Template for the Historical Investigation

This paper is broken up into three sections:

1. Identification and Evaluation of Sources
2. Investigation
3. Reflection

This template will have you fill in the information that is needed in each specific section. **This template is not the finished product**, it is a guide. Once you have finished filling out the template for each section, you must put that information into paragraphs that have detail and transitions. As you write the rough draft, be sure to look at the rubric for each section. The word count is an approximation of what you should get to.

**Part A: Identification and Evaluation of Sources (500 words)**

Scope = the time frame your research covers (example 1945-1955) and why

Historical methods = the types of sources you used (archival/primary, secondary, running records, reflective (diaries, autobiographies, memoirs) **AND** how you are writing your account: political, economic, chronological, cultural, thematic…

1st paragraph Fill in the following chart

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Research Question: |  |
| What is the scope of your research?  |  |
| What historical methods did you use?  |  |
| What are the two sources you choose to do OPCVL’s on and how did they shape your answer to the research question? |  |

OPCVL: Origin, Purpose, Content, Values and Limitations

**Tone** = is the attitude of the writer, which can be: serious, reflective, humorous, sarcastic, etc.

**DO NOT USE THE FOLLOWING SOURCES TO OPCVL**: encyclopedias (including Wikipedia), children’s books, websites that end in .org or .com, pictures, editorial cartoons, or a source you did not use very much in your paper. ***Any source that does not have an author.***

**PLEASE CHOOSE THESE SOURCES:** Academic journals, primary sources, books written by historians or other reputable authors

2nd Paragraph Fill in the following chart (1st OPCVL)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ORIGIN** | Answer | IS it valuable or limiting and WHY? |
| WHO created it? |  | Give some background, look up who he/she is:  |
| WHEN was it created? |  |  |
| WHERE was it created? |  |  |
| WHAT is the source? (book, cartoon, speech, website…) |  |  |
|  |
| **PURPOSE** | Answer | IS it valuable or limiting and WHY? |
| WHY was this source created? |  |  |
| WHO was this source created for? (self, public, government officials, other professionals, students…) |  |  |
|  |
| **CONTENT** | Answer | IS it valuable or limiting and WHY? |
| Is the language objective or does it sound one-sided? |  |  |
| What is the tone of the source?  |  |  |
| What information/specific details do they select to focus on to support their point (and is anything purposely left out)? |  |  |

3rd Paragraph Fill in the following chart (1st OPCVL)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ORIGIN** | Answer | IS it valuable or limiting and WHY? |
| WHO created it? |  | Give some background, look up who he/she is: |
| WHEN was it created? |  |  |
| WHERE was it created? |  |  |
| WHAT is the source? (book, cartoon, speech, website…) |  |  |
|  |
| **PURPOSE** | Answer | IS it valuable or limiting and WHY? |
| WHY was this source created? |  |  |
| WHO was this source created for? (self, public, government officials, other professionals, students…) |  |  |
|  |
| **CONTENT** | Answer | IS it valuable or limiting and WHY? |
| Is the language objective or does it sound one-sided? |  |  |
| What is the tone of the source?  |  |  |
| What information/specific details do they select to focus on to support their point (and is anything purposely left out)? |  |  |

\*\*\* When you write these into paragraphs, be sure to check the rubric\*\*\*

**Part B: Investigation (1,300 words)**

This is where you answer the question with your research. Be sure to do the following:

* Organize your information with structure, either chronologically (1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc.) or thematically (social, economic, cultural…) BE sure that you organize your Main Ideas so that there is a logical reason why you talk about something first, second etc. and be sure you can easily transition from one main point to the next.
* Be sure you are including different perspectives on your topic. How could someone see the evidence differently? (**Example** The US was responsible for Pearl Harbor because of the oil embargo vs. Japan was responsible because they bombed Pearl Harbor…)
* Include analysis in your main points, don’t just rattle off facts, explain them and explain **WHY/HOW they answer the research question**. Why are these points significant? Don’t just write a narrative, you’re not telling a story you are defending your answer to a question.
* Use footnotes to cite your sources

Paragraph 1: Introduction

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Research Question |  |
| Road Map: | Main Idea#1 |  |
| Main Idea #2 |  |
| Main Idea #3 |  |
| Main Idea #4 |  |
| Main Idea #5 |  |

\*\*\* For paragraphs 2-6, whenever you use supporting details that need to be cited from your sources, use **footnotes**. Anything that is not common knowledge must be cited, any analysis/idea that is specific to an author must be cited in a footnote!!!

For Google Docs: Click on “Insert” then “Footnote” and type your citation information

For Word Document: Click on “References” then “Insert Footnote”

If you have more than 3 supporting details, ADD another row below by right-clicking → insert→ row below

Paragraph 2: First Main Idea

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Main Idea : |  |
| Supporting Detail #1 |  |
| Supporting Detail #2 |  |
| Supporting Detail #3 |  |
| Analysis:  | How do these supporting details prove the Main Idea and help to answer the RQ?  |

Paragraph 3: Second Main Idea

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Transition from the previous paragraph: |  |
| Main Idea : |  |
| Supporting Detail #1 |  |
| Supporting Detail #2 |  |
| Supporting Detail #3 |  |
| Analysis:  | How do these supporting details prove the Main Idea and help to answer the RQ?  |

Paragraph 4: Third Main Idea

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Transition from the previous paragraph: |  |
| Main Idea : |  |
| Supporting Detail #1 |  |
| Supporting Detail #2 |  |
| Supporting Detail #3 |  |
| Analysis:  | How do these supporting details prove the Main Idea and help to answer the RQ?  |

Paragraph 5: Fourth Main Idea

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Transition from the previous paragraph: |  |
| Main Idea : |  |
| Supporting Detail #1 |  |
| Supporting Detail #2 |  |
| Supporting Detail #3 |  |
| Analysis:  | How do these supporting details prove the Main Idea and help to answer the RQ?  |

Paragraph 6: Fifth Main Idea (Possibly the Counter Argument)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Transition from the previous paragraph: |  |
| Main Idea : |  |
| Supporting Detail #1 |  |
| Supporting Detail #2 |  |
| Supporting Detail #3 |  |
| Analysis:  | How do these supporting details prove the Main Idea and help to answer the RQ?  |

\*\*\* If you have more than 5 main points, be sure to copy and paste a chart from above to fill out the information\*\*\*

Paragraph 7: Conclusion…BUT WAIT! Did you include a counter argument or explain a different perspective? If not, you must do so in another paragraph (copy and paste a chart and fill it out accordingly)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Restatement of the Research Question: |  |
| Answer to the Research Question |  |
| Explanation as to how the evidence presented answered the RQ: |  |

**Part C: Reflection (400 words)**

As you were researching your question, it was suggested that you look at the Reflection Questions and answer them as you worked; using your experiences researching to think about the difficulties historians face.

* It is suggested that you reflect upon 5 of the following questions
* Your answers should cite specific experiences you encountered as you researched. (EXAMPLE: After reading Jane Doe’s article on Pearl Harbor and her inclusion of the Oil Embargoes against the Japanese, it made David Smith’s book seem less credible considering very little emphasis was given this particular event. This makes one realize that bias is not only how you present the information, but also in what you intentionally leave out. This makes researching a challenge because…)
1. What methods used by historians did you use in your investigation?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. What limitations did you encounter as you performed your research?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. As you are researching, what challenges do you think historians face when they research? How do these challenges differ from someone who is a scientist or mathematician?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. What is the difference between bias (opinion/perspective) and selection?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Who decides what events are historically significant?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Is it possible to describe historical events in an unbiased way?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. What is the role of the historian? What is our purpose?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. If it is difficult to establish proof in history, does that mean that all versions are equally acceptable?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

\*\*\* When you write these answers into paragraphs, think of how some answers could be connected and be sure to give your own analysis on the process of history\*\*\*

**RUBRIC**

**Section 1: Identification and Evaluation of Sources** (6 Marks)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Marks | Description |
| 1-2 | * The RQ is stated but may be weak
* Sources are identified but there is little to no explanation as to the relevance to the investigation
* The OPCVL describes the sources, rather than evaluates their values and limitations
 |
| 3-4 | * The RQ is clearly stated and solid
* Appropriate sources are identified with some explanation as to how they relate to the investigation
* There is some evaluation of the sources, but reference to their values and limitations is shallow or generalized
 |
| 5-6 | * The RQ is clearly stated and solid
* The Sources are identified and there is a clear explanation on their relevancy to the investigation (how they shaped the answer)
* There is strong analytical evaluation of the sources with the values and limitations specific to the source
 |

**Section 2: Investigation** (15 marks)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Marks | Description |
| 1-3 | * It is not clearly organized and shows little structure (intro-body-conclusion)
* It is narrative ( story telling), with very little analysis
* Mostly relies on generalization rather than specific details to support an answer
* Citation is given, but may be limited or incorrect
* Does not show evidence of strong research (few sources and/or mostly websites)
 |
| 4-6 | * There is an attempt to organize the main ideas, but the structure may be weak, but it is not very clear
* There is some limited critical analysis, but the majority of the paper is narrative/descriptive
* Evidence is given with some specific details, but they are not connected to how they answer the RQ
* There may be some evidence of research, but there isn’t a clear understanding of different perspectives
* Correctly cited
 |
| 7-9 | * The investigation is generally clear and well organized, but there may be repetition and some parts may be unclear
* It moves beyond narrative (description) including more apparent analysis/critical commentary on the evidence, BUT it is not consistent
* There is an attempt to connect how the evidence answer the RQ, but it is weak in areas.
* There is evidence of research, and an attempt at showing different perspectives, but they are described and not analyzed
* Correctly cited
 |
| 10-12 | * The investigation is generally clear and well organized, but there may be repetition and some parts may be unclear
* There is definite analysis/critical commentary, but may need more development.
* There is evidence that the research comes from a wide variety of sources (little to no websites, mostly primary sources and secondary sources written by historians and other credible authors for academic audiences)
* There is a clear awareness of different perspectives with a decent evaluation and argues a reasoned conclusion well supported by the evidence.
* Correctly cited
 |
| 13-15 | * The investigation is clear, coherent and effectively organized with smooth transitions
* There is well developed analysis/critical commentary that is focused on answering the RQ and the evidence comes from a wide variety of source (little to no websites, mostly primary sources and secondary sources written by historians and other credible authors for academic audiences)
* There is a strong understanding of different perspectives which are thoughtfully analyzed in relation to the RQ
* A reasoned and coherent conclusion is reached and supported by the evidence given.
* Correctly cited
 |

**Section 3: Reflection (4 Marks)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Marks | Description |
| 1-2 | * There is some (but limited) discussion on what the process of the investigation showed the student about the methods used by historians
* There is little awareness of the challenges facing historians and the limitations of the methods used by historians in writing about the past
* There is a weak connection between the reflection and the work the student did, it may be implied but it is not directly stated or connected. (the answers may be more generalizations rather than specific insights connected to their experiences in researching to write a history paper)
 |
| 3-4 | * The discussion is clearly focused on how the process of their investigation gave them insights into the methods used by historians and the value or limitations of those methods
* If shows a strong understanding of the challenges facing historians by connecting the limitations of the methods in their own research
* There is a clear connection between the reflections and the work the student did by discussing specific aspects of their research and the insight it gave them.
 |