Exercise walk-through

3.1
Investigation and historical reflection: supported rehearsal

International Baccalaureate · IB Diploma · History · HL

Sources, evidence and evaluation (2)

- Use one **primary source** (a document, speech, statistic or memoir from the time) and one **secondary source** (a historian's book or article) if you can: the contrast gives you more to say.
- **Weak and strong evaluation.** Weak: "The memoir is biased because Hoare wrote it." Strong: "Because Hoare wrote in 1954, after the Second World War had made appeasement a word of shame, he had a reason to stress the danger of pushing Italy towards Germany.

Analysis, conclusion and reflection

- Section 2 is **analysis** , not narrative: each part argues one point with evidence, weighs the other side and leads into the next.
- Name the historians who disagree and explain why they disagree (different sources, different questions, different times of writing).
- The conclusion answers the question directly and follows from the argument.
- **A section 2 paragraph, analysed.** "The plan's terms mattered less than its leak.

Sources for this lesson

- International Baccalaureate, *History guide* (first assessment 2017), internal assessment criteria.
- Haile Selassie, speech to the League of Nations Assembly (30 June 1936).
- R. Mallett, *Mussolini in Ethiopia, 1919–1935* (2015); G. W. Baer, *Test Case: Italy, Ethiopia and the League of Nations* (1976).
- E. H. Carr, *What is History?* (1961).

Exercises 2.1·2.2

2.1 State the three tests a good investigation question must pass. [3]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

2.2 Improve this question: “Why did the League of Nations fail?” [2]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

Exercises 2.1·2.2

2.1 State the three tests a good investigation question must pass. [3]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

2.1 Narrow (a person, decision, event or policy – not a war); answerable (the evidence exists and is accessible); debatable (historians disagree, or the answer is not in the textbook) (3).

2.2 Improve this question: “Why did the League of Nations fail?” [2]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

2.2 Any defensible narrowing with a debatable frame: e.g. “How far was the Hoare–Laval Plan (1935) the decisive blow to the League’s credibility?” or “How far did the Manchurian crisis (1931–33) destroy the League’s enforcement credibility?” (2 for narrow + debatable).

Exercises 2.3·2.4

2.3 Name the three things a research plan must state. [2]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

2.4 Give one value and one limitation of a published cabinet minute, for a question about ministers' motives. [2]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

Exercises 2.3·2.4

2.3 Name the three things a research plan must state. [2]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

2.3 The question; the proposed method (which kinds of sources, which archives or editions); a mini-bibliography (2 for two of three).

2.4 Give one value and one limitation of a published cabinet minute, for a question about ministers' motives. [2]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

2.4 Value: it records what ministers actually decided and said in the room – contemporaneous and authoritative on positions taken (1). Limitation: it records what was minuted, not what was thought; motive must be inferred, and minutes are drafted for the record (1).

Exercise 2.5

2.5 Distinguish reflection from conclusion. [2]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

Exercise 2.5

2.5 Distinguish reflection from conclusion. [2]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

2.5 The conclusion ends section 2: it answers the question directly and states the judgement's grounds (1). The reflection is section 3: it discusses what the investigation showed about historians' methods and their difficulties (1).

Exercise 3.1

3.1 *(Planning.)* A student proposes: “How far was the Hoare–Laval Plan (December 1935) the decisive blow to the League’s credibility?” Draft the research plan: the method (which kinds of sources) and a two-item mini-bibliography, and justify the question against the three tests. [6]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

Exercise 3.1

3.1 *(Planning.)* A student proposes: “How far was the Hoare–Laval Plan (December 1935) the decisive blow to the League’s credibility?” Draft the research plan: the method (which kinds of sources) and a two-item mini-bibliography, and justify the question against the three tests. [6]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

3.1 Method: published British and French cabinet collections for the decision; the contemporary press (the leak’s vehicle) for its reception; the historiography from 1936 to the present for the debate (2). Mini-bibliography: e.g. Documents on British Foreign Policy (relevant series volume) for the pact’s text and cabinet context; a standard monograph on interwar diplomacy (e.g. a survey of appeasement-era Britain) for the debate (2). Justification: narrow (one plan, one month), answerable (the text, the press and the scholarship are all published), debatable (historians divide between structural League failure and the self-inflicted credibility wound) (2).

Exercise 3.2

3.2 *(Section 1, criterion A style.)* Evaluate Samuel Hoare's memoir *Nine Troubled Years* (1954) for this investigation: origin, purpose, one value, one limitation. [4]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

Exercise 3.2

3.2 *(Section 1, criterion A style.)* Evaluate Samuel Hoare's memoir *Nine Troubled Years* (1954) for this investigation: origin, purpose, one value, one limitation. [4]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

3.2 Origin: the memoir of the British foreign secretary who made the plan and resigned over it, published in 1954, nearly twenty years later (1); purpose: to explain and defend his decisions to the public and to history (1). Value: the only first-hand account of his own motives and of the pressures he says he faced (1). Limitation: written with hindsight by a man defending his reputation, so its account of his motives needs checking against the records of 1935 (1).

Exercise 3.3

3.3 *(Section 3, criterion C style.)* Write the reflection paragraph the worked investigation needs: name one source you could not use, one missing voice, and one thing the evidence could not settle, and say what each shows about how historians work. [4]

question

sources

analysis

reflection

Exercise 3.3

3.3 *(Section 3, criterion C style.)* Write the reflection paragraph the worked investigation needs: name one source you could not use, one missing voice, and one thing the evidence could not settle, and say what each shows about how historians work. [4]

question
sources
analysis
reflection

3.3 Model reflection: "I could read only English-language sources, so the French side rests on British records and later historians; a historian's language skills shape which archives they can use (1). Workers' and colonial voices are absent from the sources used: the press sampled is metropolitan and elite, and the pact's Ethiopian victims appear only through others' accounts (1). Finally, the evidence could not settle whether the pact's withdrawal destroyed credibility more than its terms – a counterfactual the documents cannot close; the judgement therefore rests on the pattern of subsequent crises, with that limit owned (2)."

Local review guidance: the plan names KINDS of sources, not titles alone; (R1 3.2) value and limitation must attach to THIS question; (R1 3.3) reflection is about historians' methods, tied to this investigation, not a list of personal feelings. Authored classroom guidance.