**IB1 “Mini-IA” Assessment: Success and Participation in Sport**

**INTRODUCTION:**

1. **Question and Geographic Context: (2 marks)**

In this section you want a well-focused research question with a detailed, accurate explanation of the geographic context and its relationship to the syllabus. You provide an overview of geographic area and also your hypothesis(es); what do you expect to find and why based on what you know about geography?

*Missing: present a good locational map (3marks total)*

**METHODS:**

1. **Methods of Investigation**

Here you will provide a clear description of where you got your information and explain why those methods/sources are appropriate (ie: provide a justification). We are currently using only secondary data but in our IA most will be primary.

*Missing: are the methods used well-suited to the investigation? (3 marks total)*

**ANALYSIS:**

1. **Quality And Treatment of Information Collected (3 marks) / D. Written Analysis (5 marks)**

These two criteria form your ‘Analysis’ Section. Here you ensure the information you have collected is the displayed in the best type of visual form (pie chart/bar graph/etc) based on the type of data AND that you have analyzed the data using the most appropriate methods correctly (Spearman’s Rank). After you describe what you see in the data you EXPLAIN and refer back to the fieldwork question, geographic context, information collected and illustrative material. The attempt to explain any anomalies in results is good. (Think GHLAD)

*Missing C: (5 marks total) / Missing D: (10marks total)*

**CONCLUSION & EVALUATION:**

1. **Conclusion (2 marks)**

Summarize your findings, answer your fieldwork question based on analysis. Evaluate initial hypothesis.

1. **Evaluation (2marks)**

Describe whether your methods of collecting data could have been better or more accurate. Suggest how the investigation could have been improved and suggest a way to change the question to improve it.

*Missing: (3 marks total)*

1. **Formal Requirements (4 marks)**

This is not a section but assesses the presentation of your paper and whether it is within the 1200 word limit.

*Missing: Regular IA is 2, 500 words*

*TOTAL: 20 marks (Regular IA 30 marks)*

**IB Diploma Geography Internal Assessment Modified Markscheme for MINI-IA**

There are seven internal assessment criteria for fieldwork.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion A | Fieldwork question and geographic context | 2 marks |
| Criterion B | Method(s) of investigation | 2 marks |
| Criterion C | Quality and treatment of information collected | 3 marks |
| Criterion D | Written analysis | 5 marks |
| Criterion E | Conclusion | 2 marks |
| Criterion F | Evaluation | 2 marks |
| Criterion G | Formal requirements | 4 marks |
|  | **Total**  | **20 marks**  |

**A Fieldwork Question and Geographic Context**

This criterion assesses the focus and geographic context of the fieldwork and whether the fieldwork question is related to the material in the syllabus.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Level descriptor** |
| 0 | The work does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | The fieldwork question is adequate with an acceptable attempt made to place it in its geographic context and relate it to the syllabus.  |
| 2 | The fieldwork question is well focused with a detailed, accurate explanation of the geographic context and is related to the syllabus.  |

**B Method(s) of Investigation**

This criterion assesses the description, justification and appropriateness of the method(s) used to investigate the fieldwork question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Level descriptor** |
| 0 | The work does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | There is an adequate description but limited justification of the method(s) used for information collection. |
| 2 | There is a clear description and justification of the method(s) used for information collection.  |

**C Quality and Treatment of Information Collected**

This criterion assesses the quality of information collected and its suitability for analysis in criterion D, and whether appropriate techniques have been used for both the treatment and display of information.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Level descriptor** |
| 0 | The work does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | Limited or inappropriate information has been collected and very little attempt has been made to treat or display the information collected. |
| 2 | The information collected is generally relevant to the fieldwork question. Appropriate techniques have been used for both the display of information collected. |
| 3 | The information collected is directly relevant to the fieldwork question. The most appropriate techniques have been used effectively for both display of information collected. |

**D Written Analysis**

This criterion assesses the quality of the analysis of the results, referring to the fieldwork question, geographic context, information collected and illustrative material.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Level descriptor** |
| 0 | The work does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | The report reveals very limited knowledge and understanding. The approach is descriptive with little or no attempt at analysis. |
| 2 | The report reveals some knowledge and understanding. There is an attempt at analysis, which may be incomplete or superficial, making little or no reference to the fieldwork question, geographic context, information collected and illustrative material. |
| 3 | The report reveals an adequate level of knowledge and understanding. There is an adequate level of analysis, which generally refers to the fieldwork question, geographic context, information collected and illustrative material. |
| 4 | The report reveals a good level of knowledge and understanding. There is a well-reasoned, detailed analysis of the results with references to the fieldwork question, geographic context, information collected and illustrative material. There is an attempt to explain any anomalies in results. |
| 5 | The report reveals a very good level of knowledge and understanding. There is a clear and well-reasoned, detailed analysis of the results with strong references to the fieldwork question, geographic context, information collected and illustrative material. The attempt to explain any anomalies in results is good. |

**E Conclusion**

This criterion assesses the ability of the student to summarize the findings of the fieldwork investigation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Level descriptor** |
| 0 | The work does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | There is some attempt to draw a conclusion to the fieldwork question, which may not be completely consistent with the analysis. |
| 2 | There is a clear conclusion to the fieldwork question, consistent with the analysis. |

**F Evaluation**

This criterion assesses the student’s ability to review the investigative methodology.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Level descriptor** |
| 0 | The work does not reach the standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | Methods of collecting fieldwork information have been evaluated or there are valid recommendations for improvements or extensions. |
| 2 | Methods of collecting fieldwork information have been evaluated clearly. There are valid and realistic recommendations for improvements or extensions. There may be some suggestions for modifying the fieldwork question. |

**G Formal requirements**

This criterion assesses the extent to which the student meets the five formal requirements of writing, organizing and presenting the written report:

* The work is within the 1,200 word limit.
* Overall presentation is neat and well structured.
* Pages are numbered.
* References used for background information follow standard conventions. (Guidance on referencing is given in the *Geography guide* in the section on “Secondary information” and in more detail in the section on “How to reference sources” in this teacher support material.)
* All illustrative material is numbered, is fully integrated into the body of the report and is not relegated to an appendix.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Level descriptor** |
| 0 | The work exceeds the 1,2000 word limit or meets none of the other formal requirements. |
| 1 | The work is within the 1,200 word limit and meets one of the other formal requirements. |
| 2 | The work is within the 1,200 word limit and meets two of the other formal requirements. |
| 3 | The work is within the 1,200 word limit and meets three of the other formal requirements. |
| 4 | The work is within the 1,200 word limit and meets the other four formal requirements.  |

The following are **not** included in the word count.

* Title page
* Acknowledgments
* Contents page
* Titles and subtitles
* References
* Footnotes—up to a maximum of 15 words each
* Map legends and/or keys
* Labels—of 10 words or less
* Tables—of statistical or numerical data, or categories, classes or group names
* Calculations
* Appendices—containing only raw data and/or calculations

All the main text is included in the word count, including the fieldwork question, analysis, conclusion and evaluation, as well as all annotations over 10 words and any footnotes over 15 words.