

Exemplar Extended Essay

EXAMINER CODE EXAMINER NAME:.....

SUBJECT: History.....

--	--	--	--

..... SESSION : May 2004

Category and candidate number									
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

General assessment criteria <i>Refer to the general criteria</i>	ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL	Comments
A research question	2	The same clear and well focused RQ is stated in the abstract and Introduction. Ideally a timeframe would be included, but level 2 seems merited.
B approach	2	Sound running comparison of differences in the numbers of people detained, separation of families, disposition of personal property, living conditions and rights to enlist, plus some attention to the reasons for the differences. Would need wider research base to reach level 3.
C analysis/interpretation	3	A very good attempt at a running comparison of in what ways and for what reasons the Japanese Canadian detainment was arguably more severe than that of the American, plus some thoughtful general reflection on the difficulties of achieving balanced historical accounts and interpretations.
D argument/evaluation	3	Competently develops an argument relevant to the RQ. Some substantiation, but more depth and detail would be welcome in places; the word count shows there is space for this.
E conclusion	2	The conclusion seems to merit level 2. It is clearly stated, relevant to the research question and consistent with the argument presented in the essay.
F abstract	1	Within the abstract there is a reasonably clear statement of the RQ and conclusion, but the scope of the investigation is less clear. The Abstract should be focused more clearly on the three required elements (and obvious repetition in the Abstract and Introduction avoided). Borderline 0-1. Just about enough indication of scope to make level 1 the better fit.
G formal presentation	2	Full details should be given for each reference the first time it is cited. Footnotes 15 and 18 are also incomplete. In contrast, the bibliography is sound in format.
H holistic judgement	3	Shows knowledge and skill in sustaining a running comparison, and considerable understanding and personal engagement in both the topic chosen and the difficulties inherent in achieving balanced historical explanations based on sound evidence
TOTAL OUT OF 24	18	

Subject assessment criteria <i>Refer to the subject guidelines</i>	ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL	Comments
Criterion J	2	Shows some awareness in the second half of the opening paragraph (pp. 4-5) of the possible influence of memory bias, embellishment and deliberate distortion, especially in sources such as diaries and interviews - which is very relevant to some of the sources used here. Candidate does well to integrate evaluative comments into the main body of the essay. Demonstrates rather more than level 1 awareness, but to attain level 3 there would need to be detailed and more insightful reference to the value and limitations of particular sources.
Criterion K	3	Shows good historical knowledge and understanding in relation to differences in the detainment of Japanese Canadians / Japanese Americans, and some understanding of the possible reasons for this. Borderline 2-3.
Criterion L	2	The argument would benefit from more supporting detail and more referencing. Overall, the level 2 descriptor seems to fit what is demonstrated: “the argument is generally supported by relevant information”.
Criterion M	2	Demonstrates a competent level of critical analysis in relation to the topic chosen and also some aspects of the nature of historical investigations. Despite the claim of balance, the comments in the paragraph at the top of page 12 suggest that not all the evidence has been objectively viewed.
TOTAL OUT OF 12	9	

Please replace the candidate’s conclusion (the final three paragraphs on pages 11 and 12, with the following:

This essay has focused on why the Japanese Canadian detainment was arguably more severe than that of the Americans. I’ve used evidence from interviews, diaries and history books to compare the treatment of detainees in the two countries. I’ve found differences not only in the numbers of people detained but also the separation or otherwise of families, disposition of personal property, living conditions and right to enlist. I also looked at the reasons given by the two governments for uprooting the Japanese. Both governments claimed they were uprooting the Japanese for reasons of national security. But the FBI had advised that mass evacuation was not necessary, the evacuation of Japanese Canadians was not completed until eleven months after the Pacific War began, and no acts of violence or disloyalty had occurred in Canada by 1944. The end of the war led to another difference. The Japanese Canadians were not allowed to return to their homes on the coast until April 1949, almost four years after the Japanese Americans were allowed to return to their homes on the coast.

This leads to the question 'why was the treatment of Japanese Canadians more arduous?' I found evidence in all the books I used that racial prejudice and feelings of being threatened by the economic prosperity of the Japanese influenced the way the Japanese Canadians were treated. Aware that personal bias can alter the credibility of research, I have used sources from both interments, looking for core information and avoiding what seems prejudiced. I am confident I have succeeded in these aims, but can we ever be completely sure when explaining such controversial events in history?