Internal Assessment Checklist

Same requirements for SLs and HLs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Formatting Details (Also NOT a section in the IA)** | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
| Proper sections headings in order (Introduction, Exploration, Analysis, Evaluation, References, Appendices) |  |  |
| References complete & in APA format |  |  |
| Spelling and grammar |  |  |
| Single spaced |  |  |
| Page numbers (bottom, centered) |  |  |
| Details:   * I am going to be cranky if these aren’t all checked acceptable * Don’t make your grader angry or annoyed * In-text citations ONLY, (Name, Year) or (App. 4) etc. – NO FOOTNOTES! | | |
| Notes: |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation (This is NOT a section in the IA)** | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
| Title of the investigation |  |  |
| IB Candidate Code (yours) |  |  |
| IB Candidate Code for Group Member(s) |  |  |
| Date, month, year of submission |  |  |
| Word count (1,800-2,200) |  |  |
| Details:   * All of the above should be on the title page | | |
| Notes: |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction** | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
| Stated a clear aim of the investigation and explained its relevance (reasons why) |  |  |
| Described the theory or model upon which the investigation is based in sufficient detail |  |  |
| Named & briefly described the experiment being replicated – aim/results. If the replicated study, was modified, stated how/why. |  |  |
| Explained the link between the theory or model to your investigation & H1 (reasons – how/why?)  (You may use the replicated study as part of this explanation but must explain the link to the theory/model) |  |  |
| Stated & operationalized Null and Research Hypotheses (exactly how are they being tested – be VERY specific) |  |  |
| Stated & operationalized IV & DV (only 1 of each) *as part of* the null and/or research hypothesis |  |  |
| Details:   * The aim is a statement about what was investigated & what was expected * As part of your explanation for the aim, you should address how you developed your ideas from the previous research and why it’s applicable/important/etc. You cannot say Burak chose it for you or assigned it to you or anything like that. * This, along with Evaluation, is the longest section of your IA. * Operationalized means in excruciating detail how the variable was manipulated and tested including every conceivable concept * Use the companion book to show step by step process & development | | |
| Notes: |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Exploration** | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
| Stated research design (independent/repeated measures) |  |  |
| Explained why the experimental design was chosen, *specifically* and clearly |  |  |
| Stated sampling method used to acquire participants (only one correct answer) & explained why that method was used |  |  |
| Explained your choice of participants – why this group of people? Named *three* specific, relevant characteristics of participants |  |  |
| Explained choice of materials – why and how did you use what you used? |  |  |
| Briefly stated/listed steps for conducting your experiment (can be numbered) including citations in apps where applicable |  |  |
| Explained controlled/extraneous variables – why are they extraneous and how did you control them? |  |  |
| Stated ALL relevant ethical considerations |  |  |
| Details:   * Extraneous variables MUST be more thoughtful than noise reduction, environmental issues or distraction control. It should be something specific to your study that could’ve impacted the DV. * Use all the standard ethical considerations and at least one that’s specific to this experiment. * Use the term Target Pop. to explain choice of subjects. It is VERY specific though. Also, do NOT mention that they were assigned or required to participate by Mr. B. | | |
| Notes: |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Analysis** | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
| Provided descriptive statistics (one central tendency & one measure of dispersion) for your data in written form and use of both is explained – why did you use those particular measures? |  |  |
| Stated whether descriptive results support the research hypothesis or not |  |  |
| Included in the body an accurate/relevant graph for measure of CT only, for both conditions, including proper labeling of axes, columns, and titles |  |  |
| Included appropriate inferential statistics for your data |  |  |
| Explained why that particular statistical test was used - should include details of the type of data used (nominal, ordinal, interval or ratio) and the experimental design (independent/repeated measures) |  |  |
| Calculations for inferential test were shown in appendices and referenced in body |  |  |
| Stated the conclusion of your inferential test including the levels of significance and the critical and observed values |  |  |
| Rejected or failed to reject the null hypothesis (should state that this rejection or failure to reject was based on the conclusion statement above) |  |  |
| Details:   * Do NOT discuss the results or what they mean in any way other to state that the test yielded X result and include the items mentioned above, and then make your statement relevant to your NULL hypothesis. All other discussion of results comes in the next section. * No participants should be identified by name * Raw data sheets should be saved but not all included. One example is sufficient along with the compiled table of raw data in the appendices * Graphs could include bar charts, histograms, box & whisker and/or pie charts * Cause & effect should be treated with caution and conclusions should be tentative | | |
| Notes: |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation** | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
| Discussed your findings with reference to the background theory or model from your intro – be specific and detailed |  |  |
| As part of the above, explained what your results mean in relation to your hypothesis & explained why you got your results. Compared that to the theory or model and explained how you got your results and why they may be similar or different to what the theory or model describes |  |  |
| Stated and explained (why/how) at minimum one strength **AND** one limitation of each of the following - design, sample and procedure. These must be rigorous - see note below |  |  |
| All strengths and limitations were made relevant to the investigation – can’t be errors/accidents/omissions that could have been avoided with foresight and planning |  |  |
| Described & justified modifications that are explicitly linked to the limitations of IA investigation (at least one). |  |  |
| Stated an appropriate conclusion |  |  |
| Details:   * It’s redundant to say how your results relate to your hypothesis here because you just did it in the Results section. ***Do it anyway***. And do it such a way that you reference the specific numerical outcomes even though you just did that. Compare these in detail to the replicated study/model or theory * Additionally, you should compare the aims, procedures, results, ethics, and MEGA-C aspects of your IA and the study/model or theory from your intro. * Note that strengths and limitations are plural – you should **NOT** use sample size and the environment is a super weak limitation (see below), * The “modifications” requirement is tricky. You may NOT use superficial modifications like change the environment or change the sample size. Must explicitly say why changing aspects of how you conducted your IA would yield different specific outcomes. In other words, you’d need to name what specific type of environment you’d change it to, what that new environment would provide that would shed light on your topic & what you’d expect to find as a result, i.e. what would your new aim be? | | |
| Notes: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **References** | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
| References are complete – resource(s) for theory/model, replicated and study  *If necessary other relevant links – photos, stats website, videos etc.* |  |  |
| References are in APA format – in-text citations (Name, Year)  References are in alpha order by Last Name, 1st Initial etc. |  |  |
| Notes: |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendices** | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
| Appendices are:  Numbered  Titled  Laid out well – one per page. If >1 both must fully fit on page |  |  |
| Appendices are complete and in this order:  Generic parental consent form  Unsigned informed consent form,  Standardized instructions  Samples of materials - photos, links, slides, surveys etc. Standardized debrief  Raw data  Inferential stats calculations  Any other relevant materials needed to replicate study |  |  |
| Details:   * Try to keep each app on one page, don’t have it start ½ way down & then finish on the next page. If you really want it nice looking 1 app per page. Don’t worry about trees dying. This is all digital. * Everything one would need to use to replicate your experiment MUST be included in the Apps | | |
| Notes: |  |  |