

**DIPLOMA
PROGRAMME**

Teacher Support Material

Theory of Knowledge

Assessment exemplars



INTERNATIONAL
BACCALAUREATE
ORGANIZATION

First examinations 2001

*Diploma Programme Theory of Knowledge
Teacher Support Material: Assessment Exemplars
November 2002*

The International Baccalaureate Organization wishes to acknowledge the work of IB teachers and examiners in the production of this document.

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2002

Organisation du Baccalauréat International
Route des Morillons 15
Grand-Saconnex / Genève
CH-1218

Contents

Introduction	1
Assessed Exemplars	3
Essay 1	3
Essay 2	9
Essay 3	15
Essay 4	20
Essay 5	24
Essay 6	28
Assessment Criteria	32

Introduction

Purpose of this Document

An extensively revised guide to Theory of Knowledge was published in April 1999. This included a radically different assessment scheme consisting of two components: an internally assessed oral presentation and an externally assessed essay. The first candidates to be assessed under the new scheme finished their Diploma Programme courses in May or November 2001.

Assessment procedures need to be understood by all parties involved. The essays and comments presented in this document aim to clarify how the assessment criteria for this component work in practice. The essays were submitted in May or November 2001; the comments come from meetings of senior examiners convened for the purpose, and from subsequent discussions on e-mail. The project was delayed after two meetings in Montreal had to be postponed because of the events of 11 September 2001 in the United States.

Criteria for Selection of Material

We aimed to publish sets of exemplars simultaneously in English, French and Spanish, each including at least one essay in each grade. We tried also to include more than one high scoring essay in each set of exemplars, because one effect that we wished to avoid was the notion of a “model” excellent essay. Since it was not appropriate to translate student work, the essays and comments are different in each language.

The five TOK essay grades, with mark ranges as set in May 2002, are as follows.

Grade A	Excellent	32–40	marks
Grade B	Good	27–31	marks
Grade C	Satisfactory	20–26	marks
Grade D	Mediocre work	14–19	marks
Grade E	Poor	0–13	marks

Presentation of Material

Each essay has been retyped in a consistent format but the original spelling, punctuation and bibliographic material have been retained as far as possible. Where necessary, small changes have been made to ensure that the candidate and school cannot be identified.

Now that this assessment scheme, with a small amendment in November 2001 (published in February 2002), has been tested in three examination sessions, we are satisfied that it produces consistent results when used by experienced examiners. Nevertheless, we are aware that it can be improved: we expect assessment to be a major focus of discussion in the next curriculum review.

Using this Document

There are various ways of using this document. You may wish to read one or two essays, with comments, then try marking others for yourself, to see how closely your assessments agree with those of the senior examiners. You may wish to ask your students to mark one or two of the essays, as a way of helping them to understand what they need to aim towards, or avoid, in their own essays.

Introduction

We would be surprised if you agreed completely with all the judgments presented here. Nevertheless, we hope they demonstrate a consistent approach with its own rationale. We would be interested to know whether you find this document useful, and how you have used it. If you would like to comment on the document, or make suggestions for changes to the assessment scheme, please use the TOK discussion forum on the IBO's online curriculum centre.

Assessed Exemplars

Essay 1

“Truth is that to which the community ultimately settles down” (Charles Peirce). Analyse and evaluate this claim.

Truth--its definition, its pursuit, its discovery--is central to much of human intellectual activity. One place we look for clues about what is true is in the trends of the community. We may attempt to find it in religion or cultural beliefs, for example, that we have learned from a community that shares these beliefs. We know the earth is round or that war is bad because everyone knows it.

5 Pierce’s statement praises this way of knowing, suggesting that community, whatever that community may be, is a key to the search for truth. This suggestion is tied to the idea of a body of human knowledge, the idea that the human race progresses as each community member adds to the world’s knowledge, relying on what others have concluded is true and then building on it with his or her own new knowledge. Thus, knowledge is a group pursuit, closely tied to community.

10 There are many types of communities. The whole human race may be thought of as a knowledge community. The smaller group of all scientists is often referred to as the scientific community. Even a ToK class is a kind of community. Depending on what truth we seek, we may tie it to the community of the whole world or to a smaller community that reflects a focus on a particular area of knowledge. For example, although a Catholic may tie his or her theological knowledge to the leadings of the Catholic community, he or she probably does not tie them to the theological knowledge of the world community, or even of the western world. Whatever particular community we tie our beliefs to, we often gauge truth by the guidings of the community because it is impractical to carve out all our beliefs and knowledge systems alone, and indeed would be impossible to function in such a state. Pierce’s words aptly reflect this human tendency, and are valid in alluding to the community’s place as a prominent guide in our search for truth, but raise questions because of the wholesale approach to following the community he suggests.

20 As well, although Pierce’s remark clearly relates truth to community, the remark is ambiguous about the nature of this relationship; it can be read “Whatever the community settles down to constitutes truth” or “The community can be trusted to settle down, ultimately, to the single objective ‘real’ truth.”

25 “Whatever the community settles down to constitutes truth” is a subjectivist’s perspective on truth. Central to its validity is the absence of any one objective truth. Instead, truth must be mutable, changed according to any consensus achieved in the community. Certainly this is the truth we handle daily in nearly all aspects of life. The scientist, for example, uses as truth a body of knowledge on which the scientific community has settled in the centuries before he began his work. A mathematician may use as her truth laws and postulates set down by mathematicians millennia ago. Average North Americans treat as truth the cultural assumption that all people are equal although they may not themselves have questioned its validity. None of these knowers have thoroughly tested the truths they use, but rely on the community of a particular time or place to define truths. Relying on these subjective truths is beneficial in these circumstances. We could not operate without entrusting some of our beliefs to the leading of such knowledge communities.

30
35
Even when we work with a subjective truth, however, we usually do so with the assumption that objective truth exists. The scientist who relies on a subjective truth for his work does so because he

40 seeks an objective truth. He may make hypotheses based on atomic theory, for example, but he works to find out what an atom is “really” made of. If truth is not objective, there is no search; truth may be whatever we think it is. We must search because we expect truth to conform to certain standards before we accept it; some things are untrue regardless of the community’s beliefs. The wording of the title shows that it is concerned with a single objective truth. The title’s suggestion that the community must settle implies some objectivity. If truth were subjective, the title would not read “ultimately settles” or “truth” (singular), but “A truth, at a given time, is what the community agrees on at that time.”

An objectivist interpretation of the title might read: “The community can be trusted to settle down, ultimately, to the single ‘real’ truth,” meaning that although the community might be unable to define truth, the community’s conclusions could be used as a reliable indicator of truth. The implications of this statement, if it were true, would be enormous. Truth could be found simply by following the community. Anything that the community agreed upon must be true. Certainly, this is a common subconscious belief. In every culture or era, there is a reluctance to question certain core beliefs or knowledge common to all community members. We feel that this knowledge is the truth that the human race has settled on after many years of mistaken ideas. The Western belief in human equality is one such idea. Because it is widely accepted among those we see every day, we assume human equality is true and that any other belief about human rights that has been held in another culture or at a different time was simply a step on the road to our complete understanding. Obviously, this way of thinking has its advantages, both in allowing us to suspend doubts long enough to be able to act on a belief and also in reinforcing some truth. Doubtless there is validity to the idea that some contemporary truths are better than those that have gone before simply because they are the sum of many generations of learning.

Unfortunately, there is a downside to the belief that the conclusions of the community are truth. The idea of settling on truth is itself problematic because the term ‘settles’ is ambiguous. How do we know when a community has finished settling? A resting place along the road to truth need not be the destination. The community may be at a lull in its growth. Aristotle’s ideas, for example, were accepted without question for centuries. Can one conclude that the community had settled on his ideas as truth? Absolutely not; further changes have been made. Perhaps one hundred or one thousand years from now, human culture will look back on our ideas as primitive, as steps along the road to the truth that future cultures believe they have settled on. We must qualify our title, then, with this reminder: Because we can never be sure that a community has finished its settling, the notion that whatever the community settles on is true cannot be useful, at a fixed moment in time, as an absolute indicator of objective truth.

Even this reading requires further qualification. Although a community may agree on some truths, it may also agree on some untruths. We cannot know that the beliefs of the community are approaching truth over time; they may actually be moving away from truth. The community, made up of human members, may be deceived by false evidence. Moreover, the conclusions of the community must be driven by the conclusions of its members. If these members define truth as “whatever the community settles on,” an endless feedback loop will be created. Each person, looking to the community for truth, will see only a group of people looking to the community for truth. Some outside evidence or evaluation must help direct the search for truth. Finally, since communities are often defined as people who share certain beliefs, some communities are inherently biased. It may be beneficial to limit the scientific community to exclude those who lack the knowledge and training to generate valid scientific knowledge, but we risk excluding knowers who have valid knowledge obtained by different means. Thus, when the Catholic defines his or her faith community as “all Catholics,” he essentially says, “I will follow the beliefs of those who believe as I do,” which may operate as an excuse never to question his beliefs by investigating the reasons for the beliefs of other faith communities.

Pierce makes an important point in connecting truth to the consensuses that we, as a community of knowers, reach. His assertion, however, is too broad and too absolute. We do need to rely on

- 90 knowledge communities to help us define truth and decide what we will and what we will not believe. We cannot, however rely exclusively on the leadings of a community to define our own beliefs, as the title implies. Instead, we must independently evaluate a given community before following its leads and we must consider the beliefs of other knowledge communities to keep from becoming too narrow in our understanding. We must also use our own reason and perception to
- 95 evaluate individual truths that the community appears to have settled on as part of our own responsibility as members of the knowledge community. If knowers never question their community's beliefs, these beliefs will never change and there will be no ultimate settlement. If we carefully avoid the dangers of trusting a community to point us to the truth, however, the leadings of the community can be a useful tool in our quest for truth.

1560 words

Examiner Comments and Marks

General Comments

The essay displays mastery of the topic, detailed analysis and subtle comparison. The language is eloquent and the thinking is sophisticated. There are occasional weaker moments in the argument, allowing in a little confusion. Perhaps there could have been more explicit recognition of the nature of different areas of knowledge and ways of knowing. But this remains an example of its type: that is, an excellent TOK essay.

Analysis by criterion

	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
<p>Criterion A: Knowledge Issues</p> <p>The essay rests on a distinction introduced early on (ll 22–25) where two interpretations of the Peirce quotation are identified: a relativist notion of truth defined by whatever the community chooses as a settling point, and an absolute notion that the community has a tendency to converge on a single objective truth. At the core of this distinction is the main problem of knowledge discussed in this essay: if truth is a function of community, how could it be considered objective? This distinction also gives rise to two subsidiary problems. Communities can (and do) get things wrong, which does not seem possible according to the first interpretation of the question (ll 51–61, 73–74). If one adopts the second interpretation, on the other hand, how does a community arrive at the truth and how can it know that it has (ll 64–65)? These issues are consistently in focus throughout the essay and are treated in an intellectually honest, balanced and purposeful manner. The candidate’s voice is present, explicitly so on a few occasions (l 12, ll 91–92).</p>	10	10
<p>Criterion B: Quality of Analysis</p> <p>Throughout the essay the candidate exposes the main points to detailed critical scrutiny (for example, ll 20–21, 38–40, 63ff, 80–82). This is achieved with finesse, exploring the problems implicit in the idea of a community “settling down” to the truth. How does a community “know” that it has stopped settling (ll 63–65)? The gulf between the community and an external truth can only be bridged by a mechanism (such as the scientific method), a notion alluded to (l 80) but not developed. Despite this small shortcoming, there is every reason to argue that the candidate has exhibited an excellent level of critical reflection and insight. This is evidence, if it were needed, that an essay does not have to be perfect under this criterion to gain the top score.</p>	10	10
<p>Criterion C: Breadth and Links</p> <p>There are links with areas of knowledge in this essay, although there is little explicit recognition of ways of knowing. Theological knowledge (l 14), science (l 29) and mathematics (l 31) are discussed, and cultural beliefs are mentioned (l 32). The characterization of mathematics and science could be said to be weak; both do build on the body of knowledge established in the past, as is acknowledged by the candidate, but as this could be claimed of all areas of knowledge, no particular point relevant only to these disciplines has been raised. Therefore, 4 is an appropriate score, because the essay is wide ranging (though in an abstract way) and not restricted to a narrow band of knowledge experience.</p>	4	5

Analysis by criterion (continued)

	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
<p>Criterion D: Structure, Clarity and Logical Coherence</p> <p>This essay is ambitious and operates at a high level of abstraction, calling for special clarity and the creation of categories and distinctions. In general this challenge is met with eloquence and competence. There are some lapses, however. The use of “subjective” and “objective” (first introduced ll 24–27) is sometimes ambiguous or confusing (as in the case of “subjective truth”, l 38), a defect that could have been avoided or offset by an explication of the meaning of these terms (or perhaps even the choice of different ones). A small lapse also occurs in the use of the expression “average North Americans” (l 32), the meaning of which is ambiguous. But the structure of the essay is transparent and the conclusion solid.</p>	4	5
<p>Criterion E: Examples</p> <p>Not every occurrence of the words “for example” indicates the existence of a genuine example in a TOK essay. An example is effective if it is possible to establish what it is intended to show. “The earth is round” and “war is bad” (l 4) do not necessarily illustrate religious or cultural beliefs (l 3). However, since the argument as a whole does not rest on these examples, this defect is a very minor one. Other examples—of types of communities (ll 10–12), atomic theory (ll 39–49), human equality (ll 54–57), Aristotle’s ideas (ll 65–66) are varied and are relevant to the points they are intended to illustrate. Some of these examples demonstrate sensitivity to the varied interpretations of cultures apparently different from the authors’ own; and the use of the TOK class is considered a personal example (l 12). Although not every example used is a perfect illustration, together the examples are strong enough to justify full marks on this criterion.</p>	5	5
<p>Criterion F: Factual Accuracy and Reliability</p> <p>The questionable generalizations about the average North American (l 32) and western belief in human equality (l 33) are not serious enough in the essay as a whole to be penalized. The statements about the scientist and the mathematician (ll 29, 31), although perhaps clumsy, cannot be categorized as factually inaccurate. This essay did not require citations because of its abstract nature, which made it largely self-contained.</p>	3+2	5
Total marks awarded	38	40

Essay 2

“A historian must combine the rigour of the scientist with the imagination of the artist.” To what extent, then, can the historian be confident about his or her conclusions?

Writing history, argues Thurén, can be likened to building a house, with the facts resembling the building material. “One has to have good building material and construct the building so that it is strong. But what the house will look like in the end does not only depend on the material, but also on the architect / historian.”¹ This is, to my mind, a good analogy of the *view* that history, as the subject studied by a historian, is a combination of scientific and artistic – or, in the extension, objective and subjective – knowledge. Some aspects of the end result are always determined by the facts available. If there is only timber, it is bound to be a wooden house and if there is yellow paint, the house will be yellow. But, as we all know, no two architects would build identical houses of the same building material. And, while a serious historian cannot ignore his facts, he has to use his imagination to form a whole. Likewise, I will employ, when writing this essay, facts, examples and analogies as building material, and hope that I will manage to assemble it into a strong house.

First, I am going to lay the foundation and explain what I understand and define as the three types of knowledge this discussion is mainly concerning. On the one hand, there is knowledge resulting from the scientific method, which strives to be objective and replicable. This knowledge is exposed to high demands of rigour, since to be regarded as knowledge it needs to be acknowledged and accepted at least by a majority of the scientific society, and adequate proofs have to be presented; otherwise it would be just a theory among many. On the other hand, artistic knowledge does not strive for universality or replicability, since it is based on the individual’s experiences. Hence, it can be said to be a subjective or personal kind of knowledge. Finally, between these two poles there is historical knowledge, regarded as a combination of both the former. Like in the Natural Sciences, the historian gathers information, for instance documents and accounts, and with the same rigour scrutinises his procedure and criticises his sources. But history involves humans, and the information and facts of history can only with human imagination be interpreted and put into a context. While scientific and artistic knowledge are both strong forms of knowledge, in which the knower has a high degree of confidence about his conclusions, they contain aspects which weaken each other when they are cross-bred like in history. The compromise between the objective and subjective forces of history, hence, implies the specific problems of historical conclusions.

Admittedly, all knowledge could be regarded as a combination of subjectivity and objectivity, since all information needs to pass our subjective minds to become knowledge. However, to let this limit the distinction would not be very fruitful. As I see it, the specific conditions of historical knowledge can be pointed out using a biological analogy: People with blood group A have B-antibodies, and people with blood group B have A-antibodies. If we let A represent scientific knowledge and B represent artistic knowledge, then history is represented by bloodgroup AB, (which does not have any antibodies). In case of a blood transfusion, people of blood group AB can thus receive blood from both A and B without any major problems. However, if AB blood is given to any of A or B, the latter’s antibodies would strike out the AB blood. That is, translating this to knowledge matters, problems occur when history is outside its natural body – for instance, analysed as an objective scientific report, without taking into consideration the creative aspects of history – but the influence of scientific and artistic knowledge on history is profitable as long as one is aware of the specific problems of history. However, the above model is of course simplified and used to emphasise the differences between the kinds of knowledge. In fact, the similarities might even outnumber the differences. After all, all knowledge is based upon observation of the world, and in a larger perspective ultimately treat the same questions.

Now, with the walls raised, we can go on to the roofing. Flaubert once commented that ‘writing history was like drinking an ocean and pissing a cupful’² – a comment that seems to hold some

truth. The condensation from an endless amount of information into something useful, the essence, must involve a selection. The problem is thus that history has to be the historian's choice, based on his or her interpretations. Consequently, doubts can be raised as to whether the selection and interpretation processes reflect the object of study, reality, satisfactorily. Asking a Palestinian Arab historian and an Israeli Jewish historian about the history of Palestine/Israel would perhaps result in slightly different answers. Furthermore, some historians even argue that history is created the moment it is written. This is a view that acknowledges the subjective influences in history, and emphasises the artist's influence on the historian's work. The view of others, that the historian's task is to uncover the traces of history through documents, accounts and other evidence, seemingly has the scientific rigour as the dominant influence on the historian. Either way, the historian has to take an active part, thus creating insecurities concerning the conclusions.

Yet another problem that the historian faces, is the aspect of time connected to his interpretations. Historians, like everyone else, are affected by the time in which they live, with its specific society, ideas and attitudes. Whereas facts do not change particularly over time – a bracelet from the Bronze Age is still a bracelet, even if it looks a little older today – our interpretation of these facts certainly change. And, as Håkan Arvidsson has argued, since facts are, ultimately, just our way of breaking up indissoluble contexts, they mean nothing until they are put back in a reconstructed context. "And at the construction of these contexts," he argues, "the historian is inexorably trapped by the spirit of the time".³

Thus, the historian's conclusions, in this view, have their validity limited to a specific time. When the interpretations no longer are valid, the conclusions derived from them can no longer be justified. But does this imply that historical knowledge is useless, since it is only temporary? No, certainly not. After all, history does not only depict past times, it is also a mirror of our own society; in the light of history, we can re-evaluate contemporary phenomena. And even if a historical conclusion cannot promise to hold truth for all foreseeable future, it must still have a value for the moment.

However, the spirit of the time is not the only factor influencing the historian's 'artistic self' and his interpretations. A current example of how historians with different backgrounds can come to different conclusions from the same facts is the Wallenberg-investigation. Raoul Wallenberg was a Swedish diplomat who saved ten thousands of Hungarian Jews in World War II, before he was arrested by the Red Army in 1944 and never returned. More, than 50 years after his disappearance, many historians have studied his destiny without been able to come to a satisfactory conclusion. Recently, there has been a Swedish-Russian expert group, going over newly released documents in Russian archives, and though they were working together, in their final reports in January 2001, the Swedish and the Russian researchers had come to different conclusions. The Swedish side had as one of their two hypotheses that Wallenberg was alive after July 1947, the date when some documents maintain that he died, and kept in isolation as long as maybe even to 1989 – a hypothesis which the Russian side dismisses. This is peculiar, considering the fact that both sides had access to the same material, and begs the question what the reason is for the difference. Ideology? Culture? Nationalism? Personal interests? All of the above are variables with the potential to influence the force of imagination, and affect historical conclusions. Surely, one reason for the difference, in this case, is because the historians do not have enough information and are forced to speculate. Admittedly, the more information, the closer is the gap between different interpretations, but the point should still be clear. Information and historical facts always have to be interpreted and put in a context, and in this process insecurities do exist.

So which conclusions can be drawn from the discussion above? To say that a historian can never be confident about his or her conclusions would mean that the subject of history is reduced to no more than an advanced form of guesswork, and that would be, despite the problems of history, an exaggeration. On the other hand, saying that the historian can be fully confident, combining the forces of the scientist and the artist would, to my mind, be to disregard the implications of the problem of objectivity and reliability of history itself. The hardly exciting answer is, hence, that

100 the answer is somewhere in the middle. When all criteria are met, adequate facts have been presented, critically interpreted and put in a proper context, the historian can to a large extent be confident about his or her conclusions. However, due to the nature of the subject, a historian can never, be fully confident. The architect, returning to the opening analogy, can only hope that his house will sustain the tests to which it is going to be exposed.

1571 words

FOOTNOTES

¹ Thorsten Thurén: *Källkritik (Criticism of Source)*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell 1997, 9.

² John Pemble, *Venice Rediscovered*. Oxford 1995, 82-3. in Richard J. Evans: *In Defence of History*. London:Granta Books, 1997, 23.

³ Håkan Arvidsson: "Historikern i tidens fångelse" in Tove Kruse (red): *Bud på Historien*. Roskilde Universitetsforlag 1998.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arvidsson, Håkan: "Historikern i tidens fångelse" in Tove Kruse (red): *Bud på Historien*. Roskilde Universitetsforlag, 1998.

Evans, Richard J.: *In Defence of History*. London:Granta Books, 1997.

Thurén, Torsten: *Källkritik (Criticism of Source)*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1997.

Examiner Comments and Marks

General Comments

There are many ways to respond to this title. The candidate selects a very straightforward approach and writes an excellent response. Although no remarks are made about the implicit assumption that the scientist is rigorous whereas the artist is imaginative, the essay constitutes a thorough and focused analysis of the many relevant TOK issues in the title. The essay is not without flaws, but it is exemplary of work of an excellent standard.

Analysis by criterion

	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
Criterion A: Knowledge Issues	9	10
<p>The essay is engaging to read, largely because the voice of the candidate is very strong and controls the discussion purposefully. Thuren’s analogy (ll 1–4) is used consciously and effectively to engage the reader, to introduce the title, and to establish the organizational structure of the entire essay. Problems of knowledge are explored throughout the essay, and the analysis is balanced and subtle. The candidate sees the “big picture” with remarkable clarity and insight, observing that all knowledge “ultimately treats the same questions” (l 44) and recognizing that the many shades of gray lead to the “hardly exciting” (l 97) conclusion that “the answer is somewhere in the middle” (l 98). It is important to note that the candidate is not simply ambivalent: the essay’s argument recognizes, demonstrates and articulates the frustrating truth that difficult questions cannot be dismissed with clear, simple, unambiguous answers. In spite of the candidate’s excellent recognition of the problems of knowledge implied by the title, the essay fails to address the “imagination of the artist” explicitly. This omission results in a mark of 9 rather than 10 for this criterion.</p>		
Criterion B: Quality of Analysis	10	10
<p>The level of critical reflection and insight demonstrated by the candidate is consistently excellent. The blood group analogy (l 33) is a good example: it is used to make a point, then questioned as to whether it is genuinely analogous to the way objectivity and subjectivity are combined in historical knowledge, and finally evaluated (ll 41–43). The admission that “the similarities might even outnumber the differences” (ll 42–43) demonstrates a remarkably sophisticated analysis: the candidate is aware of potential counter-claims and is willing to confront them head-on. A similar awareness is evident in the qualifications made to assertions (ll 70, 89). There is a minor lapse in the analysis when the claim is stated, rather than established, that “scientific and artistic knowledge are both strong forms of knowledge, in which the knower has a high degree of confidence about his conclusions” (ll 24–25). Given the overall level of analysis, however, it would be an exaggeration to penalize the essay for this flaw.</p>		

Analysis by criterion (continued)	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
Criterion C: Breadth and Links	4	5
<p>The essay demonstrates a good awareness of ways of knowing and areas of knowledge throughout, but some omissions are apparent. For example, the candidate asserts that “the historian gathers information, for instance documents and accounts” (l 21), but then fails explicitly to address the problems associated with perception and language that are endemic to information gathering. The interpretation required to make sense of artifacts and facts is rushed and somewhat careless (l 61). Also, it might be argued that the ways of knowing employed by the natural sciences and history are not explored as thoroughly and explicitly as they might be.</p>		
Criterion D: Structure, Clarity and Logical Coherence	5	5
<p>The essay is a model of excellence in its structure, clarity and coherence. The concise introduction and conclusion do an excellent job of framing the arguments contained within the body of the essay. Transitions and connections are apparent throughout, and the organizational structure is clearly delineated by words such as “first” (l 12), “admittedly“ (l 29), “now” (l 45), “yet another” (l 58), “thus” (l 66), “however” (l 73) and “so” (l 92). Quotations are well chosen and are used very effectively. The Thurén quotation (ll 2–4), for example, is employed to introduce the analogy (writing history is like building a house) that serves to unify the entire essay.</p>		
Criterion E: Examples	4	5
<p>The essay contains a variety of effective examples (including the interesting blood group analogy that functions as an example), but there are flaws in some of them. A bracelet (l 60)—an artifact—is not an effective example of historical fact. Moreover, the hypothetical example of “a Palestinian Arab historian and an Israeli Jewish historian” (ll 50–51) would be much more effective if the interpretations of actual historians had been included and explored. The Wallenberg example (ll 75ff) is much more specific and effective. The essay contains no obviously personal, in the sense of self-referential, examples, but the overall quality of examples was sufficient to gain a mark of 4 on this criterion.</p>		
Criterion F: Factual Accuracy and Reliability	3+1	5
<p>The essay contains no factual inaccuracies (the unwarranted assumption on ll 24–25 does not fall into this category), so it gains a mark of 3 for factual accuracy. In general, sources are referenced in a thorough and systematic fashion. Although the candidate fails to provide a page number for footnote 3, since the reference is to an essay rather than to an entire book, it would be only a minor inconvenience to track down the citation. Admittedly, the candidate’s reference to “some historians” (l 52) is vague, but this reference is a follow-up to the hypothetical example that has already been penalized under criterion E. The paragraph about the Wallenberg investigation (ll 74–84 in particular) should have included references.</p>		
Total marks awarded	36	40

Essay 3

“A historian must combine the rigour of the scientist with the imagination of the artist.” To what extent, then, can the historian be confident about his or her conclusions?

The writing of history is not undertaken for its own sake, that is without the prospect of at least one reader. Therefore the writing must be readable. This consideration is, however, at all times subordinate to that of addressing a historical problem; of framing and answering meaningful questions about the past. The extent to which the historian can be confident about his or her conclusions will depend on his or her ability to match these requirements.

If the historian applies the rigour of the scientist to his research, there is absolutely no reason why he or she should not be confident about his or her conclusions. Historians are trained in their craft. They “have reliable and agreed procedures for answering questions about what in particular occurred”. (Walsh, 1967, p. 171) Faced with a mass of material, the historian must decide and select what is important enough to be included into his or her work. However, the historian does not arbitrarily select the material that he or she is going to use. Historical method prescribes that evidence gathered is subjected to certain standards and tests, all of which are designed to enhance the certainty of the historian’s conclusions.

There are various criteria according to which research material is classified. Broadly speaking these fall into the main categories of primary or secondary sources, the former normally of greater historical value than the latter. Primary works are the original source material for historical fact and include such items as eyewitness accounts, letters and public documents like laws, treaties and court decisions. As the term implies, secondary works are one step removed from primary materials, being essentially the interpretation of the original event. So, for example, a volume of American treaties is primary material, but an interpretation of American foreign policy is not, it is a secondary source. The historian also applies what is known as external and internal criticism to the information gathered, asking questions such as who wrote the document, when was it written, is it the original, why was it written? This tests not only the authenticity of the sources, but also their veracity and reliability. Naturally questionable and unreliable source material is discarded.

Further tools of the historian’s trade include the use of auxiliary and related sciences such as chronology, archaeology, anthropology and palaeography for a more accurate and fuller correlation of evidence. Correctly applied, all these measures should ensure that the historian produces work which is systematic and exact and in which he or she can have every confidence.

Despite this rigour, it is of course entirely possible that in the evaluation and selection process bias may occur and the historian, in contrast to a scientist, could be influenced by his or her own personal beliefs and feelings when he or she interprets and portrays events. The historian, for example, may approve of capitalism and totally reject communism. A physicist, on the other hand, does not like velocity and dislike acceleration. However, this apparent lack of objectivity need not necessarily invalidate the conclusions of the historian because any reasoned interpretation of events contributes to knowledge and is thus valid.

It should also be remembered that the historian mainly deals with the doings of man. Unlike in the natural sciences where actions can be predictable, or in the biological sciences where experimentation is possible, man is totally unpredictable. From the nature of man and from the nature of the materials from which he or she works, it is impossible for the historian to achieve the same level of certainty as, for example, a mathematician, who can say that the area of a circle is equal to πr^2 . Or the biologist who can observe and dissect animals in order to make generalisations about their behaviour. The historian cannot have this kind of confidence about his or her conclusions. However, this does not mean that he or she can have no assurance at all. For when dealing with the lives of people can there be such a thing as a definitive truth? If the historian chronicles the effects of poverty, for example, he or she could conclude equally correctly that

poverty contributes to revolt, as in the French Revolution of 1789, or that poverty can contribute towards submissiveness. Both interpretations add to our knowledge of the past.

50 It is necessary to remember also that history deals with what has taken place in the past and an important component of historical writing is to illustrate this change over time. Time never stops moving. This means that new material is constantly being made available and conclusions reached in 1900 may very well be different to those reached in 2000. While the latter conclusion may differ from and even invalidate the former, it does not mean that the 1900 historian should not have been confident in his or her conclusions. This is true as long as he or she based his or her findings on rigorous and objective research of the material available to him or her at the time. The nature of
55 history thus makes it possible for the historian to come to “definitive truths” about the past, if not a “definitive truth”. For this reason the historian can be confident about his or her conclusions.

While there is little doubt that a professional examination of resource material should produce a confident conclusion, it is in the writing of history that a perception of inaccuracy exists. Yet this, too, is not necessarily so. Historical ‘facts’ do not exist in isolation. They are all connected by links
60 of consequence, cause and effect. It is the historian’s task to draw these links together and to make sense of them all. To do this, he or she does need creative ability. However, the phrase ‘imagination of the artist’ should not be taken to mean that the historian makes up history. On the contrary, his or her imagination has to lie in his or her ability to make the dry bones of history come to life. To do that, the historian has to present his or her findings in a way that makes the
65 information interesting and attractive to readers. “The appropriate rendering of (history) can only be given by art ... the historians business is to narrate ... to recite ... to do that he has to be an artist.” (Rowse, 1963) Having said that, however, it is also true that in recreating the past the historian has to subordinate his imagination to the truth, so that he is ruled in his writing by the evidence and does not go against it. If this is the way in which he or she produces his or her
70 conclusions, then the historian can have every confidence in them. As A J P Taylor says, “the historian has to combine truth and literary grace; he fails as a historian if he is lacking in either”. (Marwick, 1983, p. 211).

Imagination of the artist comes in his ability to cultivate a style that is strong, colourful and imaginative in the reproductive, rather than the creative sense. As Hockett states: “There is more
75 than one way to say a thing without sacrificing accuracy or truthfulness or intelligibility.” (Hockett, 1967, p. 171). So the historian must always keep in mind that he is dealing with events that once took place and not merely with words and logical constructions. In this way his or her subject matter will constantly remain in the forefront of the work. However, a work lacking in literary style will not be lucid, direct or concise. It will be difficult to read and understand and it
80 will not attract a good audience. Since communication of knowledge and the intellectual improvement of mankind are the goals of the historian, the audience (reader) plays an important role.

It is obvious that the task facing the historian is a difficult one. He or she may not in the smallest
85 measure manipulate material in the interests of style nor should he or she sacrifice style due to the nature of the material. The historian must keep both in mind, drawing on the full possibilities of language to convey clear, interesting and accurate reconstruction of the past, with depth of understanding. This is what distinguishes historical writing from other forms of intellectual endeavour and it explains why the historian can be confident about his or her conclusions.

1392 words

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Elton, GR. 1984. *The practice of history*, London: Flamingo.

Hockett, HC. 1967. *The critical method in historical research and writing*, New York: Macmillan.

Marwick, A. 1983. *The nature of history*, London: Macmillan.

Rowse, AL. 1963. *The use of history*, Middlesex: Penguin.

Walsh, WH. 1967. *An introduction to philosophy of history*, London: Hutchinson.

Examiner Comments and Marks

General Comments

This is a solid, well written essay that touches on several points relevant to the prescribed title, but does so superficially and without much insight. It is a good example of the following attributes: recognition of problems of knowledge as opposed to an understanding of them (criterion A); the effect that an unexamined central premise can have on an argument (criterion B); the distinction between mentions in passing of Ways of Knowing or Areas of Knowledge, links between them, and developed comparisons (criterion C); the effect that a few minor defects can have on criterion D; the distinction between appropriate and effective examples and their opposites; the effect of quotations (criterion E); factual inaccuracy and well presented citations (criterion F).

Analysis by criterion

	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
<p>Criterion A: Knowledge Issues</p> <p>The essay is a purposeful inquiry that is consistently relevant to the prescribed title. Several problems of knowledge implied by the prescribed title are recognized: selection of data (ll 9–10); the need for criteria to guide the selection of historical data (ll 10–13); evidence (l 12); interpretation (l 19); bias (ll 29–31); changeable material (l 50); the need for creativity to link historical causes and effects (ll 59–61); creativity in the presentation of history as opposed to free-form creativity in literature (ll 61–64); and the need for an effective writing style (ll 78–82). Their recognition, however, is not always accompanied by demonstrated understanding: for example, the relative value of primary and secondary sources (ll 14–16) is treated as a constant, independent of the research goal; the sciences used in the central comparison of the essay (ll 37–40) exclude human sciences, which do study man and which are acknowledged only in a list (l 26), without development. The essay also lacks balance because it focuses far more on the rigour of the scientist than on the imagination of the artist. Finally, the candidate's voice is not at the forefront.</p>	8	10
<p>Criterion B: Quality of Analysis</p> <p>The essay's approach is critically motivated, the discussion is detailed, and attempts are made to offer counter-claims (ll 29, 33) and to qualify some assertions (ll 51–54, 43). However, there are two important points that are never justified nor questioned. They are the assumption that scientific methods are infallible, and the assumption that an analogous “historical method” prescribes rigorous standards and tests that produce “work which is systematic and exact and in which [the historian] can have every confidence” (ll 12–28, 57–58). Instead of arguing why this type of historical method would provide such “exact work”, the essay offers descriptions (primary and secondary sources, and external and internal criticism) and mentions technical terms (authenticity, veracity and reliability) without development. The single counter-claim to the assumed infallibility of science (ll 29–31) is weak in its assertion that scientists are not subject to bias caused by personal beliefs and feelings. In its treatment of the “imagination of the artist”, moreover, the essay develops the need for an effective writing style, but gives less evaluative treatment to the role of imagination in interpretation of cause and effect. Finally, some unjustified claims are made (ll 36–38, 58).</p>	7	10

Analysis by criterion (continued)	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
<p>Criterion C: Breadth and Links</p> <p>The essay mentions Ways of Knowing (ll 16–29) and Areas of Knowledge (ll 25–26), but leaves their relevance implicit or undeveloped. A link is made between history and other disciplines (ll 33–35) and more explicit comparison is made, in passing, between history and mathematics (ll 39–41). The overall awareness in response to the title is satisfactory and appropriate, given the central comparison of the title, but the comparative element is not quite strong enough to gain a mark of 4.</p>	3	5
<p>Criterion D: Structure, Clarity and Logical Coherence</p> <p>Despite an obvious ambiguity (perhaps there should be a comma in between “Naturally” and “questionable”, l 24), an occasionally poor choice of words (“definitive” (l 55) should be “provisional” and “definitive” (l 56) should be “absolute”), and the overlap of ideas in the two penultimate paragraphs, the essay’s achievement level is closer to a 5 than to a 4. The quotations included in the essay appropriately serve to express points elegantly, or to clarify points made. The overall structure of the argument is clear, and each paragraph flows coherently from the preceding one.</p>	5	5
<p>Criterion E: Examples</p> <p>Five examples are offered. Two are appropriate and effective (ll 19, 40), one is merely appropriate (l 46) and not quite complete, and one verges on being inappropriate (l 41). Finally, one is ineffective: to discuss bias by comparing capitalism with velocity (ll 32–34) is logically non-parallel; a far better comparison would have been between capitalism and Darwinism. Several quotations are appropriately and effectively used (ll 9, 67, 76), but quotations are not examples. Indeed, one shortcoming of this essay is that general assertions are not well supported by examples.</p>	2	5
<p>Criterion F: Factual Accuracy and Reliability</p> <p>One point was subtracted for factual inaccuracy (ll 36–38). No points were subtracted for citation, despite one missing page number (l 67), which is a minor flaw given the other detailed citations and the bibliography offered.</p>	2+2	5
Total marks awarded	29	40

Essay 4

How do beliefs about the world, and beliefs about what is valuable, influence the pursuit of knowledge?

If you ask a person from anywhere in the world what he or she values most there is a good chance that the answer will be “my family”. In some places it might seem like the most obvious answer while in others it might be the answer given to please rather than a honest and real answer. Wouldn't our world look much different if the answer turned out to be true? Then people wouldn't have to write books to hang out their evil parents, there would be no more families broken up because of financial successes or failures, but then again everyone's idea of the perfect family probably is not the same. While I would consider perfection to be a place where family members show each other respect and consideration while getting along, a Muslim father in a traditional setting may worry about family pride and liaisons between children and future spouses. In the end, how does it influence their pursuit of knowledge?

“A successful sumo (Japanese wrestler) is well fed, well paid, and is showered with gifts from his fans. He lives and trains in a stable with other wrestlers where teenage apprentices cook for him, do his laundry-and even wipe his bottom if he is too fat to reach it himself. When he wants to get married he has little trouble finding a bride-often among Japan's top models or actresses. Luckily for his new wife, he will lose weight after retiring (usually in his early 30s). By that time, he may be able to perform his toilet duties alone.” (COLORS October-November 1999 issue, pg. 14) In Japan it is considered high status to be a sumo. How does different ideals and role models influence the pursuit of knowledge? Having traditional roles such as sumo wrestlers or geishas in Japan as a few examples, influences knowledge of the people because the roles dictate what you know and how you should act in certain situations. Geishas are trained from an early age to master the art of serving men and providing their patrons with the ultimate pleasure. What they know is decided by their role in society, and how they use their knowledge is dictated by tradition. Years of training prepare them to fulfil their tasks with grace and perfection.

For some people the ultimate achievement is to be on television. For them it is valuable to be seen where everyone looks, and sacrificing privacy or pride does not seem like a high price where everyone wants to get their fifteen minutes of fame. In their world everything orbits around a commercial, media-based planet where producers ridicule the people willing to expose themselves for a nanosecond of fame. On talkshows the people running the show want to make money, the host wants to get good ratings and the guests want to be on TV. They are examples of different sets of morals and values and beliefs about the world. So how does this influence their pursuit of knowledge? Andy Warhol, the frontfigure for the pop art movement in new York during the sixties, said that in the future everyone would be famous for fifteen minutes. Nowadays in America, people expose their lives to be in programs on television. With the enormous number of people that watch TV in the united states, it seems likely that you would, be famous if your face appears on TV, right? But in a way if everyone is on TV, then no-one is on TV, because the importance of every individual diminishes rapidly. When what you value is being part of a fast moving machine of commerce, which is basically what people on various television shows are, then the phenomena you are left with is a place where people's knowledge is based on their ideals and foremost interests. The target group could be assumed to be undereducated, bored people, but surveys performed by other television programs such as the Jay Leno show, where reporters ask people at various prestigious universities around the us about current political issues and everyone draws a blank, while every single person can name the characters in the most popular television sitcoms.

45 In a society based on capitalism, people may have materialistic values. A nice house or car might
be important, or being able to buy lots of expensive clothes could be desirable. In an internet
survey one third of the Americans participating claimed that their primary hobby was shopping.
Money moves fast through people's hands and lives, and what they value changes accordingly.
50 Would the world have pop culture if it was not a very strong current in people's minds? Capitalism
creates great opportunities to succeed in a high risk world with no safety net to fall into when you
lose balance, and a lot of people do. The vision of glitter and glamour being within your reach
make people crave for more, and lets them keep the faith that one day they may be in people
magazine or somebody in the world of fame. "You can't be too rich or too thin in America"
(saying in America), the statement suggests the obvious. An enormous number of people in the us
55 spend all their time making money and improving their looks. Fame is bought through silicone
breasts and lipo suction, that in return could lead to more money and luxury. How does greed and
obsessions influence the pursuit of knowledge? Well, it certainly changes the way to look at the
world, making people willing to sacrifice it all, including the health of themselves and the planet,
to make another dime or two. It would obviously not be fair to say that every one of the citizens in
60 the United States values money and looks, but the current seems to be strong enough to be a valid
subject for discussion. The ideas seems to be very short term and everything seems
interchangeable. Throw away and buy a new, setting a pace for the replacement of anything, short
and intensive life spans for everyone and everything. What do you need to know in this world?
First and foremost I think you need to have faith, to believe in a kind of romantic existence, in a
65 utopia on the other side of the fence. While a fancy university could certainly give you some of
what you need to succeed, if for nothing else for the status it gives you to be able to hang a nice
and framed diploma on your wall, the bits and pieces picked up at social events may be just as
helpful. After all it is not who you are but who you know that defines you on your quest to wealth
and glory.

70 Maybe intelligence cannot really be measured in knowledge on a hierarchy scale, but rather
understanding that different people know different things, and because you happen to know all
about moviestars and nothing about nuclear physics, it does not necessarily mean that you are a
bad person. People in different parts of the world, in different social groups and walks of life,
know different things because the same things are not necessarily important to the global
75 population of humans. What we are brought back to time and time again are items of status. They
change from place to place, but people strive for what is most likely to get them status in their
particular clique. Saying that your most cherished thing in the world is your family or your friends
is a beautiful thought, but in the end, how much of that would we sacrifice to get to where we want
to be ourselves? Ultimately, what is the price of health, for us and for the planet? and which is
80 going to get you furthest, thinking about yourself because nobody else will, or stepping back to get
a wider angle and a different perspective and trying to be moderate and understanding? And what
does getting far mean? For man to be pursuing knowledge with an open mind and unselfish goals
may today be wishful thinking, but without wishful thoughts for a more considerate place where
different kinds of knowledge can be appreciated on an equal basis, there maybe would not be any
hope at all.

1369 words

Examiner Comments and Marks

General Comments

This essay is characterized by a blend of strengths and weaknesses frequently seen in work of this level of achievement. While the essay does touch on some problems of knowledge implicit in the title, the discussion of them is undone by an extensive sociological commentary, which altogether overpowers the faint attempts at analysis and argument. Moreover, the treatment of “beliefs about the world and beliefs about what is valuable” is limited in range, as the bulk of the essay concentrates on the supposed desire of people in the United States for “fame and materialism” (ll 32ff). Nevertheless, the student does show awareness of some values held by others outside this context and does connect the discussion with the topic, even if it is in an indirect way.

Analysis by criterion

	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
Criterion A: Knowledge Issues	4	10
<p>The essay does not explicitly identify problems of knowledge nor does it centre on methods of justification (and their limitations) in the pursuit of knowledge. This is its major weakness. The extensive deploring of a self-centred culture, which constitutes the “development of ideas”, however, is better described as “generally irrelevant” (so, a mark of 4 is appropriate) than as “irrelevant” (a mark of 2): the student does identify beliefs about what is held to be valuable by a Muslim father (l 8), Sumo wrestlers and geishas (ll 11–23), and seemingly most people in the United States (ll 24–68). The essay lacks balance, however, and does not pay any close attention to “beliefs about the world” and the “pursuit of knowledge”. The candidate does consider knowledge in the form of training (ll 18–23), and the replacement of knowledge with ignorance and the pursuit of material success. The main point made in the essay is that values not only influence the pursuit of knowledge but also can destroy them. The student’s own voice sometimes emerges too strongly: in the essay’s conclusion it focuses to some extent on the values placed on knowledge, but the “knowledge” that is to be preferred remains vague and the “pursuit” of it even more so.</p>		
Criterion B: Quality of Analysis	4	10
<p>Within the limited identification of the problems of knowledge of the title, the student tends to assert and describe rather than argue and analyse. Certainly the essay possesses detail, but the “adequately detailed discussion” that would gain a mark of 6 is conceived in the criteria as a developed evaluation of problems of knowledge rather than, as here, a proliferation of general comments on society (ll 34–35, 61–62, 72–74). There are occasions when the essay does acknowledge the limitations of its own generalizations, for example in asserting “it would not be fair to say...” (l 58), but elsewhere there are sweeping statements (ll 22–23, 39–43 and many more). Some fallacious reasoning takes place, perhaps as a result of the passionate stance adopted about the values presumed by the candidate to be at large in society (conceived primarily in terms of the United States).</p>		

Analysis by criterion (continued)	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
<p>Criterion C: Breadth and Links</p> <p>The essay contains no comparisons and only one indirect link to Areas of Knowledge (specifically, ethics, ll 57 and 77–80). Even so, a mark of zero would be too harsh for an essay that shows awareness of different cultural perspectives, demonstrates critical awareness of television as a “way of knowing” and acknowledges different kinds of knowledge in the conclusion.</p>	1	5
<p>Criterion D: Structure, Clarity and Logical Coherence</p> <p>The essay has a general structure that adequately conveys the main points, even though the connection between each paragraph and the overall topic has been neither clearly formulated nor established. Perhaps if there had been an attempt to answer the questions posed relating specifically to the prescribed title (“So how does this influence the pursuit of knowledge?” ll 18, 30 and 55), these relations would have been made clear. The writing conveys ideas in a simple (perhaps even simplistic) way and so is easy to understand. But it would be an exaggeration to claim that concepts and distinctions are clarified at all. “Beliefs” and “values”, arguably the key concepts in this title, are not distinguished, explored or examined in any way.</p>	3	5
<p>Criterion E: Examples</p> <p>The examples given are quite well chosen and support the essay’s argument, even though it is not a strong argument (this shortcoming has already been penalized). The essay contains many details, some of which function as effective illustrations of general ideas. They also show cultural diversity.</p>	4	5
<p>Criterion F: Factual Accuracy and Reliability</p> <p>The essay contains no obvious factual inaccuracy (and the sweeping generalizations have already been penalized under criterion B). Certain supposed facts should have been referenced, however: for example, the Internet survey about shopping (ll 45–46) and the alleged Warhol quotation (ll 31–32).</p>	3+1	5
Total marks awarded	20	40

Essay 5

Consider the meaning of “justification” in different areas of knowledge. Is any one kind of justification more compelling than any other?

5 Have you ever wondered where things come from or how they appeared? In this high-paced world, we as humans live, there are many such questions for which we have no answers. By using the different areas of knowledge; history, art, natural science, human science, ethics and math, one is able to justify these questions. Though all the areas of knowledge are useful in determining the truths of the world, math is more compelling than any other. Math, more so than any other, seems to display more answers to our continuous questions.

10 In history, a person can learn about knowledge, because it has been recorded for future generations. Though it is good for one to see the artifacts and history of the past, we often find that we as humans have transformed the history ourselves by perceiving things differently. Even when one is looking at facts on display, different people can see the same facts in a different manner. An example taken from today would be a news reporter reporting the news. While numerous reporters from various stations would be reporting the same news, they would each have diverse stories according to their point of view. The same principle applies in both cases, though it may be the same object people view images differently. The different perceptions that are viewed
15 down through the years are a problem when viewing history as a subject. This happens because you do not know which view to believe; even if they are reporting or recording the same events. This will ultimately create different content and pictures, so it clouds the mind of the future reader.

20 In the area of art, knowledge can be justified by the viewing of objects, such as paintings, papers, sculpture and more. Although this is a valid way of receiving knowledge, this too has its limitations. A blind person, unlike one who can see, would not be able to view the art but merely touch it. Though this person may receive some knowledge of the art piece, the true colors of the art and the way the artist intended it to be did not give the viewer the full appreciation of the masterpiece. These are just some of the ways one could be hindered by trying to display knowledge through art.

25 Natural sciences and knowledge are partners in the aspect that in human sciences, one must do a chain of experiments before a census is reached. This chain of experiments is called the research method. In the research method there is a hypothesis, analysis, research, data and conclusion. It is the same in knowledge, one must do experiments and try numerous things before the final product is shown. But one thing that comes from doing experiments and testing the validity, is that nothing
30 is certain. So if none of your information is certain, how can you base your foundation for knowledge on something that is not solid itself? Once you have your experiment finished and you can prove or disprove your hypothesis, you now have a foundation in which to base your knowledge claims upon. This will soon become your source for the validity of your claims.

35 In human sciences, one can turn to the art of psychology and sociology for justification. One can think of the brain as the master computer and its functions would be that used to do justifications. But one way, we as all humans fail, is that we can not analyze ourselves without being biased toward our own race. If any man regardless of age, occupation etc...., views himself he is unknowingly altering the out come of the gathered information.

40 Although there are different cultures that view themselves in different perspectives, such as eastern and western cultures. Usually eastern cultures focus on the group and doing what is best for the group, while western cultures usually focus on self-praise or what is best for the individual. An example would be eastern cultures, such as Japan during World War II and their “kamikaze” planes, in which men knowingly gave their lives to benefit their country. Also during World War II western civilizations, such as the United States wanted to do what was best for the group but
45 also gave self praise, such as the purple heart. Only men who were wounded in action while

showing courage were awarded the purple heart. This again shows the biased present within people and why knowledge gained from human sciences is only valid if in regard to another species.

50 Ethics, as a whole, justifies your knowledge for truth in a way no other area can. Ethics is really made up of alternatives including religion and morals which feed into a immense culmination entitled ethics. In religion, knowledge is gained through the Bible, manuscripts or teachers of the time. One thing you have to take into account is the language barrier of the time compared to today's many languages. There could have been words misinterpreted from Hebrew and Greek (native languages of the Bible) to the English translation and numerous other translations it is in today. Scientist have actually found in one modern translation, the King James Version (KJV) 55 errors present with the text. In ethics, as a whole, humans must rely on knowledge gained through experience to justify information about themselves, creating problems not just for the one making the decision but everyday people. And again, as stated previously, A man can not view himself with out being biased to him or his race. So it is evident that knowledge based on ethics does not 60 create a stable footing for upon building solid arguments.

In the area of math one can justify his knowledge through laws, axioms and ratios. An example of this can be shown by doing a math problem. This can be seen by adding $\frac{2}{3}x + \frac{5}{6}y = 0$ or $\frac{5}{6}y + \frac{2}{3}x = 0$. As you have noticed, you can perceive this in two different ways, yet it is still the same problem. This is also true for axioms and ratios too. There is one ratio that justifies not only the 65 knowledge in math but the knowledge in the world as a whole. This special ratio would be called the divine proportion or more commonly known as the "Golden Ratio." This is a ratio that when divided will always equal the sum of 1.6. Something that is an unknown fact to many is that the Golden Ratio, 1.6 is observed not only in nature, but also in geometry, art, music and architecture.

70 Often, one may ask how can the Golden Ratio be observed in all those places, and the answer is it is basically everywhere. The Golden Ratio is seen in Chambered Nautilus, in the shape of the shell. If you look at the spirals of the shell they are in 1.6 conversions. In geometry, the divine proportion is seen in Icosahedron. Other areas this proportion can also be seen is in art museums. This is because the ratio 1.6 has been proven to be the most pleasing proportion to the naked eye. That is why many architects built houses with the length and width divided equaling 1.6, because it 75 is the most appealing to look at. Not only has the ratio been proven beautiful to ones' eyes but also been apparent in ones' ears. That is why the major 3rd and major 6th intervals are noted as being the purest and most soothing to the ears. This ratio is not just a modern fact. Even when the Parthenon in Greece was built, which dates from somewhere between 500- 432 BC, the Golden Ratio was saw as a tool to be used to build beautiful eye catching structures.

80 There are not any areas of knowledge in which are with out flaws, including math. Math seems to display the truest and purest form of truth, even though Euclid's 3rd axiom didn't fit. This is because Euclid's 3rd axiom stated; if you take two parallel lines and run the two lines indefinitely, the two parallel lines will eventually meet at one point. It is impossible to see how we cannot create two parallel lines in third dimensional form that run indefinitely. The French mathematician, 85 Rene Decartes, doubted everything that could not be explained through math, including Euclid's 3rd axiom. He even doubted his own existence until one day he said he must exist because, "I think, therefore I am."

90 With all the pondering of the ways of knowing, or the justifications of knowledge; history, art, natural science, human science ,ethics and math, it is clear to see that math has the most justification for knowledge. True math has its flaws but, it has the least amount of flaws within the justifications of knowledge. Though using the laws, axioms and ratios you can gain the uttermost amount of knowledge conceivable to man.

1515 words

Examiner Comments and Marks

General Comments

This essay exhibits a number of characteristics that are often found at this level of achievement. The first, and by far the most important, is a weak conception of knowledge itself, evidenced in this case by statements such as “Natural sciences and knowledge are partners...” (l 25) and others of this vague kind (ll 7, 19). Statements such as these suggest that the student has not formed a clear model of knowledge, which in turn hampers the treatment of **problems** of knowledge. Secondly, the essay does not demonstrate an understanding of either the nature of justification, which is central to the essay, nor its relation to knowledge. Thirdly, the ideas the examples are meant to illustrate are frequently unclear.

The failure to elucidate the central notion of justification is a serious flaw. Yet there is a clear attempt to answer the question in the title. Furthermore, the discussion, though thin in many places, is relevant in this respect. The essay is structured in such a way that each Area of Knowledge is discussed in turn. When well developed, this “tour” model can be an effective vehicle for TOK ideas. However, the present example illustrates its shortcomings.

Analysis by criterion

	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
Criterion A: Knowledge Issues	5	10
The essay attempts to do what the prescribed title demands, and recognizes, to a certain extent, problems in different Areas of Knowledge. For example, the discussion of history (ll 7–9) hints at the idea of a dialogue between present and past but this is not developed. On the contrary, it is reduced to supporting the observation that different people perceive the world differently (l 17). The essay mentions or discusses the following problems: the foundation of knowledge (ll 29–31), the role of the observer in the human sciences (ll 36–38), the role of cultural bias (l 39), and translation between languages and its implications in religious knowledge (l 53). But these are not always linked to justification, and the understanding of them is often poor (ll 9–17, 29–31, 36–38, 56–60, 61). Evidence is treated (ll 10, 18, 26–29, 51, 61), as are interpretation and bias (ll 14, 46, 53–59) and there is some evidence of an awareness of limitations to knowledge (for example, with respect to the human sciences, on l 36). There is a genuine attempt at personal engagement, and although the voice of the candidate is indistinct at times, there is purposefulness about the enterprise.		
Criterion B: Quality of Analysis	2	10
The discussion is generally superficial and more descriptive than analytical. An attempt is made to defend the idea that all areas of knowledge have flaws (l 80) but that mathematics is somehow less flawed than the rest, through examination of each area in turn. Although none of the arguments is strong because they are couched in very general terms, there is an attempt to establish the first part of the thesis. However, the superiority of mathematics is stated (l 91) without justification. The arguments from specific examples (sometimes themselves flawed) run into problems when generalizations are based on them. For example, the case of kamikaze pilots during the second world war is intended to support the questionable general conclusion that eastern cultures focus on the group, while those of the West put the individual at the centre (l 40). The essay contains some inconsistencies (ll 2–4, for example). Although there are some attempts to engage in critical reflection, these are either invalid (ll 43–48) or undeveloped (ll 13–17, 56–60).		

Analysis by criterion (continued)

	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
<p>Criterion C: Breadth and Links</p> <p>The essay canvasses Areas of Knowledge, and also mentions different Ways of Knowing, in both cases without building effective links or comparisons between them. For example, the link between perception and history (ll 9–11) has not been developed, and the link between the arts and perception (ll 20–23) is ineffective. The attempt to base the arts on a mathematical footing through the “Golden Ratio” (ll 64–79) is also ineffective since it rests on mistaken factual assumptions. The candidate reserves the only comparative judgment for the conclusion of the essay: “math has the most justification for knowledge” (ll 88–89).</p>	2	5
<p>Criterion D: Structure, Clarity and Logical Coherence</p> <p>In terms of structure, the essay would qualify as “satisfactory”. The thesis is stated immediately (ll 5–6), but it does not address both parts of the prescribed title. A conclusion of sorts is reached (ll 88–91) and the “tour model” is used between thesis and conclusion. In terms of clarity and logical coherence, the essay would qualify as “poor” since frequently the reader is left wondering what the author intends (ll 4, 25, 71, 35, 61). “Justification”, the key concept for this title, is not defined. Moreover, throughout the essay there are numerous instances of conceptual confusion (ll 8–10, 26, 61, 34). So generally, although the essay displays a satisfactory structure, the overall mark for this criterion is 2.</p>	2	5
<p>Criterion E: Examples</p> <p>The essay includes numerous examples but these are often inappropriate. A case in point is the example of a blind person viewing a work of art (l 20). This is at best a pseudo-example of a trivial idea (a blind person cannot perceive a work of art in the same way as a sighted person). Although there is some attempt to introduce cultural diversity (ll 39–45) there is a lack of cultural awareness illustrated in the assumption that the only religion is Christianity, which underpins the statement: “In religion, knowledge is gained through the Bible...” (l 51).</p>	2	5
<p>Criterion F: Factual Accuracy and Reliability</p> <p>There are enough instances of factual inaccuracy to justify “some” rather than “little” factual inaccuracy. There are several inaccurate or questionable statements about the “Golden Ratio”. For example, it is questionable whether major thirds and sixths are the most “soothing” (l 76) of chords—this sort of judgment probably depends to some extent on cultural background. Moreover, it remains to be demonstrated that the effect is due to the proximity between the ratio of the major sixth and the “Golden Ratio”. The generalizations (ll 75, 77 and several others) must either be considered inaccurate or require reference to a source. There are other examples of factual inaccuracy (ll 45–46, 64–65, 82–83, 85). Citations would have been necessary in several other places (ll 55, 65–79, 84–86) but none was offered.</p>	1+0	5
<p>Total marks awarded</p>	14	40

Essay 6

“Truth is that to which the community ultimately settles down” (Charles Peirce). Analyse and evaluate this claim.

5 Truth, according to The Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary, is a judgment, proposition or idea that is true, or accepted as true. Well, then when is something true? True, again according to the Merriam Webster Dictionary, is when something is in accordance with reality of a proven fact. Well, then what constitutes a reality? Merriam Webster states that reality is the quality or state of something being real. Well, then what is real? The questions could go on and on, like you had just discovered the word why when you were six. The concept of truth proves to be just as fascinating. However, I believe the dictionary to be wrong about a couple of things. Truth, I think, while often interpreted as concrete, is actually an objective word. I believe truth to be an individual decision, and would therefore differ from person to person. This, while my person feelings on the issue of truth, is the exact reason that I disagree with the above statement made by Philosopher, Charles Pierce.

15 Contemplate the following scenario; a large group of people are sitting in a room. They are discussing a currently pressing social issue and trying to come to some universal conclusions and/or solutions. Well, if truth can be something ultimately decided by a community, as it is according to Pierce, then why in the world are they bothering to debate it? If Pierce was correct then there would be absolutely no reason to debate such a topic what so ever. If there was such a concrete answer then a little old bald man would have sat at his teetering wooden desk late one night and figured out all of the hard questions in the world. He would have written it all up in laymen terms, published it, made millions and maybe even gotten a TV movie out of it. However, we live in a rational world and know this isn't rational idea, so why couldn't Pierce see that an ultimate truth is just as equally irrational. If all the historical roller coasters of the millennium have taught us anything, it has taught us this.

25 Political theorist, John Stuart Mills says “There is no such thing as absolute certainty, but there is assurance sufficient for the purposes of human life. We say and must assume our opinion to be true for the guidance of our own conduct.” His ideas all generated from his modern belief in the strength and freedom of the individual. He was surprisingly modern for the 1800s, when he was alive and wrote his ideas. He argues that the individual utilizes this strength through the ability to make decisions, a process he believed to not be taken lightly. He often said, “There is the greatest difference between presuming an opinion to be true simply because it has not been contested, and not contesting it because one believes in it.” I find myself in agreement with Mills, except find one of his ideas to be misleading. With an independently powerful individual, I see it as being only natural for other individuals to want to share their common beliefs with one another, thus creating strength in numbers. This will result in a futile way of converting non-believers, and does not make their ideas any more true. Therefore, man power does not justify a belief into a part of reality.

40 Francis Bacon has a far more abstract view on the subject of truth. Bacon was an philosophy from the late 1500s. He was extremely revolutionary for the time in which he lived (1561-1626). “The inquiry of truth, which is the love making or wooing of it: the knowledge of truth, which is the praise of it: and the belief of truth, which is the enjoyment of it, is the sovereign good of human natures.” This statement celebrates the diversity and unpredictability of what one defines as a truth. I find it to be easier for people to understand when considering what they believe to be true. Take something you know and follow these steps. 1.) First contemplate why you think this idea to be true. You can't just proclaim it to be true, it must have been justified in some way first. 2.) Once you have fully understood it, you can then recognize and appreciate the knowledge that is gained through the truth of the statement. This is for most people the final step in the life of a truth. Therefore truth is never fully understood. A meticulous person will continue the process with step three; the lacing of this new knowledge into the believer's everyday life. I believe in this process,

and I personally try to utilize everything I believe to be true on a daily basis, because if you don't use what you know to be true, then what is the point in believing it and carrying the knowledge with you.

William James was a modern philosopher. He compared truth to other common obscurities in order to try and find some sort of formula or pattern for discovering a way to define these things. Truth was compared to the words beauty and good. First he asked the question, "Does everyone find the same things to be beautiful?", and of course the answer was no. A group might be able to decide on elements of beauty, but all of these elements would be subjective when interpreted by the individual. Ultimately variations of whatever was decided upon by that group would arise in each individual. The same experiment was performed with the word good, and the same results were found; elements of goodness may be agreed upon, but the interpretation of what fit these elements would differ according to individual. Through his failure to find a pattern, James created an ingenious theory not found by most philosophy. This was the theory that there was indeed no theory in defining truth. His idea is far less pretentious than that of Francis Bacon or John Stuart Mills. James believes truth to be what "happens to an idea." He calls it the "cash value" of an idea. Therefore I tend to feel that James as possesses a more genuine theory than the other philosophers discussed in this paper, on the basis that his idea is more sincere. A good way to describe his theory of truth is found in the familiar method of guess and check used by school children, just beginning to learn algebra. You try an answer and if it doesn't work you try another. There is no theory or formula to follow, just one's own personal journey of discovery.

These three Philosophers I have explored, an Mr. Charles Pierce himself, all illustrate the subjective nature of a word such as truth. These four men are all very educated and well read, yet they all have extremely different views on such a small word. That in it's self becomes an argument for the changing definition of the word truth. If these men can't agree on a meaning of truth, then does that mean they are all wrong? No! It means they all possess their own opinions, as does everyone else in the world. Therefore, I conclude in saying that the day in which all of our ideas become uniform is the day in which the individual dies.

1216 words

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Durant, Will. The Story of Philosophy. Simon and Schuster Publishing, New York, New York. Copyright 1926.

Mills, John Stuart. On Liberty. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Great Britain. Copyright 1998.

Examiner Comments and Marks

General Comments

This essay is weak as an example of a vessel of ideas pertaining to TOK. Dictionary definitions rarely contribute to a good essay and, in the case of this essay, they lead to circularity of argument. The essay uses familiar TOK language but the approach adopted, a poorly understood presentation of historical philosophical positions, allows the candidate to avoid an examination of the issues involved in the prescribed title. Those authorities used to support the claims drown out the voice of the knower. Crucially, the choice of quotations is clumsy at best and irrelevant at worst, with the result that there is no discussion of the central notions in the question.

Analysis by criterion

	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
Criterion A: Knowledge Issues	2	10
<p>There is an attempt by the student to address the question, as evidenced by the description of a scenario in which the universality of knowledge claims is under discussion (l 12). The remarks on Mill (l 23) may be an attempt to present an alternative to the view expressed in the title, although the reader needs to interpolate this connection, as the candidate does not expressly make it. Similarly, the discussion about Bacon (l 36) has not been made relevant to the title, although a reader might like to assume that it is. Since there is little in the way of development of ideas, assessing their relevance to the title is difficult. There is an attempt to approach the question at different points in the essay (ll 31, 47, for example), although the central problems of knowledge are not addressed. A shadowy thesis does emerge, however (ll 45, 56, 64): the individual decides truth. Generally, problems of knowledge are neither recognized nor addressed, yet there is a sense in which the essay is not entirely irrelevant—truth after all seems to be an abiding theme even if it receives a very rough treatment throughout.</p>		
Criterion B: Quality of Analysis	1	10
<p>There are several instances of flawed logic and self-contradiction (between ll 7 and 8, and on ll 14, 61, 72) as well as some unjustified claims (ll 20, 31, 46, 56, 60). Although not every appearance of the word “however” can be assumed to usher in a counter-claim, there is one authentic hint at a critical stance (l 20). Line 54 suggests an awareness of the limitations of the group construction of truth, although this point has not been clearly formulated. To award a zero is too harsh, considering the above points, but the essay does not justify a mark of 2. Therefore it is awarded a mark of 1.</p>		
Criterion C: Breadth and Links	1	5
<p>There is some awareness of ethics and aesthetics (ll 53ff), although barely more than a mention is made of these. Algebra (l 66) is also mentioned, but only in passing.</p>		

Analysis by criterion (continued)

	Marks awarded	Maximum marks available
<p>Criterion D: Structure, Clarity and Logical Coherence</p> <p>The essay does possess a loose structure: beginning (ll 1–11), middle (ll 12–67) and end (ll 68–74), though this last section, intended as a conclusion, is weak because it only restates the view taken, but not justified, previously. The essay generally lacks clarity, is disjointed and shows only the slightest attempt to link paragraphs, to integrate external sources and to provide context to the statements made. Not only does the language obscure many of the ideas presented, but the failure to make distinctions or to understand the distinctions made by others often results in confusion. Moreover, it is difficult for the reader to know exactly what is meant by some key statements and questions (ll 7, 14, for example).</p>	1	5
<p>Criterion E: Examples</p> <p>One example is presented (ll 65–66), an arguably false description of how school children learn algebra. It could be claimed that another example is present in the form of the “little old bald man” (l 17), but this is a pseudo-example, and part of what seems to be a facetious disposal of the idea of an eternal objective truth.</p>	0	5
<p>Criterion F: Factual Accuracy and Reliability</p> <p>There are some unsubstantiated generalizations (l 45, for example) and some questionable claims with an arguably factual content (ll 19, 21). The interpretation of James (ll 51ff), if it makes sense, is not a fair representation of his position. The names of Peirce and Mill are inaccurately spelled—errors that on their own constitute a minor defect but in this essay underline a generally sloppy approach to textual accuracy.</p> <p>The point of including references is to allow the reader to locate the passages quoted—the works cited in the bibliography fail to accomplish this. The quoted passages (ll 23–25, 28–30, 37–40) required, but did not receive, precise referencing. Moreover, Bacon is not included in the bibliography at all. For these reasons it is fair to claim that the candidate provides no workable information about sources.</p>	2+0	5
<p>Total marks awarded</p>	7	40

Assessment Criteria

Part I External Assessment Descriptors

A Knowledge Issue(s) (10 points)

Is/are the problem(s) of knowledge implied by the prescribed title recognized and understood, and prominently maintained throughout the essay?

The phrase “problems of knowledge” refers to possible uncertainties, biases in approach to knowledge or limitations of knowledge, and the methods of verification and justification appropriate to the different Areas of Knowledge.

If appropriate, intermediate points (1,3,5,7 and 9) may be awarded by the assessor.

Achievement Level

- The candidate has:
- 0 not recognized any problem(s) of knowledge implied by the prescribed title.
 - 2 a very poor recognition and understanding of the problem(s) of knowledge implied by the prescribed title; the development of ideas is irrelevant to the prescribed title.
 - 4 a poor recognition and understanding of the problem(s) of knowledge implied by the prescribed title; the development of ideas is generally irrelevant to the prescribed title.
 - 6 a satisfactory recognition and understanding of the problem(s) of knowledge implied by the prescribed title; the development of ideas is generally relevant to the prescribed title, is a balanced inquiry, and, for the most part, reflects the voice of the candidate.
 - 8 a good recognition and understanding of the problem(s) of knowledge implied by the prescribed title; the development of ideas is consistently relevant to the prescribed title in particular, and to TOK in general; it is a balanced inquiry, and reflects the voice of the candidate.
 - 10 an excellent recognition and understanding of the problem(s) of knowledge implied by the prescribed title; the development of ideas is consistently relevant to the prescribed title in particular, and to TOK in general; it is a balanced, purposeful inquiry, and reflects the voice of the candidate.

B Quality of Analysis (10 points)

Do the analysis, and the treatment of counter-claims, show critical reflection and insight in addressing the problem(s) of knowledge?

If appropriate, intermediate points (1,3,5,7 and 9) may be awarded by the assessor.

Achievement Level

The candidate demonstrates:

- 0** no concern with the problem(s) of knowledge implied by the prescribed title.
- 2** a very poor level of critical reflection; the discussion is entirely superficial or the arguments are logically invalid; the main points are not evaluated, and there is no acknowledgment of their implications.
- 4** a poor level of critical reflection; the discussion is generally superficial, or the arguments are logically invalid; some of the main points are justified and evaluated, but there is little acknowledgment of their implications.
- 6** a satisfactory level of critical reflection and some insight; the discussion is adequately detailed and, in general, the arguments are logically valid; the main points are justified and evaluated, and there is acknowledgment of their implications; counter-claims are identified.
- 8** a good level of critical reflection and insight; the discussion is detailed, and the arguments are logically valid; the main points are justified and evaluated, and there is acknowledgment of their implications; counter-claims are identified and evaluated.
- 10** an excellent level of critical reflection and insight; the discussion is detailed, and the arguments are logically valid; the main points are cogently justified and evaluated, and there is effective acknowledgment of their implications; counter-claims are identified and thoroughly evaluated.

C Breadth and Links (5 points)

Does the essay reflect an awareness of different Ways of Knowing and different Areas of Knowledge, and of how they may be linked?

The terms “Ways of Knowing” and “Areas of Knowledge” refer to the elements of the TOK diagram. This is not to discourage reference to elements that do not feature on the diagram and that may be equally relevant and appropriate.

The word “across” here denotes links and comparisons across elements in the same radial section of the diagram. The word “between” here denotes links and comparisons between elements in different radial sections of the diagram.

Achievement Level

The candidate demonstrates:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 0 | no awareness of different Ways of Knowing and different Areas of Knowledge. |
| 1 | a very poor level of awareness of different Ways of Knowing and different Areas of Knowledge; links are attempted but are inappropriate. |
| 2 | a poor level of awareness of different Ways of Knowing and different Areas of Knowledge; some links are drawn either across or between them, but these are not always appropriate. |
| 3 | a satisfactory level of awareness of different Ways of Knowing and different Areas of Knowledge; appropriate links are drawn either across or between them. |
| 4 | a good level of awareness of different Ways of Knowing and different Areas of Knowledge; appropriate links and comparisons are drawn across and between them. |
| 5 | an excellent level of awareness of different Ways of Knowing and different Areas of Knowledge; effective links and comparisons are drawn across and between them. |

D Structure, Clarity and Logical Coherence (5 points)

Is the essay structured, clear and logically coherent?

If the essay is of fewer than 1200 words or exceeds 1600 words in length, zero will be awarded for this criterion.

This criterion is not intended to assess linguistic skills. Rather, it is intended to assess the extent to which the main ideas are clearly and coherently conveyed in an appropriately structured form.

Achievement Level

The essay is:

- 0** unstructured, unclear or logically incoherent or has no relevance to the prescribed title.
- 1** very poor in its structure, clarity and logical coherence.
- 2** poor in its structure, clarity and logical coherence.
- 3** satisfactorily structured, adequately clear and logically coherent enough to convey the main points.
- 4** well structured, with a concise introduction, and a clear, logically coherent development of the argument leading to a conclusion; concepts and distinctions are defined and clarified.
- 5** excellently structured, with a concise introduction, and a clear, logically coherent development of the argument leading to an effective conclusion; concepts and distinctions are succinctly defined and clarified.

E Examples (5 points)

Is the essay well supported by appropriate examples drawn from a variety of sources?

Achievement Level

- The candidate uses:
- 0** no examples relevant to the prescribed title.
 - 1** very poor (or inappropriate) examples, drawn from narrow sources, not supporting the main points of the essay.
 - 2** poor (rarely appropriate) examples, drawn from a limited variety of sources, to support the main points of the argument.
 - 3** satisfactory (generally appropriate) examples, drawn from a variety of sources, to support the main points of the argument.
 - 4** good (consistently appropriate) examples, drawn from a variety of sources, including the candidate's own experience, to support the main points of the argument; the examples reflect a degree of cultural diversity.
 - 5** excellent (consistently appropriate and effective) examples, drawn from a wide variety of sources, including the candidate's own experience, to illustrate succinctly the main points of the argument; the examples reflect a high degree of cultural diversity.

F Factual Accuracy and Reliability (5 points)

(revised November 2001)

Are the affirmations factually accurate and, if sources were used, were they reliable and correctly cited?

There are two strands in criterion F, which can work independently. In this revised version these are separated out, so that factual accuracy becomes one strand, and proper citation the other. The overall score is obtained by adding the levels achieved in the two strands.

Essays which have no relevance to the prescribed title will be awarded zero.

Achievement Level

Factual accuracy.

- 0** The essay contains extensive factual inaccuracy.
- 1** The essay contains some factual inaccuracy.
- 2** The essay contains little factual inaccuracy.
- 3** The essay contains no factual inaccuracy.

Citation. Non-original ideas, quotations and verifiable facts should be cited by candidates in a way that enables their sources to be traced.

- 0** No workable information about sources is given.
- 1** Most sources are adequately cited.
- 2** All sources are cited in a thorough and systematic fashion, or the essay requires no citations.