IA Section II: Investigation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Level Descriptor (I.B. Language)** | **Translation (Regular Language)** |
| **0** | The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. | You did nothing or what you did was nonsense. |
| **1 - 3** | The investigation lacks clarity and coherence, and is poorly organized. Where there is a recognizable structure there is minimal focus on the task.The response contains little or no critical analysis. It may consist mostly of generalizations and poorly substantiated assertions. Reference is made to evidence from sources, but there is no analysis of that evidence. | Your investigation is hard to follow and has poor structure (paragraphs/sections). You are not focused on answering a question, but just “talking about stuff.”You don’t analyze, you just “tell the story” without much direct historical evidence. Far too broad and vague. Not nearly enough evidence is present.  |
| **4 - 6** | There is an attempt to organize the investigation but this is only partially successful, and the investigation lacks clarity and coherence.The investigation contains some limited critical analysis but the response is primarily narrative/descriptive in nature, rather than analytical. Evidence from sources is included, but is not integrated into the analysis/argument.  | You have an OK system of organization & structure.Your investigation has some focus on the question, but it is not sustained and is hard to follow at times.You are still mostly “telling the story” but you try to make arguments in some places. You have some evidence of research, but it is **NOT** used to defend a **specific argument** (rather it is mostly used to “describe” what happened). |
| **7 - 9** | The investigation is generally clear and well organized, but there is some repetition or lack of clarity in places.The response moves beyond description to include some analysis or critical commentary, but this is not sustained. There is an attempt to integrate evidence from sources with the analysis/argument.There may be awareness of different perspectives, but these perspectives are not evaluated. | Your IA is well-organized and easy to follow. You are mostly “telling the story” but you have attempted to analyze in places. However, most of the IA is still “descriptive.” You have some good sources and some good historical evidence which is used to help your argument in some places (but not throughout the IA). **You probably rely too much on 1 or 2 sources**.You talk about “counter-claims,” but you don’t really give details or direct links to your specific question.  |
| **10 - 12** | The investigation is generally clear and well organized, although there may be some repetition or lack of clarity in places.The investigation contains critical analysis, although this analysis may lack development or clarity. Evidence from a range of sources is used to support the argument.There is awareness and some evaluation of different perspectives. The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion. | Your organization and structure are easy to follow. You have a clear argument, but it may be a bit vague in places. You need to expand your arguments more and in greater detail. You have good evidence from several sources, demonstrating a good breadth of research. This evidence is used to back up the points you are making. You discuss “counter-claims” effectively enough to reach a specific answer to your question. You recognize and refute “counter-claims” to some degree. |
| **13 - 15** | The investigation is clear, coherent and effectively organized.The investigation contains well-developed critical analysis that is focused clearly on the stated question. Evidence from a range of sources is used effectively to support the argument.There is evaluation of different perspectives. The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion that is consistent with the evidence and arguments provided. | You IA is well-organized and easy to follow. All points and evidence are linked to a larger argument which directly answer the question asked. You make clear arguments throughout the IA. You have a lot of different sources and they are used to support your argument. All evidence is relevant to the question asked. You discuss “counter claims,” evaluate their arguments and refute them as related to your research question. “Counter claims” are used to help prove your argument, not just “thrown in” without clear focus.  |

**Step One** of your investigation you need to create list of evidence that you have gathered from the sources. You should have this done prior to your IA work day in order to make sure you will have a finished Part II by the due date!

To start, the evidence will take the form a bullet-pointed list.

**This section should consist of factual material that is:**

* **Organized AND referenced AND provides evidence of thorough research**
* **Drawn from sources that are appropriate for the investigation (scholarly books - NOT encyclopedias or brief overviews or online websites!).**
* **Correctly and consistently referenced.** *Every single bullet-pointed sentence should be cited, Chicago Style footnotes! NO EXCEPTIONS*
* **Organized thematically OR chronologically under sub-sections.**

Guidelines and Suggestions

Every piece of evidence that is included in this section WILL be analyzed.

You have to include evidence of different possible answers. Every question can have more than one correct perspective.  This can also be a good way to organize the paper… by historiographical perspective.

You must have evidence that considers other interpretations. See above.

Here you are simply listing excerpts from the research you have done and referencing them properly. And, by using bullet points, this promotes the idea that is a listing of relevant information.

* Try to stay within 800 words. **If you have less you probably do not have enough evidence to properly analyze.**
* Your evidence must clearly be connected to your research question
* Present the most significant evidence that helps to answer your question. **Non-significant evidence is a waste of words**.
* Keep this a summary. Use short, clear sentences. Choose words carefully. Do NOT use direct quotes from you sources unless that direct quote is critical to your analysis. You MUST cite everything that you summarize from your souces!
	+ Write [Subject, Verb and fact]
	+ Example: George Washington served as first president.
		- NOT: George Washington was chosen by the people and served 8 years as the United States' first president.
* All of your evidence must be cited using the Chicago. You should have **at least six sources**, if not more. *(Remember: depth AND breadth.)*
* Make sure you present **ample** evidence from the two sources you analyzed in Section 1. If you do not use those sources frequently, that is your sign that you need to change one or both of them to a different source!

Example of Section 2: *Structuring your Evidence*

For example, if your question is:

 "To what extent was the United States firebombing of Dresden in 1945 an act of terrorism?" you may want to approach it like this:

* Here is a summary of evidence from the various sources and viewpoints researched to help answer this question. This section will start with a couple of widely accepted definitions of terrorism:
* In order to fully answer this question, the bombing has to be put into historical context. Here are a few of the things happening during WWII that may help the reader judge whether it was an act of war or terrorism.
* Here is a summary of evidence that supports the idea that the bombing was indeed a terrorist act:
* Here is a summary of evidence that suggests the bombing was simply an act of war:
* You must gather enough evidence that will allow you to evaluate different interpretations. If you have evidence that supports only one possible answer, then you will have nothing to evaluate and analyze.
* Make sure you define terrorism so you can evaluate whether the bombing fits the description. You may include different definitions from different views, which can be analyzed.
* Research 2-3 views that argue that it was terrorism.
* Try to get primary sources of people involved in the actual decision and/or were affected by the bombings .
* Research 2-3 views that argue it was **NOT** terrorism, but an act of war.
* Present evidence that puts the event into historical context, like the fact that Germany had bombed London, or was currently implementing the Final Solution.
* Alternatively, part of the historical context could be the US knew the war was won by this time; but bombed them anyway!
* It is important that these suggestions to not limit your research but are designed to give you ideas! **Go BEYOND my suggestions!**

While grading I will look for (therefore so should you…):

**Sub-sections** (You will eventually take these out… I want you to put them here temporarily to make sure you achieve the IB bullet in the 13-15 range that states “The investigation is clear, coherent and effectively organized.”)

* Is your evidence organized thematically by sub-sections?
* Is the first sub-section named "Historical Context"? Are you setting the stage for what is taking place during the time period surrounding your question?
* Is there a sub-section arguing in support of your question?
* Is there a sub-section that provides evidence against your question?
* Is there a sub-section considering other possible interpretations of your question?
* Do **NOT** put a sub-section in at the end that is a "Miscellaneous" or "Other Evidence" category. This indicates you don't know what to do with the evidence that you list under the category. Instead, either find an appropriate category for it, or delete the evidence.

**Evidence**

* Is all of the evidence cited individually?
* Does all of the evidence directly relate to your question? (Not in general, but specifically.)
* Are there at least six significant sources relied on to ensure that the investigation is "well-researched"?
* Are all of the sources scholarly that provide in-depth material? Or, is there a reliance on websites and encyclopedias? (Again, "well-researched".)
* Are primary sources used?
* Does all the evidence come in around 800 words?

**Bibliography AGAIN…**

* If a source is cited in Section 2, a full bibliographic entry needs to be listed in your Bibliography.
* Does the Bibliography follow Chicago style directions???
* Are the bibliographic entries in the Bibliography alphabetized by the author's last name? If no author for a source is available, is the entry alphabetized by the source's title? (Don't alphabetize by "A" and "The." Instead use the first significant word.)
	+ Example: For the "The Sea of Despair" you would alphabetize it by S, Not T.
* There should be no additional sources outside of what you have cited in Section 2

Step Two

Analysis of your evidence:

You need to take your bulleted point list of evidence and turn it into an eloquent written paper!

A suggested number of words for this section is **1300**. This section of the internal assessment task consists of the actual investigation.

The investigation must be clearly and effectively organized. **(Keep the sub-headings so I can see if you connect your analysis to your organization BUT, you will need to delete these headings in the next drafts.)** And, it must contain critical **ANALYSIS** that is focused clearly on the question being investigated, and must also include the **CONCLUSION** that you draw from your analysis.

You must use a range of evidence (from both primary and secondary sources) to support your argument. *(What answers to your question have you discovered from your sources?)*

This section should consist of the following:

* A demonstration that you understand the significance of the issue in its historical context.
* What was going on in the world during the scope of your investigation that may have influenced events that you have investigated?
* Set the stage for a critical analysis of your evidence.
* A critical examination of the two sources discussed in Part I.
* A critical examination of one to several possible answers for your question.
* A critical examination of other possible interpretations / answers for your question.
* A demonstration of your awareness of the significance of the sources that you evaluated in Part I.
* All references to these sources MUST be cited.
* Conclusion: The stated conclusion must be clearly stated and consistent with the evidence presented. No further substantiation of your position should be provided be brief, and to the point.