Moderator comments  Samples 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General comments

Page 2 provides a picture and a reference to Mike Wallace. Whether this was necessary or merely decorative is a matter of opinion. There was no appropriate referencing of the picture or quotation.

Criterion A

There is a comprehensible task but the scope is not clearly articulated. The second paragraph of this rather long plan of investigation details how the investigation will unfold but essentially it replicates information about the set structure of the investigation. It is not necessary to summarize sections B, C, D and E.

The section could have been better structured and more attention should have been given to areas for investigation to allow for a satisfactory judgment to be reached.

Criterion B

There is much information provided but it is not always accurate. While referencing is present, it is not always complete (note the lack of page numbers, for example). Terms of importance that need explanation could have been included in a glossary and indicated in section B. The frequent references to “excerpts” do not always help clarify matters unfortunately.

While relevant factual material showing evidence of research, organization and referencing is therefore present, the award falls into the level 3–4 markband.

Criterion C

Why the student has included the actual sources to be evaluated within section C is puzzling. They could have been included in an appendix. Putting them in the main body technically means they should be included in the word count. The supervising teacher could have provided better guidance on this matter.

The evaluation itself does use the OPVL structure (though the “P” is absent in terms of explicit treatment in source 1). The first source is a relatively short excerpt from a text but the attempt at evaluation is marred by lack of clarity of expression and a tendency at times to describe content rather than convincingly point out its strengths and limitations as an historical source.

Source 2, a “segment” from a video, is lightweight in terms of coverage of value and limitation. The student notes a word count of 331 for section C, obviously assuming that the text of both sources will not be counted. This really needed to have been checked prior to submission.

There is some evaluation of sources but reference to their OPVL may be limited, hence the award falls into the level 2–3 markband.

Criterion D
Better proofreading of this section could have reduced the problems of expression and weak sentence structure that hindered the analysis. There is heavy emphasis on describing what particular authors think, though the student’s own leanings or argument in this analysis is difficult to discern. There is no referencing provided despite the copious references to the viewpoints of different writers.

To reach level 3–4 references need to be provided. Analysis is more than narrating the views of others.

**Criterion E**

There is a conclusion stated but it is not entirely consistent with the evidence provided. It is not clear whether the student is entirely confident or clear in this judgment.

**Criterion F**

A list of sources is provided. More proofreading could have, however, eliminated careless errors of spelling, incomplete bibliographical detail and wrongly entered (alphabetically) details.

Technically the inclusion of the excerpts in section C puts this significantly over the 2,000-word limit but the student has not been penalized.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion A**

The research question is articulated within the plan of investigation. There needed to be more consideration of areas to be examined in order to permit an effective treatment of such a “To what extent…?” task. Describing the sources to be used (that is, contemporary accounts and recently declassified documents) is not an adequate replacement for a structured and explicit identification of what factors are to be dealt with in the subsequent section B evidence base which will then form the basis for analysis in section D.

The plan is best described by the descriptor for level 2: “The research question is clearly stated. The method and scope of the investigation are outlined and related to the research question.” This descriptor is more appropriate than that applicable for just 1 mark but note the lack of development necessary to reach the level 3 markband.

**Criterion B**

While the student has referenced the section this has not been done accurately or, in some cases, comprehensively enough (provenance of the source being omitted in cases). Such errors, together with errors in spelling the names of important figures (“Slavador Allende”, “Kissenger”), could have been eliminated by better proofreading. The student at times strays into opinion rather than the presentation of factual evidence and, arguably, bullet points and a structured approach (sub-headings) might have helped to produce a better product. While the section is fairly well focused, more “hard” evidence rather than the citing of opinions might have been welcome.
Hence the descriptor “[t]here is relevant factual material that shows evidence of research, organization and referencing” applies but there are weaknesses in terms of the nature of the evidence and its referencing that prevents it from accessing the highest award for this section.

**Criterion C**

Two sources are evaluated and the OPVL are addressed, sometimes with explicit reference to the category, sometimes not. The first source is less well dealt with than the second arguably. The question of “value” in the first source is rather general and the use of the term “reliable” makes the reader ask what exactly it is reliable for. Reference to the “controlled” media in the first source needed development.

There is an attempt to carry out evaluation, however, and the award is a borderline 3/4. The best fit is the bottom of level 4–5.

**Criterion D**

The analysis required more detail and development of points raised and clarification where speculative assertions were being made. The last paragraph’s first sentence contains a paradox or contradiction which could have benefited from further comment. While there is referencing, more was necessary and the inclusion of details which were not referred to in section B should be avoided.

Hence while “[t]here is analysis of the evidence presented in section B and references are included” the award lies in the level 3–4 markband.

**Criterion E**

The conclusion is clearly stated and consistent with the evidence presented.

**Criterion F**

The last section headed “References” is not well set out and provides insufficient detail of where exactly the material can be accessed. A standard method or bibliographical convention is not used. The investigation is within the word limit and the word count is present on the title page.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion A**

The question is stated in thesis form. The scope is discussed but method is unclear. In addressing sabotage there needs to be some clarification of how the term "sabotage" is being used. The paper indicates that Allied bombing falls under this description which is questionable. This narrowly falls into level 2.

**Criterion B**
The evidence is largely based on two sources which prevents it from being classified as “well researched”. It is also not “clearly” organized although there is some organization. There is relevant information which is referenced.

**Criterion C**

The OPVL are evaluated but in a limited fashion. There is no purpose stated for the first source.

**Criterion D**

There is limited “clear analysis” which shows no awareness of the significance of sources used in section C and does not include any references.

**Criterion E**

The conclusion is not strong but is consistent with material in the rest of the essay.

**Criterion F**

Sources listed are “just” appropriate, using one standard method. Word count is appropriate and listed on the title page.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks awarded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General comments**

A coversheet is provided along with a topic area (rather than a focused question suitable for effective investigation) as well as a word count.

The student needed from the start to provide a question or task that would allow for a judgment to be reached. Providing a general topic heading simply invites a narrative attempt which, in combination with a failure to produce relevant factual detail to serve as a base for analysis, cannot score well.

**Criterion A**

There is no explicit research question stated in this section, merely general points about the political “activity” of “peasant French women” during “times of crises”. Without a clear task at the outset, the student necessarily jeopardizes her performance in the internal assessment component. The absence of a focused task is accompanied by the lack of clear indications of areas to be examined in order to successfully reach a judgment on the ill-defined, or rather non-existent, question. Since there is no appropriate research question, treatment of scope and method cannot be successfully undertaken.

**Criterion B**
None of the information referred to in this section is referenced, either in text or in footnotes. This failure to reference alone resulted in the award being limited to level 1–2, “[t]here is some relevant factual material but it has not been referenced”. The evidence itself consists of a narration of events linked to events in France 1789–91. The topic of “Women in the French Revolution”, which already lacks an explicitly articulated task in section A, is noted in a marginal fashion at best.

**Criterion C**

This section has been wrongly lettered by the student as section D. It should have followed the summary of evidence section (section B). Only one source has been selected for evaluation. The evaluation attempt has resulted in a long quotation of dubious relevance. The “origin” is not complete in that publisher and date are omitted. Reference to purpose, values and limitations of the source is lacking. The little that is present is brief and is an extremely general description of the author’s publishing history.

Why two sources have not been attempted is curious. Of the one done there is so little written that this is a borderline call. The level descriptor for level 1 states “[t]he sources are described but there is no reference to their origin, purpose, value and limitation”. In this case sources (plural) have not been dealt with and the level of evaluation is so weak that an award of 0 is the best fit.

**Criterion D**

No referencing is provided which limits the level to the 1–2 markband.

Much of what is covered in this section is content that was not produced in section B. The analysis needs to be based on relevant material, suitably researched, set out and referenced in the summary of evidence. Hence the “analysis” in this section cannot be awarded many marks.

**Criterion E**

It is necessary for the conclusion to be consistent and relevant to what has gone before. Given the lack of an explicit research question at the beginning, the “investigation” has had difficulty in meeting the requirements of many of the criteria. The best fit here is probably level 1: “There is a conclusion stated but it is not entirely consistent with the evidence presented.” It is once more open to some interpretation as to whether this is borderline 0/1.

**Criterion F**

The investigation is within the word limit and the word count is clearly stated on the title page. There is some attempt to set out the works in a standardized bibliographical convention but there are errors and omissions of relevant detail. On balance an award of 2 marks is appropriate.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion A**
The research question is stated clearly but it would be better to place it in the body of the plan of investigation. It is not necessary to state what will not be discussed as it takes words from the word count and has little value. The scope is addressed but the method is limited. It would be better to address the type of sources needed to answer the question and how the student might use them instead of stating that two sources will be evaluated for OPVL.

**Criterion B**

Analysis is mixed with fact and should not be in this section. There might have been a better balance of facts tied to imperialism and those tied to social Darwinism. There is relevant material with evidence of research, organization and referencing.

**Criterion C**

There is explicit reference to OPVL. The second source could have developed a strong discussion of limitations.

**Criterion D**

There is analysis of the evidence in section B with references. There is awareness of the significance of one of the sources used in section C which is then developed.

**Criterion E**

The conclusion is consistent with the material in the paper.

**Criterion F**

There is an appropriate source list and word count.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion A**

The question needs to be more focused. Phrases like “strengthening of Nazism” and “impact the migration” should be more specific. The question does not ask how Jewish people were treated in the new country yet this is addressed as part of the plan of investigation. The question itself is clearly stated (although not focused) while the scope and method are limited in their development. This narrowly achieves level 2.

**Criterion B**

The citation style is not standard, for example, sources with authors should use author’s name in citation. There is analysis used in this section which should only have factual information. There should be some
attempt to clarify “strengthening of Nazism” but this is not done. Instead of stating “a law was passed” it would be better to state the specific law, which was done in some instances but not in all. It does fit the low end level 3–4 as there is relevant material showing evidence of research and referencing.

**Criterion C**

The first source is the website of the Holocaust Museum. The site itself is an appropriate source to utilize in research but it is not as appropriate for this evaluation. A specific article or section of the site would be more appropriate to evaluate due to the nature and breadth of the full site. OPVL are mentioned but limited. The value and limitations are based more on utility than tied to the origin and purpose of the sources.

**Criterion D**

There is some analysis of the material with awareness of the significance of the sources used in section C and limited references. It just qualifies for level 3.

**Criterion E**

The conclusion is limited but consistent with material presented.

**Criterion F**

One standard form is not used. Authors of some sources are not used appropriately.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks awarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion A**

The question is somewhat vague and is not stated clearly in the plan of investigation. The student attempts to address scope by simply restating the question which does not provide a more comprehensive understanding of the issue being developed. Method should not simply be a quick comment on each section of the investigation. The research question, scope and method are not clearly stated.

**Criterion B**

Referencing is not always complete; some material needs to be cited and is not. The first citations for sources are not complete and therefore not correct. The section includes some relevant material which is organized and referenced (not always in correct form).

**Criterion C**

The URL address does not need to be stated here for the source but should be in the bibliography. In the paragraph about the value of the second source, examples of “angles and perspectives” would have strengthened the entry. “Objective” is referred to as a limitation which is questionable. There is evaluation of the sources with specific reference to OPVL.
**Criterion D**

Some attempt at analysis is made but with limited success.

**Criterion E**

The conclusion is not really consistent with the original question.

**Criterion F**

Sources are listed using one style but with one exclusion.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion A**

The research question is stated but should be included in the body of the plan of investigation. The scope is stated but method is somewhat limited. Stating the two sources for OPVL and what will not be included in the investigation is not necessary and has limited value. It would be better to describe the type of sources needed to answer the question and incorporate those into the method. This narrowly falls into level 2.

**Criterion B**

There are some issues with the citation style for a number of sources. Analysis has been included in this section which should have been included in section D. There is some relevant factual material that is referenced (although not always correctly) with some organization.

**Criterion C**

OPVL are addressed but in a limited fashion.

**Criterion D**

There is some inconsistency around the discussion of the Reinsurance Treaty but there is some analysis with references. There is also limited awareness of the significance of sources used in section C.

**Criterion E**

The conclusion is consistent with material in the paper.

**Criterion F**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks awarded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General comments

Interesting in this example is the extensive referencing but it is not intrusive and the detail contained therein is largely explanatory of the points raised rather than an obvious attempt to circumvent word limit levels.

Criterion A

In this tightly focused plan of investigation the student has shown evidence of context and a clearly articulated research question that permits the student to work towards providing a balanced judgment after a consideration of factors. The way in which the task is then broken down and areas of investigation noted to allow for a judgment to be reached reveals a succinct and focused coverage of scope and method. While it only uses 105 words, the student has set the scene for what follows in terms of organization in the following section.

Criterion B

The summary of evidence has been treated in bullet-point form. This can help to avoid the tendency of students to venture into the field of analysis. The section requires the selection and deployment of evidence that can be used as the basis for analysis in section D. The use of sub-headings has aided in the organization of the factual material. Most of these sub-headings are based on the areas identified in the previous section (with some relevant additions such as “Lenin’s Pragmatism”). This organization of material, based upon what has been identified in section A, has much merit in terms of keeping the investigation focused.

Referencing is very full and largely accurate in the use of a consistent method of footnoting. The footnotes are a mixture of referencing of detail as well as information footnotes clarifying content.

The details are appropriate and cover most of what is identified as the appropriate themes or factors in section A. There are points which are not always clearly explained or where the significance is not clear (see Lenin’s Pragmatism and the fourth bullet point, for example).

Criterion C

The source types selected—one textual and one visual—are appropriate and relevant.

There is explicit coverage of the necessary OPVL areas for each source and the student has gone beyond generalizations about bias and dealt quite specifically with the problematic nature of the selected sources. There are elements of description of content but these are followed by relevant critical evaluation and comment associated with this brief description.

The student has shown sufficient understanding of the process of evaluation to meet the demands expressed in level 4–5 of section C.

Criterion D
The section is effectively referenced. It refers to a variety of historians’ views in an integrated fashion in the analysis. The critical commentary is largely consistent with what has been stated in section B, though there could have been “some evidence of awareness of the significance to the investigation of the sources evaluated in section C”. There is a well-written and balanced coverage of factors in this 714-word section.

**Criterion E**

The conclusion could be better written (see the claim that Trotsky was “the major benefactor”, perhaps better as “a major benefactor”) but it is clear enough and consistent with the evidence provided. In this case a best-fit approach would result in a mark at the top of the level for section E.

**Criterion F**

The works are set out according to a standard bibliographical convention. The sources used are appropriate to the area of study and are largely text based. Most are secondary, with some primary sources.

A standard style is used with an appropriate list of sources.