**Marksheet for History IA**

[Title of Study]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Suggested word allocation** | **Marks** |  |  |  | **Mark and Comment** |
| **1. Identification and evaluation of sources** | 500 | 6 | This section requires you to analyse in detail two of the sources that you will use in your investigation. The sources can be either primary or secondary sources. This section might be structured as follows:  **c. 100 Words**  • State the question you have chosen to investigate (“This study will investigate the question…”).  • Specify the date period / themes to be covered (“To keep the scope of this study manageable, I will focus on…”).  • Outline three sources you will be using which are NOT the two you will evaluate in a moment (“Beyond the two sources chosen for evaluation (below), the study will make use of a range of sources, a full list of which are included in the bibliography. These include…”). For each source you mention, make sure you briefly explain what it is particularly useful for understanding and / or why it’s reliable, and provide a proper reference in a footnote).  **c. 400 Words (i.e. 200 words per source)**  • Include a brief explanation of the nature of the first source you have selected for detailed analysis, including an explanation of its relevance to the investigation (“The first source I have selected for detailed evaluation is…[describe *what* it is, *who* produced it, *when*, *where* and *why*]” / “This source is particularly relevant my particular investigation because… [explain]”)  • Analyse the *value* and *limitations* of this source in relation to the investigation, with explicit reference to its *origins*, *purpose* and *content* (“The *origin* of this source is…from this we can deduce its *purpose* is…On this basis it is *valuable* for an investigation of the key question because [*focus on what it says/implies, why we should trust it*]…Nevertheless the source does have some *limitations* for this particular investigation because…[*focus on what it leaves out, why it might not be totally reliable*]”)  ▪ Repeat this format for the second source.  ▪ DO: Use two different types of source in this section. Be as specific as you can in your evaluation. For example, if it is a book, find a review of it or something specific about the career/reputation of its author.  ▪ DO NOT: rely on speculation and possibilities (“It might be…It could be…Perhaps…”). Focus on concrete things you can categorically demonstrate through explicit cross-references to other sources, statistics, hard facts. | The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. | 0 |  |
| • 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. | 1-2 |
| • 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. | 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.  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 |
| **2. Investigation** | 1,300 | 15 | This section of the internal assessment task consists of the actual investigation. In this section, you must use a range of evidence to support your argument. You can use primary sources, secondary sources, or a mixture of the two. This section might be structured as follows:  **Introduction (c. 100-150 words)**  • Set the scene / generate reader interest by establishing why this question was important at the time, and remains relevant today.  • Summarise the different historical perspectives that exist in relation to the question. If there aren’t any, then this isn’t much of a question for investigation!  • Outline how the essay will be structured, and the main conclusions that will be reached.  **Main Body (c. 1000-1100 words)**  ▪ Evaluate the evidence for several different perspectives in separate paragraphs.  ▪ Within each paragraph, start with a clear topic sentence which is clearly focused on the question. Then explain it with carefully selected and properly referenced evidence (use quotes as necessary).  ▪ Ensure that you stress the value of the evidence you use, but also acknowledge its limitations, with reference to *Origin*, *Purpose* and *Content* as appropriate.  **Conclusion (c. 100-150 words)**  ▪ Provide a direct answer to the question you set yourself by synthesizing the main points of your essay. In particular, stress which historical perspective you agree with most and why, and which historical perspective you reject and why, or whether you think it is possible to accept different elements of different perspectives to provide a new interpretation.  NOTES:  1. An appendix is not formally required, but if there are particularly important sources (e.g. speeches, images, statistics) that you refer to in your study, it is a good idea to include them at the end and cross refer (“See Appendix 1”) at appropriate points. These are not included in your word count.  2. Avoid footnotes to lame sources like Wikipedia and GCSE Bitesize. These are amateurish. Wikipedia can be used, but check the footnotes the article uses and refer directly to these sources instead.  3. Footnotes need to be in a standard format. If you use the ClassTools citation generator, that’s great, but any sources that come up as 'Unknown' as an author name require you to \*go manually to the source\* and get the author name \*yourself\*. Similarly if it is saying 'untitled page' then give the main title of the website e.g. "ActiveHistory Website". For For DVDs you use the editor / producer as the author, don't say "N/A". Similarly, films are produced by COMPANIES, so find out who they are - don't just say 'N/A'. | • 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.  • 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.  • 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. | 7-9 |
| • 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. | 10-12 |
| • 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 consistent with the evidence & arguments provided. | 13-15 |
| **3. Reflection** | 400 | 4 | ▪ This section of the internal assessment task requires you to reflect on what you have learned through this investigation about the methods used by, and the challenges facing, the historian. Examples of discussion questions that may help to encourage reflection include the following.  • What is the role of the historian in society?  • Can lessons be drawn from history?  • What challenges do historians face when defining key terms and concepts?  • Should historians aim to inform, or to persuade?  • How can the reliability of sources be evaluated?  • How do historians keep the scope of their investigations manageable?  • Is it possible, or advisable, to describe historical events in an unbiased way?  • What is the difference between bias and selection?  • If historians are able to disagree so easily, does that mean that there is no such thing as historical truth?  • Do historical studies tell us more about the period they were written in than the period they claim to be writing about?  • What are the values and limitations of particular types of sources material such as art, statistics, photographs?  • How do the challenges faced by historians differ from the challenges facing scientists or mathematicians?  ▪ Within this section, give clear and explicit examples of three or four such issues that your investigation has helped you form a judgement about. (“One issue raised by this study relating to the methods used by historians is the challenge of …” / “In terms of this particular study, this issue manifested itself in the following manner…” / “I tackled this issue by ….” / “Through this process I learned/reached the conclusion that…” ). Make sure in particular that you give very explicit examples from your own investigation which illustrate these points rather than generalized observations. Whenever possible, refer to and quote particular historiographers/historians who have considered this particular issue. | • 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.  • 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. | 1-2 |
| • 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. | 3-4 |
| ***Bibliography*** | *N/A* | *N/A* | A bibliography and clear referencing of all sources **must** be included in the investigation, but these are not included in the overall word count.  There is not a specific criterion relating to, or rewarding, the inclusion of a bibliography. However, one **must** be included to avoid academic honesty infringement. | | *n/a* |  |
| **Total** | **2,200 words MAX** | **25** | The word limit for the historical investigation is 2,200 words. If the word limit is exceeded, then the teacher's assessment must be based on the first 2,200 words. | |  |