable about philosophical theories), but living philosophy”; this idea affects the “function of philosophy” and relates to questions such as: What should the goal of philosophy be? Does philosophical activity involve more than abstract thinking? Ancient Western philosophy as explored in the text and many non-Western traditions emphasize the association of philosophy with spiritual practices. Among other prescribed texts *Tao Te Ching* offers ways to reflect on these issues
 - The “aim of philosophy is to teach one how to live one’s life better”, as identified in the text, might be discussed in terms of both the “function” and “meaning” of the philosophical activity; the text maintains that what prevents us from reaching the happiness is the passions, underlying that philosophy can teach the “art of living well”, which “is measured by the ability to control one’s passions”; these ideas might be discussed in relation to the topic of emotion and reason presented in the Core theme
 - The question whether philosophical activity can inform our understanding of who we are and our place in the world raises the question of the “meaning” of philosophical activity; the text maintains that philosophy implies “more than a merely moral or intellectual exercise, but” consists of “a total transformation of one’s existence”; the issues associated with it might be discussed in relation to Taylor’s prescribed text *The Ethics of Authenticity*, and related in various ways to some of the Optional themes, eg, Ethics and Philosophy of religion
 - A close related cluster of questions regarding the “meaning” of philosophical activity is presented by the text when stating: “To learn to die, therefore is not to be obsessed about death in a morbid way, but to aim for a higher existence; to think of one’s death in one’s life is to realize what is and is not important. It is the very possibility of an authentic life”; here discussions might further refer to Camus’s claim that the only real philosophical problem is suicide and to Plato’s *The Republic* or Nietzsche’s *The Genealogy of Morals* prescribed texts
 - “To read, to gain knowledge, is not an end in itself but for the sake of self-formation, to understand oneself,” as presented in the text, might be critically analysed in relation to questions concerning the “methodology” of philosophical activity; the dialogue as a form of philosophical procedure as exercised in Plato’s *The Republic* prescribed text might be considered
 - The “four distinctive disciplines”, which learning respectively refers to: live, dialogue, die and read, might be linked to TOK, particularly to the “methodology” element of the knowledge framework used to compare areas of knowledge in the TOK course, and to the approaches presented in Optional Themes such as Epistemology and Philosophy of science.
-