



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCE

## Philosophy

### Unit PLY6

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## A LEVEL PHILOSOPHY UNIT 6

### Generic Marking Criteria

In order to ensure that the knowledge, understanding and evaluative skills acquired in all units of the AS and A Level course are integrated, and to ensure that candidates are aware of the relationships between different aspects of the course, all candidates for the A Level must complete an extended essay which *either* assesses the relative contributions of two philosophers to a major debate, *or* assesses the impact of one philosopher on the development of ideas within a philosophical theme. This 'synoptic' element will account for 20% of the total A Level assessment. The essay should be researched in advance (individually and/or in groups) but the final version will be produced by candidates individually, in supervised class sessions totalling up to four hours, during the final Spring term. The essays will be marked by an AQA-appointed Examiner.

Essays will be based on **one** of the **six** titles below in Alternative A - Comparative Study, **or one** of the **six** titles in Alternative B - Complementary Study.

The titles for June 2003 are shown below.

Both the Comparative study and the Complementary study are designed to test the extent to which candidates are able to integrate and otherwise link the work of philosophers in the specification with individual broad areas or debates within philosophy, and in particular with the issues raised in the themes in Modules 1, 2 or 4. The extended essay paper is therefore designed to encourage and test candidates' ability to establish bridges between Modules 1, 2 and 4 (Themes) and Modules 3 and 5 (Texts). Both the Comparative Study and the Complementary Study are designed to be equally demanding and are assessed in the same way and against the same marking criteria.

#### Alternative A – Comparative Study

Candidates choosing the Comparative Study are required to assess the contributions of two philosophers to a major philosophical debate or area of concern. The philosophers should be seen as adopting differing, contrasting or opposing positions.

- (a) Compare and contrast the contributions of Plato and Aristotle to our understanding of the sources and nature of 'the Good' for humans.
- (b) Compare and contrast the contributions of Nietzsche and Aristotle to philosophical debate about the requirement for moral and social duty.
- (c) Compare and contrast the contributions of Russell and Hume to the debate about induction as a legitimate part of scientific methodology.
- (d) Compare and contrast the contributions of Descartes and Sartre to our understanding of the significance of the idea of human subjectivity.
- (e) Compare and contrast the views of Plato with those of Marx & Engels on the role of the Philosopher.
- (f) Compare and contrast the contributions of Descartes and Hume to the debate on the nature and existence of mind.

**Alternative B – Complementary Study**

Candidates choosing the Complementary Study are required to assess the contribution of one of the set authors or texts to the development of a debate within one of the set themes.

- (a) Explain and discuss Ayer's contribution to the status of science.
- (b) Explain and discuss the implications for Political Philosophy of Mill's views on the power of the state and the tyranny of the majority.
- (c) Explain and discuss the significance of Russell's work on the nature of universals.
- (d) Explain and discuss the significance of Marx & Engels' work on social change for Political Philosophy.
- (e) Explain and discuss the impact of Nietzsche's *'Beyond Good and Evil'* on Ethics.
- (f) Explain and discuss the implications of Sartre's claim that existence precedes essence for the view that both mind and body exist.

AO1 Knowledge and Understanding (10 marks available)		AO2 Selection and Application (20 marks available)		AO3 Interpretation and Evaluation (30 marks available)	
<b>Level 0 0 marks</b>	The work does not meet the threshold criteria for knowledge and understanding.	<b>Level 0 0 marks</b>	The work does not meet the threshold criteria for selection and application.	<b>Level 0 0 marks</b>	The work does not meet the threshold criteria for interpretation and evaluation.
<b>Level 1 1–2 marks</b>	There is little evidence of knowledge or grasp of the philosophical issues and concerns. Mistakes in grammar, punctuation and spelling are significantly intrusive.	<b>Level 1 1–4 marks</b>	The essay is seriously incoherent or fragmentary, displaying little or no skills in selection, application or recognition of relevance. No substantial links are made between authors and themes.	<b>Level 1 1–6 marks</b>	Incoherent and fragmentary, with <b>either</b> no interpretation or evaluation, <b>or</b> evaluative and interpretative points that are largely not relevant to the title. Supporting material as evidence or example is either absent or ineffective.
<b>Level 2 3–4 marks</b>	While some grasp is demonstrated and a number of important points are identified, much understanding is superficial and/or basic. There may be errors of grammar, punctuation and/or spelling, and these may significantly intrude on the argument being made.	<b>Level 2 5–8 marks</b>	The candidate selects material in a basic way, with little discrimination, and applies it crudely. Relevance is not sustained and the title is only partially addressed or answered. Some material is effectively deployed. Links between authors and themes are weak and infrequent.	<b>Level 2 7–12 marks</b>	Weaker responses demonstrate significant errors of reasoning and many evaluative or interpretative points are wrong, confused or seriously inaccurate. In better responses interpretative and evaluative points are simplistic or crude, or are asserted without argument. Supporting material is unconvincing or is not appropriate.

AO1 Knowledge and Understanding (cont.)		AO2 Selection and Application (cont.)		AO3 Interpretation and Evaluation (cont.)	
<b>Level 3 5–6 marks</b>	Generally accurate knowledge and adequate grasp of most of the main points. The understanding often goes beyond the superficial and basic, but it is not sharp. There may be errors of grammar, punctuation and/or spelling, but these do not significantly intrude on the argument being made.	<b>Level 3 9–12 marks</b>	Much relevant material is selected but is not always well applied, <b>or</b> a limited amount of material is selected but is usually well applied. The response to the question is direct but lacks coherence, <b>or</b> is coherent but misdirected. Some effective links are made between authors and themes. Relevance is sustained for substantial passages.	<b>Level 3 13–18 marks</b>	Evaluative and interpretative points are largely correct, clear and accurate. There is some evidence of reflection, although this is not sustained or comprehensive. Some discussion is developed or telling.
<b>Level 4 7–8 marks</b>	Key philosophical issues are understood in some detail, although there is evidence that some issues of significance for the title are not. The response is capable but not exact. Much of the response demonstrates insight. There may be only occasional errors of grammar, punctuation and/or spelling	<b>Level 4 13–16 marks</b>	Largely relevant material is selected and applied well but is not fully drawn out or important points are left out. The essay is mostly coherent and direct and contains a substantial response to the title. Much material is effectively deployed. Links between authors and themes are made frequently and effectively.	<b>Level 4 19–24 marks</b>	There is clear evidence of an ability to scrutinize and reflect. The discussion is a very competent and largely systematic treatment of the issues. Most arguments are subtle and/or compelling and much of the supporting material is convincing and appropriate. Alternatively, the discussion is narrow but it is impressively analytical and pithy.
<b>Level 5 9–10 marks</b>	The philosophical issues are thoroughly understood and the response demonstrates sophisticated insight. There are few, if any, errors in grammar, punctuation and/or spelling.	<b>Level 5 17–20 marks</b>	Relevant material is selected and applied and the implications of the material fully drawn out. All material is effectively deployed and few, if any, important points are left out. Relevance is sustained and the essay is coherent and direct. Links between authors and themes are made frequently and effectively.	<b>Level 5 25–30 marks</b>	Evaluative and interpretative points are correct, clear and accurate and the discussion reads as a sustained critical engagement. There is evidence of reflection, initiative and imagination. Arguments are subtle and/or compelling and supporting material is convincing and appropriate.