

Example 9: Tower of Hanoi

General guidance

[How to use this teacher support material](#)
[Teacher responsibilities](#)
[Skills and strategies required by students](#)
[Developing the exploration](#)
[Use of technology](#)
[Planning](#)
[Authenticity](#)
[Assessment criteria](#)
[Record keeping](#)

Assessed student work

[Overview](#)
[Examples of explorations](#)
[Example 1](#)
[Example 2](#)
[Example 3](#)
[Example 4](#)
[Example 5](#)
[Example 6](#)
[Example 7](#)
[Example 8](#)
[Example 9](#)
[Example 10](#)
[Example 11](#)
[Example 12](#)
[Example 13](#)
[Example 14](#)
[Example 15](#)
[Example 16](#)
[Example 17](#)
[Example 18](#)
[Example 19](#)
[Example 20](#)
[Example 21](#)
[Frequently asked questions](#)

Assessment

Criterion	A	B	C	D	E (SL)	E (HL)	Total (SL)	Total (HL)
Achievement level awarded	4	2	2	2	4	2	14	12
Maximum possible achievement level	4	3	4	3	6	6	20	20



[Student work \(PDF\)](#)



[Annotated student work \(PDF\)](#)



[Comments](#)

Comments

Criterion A: Communication

A4—The exploration is well organized, coherent, concise and complete, and fulfills its aims. This means that it is complete and is awarded a level 4.

Criterion B: Mathematical presentation

B2—The “approximately equal to” sign is either not used, or is inconsistently used. The student did not recognize that the data are discrete.

Criterion C: Personal engagement

C2—Some personal interest is expressed, with evidence of thinking independently.

Criterion D: Reflection

D2—The student links mathematical ideas and considers the significance of the results. But this is not extended in the context of the exploration and not enough questions are raised.

SL Criterion E: Use of mathematics

E4—The mathematics used is relevant and commensurate with the level of the course, but the knowledge shown is not good.

HL Criterion E: Use of mathematics

E2—Although commensurate with the level of the course, the knowledge demonstrated is not good, and this merits only a level 2.



