

Extended Essay: research decisions

Companion discussions for the current introductory lessons

Make an interest researchable

- Rivers is a broad interest. A student proposes nitrate measurements at six accessible sites.
- What evidence can that plan provide, and what wider claim would remain unsupported?

Focus, feasibility and method

- Specify the sites, variables and question; check access, equipment and a suitable subject method.
- One visit may reveal a local pattern, but cannot establish an annual trend. Agree safety and ethics before collection.
- Record changes and use the assessment-session guide; the acquired brief is for first assessment 2027.

Three articles, how many sources?

- Three news articles all cite the same survey. A draft calls them three confirmations.
- What should the researcher evaluate before using this agreement?

Evaluate the original evidence

- Trace the survey, its purpose and method. Judge relevance to the exact research question.
- Explain the steps from findings to inference, compare alternative explanations and credit quotations and paraphrases.
- The conclusion answers the question using developed findings; it does not introduce a new unsupported claim.

Shade or surface?

- An open paved site is warmer than shaded soil. Three readings were taken at each.
- Which explanation can this comparison distinguish? Would more readings solve the same problem?

Explain what the limitation changes

- Shade and surface vary together. Report the observed site difference without claiming shade alone caused it.
- An approved comparison using the same surface can address that alternative; consistent timing and instruments still matter.
- Keep original observations and units. Document any justified exclusion and its effect rather than deleting inconvenient results.

When access is refused

- A two-site study loses access to one site. The original comparison cannot proceed.
- What should the student bring to the supervisor and record about the change?

Reflect on the decision and its effect

- Present the restriction, question, evidence and feasible alternatives. A one-site question loses the original comparison.
- Explain the assumption challenged, the reason for narrowing and what earlier access checks would improve next time.
- Keep the process honest. Confirm the session's reflection requirements; this case is not an official completed form.

Review research decisions

- Narrow a research question to evidence you can obtain using a permitted method.
- Explain why an observed site difference need not establish a single cause.
- Show how an access restriction changes the question and conclusion.
- Identify your assessment session before using reflection forms or submission rules.

What does the museum report establish?

- An announcement promises easier visits for everyone. A report says 18 of 20 audio-guide users found instructions clearer.
- Which group and outcome does this evidence cover? What does the announcement establish?

Build the connection and state its limit

- The reported finding concerns those users and instruction clarity. It does not measure every part of a visit or cover non-users.
- Explain why the evidence supports the narrower claim. Check how respondents were chosen before asserting a selection problem.
- Define the outcome and feasible evidence before widening a real research question; this museum case is fictional.

Three reports, one survey

- A council note, newspaper article and campaign page repeat one survey: 24 of 30 respondents prefer later Friday closing.
- Does their agreement establish three independent datasets or a preference among all residents?

Preserve and credit the finding

- Trace the source actually read; record the passage location and the original group, measure and period.
- A paraphrase uses your own wording and structure, but the borrowed idea still needs credit. Mark exact borrowed wording as a quotation.
- A morning survey about keeping the opening time unchanged concerns another decision. Compare questions and sampling before asserting disagreement.

Check yourself

- Frame a feasible question and justify the subject method.
- Trace repeated reports to one dataset; credit borrowed wording and ideas.
- Preserve the group and measure; explain inference limits and a relevant next check.
- Record research decisions and confirm the applicable assessment session.