

## IB Historical Investigation 2017-2018

### I. Project Description:

The Historical Investigation (HI) is an investigation based on a question of your choice. This study is meant to be a problem-solving activity which enables candidates to demonstrate their ability to apply skills and knowledge to an area which interests them. The HI is not an historical essay or narrative; rather, it is designed to assess specific research skills.

### II. Topics

- You may choose your topic but it should fall between the years 1800 and 1992.
- No HOA student may have the same research question as any other student. Those students with similar questions will be expected to alter their question.

### III. Sources

- You must use at least six sources. Two of these sources must present alternative views on your research question.
- Sources must be scholarly—i.e., peer-reviewed. You may use history books and journal articles found in JSTOR. You may use internet sources that are peer-reviewed. You may also use primary sources.
- Examples of sources that are absolutely *not* acceptable include: encyclopedias, introductory/general books written for young adults; Wikipedia; self-published or unpublished works.

### IV. General Requirements

Your final investigation should include the following components. A model is attached and is provided as a template on Blackboard.

- Word count: minimum: 1500 words; maximum: 2200 words. Only Sections 1-3 are included in the word count.
- Format: Typed, double spaced, Times New Roman or Calibri, 12 point font, 1 inch margins
- Citations: MLA format (parenthetical documentation within the body of the paper)
- Components:
  - Title Page: Research Question, Name, IB Number, Date, Word Count
  - Table of Contents
  - Sections (with each section clearly labeled)
    - Section 1: Identification and evaluation of sources
    - Section 2: Investigation
    - Section 3: Reflection
  - Works Cited: Only list sources actually cited in the HI; must be on a separate page.

### V. Important Rules You Need to Know About the HI

- The HI must be completed in order to sit for the IB exam.
- If you do not complete the HI, you will not be allowed to enroll in Topics in your senior year.
- The HI grade will be a part of your final grade for both HOA and Topics.
- The HI must be original work and must be submitted to Turnitin.com. The resulting reports will be carefully verified by your teacher.
- Work that has been previously submitted for Honors Government or for other courses will not be accepted for this project.
- According to IB rules, you may receive written feedback one time--on the initial draft of your HI; therefore, it is critical that your initial draft be as complete as possible.
- The HI is 20% of the total IB Exam Grade and has strategic importance as you prepare for the written IB exams.

## **Historical Investigation Timeline**

### **Checkpoint 1:**

#### **Research Question and 2 Scholarly Sources**

**DUE DATE: November 20/21 (Blue/Red)**

Your first submission should include:

1. Your research question.
2. An explanation of the scholarly debate surrounding your question.
3. 2 scholarly sources with differing views on your question – explain the perspective of each source

### **Checkpoint 2:**

#### **Noodle Tools Notecards**

**DUE DATE: December 14/15 (Blue/Red)**

Your second submission consists of the notecards you have compiled on Noodle Tools. By this date you should have:

1. Identified and extracted information from 6 scholarly sources
2. Compiled at least 10 notecards from each of your 6 scholarly sources

### **Initial Draft**

**DUE DATE: January 16, 2018 (ALL CLASSES)**

Using materials from the first two checkpoints:

1. Complete sections 1, 2 and 3 as if you were turning them in for a final draft. This is an excellent opportunity to receive feedback prior to the next submission. Please take this submission seriously. You will only receive so much feedback from your teacher on the HI.
2. Make sure that your word count is at least 1500 words and no more than 2200.
3. Make sure that it follows the required format.
4. Make sure that you have at least six sources.
5. Make sure that you provide complete and appropriate citations for your sources.
6. Submit your draft to Turnitin.com.

### **Final Draft**

**DUE DATE: April 16, 2018 (ALL CLASSES)**

Your final draft will be read and scored by the teacher who read your initial draft, who will then submit your score to your Topics teacher.

1. Finalize your HI by addressing all concerns and comments noted by your teacher on your draft.
2. Double check your word count.
3. Double check your formatting.
4. Submit your final version to Turnitin.com

## IB Historical Investigation 2017-2018 Research Guide

The Historical Investigation (HI) is an investigation based on a question of your choice. It is a problem-solving activity enabling you to demonstrate your ability to apply skills and knowledge to an area which interests you. Keep in mind throughout this process: the HI is not an historical essay or narrative – it is not just a paper *about* something. Instead, it is **an analysis of an historical question with multiple perspectives**. Your goal is to identify an historical question with multiple perspectives, research and explain the perspectives, analyze them, and reach a conclusion.

### Step 1: General Background Research

What areas of history interest you? What are some historical events that you'd like to know more about? This is the time to find out general information about a topic or event in history.

Read about a couple of topics or events in history that interest you. At this stage, using Internet sources, online encyclopedias, unpublished works, and Wikipedia is fine (though many Wikipedia entries are often confusing and very poorly written). Materials that are written for general readership will give you a broad overview of a topic or event.

**Pro Tip:** Start this as soon as the HI is assigned – you will need to move from this stage to finding scholarly sources fairly quickly.

Some suggestions for your background research: Online encyclopedias (i.e., the GALE reference series on the GCM Library website: Databases > General); National Archives of the United States; Library of Congress; presidential libraries; museum and historical landmark websites; PBS (especially their *American Experience* series); U.S. Department of State Historical Milestones; college and university websites; history websites.

Don't forget videos. *Crash Course* videos and historical documentaries are a great introduction to a topic or event you don't know much about. Use historical fiction (i.e., *Dunkirk*) with caution – directors often take some artistic license with characters and events to tell a compelling story.

Focus of Research in Step 1: At this early stage of the project, look for:

- *What happened?* Establish a timeline of important events. Make it as detailed as you possibly can.
- *Who was involved?* Write down the people involved in the event and what they did.
- *Are there important primary source documents associated with the event?* Note any treaties, legislation, executive orders, important speeches, letters, memoranda, diaries, newspaper articles/editorials, or similar materials. Make sure to include the authors, audiences, and/or recipients (if any).
- *What is the context of the event?* Note how this event fits within the broader context of US or world history.
- *What sources are referenced?* Note the names of any authors, books, articles, primary sources, or other materials referenced – these may lead you to the scholarly sources you will need to write your paper.

- *What source are you reading/viewing?* Don't forget to write down the website, article title, author (if any). Copy the URL into your notes so you can find it again.

## Step 2: Identify a Scholarly Debate and Formulate a Research Question

At this stage, you will move from general background research to scholarly research. You will need at least 6 scholarly sources for your HI, and there must be a debate among scholars about some aspect of your research topic. See p. 9 for a **Guide to Scholarly Sources**.

### Identify a Scholarly Debate

Remember, your HI is not just a recitation of facts about an event. It is an evaluation of historians' **differing views** about the event.

The assembling of the relevant facts must certainly be carried out dispassionately, without either anger or enthusiasm; this aspect of the historian's craft is no different from the scientist's. But this is only the beginning of the historian's task, because the sorting of these facts – the decision as to which are “relevant” – requires judgment, and judgment rests on values. Facts as such are meaningless, since they furnish no guide to their selection, ordering, and emphasis: to “make sense” of the past, the historian must follow some principle. He usually does have it; even the most “scientific” historians, consciously or not, operate from preconceptions (Pipes 403).

### How to Identify a Scholarly Debate

- Use a “historiography of \_\_\_\_\_” search. Historiography is the study of writing about history – how historians have written about and interpreted historical events. Historiography articles collect and discuss the views of different historians on major questions related to your topic. They will also help narrow the focus of your question. Some examples:
  - Historiography of the Spanish-American War
  - Historiography of the Cuban Missile Crisis
  - Historiography of the Russian Revolution
  - Historiography of the Civil Rights Movement
- Books such as *Interpretations of American History* or *32 Problems in World History* discuss differing perspectives on historical questions and often identify scholars associated with different perspectives.
- The word “revisionist” – if you see a scholarly source characterized as revisionist, that's a strong clue that you're onto a scholarly debate. It means that this source is revising (changing) a traditional interpretation of an historical event.
- Identify the “schools of thought” that have developed within your topic. Many times, scholars who have adopted a similar historical interpretation are grouped together into “schools,” such as “traditional,” “orthodox,” “revisionist,” “post-revisionist,” “realist” and the like. Identify these schools of thought and the scholars associated with them. Examples:
  - The Soviet Union was to blame for the cold war (Orthodox)
  - The United States was to blame for the cold war (Revisionist)
  - Miscalculations by both the Soviet Union and the United States led to the cold war (Realist)

**Pro Tip:** If you can't find a scholarly debate, you will need to look for a different research question.

### Formulate a Research Question

Once you identify a scholarly debate within your topic, you can frame it in terms of a question for investigation. Your question must be one that invites analysis of differing historical perspectives, not merely factual recitation.

- Good Questions – these questions require you to analyze differing perspectives:
  - To what extent was the Vietnam War a nationalist independence movement?
  - What was the primary reason why President Harry Truman decided to drop the atomic bomb on Japan in 1945?
  - What was the primary reason for US intervention in Cuba in 1898?
- Bad Questions #1 – these questions just call for a recitation of facts:
  - What actions did Herbert Hoover take to combat the Great Depression?
  - What actions did the United States take to halt Japanese expansion in the Pacific between 1937 and 1941?
  - What actions did the United States take to limit European influence in the Western Hemisphere between 1890 and 1920?
- Bad Questions #2 – there is no historical debate here – the answer is obvious.
  - Did the United States entry into World War I help the allies win? (Yes!)
  - Did harsh labor conditions contribute to progressive reforms in early 20<sup>th</sup> century America? (Yes!)
  - Did America's industrial strength help the allies win World War II? (Yes!)

### **CHECKPOINT 1: Research Question and 2 Scholarly Sources**

This first progress report on your investigation should include the following information:

- Your research question
- An explanation of the historical debate about your question
- Two scholars who have differing views of your question
  - Who are they?
  - Why are they scholars?
  - What is their viewpoint?
  - What evidence supports their viewpoint?

### **Step 3: Read, Write, Repeat!!!**

There's no way around it – you're going to have to **read** some challenging texts and **take detailed notes** as you go.

### Reading Scholarly Sources

- For all sources: Read with a critical eye. Ask yourself: How does the author know that? What evidence supports that statement? Why does that evidence support that statement? Are there other ways to interpret that evidence? What sources does this author rely upon?
- For books:
  - *Get an overview*. Read the table of contents to get an idea of what is in the book and how it might help you answer your research question.
  - *Read the Preface and/or Introduction*. This is where the author will tell you why he/she wrote the book, what his/her thesis is, and what evidence he/she will present to back it up.

- *Read the last chapter.* Here is where the author will summarize his/her conclusions and explain why he/she reached these conclusions.
- *Read the relevant parts of the book.*
  - If you are reading online, use the search tools to find specific portions of the book that relate to your question.
  - If you are reading a print version, use the index for this purpose.
  - Look for headings and subheadings to help you understand themes and concepts the author believes are important.
- For articles:
  - *Read the abstract.* This provides a summary of the article, explains the author's thesis, and summarizes the evidence the author found relevant in reaching his/her conclusions. **NOTE: The abstract is NOT part of the article, so don't cite it in your paper.**
  - *Read the introductory section.* The author will often tell you what question he/she is investigating and how he/she intends to go about the investigation.
  - *Read the concluding section.* The author will summarize his/her conclusions and the supporting evidence.
  - *Read the article.* Use headings and subheadings to help you understand themes and concepts the author believes are important.

### Use Noodle Tools

Take notes in Noodle Tools as you read your sources. Share your project with your teachers. For each source, create note cards that include:

- Source information for your citations (author, title, publishing information, year).
- Main points the author makes that relate to your question
  - **1 point or idea per note card**; if it is a point/idea that is important to the author's thesis, you may have several cards about that point/idea
  - This will help you organize your notes later (see Synthesis below)
- Evidence supporting main points
- Direct quotations from the source (if appropriate)
- Your thoughts and connections (if appropriate) – begin to note points of similarities and differences with other sources, or questions you have.

**Pro Tip: TAKE NOTES!!**

- "I'll remember where I saw it" said every student ever.
- No, you won't.

**CHECKPOINT 2: Create at least 60 note cards (10 from each source) documenting your research efforts. Your teacher will check these for proficiency.**

### **Step 4: Write Your Draft**

Part A: OPCVL – this is where you evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of **TWO** of your main sources. **The two sources must have differing perspectives on your historical question.** In IB parlance, strengths are assessed as "values;" weaknesses are assessed as "limitations." Both values and limitations are assessed by referencing the origin, purpose, and content of a source. See **OPCVL Guidance**, p. 11, for more detail.

- *Origin* – notes who wrote the source, what the source is, when the source was written, and where the source was written.
- *Purpose* – notes why the author wrote the source.
- *Content* – notes the perspectives and evidence contained in the source
- *Value* – assesses how the source helps you answer your question
- *Limitations* – assesses the weaknesses of the source

## Part B: Investigation

- Context – briefly explain the historical context in which your question arises. Don't just jump into describing and analyzing your sources.

- Synthesis

Your HI should *synthesize* your research, not just walk through what each of your sources says about your research question. To do this, look for common themes across all of your research sources and pull them together into a discussion of that theme. For example:

- *Research Question*: What was the primary reason for US intervention in Cuba in 1898?
- *Organize by Themes*: pull together all of your note cards for all of your sources that discuss each theme.

- The US intervened to advance American economic interests
- The US intervened to gain a strategic military advantage in the Caribbean
- The US intervened to help the Cubans gain independence
- The US intervened because the public pressured McKinley for war

**Pro Tip:** If you have prepared your notecards properly – limited them to one point/idea per card – you can easily organize them by theme, rather than by source. Viola! Synthesis!

- Analysis

- *Compare* – for each theme, what are the points of similarity across your sources?
- *Contrast* – for each theme, what are the points where they differ?
- *Evidence* – what evidence does each source rely upon to support his/her view?
- *Evaluation* – which argument(s) seem the strongest to you? **NOTE: you should be using your OPCVL extensively here.** Look at:

- Strength of the sources' scholarly credentials
- Strength of the evidence supporting a source's view
  - What choices does the author make?
  - What evidence is emphasized, discounted, or omitted when comparing and contrasting the sources?
- Strength of the author's sources
  - Is the book well-referenced?
  - Does the author use a wealth of primary sources?
  - Does the author rely mostly upon the works of other scholars?
  - If evaluating events involving multiple countries (i.e., World War I), does the author rely primarily on English sources?
- Availability of new evidence that other sources may not have had.

**Pro Tip:** Book Reviews (see p. 10) can help you understand how other scholars assess the strengths and weaknesses of your sources.

- Bias – is the author’s view influenced by a personal political/economic/ethnic/religious interest?
- *Conclusion* – make sure you answer your research question. Your analysis should lead you to a well-reasoned conclusion.

Part C: Reflection – this is where you will reflect on the task of being a historian. Your Reflection should focus on what was unique about YOUR investigation. What challenges did YOUR investigation present? How did YOU overcome them? If your Reflection is very generic and could be tacked onto any investigation, it is not specific enough to YOUR investigation.



## Guide to Scholarly Sources

What is a Scholarly Source? There are two hallmarks of a scholarly source:

- First, scholarly sources are written by **experts who have studied the primary source documents and the work of other experts to write about the event**. Scholarly sources are usually written by professional historians, though journalists, government leaders, and others may also be considered scholarly sources depending on how they acquired their expertise.
- Second, scholarly sources are those considered by other experts to be **factually accurate and analytically sound**.

Where Do I Find Scholarly Sources?

- *On the GCM Library website*, click on Databases, then General. Use one of these 3 databases to find scholarly sources:
  - JSTOR – Academic Journal Storage
    - For articles written by scholars that appear in academic journals accepted as authoritative for a particular area of study.
  - Questia – For books written by scholars and accepted as authoritative for a particular area of study.
  - ProQuest eLibrary – Also for books written by scholars and accepted as authoritative for a particular area of study.
- *Google Scholar* – you can ask your question just as you would in any other Google search, but your results will be limited to academic sources. You may not be able to get full access to sources you find this way, but note the relevant information and see if you can find it in the GCM Library databases, booksellers, or outside libraries.
- *Amazon, Barnes and Noble, and other bookseller websites* – this is a great way to identify books about your topic. You can usually see a summary of the book, look at the table of contents, read reviews of the book, and view information about the author and publisher to see if it is a scholarly source. If you don't want to purchase a book, see if you can find it in the GCM Library databases or an outside library.
- *Outside Libraries* – if you identify a source you'd like to read, but can't find it in the GCM Library databases, see if you can find it through the Fairfax County library system or through one of the local university libraries. Most university libraries will let you read and copy materials in the library, though you can't usually check them out.

How Do I Know if Source Is “Scholarly”?

- For Articles in JSTOR: These articles will almost always be scholarly sources. These articles are written by recognized scholars and are “peer reviewed,” meaning that other experts within the discipline have read the article to ensure its accuracy and academic scholarship before publication.

- For Books:

- If the source is *written by an historian teaching at a college or university*, that is usually enough to establish that the source is scholarly. The work of college and university professors is peer-reviewed to ensure accuracy before publication. No college/university wants to be embarrassed by its faculty.
- If the source is *published by a college or university press*, that is also an indication that it is a scholarly source. These works are also peer-reviewed to ensure accuracy before publication. No college/university wants to be embarrassed by publishing an inaccurate book/article.
- For books published outside the college/university setting (present and former government leaders, journalists, media personalities, general-interest authors) look for **book reviews** of the book. You can find book reviews in JSTOR, Kirkus Book Reviews, the *New York Times Book Reviews*, *The Washington Post*, and other large-market newspapers. If the book is not considered factually accurate or analytically sound, the reviewer will let you know. If you can't find a review of the book, that may also be an indication that it is not considered a scholarly source.

**Pro Tip: Book Reviews**

Book reviews are usually written by other scholars in the same academic discipline as your book's author. They can help you:

- Verify if a source is "scholarly"
- Summarize a book's contents
- Identify the scholarly debate(s) surrounding an historical event
- Clarify the viewpoint of the book's author on historical questions related to the event
- Identify strengths and weaknesses of a particular book (useful for your OPCVL)

- For Primary Sources: Significant primary sources can be used as scholarly sources IF they have an identifiable author AND they are of critical importance to the topic/event you are researching.

- Definitely NOT Scholarly: Encyclopedias; news media articles, whether in print or on a website; articles appearing on interest group websites (i.e., Heritage Foundation, Brookings Institution); sources written for a young adult (YA) audience; Wikipedia; unpublished works; student thesis papers and dissertations.

## OPCVL Guidelines

The OPCVL is an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of **TWO** of the main sources you use in your investigation. The two sources you choose should have differing perspectives on your question. In IB parlance, strengths are referred to as “values;” weaknesses are referred to as “limitations.” You should assess the values and limitations of your sources with reference to their origin, purpose, and content.

### Origin:

- What is the document’s origin?
- Who wrote it and where was it written?
- What are the scholarly credentials of the author – what makes him/her an expert?

### Purpose: Why was the document written? Some possibilities (not exhaustive):

- To explain an idea or view
- To compile evidence on a topic
- To persuade the reader that a particular view is correct
- To oppose another author’s view
- To challenge a prevailing view
- To defend a particular point of view

### Content: What is included in the book or article?

- What is the author’s perspective?
- What evidence does the author rely upon to support his/her perspective?
- What evidence is included?
- What evidence is excluded?
- What assumptions does the author make in choosing or emphasizing evidence?

### Value: How does this source help you answer your research question?

- What are the scholar’s credentials? (**reference the source’s Origin**)
  - What makes him/her an expert in his/her field?
    - Degrees from colleges or universities?
    - Their present or past job(s)?
    - How did he/she become an expert in his/her field?
  - Has he/she published extensively in this field?
  - Has the author or the source itself won awards for work in this field?
- Does the author make a significant, new contribution to the scholarship? (**reference the source’s Purpose/Content**)
  - Does the author have access to historical information that has not been available to other authors (i.e.: newly declassified information; opening of the some archives of the Soviet Union)
  - Is the author the first to examine a particular question or topic?
  - Is the author the first to question the prevailing view on a topic?
- How do other scholars regard this author’s work? (**reference the source’s Origin and Content**)
  - Do other scholars consider the author to be an expert in the field?
  - Do other scholars cite the author in their own books and/or articles?
    - Check Google Scholar

- Is the author considered a top expert in the field -- someone whose views are nearly always cited in other sources?
- **NB: Book Reviews will be very helpful in determining how other experts view your source.**
- Does the author have a unique perspective that enhances the value of the source? **(reference the source's Origin, Purpose, and Content)** Some possibilities (not exhaustive):
  - Does the author have particular first-hand experience (i.e., a former military officer, diplomat, CIA operative who was involved in an event)?
  - Did the author personally witness or experience an event?

Limitations: What factors might limit the usefulness of the work?

- Is the author's scholarship limited? **(reference the source's Origin)**
  - Is he/she writing outside of his/her field of expertise?
  - Is this the only work he/she has written on the topic?
  - Is he/she new to the field and still developing expertise?
- What has the author failed to consider? **(reference the source's Content)** Some possibilities (not exhaustive):
  - Writing about economic prosperity in Trujillo's Dominican Republic, without considering human rights abuses.
  - Writing about states' rights in the United States without considering segregation and Jim Crow laws.
  - Writing about protection of US economic interests in the Middle East without considering the rise of radical movements
  - Writing about the strategic importance of the Panama Canal without considering that it enabled Noriega to retain power
- Has the author's work been criticized by others? **(reference the source's Content)** If so,
  - What is the basis for the criticism?
    - Mere disagreement?
    - Flawed methodology?
    - Inaccurate facts?
    - Plagiarism?
  - Have other authors written to defend the views/methodology/sources/interpretation of your source? Or is the criticism pretty unanimous?
  - **NB: Book Reviews can be helpful in assessing the criticism of your source.**
- Is the author biased? **(reference the source's Origin and Purpose)**
  - Do the author's personal background and/or beliefs influence his/her ability to write objectively about a topic?
  - BE CAREFUL WITH THIS ONE:
    - A source whose family fled Cuba in 1959 might well be biased against Castro.
    - A source who comes from a military background might well be biased in favor of military explanations of events.
  - HOWEVER:
    - An author is not necessarily biased because he/she is an American writing about events in Latin America

- An author is not necessarily biased because he/she is a Chilean writing about slavery in the United States
- Is the author's view influenced by lack of perspective? (**reference the Origin, Purpose, and Content**)
  - Was it written in the immediate aftermath of an event?
  - Has the passage of time altered how an event is perceived (i.e.: the specter of communist infiltration of the US government in 1950s)?
  - Has new information altered the perception of an event?

## Citing Sources

**Citations** are used within the essay to signal the reader that what they have just read is borrowed from another source. Information you use from outside sources can be presented in your essay in several ways:

- as a direct quote (information you take directly from an author. You use it exactly as it appears in the text, and you place quotation marks (“ ”) around it;
- as an indirect quote (you restate the information in your own words); and
- as unique but generally stated ideas that are still ascribable to the original source.

**You must cite your sources within your essay using “internal citations”!**

★ **Internal citations** are short notes separated from the text of the essay by parentheses. The notes include the author’s name and the page number on which the original information can be found. This is an example of an internal citation (Brannan 21-22). The reader uses this information (the author is Brannan and the information used in the essay is from pages 21-22). A Works Cited Page, which includes the name of the publication, its publisher and the date of publication, is included on a separate page at the end of the paper.

**The Works Cited page** appears at the end of the essay and it carries the title “Works Cited.” The rules for constructing a Works Cited page come from the MLA Handbook. This MLA style guide sets forth very specific rules for how citations are done. On the GCM Library website, the librarians have placed the directions on how to do MLA citations. It contains many examples of how to cite your sources. Please refer to this style guide when creating your Works Cited page. The web address is <http://www.gcmhslibrary.com/research-guides/general-research-assistance/> . Here is an example of a correctly formatted Works Cited page:

### **BOOK:**

Gaddis, John Lewis. *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997. Print.

### **SPECIFIC CHAPTER FROM A BOOK WITH EDITOR(S):**

Kramer, Mark. "The Decline of Soviet Arms Transfers to the Third World." *The End of the Cold War and the Third World: New Perspectives on Regional Conflict*. Ed. Artemy M. Kalinovsky and Sergey Radchenko. London: Routledge, 2011. 17-32. Print.

### **E-BOOK:**

Roush, Chris. *Inside Home Depot: How One Company Revolutionized an Industry through the Relentless Pursuit of Growth*. New York: McGraw, 1999. ebrary. Web. 4 Dec. 2005.

### **SCHOLARLY JOURNAL (e.g. JSTOR):**

Coleman, David G. "Eisenhower and the Berlin Problem, 1953–1954." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 2.1 (2000): 3-34. Print.

### **WEBSITE:**

"A Short History of the Department of State: Containment and Cold War, 1945-1961." *U.S. Department of State: Office of the Historian*. N.p., 3 Dec. 2010. Web. 29 Nov. 2012. <<http://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/short-history/containmentandcoldwar>>.

**Historical Investigation Criteria**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part A: Identification and Evaluation of Sources (6 marks)**

Marks	Level descriptor
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The response describes, but does not analyse or evaluate, two of the sources.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>There is some analysis and evaluation of two sources, but reference to their value and limitations is limited.</li> </ul>
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>

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

Marks	Level descriptor
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</li> </ul>
1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The investigation lacks clarity and coherence, and is poorly organized. Where there is a recognizable structure there is minimal focus on the task.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an attempt to organize the investigation but this is only partially successful, and the investigation lacks clarity and coherence.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The investigation is generally clear and well organized, but there is some repetition or lack of clarity in places.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>There may be awareness of different perspectives, but these perspectives are not evaluated.</li> </ul>
10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The investigation is generally clear and well organized, although there may be some repetition or lack of clarity in places.</li> <li>The investigation contains critical analysis, although this analysis may lack development or clarity. Evidence from a range of sources is used effectively to support the argument.</li> <li>There is awareness and some evaluation of different perspectives. The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion.</li> </ul>
13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The investigation is clear, coherent and effectively organized.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>There is evaluation of different perspectives. The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion that is consistent with the evidence and arguments provided.</li> </ul>

**Part C: Reflection (4 marks)**

Marks	Level descriptor
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reflection contains some discussion of what the investigation highlighted to the student about the methods used by the historian.</li> <li>The reflection demonstrates little awareness of the challenges facing the historian and/or the limitations of the methods used by the historian.</li> <li>The connection between the reflection and the rest of the investigation is implied, but is not explicit.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reflection is clearly focused on what the investigation highlighted to the student about the methods used by the historian.</li> <li>The reflection demonstrates clear awareness of challenges facing the historian and/or limitations of the methods used by the historian.</li> <li>There is a clear and explicit connection between the reflection and the rest of the investigation.</li> </ul>

Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Remarks:

**A – 19-25****B – 16-18****C – 13-15****D – 10-12****F – 0-9**

## Works Cited

Pipes, Richard. *A Concise History of the Russian Revolution*. Vintage Books: New York, 1995.