

Markscheme

May 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. Interview 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 stimulus raises the issue of intention and awareness in conscious humans, and how much these brain faculties contribute to the humans who possess them being considered persons. The corollary of this view is that it might not be possible to consider a being, who is unaware or unable to demonstrate intentionality, as being a person and, thus, not fully or even properly human. In this extract, it is clear that families encountered by the doctor being interviewed see an ability to show intention as “a part of being human” or a “part of them as persons”. Some thinkers would reject the idea of intentionality being some kind of package that can be added to a body to make that body a person. Much of this relates to the Cartesian issue of the person as a thinking thing, in combination with being a physical thing, with thinking being treated as a substance, like the body is, in Descartes’s dualism. In more recent work on consciousness and AI, the issue of intentionality is famously raised by John Searle in his Chinese Room Argument, where he regards intentionality as a specifically human attribute unable to be replicated in AI. In this way, Searle argues that persons are distinctive ontologically. Machines cannot attain the independence of a person because the formal programming that dictates their function does not allow for intentionality.

Some answers might make reference to ethical issues that arise over end-of-life decisions. These might discuss the role of consciousness and awareness in deciding upon the quality of human life. Singer would claim that a particular (very serious) lack of brain functionality disqualifies the human being from being understood as a person and being afforded protection in law in medical ethical decision-making. Hence, Singer reflects the functionality approach to human meaning, linked to Skinner’s behaviourism and more recent philosophical work on AI.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Cartesian dualism – the mind-body problem, the problem of other minds and consciousness
- More recent accounts of the interaction between mind and body that does not entail a belief in them being separate substances – what, if any – are the relationships between mind and body? Why do we believe that other people have minds like ours?
- Functionalism
- Behaviourism
- Sacred views of the meaning of human life and what constitutes a person
- Different traditions treat human life’s essence as being located in the heart (see Jewish end of life positions) not the brain
- Artificial intelligence
- Modern neuroscience – what do recent advances in neuroscience tell us about how the human mind works?
- Intentionality as a distinctively human faculty – Searle’s Chinese Room Argument
- What makes me a person? What makes me the same person as I was 10 years ago?
- Could animals or machines be considered persons?
- The spectrum of awareness/consciousness-unconsciousness: different vegetative states and our understanding of them
- Bioethical issues, eg: “do not resuscitate” orders, living wills, advance healthcare directives, a person’s life in data after death
- End of life issues, eg: euthanasia, mind-uploading, the possibility of excessive medical treatment.

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.

The image raises questions about culture and what separates and binds groups of people. How much can the families understand of each other given the divergent customs and cultures they have experienced since birth? How much of an influence of nature and nurture might be gleaned from this image? How much of the identity of the families involved is shaped by their culture? Are there key modes of understanding, like time, that are transmitted by culture and language, as opposed to inherent intellectual faculties?

What is inter-subjectivity? How much can/do we change our understanding of ourselves through interaction with others? See the issue of language and how it is understood to function by different thinkers, eg: Wittgenstein. In the face of the forces of the new habitat and the life of the new neighbours, how much agency do members of any family have given the imprint bestowed by birth and upbringing? How much is the identity of persons wrapped up with attributes they gain from people and cultural understanding around them? What is universal about human life, what is individual? What are the areas of life over which an individual can claim responsibility and authenticity? The candidates might consider whether the image delivers or fosters cognitive bias (prejudices) in terms of cultural, sexual, religious or economic differences, or opens up to an inclusive analysis of differences as a ground for mutual cultural and personal development.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Individuality and universality
 - The nature *versus* nurture debate – do humans have common characteristics that are independent of culture? If so, what are these characteristics and what causes them?
 - Social conditioning – how fixed/malleable is human nature?
 - How much is our identity shaped by membership of the groups to which we belong?
 - Does discrimination stem from diversity?
 - The influence of material possessions and the environment in which you live
 - Personal identity
 - Identity over time
 - Social and cultural identity
 - Self-consciousness
 - Agency
 - Responsibility and authenticity
 - Language
 - Inter-subjectivity
 - The role of media (including social media) in shaping understanding of ourselves
 - Globalization and the increasing ease for people to travel to different countries/cultures
 - Tourism and the possibility of exploitation
 - The issue of “cultural industry”, eg: the Frankfurt School.
-