

IA Formatting Guide
SCORING FROM MAY 2019 SUBJECT REPORT (No change from previous reports)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
IA	0-2	3-5	6-8	9-12	13-15	16-19	20-25
	0%	12%	24%	36%	52%	64%	80-100%
Section B only	1	2-3	4	5-6-7	8-9	10-11	12-15

File type	Must be submitted as a Google Doc file.
Font Size	Size 12 font
Font Type	Something boring/universal: Times New Roman, Arial, Calibri, Cambria.
Spacing	Double spacing throughout
Margins	1 inch or 2-3 cm
Headers / Page #s	Page numbers yes. Nothing else: no name, no assignment title, no research question-nothing.
Title page	Just the following at the top of the page center adjusted: Research Question, Your name, Total word count No fancy headings (Microsoft Word wants you to make a blue size 24 font heading—don't do this), No pictures, No separate IA title
Works cited	Must be labeled Works Cited (bold, center adjusted) Must be on the same file Must be on it's own page with a page break separating it. Use "insert page break" Every entry on the Works Cited page must be cited somewhere in the paper. I will check this. Any entries listed on the Works Cited, but not cited in the document, I will force you to remove them.
Table of contents	None. Don't include one. This is an IA, not an EE.
Word Count Must be 2,200 words or less.	What is NOT included in the word count? Title page, IA section headings (e.g. Section 1: Identification and Evaluation of Sources), Works Cited page, in-text references. How do I calculate the word count? It is a tedious process. Most students count each section and manually count out the in-text references. This is complicated when you've got an in-text reference, which is more than author+page number. I've seen students copy and paste the paper into a new document and delete everything not included in the word count. N.B. Any subheadings you may put into your Investigation section like "Context" "French relationship with Habyarimana prior to 1990" do count in the word count, because they are part of the IA.
Section headings	Should be left adjusted, in black font, bolded and also size 12 font. Nothing fancy at all here. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Section A: Identification and evaluation of sources ● Section B: Investigation ● Section C: Reflection

Formatting things just for the first draft

File type	Must be submitted as a Google Doc file. This is because of the use of Comments. I will provide most of my feedback via the use of inserting comments.
Questions for me	Throughout each section provide 2-3 questions from you to me as inserted as comments. Meaning I want you to highlight one word from a sentence or section and then write a comment phrased as a question. It can be a question about the wording of a claim or about the use of a quote or if some evidence should be quoted or paraphrased or anything else you can think of.
Self-Scoring	After each section score yourself. To get the score descriptors, scroll down to where I've copied and pasted them. Then copy and paste the descriptor and mark of where you think the section currently is. No need to pick a specific number. Provide a 2-3 sentence explanation for why you think the section gets this score.
Word Count	In addition to the total word count on the Title page, include a word count after each section. This way we can both see sections, which are way under/over the suggested word count. For example, a 1,700 word investigation section means you should score well on that section, but you will have trouble on the other two sections.

Section A: Identification and evaluation of sources (6 marks, 500 words)

IB Criteria: Score 5-6	Checklist of questions
An appropriate question for investigation has been clearly stated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is the question appropriate for an IA? Otherwise, you cannot score more than a 2 out of 6. ● Do you clearly state the research question as a question? Yes, a question mark is required. ● Has the research question been stated within the first two sentence of Section 1? ● Does the grammar of the question make sense? ● Has the question, in this current wording, been approved by me?
The student has identified and selected appropriate and relevant sources,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are the two sources you are evaluating appropriate and relevant? ● To see what makes a source appropriate and relevant, see below.
and there is a clear explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If you don't talk about relevance you cannot get more than a 2. ● Writing about relevance automatically means when you evaluate each source you cannot evaluate its relevance as a limitation or value. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No sentences like, "This source is limited because it doesn't really focus on my research question..." ○ No sentences like, "This source is valuable because it has lots of information answering my research question..." ● Do you provide a 1-2 sentence explanation of the relevance of each source to the investigation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Possible sentence starters <i>This source is relevant to this investigation because...</i> ○ <i>This source is particularly important because...</i> ○ <i>This source provides X for my investigation because...</i> ○ <i>This source was selected for evaluation because...</i> ● When thinking about the relevance of a source think about what is unique or important about this particular source. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What does it provide for your argument that no other source can? ○ Is it a unique perspective? ○ An argument that reflects mainstream scholarship? ○ Does the source make an argument that is particularly relevant for you to prove your point? ○ Is this source the most scholarly work available? Or, is it a contrarian argument, which provides a counterpoint to everyone else? ○ Is it an eyewitness account? An insider's account? ○ A confidential source that reveals what no other source might?
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,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In your evaluation, do you use the words origin, purpose, content, value, and limitation? ● Do you use the sentence frames from the Sample IA? (file name: sample02_en Score 22) ● Do you provide in-text references in this section? This means anything, which is not common knowledge needs a citation. This can include any biographic information on the author—where s/he works, what s/he has published. Cite any reviews used of secondary monograph. For example, if you are evaluating Des Forges' <i>Leave none to tell the story</i>,

<p>with reference to the origins, purpose and content of the two sources.</p>	<p>and you use one of the many reviews found on JSTOR, this review must be cited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Did you use the right term to describe the source? Some examples of source types: historical monograph, journal article, newspaper article, research report, biography, autobiography, telegram etc.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Don't use the words: Book or novel.● Did you use the source itself to identify the purpose of the source? (Preface or Abstract, thesis somewhere in the first few pages, listed on the back cover of the book).● If it was a journal article, did you investigate the academic journal for its purpose?<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Academic journal descriptions○ Historical monograph description○ Newspapers● If the source is a monograph, did you use a review to support values and/or limitations?● Did you use the tips and tricks from the file titled 2017 OPCVL Answer Writing Guide First Draft? This was a file developed for help with Paper 1 source evaluation. The questions to ask yourself are especially helpful.● Did you cite content specifically to support one of your values or limitations?
---	--

Section B: Investigation (15 marks, 1,300 words)

<p>The investigation is clear, coherent and effectively organized.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do you provide historical context to your question? Is this context no more than a few sentences? ● Does every paragraph begin with a clear claim, which is addressing some aspect of your RQ? ● Quoting: Is the quote necessary? You need to watch out for over-quoting where you rely too much on the words of others. Quotes should be reserved for precise arguments from historians or key pieces of evidence. ● When including a quotation do you appropriately introduce the quotation? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As X argues... / X asserts that ... / ○ X implies that... ● Is every quotation explained afterward? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What this quote is showing ... ○ In other words, what this means... ● Is every quotation used as an opportunity to explicitly introduce/use perspectives? This can be done in the introduction of the quotation or in the explanation of the quotation: For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● From X’s perspective...
<p>The investigation contains well-developed critical analysis that is focused clearly on the stated question.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does every paragraph end with at least one sentence of analysis, which connects the claim in the topic sentence back to the research question? ● Is there analysis in the middle of larger paragraphs? ● Is each example/piece of evidence’s connection back to the research question explained?
<p>Evidence from a range of sources is used effectively to support the argument.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Number: As you can see on the left here there is no number, but rather “a range”, but everyone wants a number, so I say “8 high quality sources”. These 8 do not include those used in section 1’s source evaluation to support the evaluation itself, obviously the two sources evaluated will be part of the 8. If possible at least one primary source should be used. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sometimes, when the same information is repeated over and over in the sources people just want to cite the same source 5 times and be done with it. This is usually the case for background information. However, this is an opportunity to show that you’ve researched widely and cite multiple sources to cover that background information. ● Are the sources cited high quality? Be prepared to defend any website which is not a collection of primary source documents or an interview. I will not challenge websites which contain biographical information on authors used in section 1’s source evaluation. ● Are big sections of each body paragraph filled with citations? ● There should be long parts of your paper where every sentence is cited. If you write complex sentences, there might be more than one citation in a single sentence.
<p>There is evaluation of different perspectives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do you state the main perspectives in your introduction? This could be the perspectives of historians on your research topic or it could be the perspectives of participants in the historical event in question. ● Are the perspectives of the two sources which were evaluated in section 1 explicitly noted?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do you explicitly use the word perspective or a related synonym? For example: From the perspective of... / This point of view indicates... / ● Do you incorporate historians/sources into sentences to indicate perspectives? For example: Historian X's contends that... ● Do you evaluate the perspectives you included? This means that you have moved beyond just name dropping and have done something with those perspectives. For example: While X contends that... , Y makes the case that... Ultimately, Y is more convincing because... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When comparing X's perspective to Y's we can see that X is more reliable because...
<p>The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion that is consistent with the evidence and arguments provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does your conclusion answer your question? ● Is your conclusion consistent with the evidence that you presented? ● Does your conclusion make a clear judgment? ● Did you make sure to not include new material, evidence, quotes or judgments in the conclusion paragraph? ● The best approach to this section is to think of it as 4-6 sentences which summarize the preceding 4-6 paragraphs one at a time. You can also make a final evaluation of the different perspectives in your conclusion.

Section C: Reflection (4 marks, 400 words)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See below this table for the suggested list of questions from the IB for this section. ● The reflection is more about what you’ve learned about how historians do their work as opposed to your own struggles. There is a fine difference between these two things. ● Do you use the following phrases in this section? “methods of a historian” “challenges facing the historian” or “limitations of the methods used by the historian” ● If you read the scoring criteria below you can see that they have clearly separated the methods used by a historian from the challenges/limitations faced by a historian. This indicates to me that this reflection section can easily be divided into two paragraphs—one on methods and one on challenges. ● Another approach is to make this section two or three short paragraphs where you reflect on one method of a historian and then talk about a connected challenge or limitation.
<p>The reflection is clearly focused on what the investigation highlighted to the student about the methods used by the historian</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What are the methods of a historian? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sourcing a text ○ Contextualization of the information ○ Corroboration of the information ○ Close reading ○ Dealing with competing claims by other historians ○ Dealing with evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ insufficient evidence to prove a point ▪ contradictory evidence ▪ connecting evidence to a historical concept (significance, causation, consequences) ● Refer to the Historical Thinking Chart pdf for skills shown by historians as well as questions, which might help clarify the skills. Generally avoid the sentence starters because they are for working with a single source at a time. ● Where did you get stuck when writing this IA? What did you do to get unstuck? Answering these should point you towards a method or two. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ But just mentioning where you got stuck is not enough, you must also connect it to something historians do.
<p>The reflection demonstrates clear awareness of challenges facing the historian and/or limitations of the methods used by the historian.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I think one way to approach this section is to think of a KQ (yes, TOK!) that your research and writing process brought up and answer it with explicit focus on methods and challenges. ● See the list above of methods, many of these could be discussed as challenges as well ● Did you read the TOK subject guide section on the AOK of history before writing this section? (Pgs 40-41 Guide, 48-49 pdf) ● This section is going to be written in TOK-style writing. ● This section should vary depending on the research conducted—if you’ve got a controversial topic like we had with the Mau Mau then your reflection can focus on the idea of how historians arrive at certainty or truth. If you’ve got a topic where there is a lot of agreement then perhaps look at why this topic has agreement. What makes something non-controversial? ● Primary sources: If you have used a primary source what are the challenges facing a historian when reading a primary source? ● Did you have a source which was particularly controversial or challenging? If yes, then this could be a source of reflection.
<p>There is a clear and explicit connection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do you directly connect some aspect of your reflection to each of the two sources evaluated in section A?

<p>between the reflection and the rest of the investigation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This can be the same as above, but do you directly connect your reflection to the different perspectives found in your IA? For example: When considering what to do with the contrary arguments made between X and Y, I was shown one of the challenges facing a historian... ● If you aren't connecting to a specific source or a perspective (or two), then you need to connect to a piece of evidence or event.
--	---

Section 3 Reflection questions from the IB Subject Guide:

Examples of discussion questions that may help to encourage reflection include the following.

- What methods used by historians did you use in your investigation?
- What did your investigation highlight to you about the limitations 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?

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

0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-2	The question for investigation has been stated. The student has identified and selected appropriate sources, but there is little or no explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation. The response describes, but does not analyse or evaluate, two of the sources.
3-4	An appropriate question for investigation has been stated. The student has identified and selected appropriate sources, and there is some explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation. There is some analysis and evaluation of two sources, but reference to their value and limitations is limited.
5-6	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. 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.

Criterion B: Investigation (15 marks)

0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.

Criterion C: Reflection (4 marks)

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

SCORING FROM MAY 2018 SUBJECT REPORT (No Change from May 2017)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
IA	0-2	3-5	6-8	19-12	13-15	16-19	20-25

**2021 May IB History Internal Assessment
Teacher Comment Sheet**

Name:

[name removed and replaced with personal code when uploading to ibis]

Research Question:

Authenticity of work

- All students submitted their papers to turnitin.com, a web-based plagiarism detection service. The teacher verified all instances of similarity as being quotes or not constituting plagiarism.
- All students used NoodleTools, a web-based research tool; to build all works cited page entries and corresponding in-text references. The format of all entries conforms to MLA 8th edition requirements.
- Any entry listed on the works cited page is found in the paper. Students were not allowed to list anything that was not cited in the paper.

Criterion A: Identification and evaluation of sources (6 marks) [SEP]

0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1-2	The question for investigation has been stated. The student has identified and selected appropriate sources, but there is little or no explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation. The response describes, but does not analyse or evaluate, two of the sources.
3-4	An appropriate question for investigation has been stated. The student has identified and selected appropriate sources, and there is some explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation. There is some analysis and evaluation of two sources, but reference to their value and limitations is limited.
5-6	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. 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.

- RQ is clearly stated.
- Author, title of source, and date of publication are provided for each source.
- Relevance stated for each source.
- Source #1
- Source #2

Criterion B: Investigation (15 marks)

0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.

--

Criterion C: Reflection (4 marks)

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

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reflection on methods: ● Reflection on challenges/limitations: ● Connection to IA: |
|--|

Total Marks /25