

Presentation

The following details should be stated in the header of the report.

- Title of the investigation
- IB candidate code (alphanumeric, for example XYZ123)
- IB candidate code for all group members
- Date, month and year of submission
- Number of words

The report should be between 1,800 and 2,200 words in length and consist of the following components:

- Introduction
- Exploration
- Analysis
- Evaluation
- References
 - The references are not assessed but must be included to meet the requirements of honest academic practice. Not attributing ideas of others included in your work amounts to academic misconduct. If academic misconduct is discovered in any work you submit for IB assessment, you will not be awarded a grade for the subject.

The appendices do not count towards the word count but should be kept to a minimum. Appendices should include:

- raw data tables
- print-outs of calculations and/or results from statistics software **or** calculations made for analytical purposes
- consent form pro forma (unfilled)
- copy of standardized instructions and debriefing notes
- supplementary materials.

Ethical guidelines should be adhered to throughout the planning, conducting and reporting of the experimental work for internal assessment.

Using assessment criteria for internal assessment

For internal assessment, a number of assessment criteria have been identified. Each assessment criterion has level descriptors describing specific achievement levels, together with an appropriate range of marks. The level descriptors concentrate on positive achievement, although for the lower levels failure to achieve may be included in the description.

Teachers must judge the internally assessed work at SL and at HL against the criteria using the level descriptors.

- The same assessment criteria are provided for SL and HL.

- When assessing a student's work, teachers should read the level descriptors until they reach a descriptor that most appropriately describes the level of the work being assessed. If a piece of work seems to fall between two descriptors, both descriptors should be read again and the one that more appropriately describes the student's work should be chosen.
- There are a number of marks available within a level; teachers should award the upper marks if the student's work demonstrates the qualities described to a great extent; the work may be close to achieving marks in the level above. Teachers should award the lower marks if the student's work demonstrates the qualities described to a lesser extent; the work may be close to achieving marks in the level below.
- Only whole numbers should be recorded; partial marks (fractions and decimals) are not acceptable.
- Teachers should not think in terms of a pass or fail boundary, but should concentrate on identifying the appropriate level descriptor for each markband.
- The highest level descriptors do not imply faultless performance but should be achievable by a student. Teachers should not hesitate to use the extremes if they are appropriate descriptions of the work being assessed.
- It is recommended that the markbands be made available to students.

Internal assessment criteria SL and HL

The assessment of the internal assessment task is the same for both SL and HL students and uses the following rubric.

I. Introduction (6 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	Does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The aim of the investigation is stated but its relevance is not identified. The theory or model upon which the student's investigation is based is identified but the description is incomplete or contains errors. Null and/or research hypotheses are stated, but do not correctly identify the Independent or Dependent Variables.
3–4	The aim of the investigation is stated and its relevance is identified but not explained. The theory or model upon which the student's investigation is based is described but the link to the student's investigation is not explained. The Independent and Dependent Variables are correctly stated in the null or research hypotheses, but not operationalized.
5–6	The aim of the investigation is stated and its relevance is explained. The theory or model upon which the student's investigation is based is described and the link to the student's investigation is explained. The Independent and Dependent Variables are stated and operationalized in the null or research hypotheses.
Marks	Comments

II. Exploration (4 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	Does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The research design is described. The sampling technique is described. Characteristics of the participants are described. Controlled variables are described. The materials used are described.
3–4	The research design is explained. The sampling technique is explained. The choice of participants is explained. Controlled variables are explained. The choice of materials is explained.
Marks	Comments

III. Analysis (6 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	Does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	Only descriptive or inferential statistics are applied. A correct graphing technique is chosen but the graph does not address the hypothesis. There is no clear statement of findings.
3–4	Appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics are applied but there are errors. The graph addresses the hypothesis but contains errors. The statistical findings are stated but either not interpreted with regard to the data or not linked to the hypothesis.
5–6	Descriptive and inferential statistics are appropriately and accurately applied. The graph is correctly presented and addresses the hypothesis. The statistical findings are interpreted with regard to the data and linked to the hypothesis.
Marks	Comments

IV. Evaluation (6 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	Does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The findings of the student's investigation are described without reference to the background theory or model. Strengths and limitations of the design, sample or procedure are stated but are not directly relevant to the hypothesis. One or more modifications are stated.
3–4	The findings of the student's investigation are described with reference to the background theory or model. Strengths and limitations of the design, sample or procedure are stated and described and relevant to the investigation.

	Modifications are described but not explicitly linked to the limitations of the student's investigation.
5–6	The findings of the student's investigation are discussed with reference to the background theory or model. Strengths and limitations of the design, sample and procedure are stated and explained and relevant to the investigation. Modifications are explicitly linked to the limitations of the student's investigation and fully justified.
Marks	Comments