

## Summer Assignment

IB History 12

Students,

As you know, your summer work this year is to complete your History IA. Please, feel free to email me with questions over the summer.

**If any student moves in to the IB program over the summer, and is reading this online, you need to contact me immediately, to begin this process.**

General Instructions

- You must turn your IA in on the first day of class. You must turn in a printed copy.
- It must include a title page, Criterion A, B, C, and a bibliography. A table of contents is not needed. Appendices are optional, depending on your IA and research.
- Specific IA instructions and a grading markscheme (rubric) are attached.
- If you have any questions during the summer concerning your IA, please feel free to email me. I'll be happy to help you.

Email address: [bswheeler@auburnschools.org](mailto:bswheeler@auburnschools.org)

Once your IA Research Question has been approved by Ms. Vatella, you may NOT change your question without getting permission from either Ms. Vatella or myself. You may narrow your question, or make it more specific.

## Internal Assessment Instructions

Truncated from the IB 2017 History Guide

IB History 11/12

At this point you have already selected your topic and developed your research question. Be aware that the format for the History IA changed in 2017, and if you look up examples online these will often be in the old format, and therefore, not helpful.

Your IA will be divided in to three main sections, plus a bibliography. The breakdown of the mark scheme and suggested word limits is as follows:

| Section                                     | Suggested word allocation  | Associated assessment criteria              | Marks           |
|---|----------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. Identification and evaluation of sources | 500                        | A. Identification and evaluation of sources | 6 marks         |
| 2. Investigation                            | 1,300                      | B. Investigation                            | 15 marks        |
| 3. Reflection                               | 400                        | C. Reflection                               | 4 marks         |
| 4. Bibliography                             | Do not count in word count | Not applicable                              | Not applicable  |
| Total (maximum word limit)                  | <b>2,200</b> don't exceed  |   | Total: 25 Marks |

### Section 1: Identification and evaluation of sources

You will analyze two of the sources that you will use in your investigation. They may be primary or secondary sources. In this section, using about 500 words, you will:

- clearly state the question you have chosen to investigate (this must be stated as a question)
- include a brief explanation of the nature of the two sources you have selected for detailed analysis, including an explanation of their relevance to the investigation
- analyze two sources in detail. With reference to the origin, purpose and content, you should analyze the value and limitations of the two sources in relation to the investigation.
  - Origin: Who wrote it?
  - Purpose: Why did he/she write it?
  - Content: What does the source include?
  - Analysis: What is the value of this work to a historian? What are the limitations of this document? (what is it lacking, is it biased, too narrow, etc.)

## **Section 2: Investigation**

This section will consist of about 1300 words, and will be your actual investigation. Your investigation must be clearly and effectively organized. There is no prescribed format for how this section must be structured. However, 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 investigation and analysis. You must use a wide range of evidence to support their argument. You should use a mixture of primary and secondary sources.

## **Section 3: Reflection**

In this section, you will reflect on what undertaking your investigation highlighted to you about the methods used by, and challenges facing, the historian.

Some questions that may help you reflect on your historical investigation process:

- What methods used by historians did you use in your investigation?
- What did your investigation highlight to you about the limitation of those methods?
- What are the challenges facing the historian? How do they differ from the challenges facing a scientist or a mathematician?
- What challenges in particular does archive-based history present?
- How can the reliability of sources be evaluated?
- What is the difference between bias and selection?
- What constitutes a historical event?
- Who decides which events are historically significant?
- Is it possible to describe historical events in an unbiased way?
- What is the role of the historian?
- Should terms such as “atrocious” be used when writing about history, or should value judgments be avoided?
- If it is difficult to establish proof in history, does that mean that all versions are equally acceptable?

## **Bibliography**

- A bibliography and clear referencing of all sources must be included, using Turabian/Chicago style formatting.
- Make sure you are NOT counting your bibliography or footnotes in your word count
- While the bibliography is no longer marked, having a poorly executed bibliography can hurt your marks in other sections.

## **Appendix**

An appendix is not needed for all IAs. Things that may be in an appendix:

- maps, charts, graphs, statistical information you refer to in your IA
- unpublished items, such as an interview you conducted for your IA

## Internal Assessment Criteria (2017 version)

IB History 11/12

### Criterion A: Identification and evaluation of sources (6 marks)

| Level descriptor  | Marks | Score |
|---|-------|-------|
| The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below   | 0     |       |
| The question for investigation has been stated.<br>The student has identified and selected appropriate sources, but there is little or no explanation of the relevance of the source to the investigation<br>The response describes, but does not analyze or evaluate, two of the sources   | 1-2   |       |
| An appropriate question for investigation has been stated.<br>The student has identified and selected appropriate sources, and there is some explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation.<br>There is some analysis and evaluation of two sources, but reference to their value and limitations is limited.  | 3-4   |       |
| An appropriate question for investigation has been clearly stated. The student has identified and selected appropriate and relevant sources, and there is a clear explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation.<br>There is a detailed analysis and evaluation of two sources with explicit discussion of the value and limitations of two of the sources for the investigation, with reference to the origins, purpose and content of the two sources. | 5-6   |       |

### Criterion C: Reflection (4 Marks)

| Level Descriptor  | Marks | Score |
|---|-------|-------|
| The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below   | 0     |       |
| The reflection contains some discussion of what the investigation highlighted to the student about the methods used by the historian.<br>The reflection demonstrates little awareness of the challenges facing the historian and/or the limitations of the methods used by the historian.<br>The connection between the reflection and the rest of the investigation is implied, but is not explicit. | 1-2   |       |
| The reflection is clearly focused on what the investigation highlighted to the student about the methods used by the historian.<br>The reflection demonstrates clear awareness of challenges facing the historian and/or limitations of the methods used by the historian<br>There is a clear and explicit connection between the reflection and the rest of the investigation.                       | 3-4   |       |

**Criterion B: Investigation (15 marks)**

| <b>Level Descriptor</b>   | <b>Marks</b> | <b>Score</b> |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below   | 0            |              |
| The investigation lacks clarity and coherence, and is poorly organized. Where there is a recognizable structure there is minimal focus on the task.<br>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.   | 1-3          |              |
| 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.   | 4-6          |              |
| The investigation is generally clear and well organized, but there is some repetition or lack of clarity in places.<br>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.<br>There may be awareness of different perspectives, but these perspectives are not evaluated.      | 7-9          |              |
| The investigation is generally clear and well organized, although there may be some repetition or lack of clarity in places.<br>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.<br>There is awareness and some evaluation of different perspectives. The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion. | 10-12        |              |
| The investigation is clear, coherent and effectively organized.<br>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.<br>There is evaluation of different perspectives. The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion that is consistent with the evidence and arguments provided.   | 13-15        |              |