1.1 Research questions, evidence and academic integrity

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 21 marks**

KEY WORDS research question • academic integrity

Research questions, evidence and academic integrity

Objective

Supported preparation: Narrow a topic into an arguable research question; Structure evidence, integrity and reflection around it. This is original rehearsal, not completion of the assessed task.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

> **Research toolkit.** The research question: focused (one bounded case), arguable (two defensible answers), researchable (sources a student can reach). Evidence: primary read closely, secondary positioned; every paragraph advances the answer; sources evaluated for perspective and provenance. Integrity: cited at the point of use, consistent style, the author's own voice. Three reflection sessions; the RPPF names real decisions. The essay is 4000 words: structure chosen so the argument fits. Worked: the reparations essay.

2 Practice

2.1 What three properties must a research question have? [3]

2.2 What does "sources evaluated for perspective and provenance" mean? [2]

2.3 What is the difference between citing and listing a bibliography? [2]

2.4 How many reflection sessions are mandatory, and what does the RPPF assess? [2]

2.5 What does description earn in the extended essay? [1]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Narrowing style.)* Narrow "the treaty's consequences" to a research question in three moves, naming what each move cuts. [3]

3.2 *(Integrity style.)* A draft paraphrases a historian's paragraph closely with no citation. Diagnose, and prescribe the fix. [4]

3.3 *(Reflection style.)* The interim reflection reports hours worked and books read. Diagnose, and draft the reflection the form wants. [4]

Solutions

2.1 Focused (one bounded case) (1); arguable (two defensible answers) (1); researchable (sources a student can reach) (1).

2.2 Perspective: who wrote, when, for whom, with what interest (1); provenance: where the source came from and how it reached the essay (1).

2.3 Citing places the source at the point of use, inside the argument (1); the bibliography lists everything cited at the end (1).

2.4 Three sessions (1); engagement: what the researcher learned about research, evidenced by real decisions (1).

2.5 No words (analysis earns them) (1).

3.1 Move one: from book to field, cutting everything outside the treaty and the German economy (1); move two: from field to contested case, cutting the years without the hyperinflation (1); move three: to the question that names object, angle and scope (the reparations clauses against monetary policy in the 1923 hyperinflation) (1).

3.2 Diagnosis: a close paraphrase without citation is borrowed sentences reshuffled: a breach of integrity and of the author's-voice requirement (2). Fix: cite the historian at the point of use, name the disagreement, and let the essay's own voice carry the comparison (2).

3.3 Diagnosis: hours and books report activity, not engagement: the form assesses what was learned about research (2). The reflection wanted: a real decision (the question narrowed when the sources failed), what changed, and the lesson (a question must match reachable sources), in honest words (2).

Local review guidance: (R1) 3.1 names what each move cuts; 3.2 prescribes voice, not just citation; 3.3 writes decisions, not hours. Authored guidance.