# Geography IA Grader



**revisiondojo.com**/grader/rubric/geography-ia

RevisionDojo

This page is designed to help you understand the assessment criteria for the IB Geography Internal Assessment (IA) and to interpret your grades effectively. An embedded grading tool is available to assist you in self-evaluating your work.

## Quick Start Checklist

Before using the grader, ensure you have the following:

1. **Fieldwork Question and Geographic Context**: Clearly defined research question and relevant geographic background.
2. **Method(s) of Investigation**: Detailed description and justification of data collection methods.
3. **Data Collected**: All primary and secondary data gathered during your fieldwork.
4. **Data Presentation**: Graphs, charts, and maps used to display your data.
5. **Analysis and Interpretation**: Written analysis of your data, including identification of patterns and anomalies.
6. **Conclusion**: Summary of findings in relation to your research question.
7. **Evaluation**: Reflection on the strengths and limitations of your investigation.
8. **Formal Requirements**: Ensure your report adheres to the IB guidelines, including word count and formatting.

## Rubric Breakdown (Paraphrased & Plain English)

### Criterion A: Fieldwork Question and Geographic Context (3 marks)

**What it tests**: Clarity and focus of your research question and its connection to geographic concepts.

**Performance Levels**:

- **High (3 marks)**: The research question is clear, focused, and directly related to geographic theory. The geographic context is well-explained with a detailed location map.
- **Medium (2 marks)**: The research question is clear but may lack focus. The geographic context is explained with a location map.
- **Low (1 mark)**: The research question is unclear or unfocused. The geographic context is poorly explained or lacks a location map.

**Common Mistakes**:

- Vague or overly broad research questions.
- Insufficient explanation of the geographic context.
- Missing or poorly constructed location maps.

**Evidence to Show**:

- A well-defined research question.
- Comprehensive explanation of the geographic context.
- Detailed and accurate location map.

### Criterion B: Method(s) of Investigation (3 marks)

**What it tests**: Appropriateness and justification of your data collection methods.

**Performance Levels**:

- **High (3 marks)**: Methods are clearly described and well-justified, directly addressing the research question.
- **Medium (2 marks)**: Methods are described and justified but may lack detail or relevance.
- **Low (1 mark)**: Methods are poorly described or lack justification.

**Common Mistakes**:

- Insufficient detail in method descriptions.
- Lack of justification for chosen methods.
- Methods not aligned with the research question.

**Evidence to Show**:

- Detailed description of data collection methods.
- Clear justification for each method.
- Alignment of methods with the research question.

### Criterion C: Quality and Treatment of Information Collected (5 marks)

**What it tests**: Relevance, quantity, and quality of data collected, and effectiveness of data presentation.

**Performance Levels**:

- **High (5 marks)**: Data is directly relevant, sufficient, and well-presented using appropriate techniques.
- **Medium (3-4 marks)**: Data is relevant and sufficient but may lack quality or effective presentation.
- **Low (1-2 marks)**: Data is irrelevant, insufficient, or poorly presented.

**Common Mistakes**:

- Collecting insufficient or irrelevant data.
- Poor data presentation techniques.
- Lack of variety in data presentation methods.

**Evidence to Show**:

- Comprehensive and relevant data collection.
- Effective use of graphs, charts, and maps.
- Clear labeling and referencing of data presentations.

### Criterion D: Written Analysis (10 marks)

**What it tests**: Depth and clarity of analysis, including identification of patterns, trends, and anomalies.

**Performance Levels**:

- **High (9-10 marks)**: In-depth analysis with clear identification and explanation of patterns, trends, and anomalies.
- **Medium (5-8 marks)**: Adequate analysis with some identification of patterns and trends.
- **Low (1-4 marks)**: Superficial analysis with little to no identification of patterns or trends.

**Common Mistakes**:

- Descriptive rather than analytical writing.
- Failure to identify or explain anomalies.
- Lack of connection between data and geographic theory.

**Evidence to Show**:

- Detailed analysis of data.
- Identification and explanation of patterns and anomalies.
- Linking analysis to geographic concepts.

### Criterion E: Conclusion (2 marks)

**What it tests**: Ability to summarize findings and relate them to the research question.

**Performance Levels**:

- **High (2 marks)**: Clear and concise conclusion directly addressing the research question.
- **Low (1 mark)**: Conclusion is vague or does not fully address the research question.

**Common Mistakes**:

- Restating analysis without summarizing findings.
- Failure to directly address the research question.

**Evidence to Show**:

- Concise summary of findings.
- Direct relation to the research question.

### Criterion F: Evaluation (3 marks)

**What it tests**: Reflection on the strengths and limitations of the investigation.

**Performance Levels**:

- **High (3 marks)**: Comprehensive evaluation with clear identification of strengths, limitations, and suggestions for improvement.
- **Medium (2 marks)**: Adequate evaluation with some identification of strengths and limitations.
- **Low (1 mark)**: Superficial evaluation with little reflection on the investigation.

**Common Mistakes**:

- Lack of critical reflection.
- Failure to suggest improvements.
- Overlooking limitations of the study.

**Evidence to Show**:

- Identification of strengths and limitations.
- Suggestions for improvement.
- Reflection on the overall investigation process.

### Criterion G: Formal Requirements (4 marks)

**What it tests**: Adherence to IB guidelines, including word count, structure, and referencing.

**Performance Levels**:

- **High (4 marks)**: Report meets all formal requirements with no errors.
- **Medium (2-3 marks)**: Report meets most formal requirements with minor errors.
- **Low (1 mark)**: Report fails to meet several formal requirements.

**Common Mistakes**:

- Exceeding word count.
- Improper formatting.
- Inconsistent or missing references.

**Evidence to Show**:

- Adherence to word count.
- Proper formatting and structure.
- Consistent and accurate referencing.

## How to Interpret Your Grade from the Tool

The embedded grader provides a score for each criterion, which can be interpreted as follows:

- **High Band**: Excellent performance; minimal improvements needed.
- **Medium Band**: Good performance; some areas for improvement.
- **Low Band**: Needs significant improvement.

If you're between bands or uncertain, focus on the specific feedback provided for each criterion to guide your revisions.

**Improvement Actions**:

- **Criterion A**: Refine your research question for clarity and focus.
- **Criterion B**: Provide detailed descriptions and justifications for your methods.
- **Criterion C**: Ensure data is relevant and presented effectively.
- **Criterion D**: Deepen your analysis