

# Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level

January 2024

Paper  
reference

**WGE04/01**

## Geography

International Advanced Level

**UNIT 4: Researching Geography**

**Advanced Information: Research Focus**

You do not need any other materials.

### Instructions

- Select **one option**, based on the research you have carried out for Unit 4.
- You should use information contained in the **research focus** to prepare for the Unit 4 examination.
- The **research focus** will give you an idea of the material which you need to study in order to answer the question in the examination for Unit 4.
- To help you, the **research focus** is divided into:
  - **concepts**, meaning the appropriate background ideas, processes, theories and models
  - **places**, meaning a range of relevant geographical environments and appropriate case studies.
- You will be expected to produce a **report**, with clear sub-sections and referencing. Please consult the accompanying generic mark scheme, which can be found on pages 3 to 5 of this booklet.

Turn over ►

W73512A

©2024 Pearson Education Ltd.  
W:1/1/1/1/1/1



  
Pearson

### **OPTION 1: Tectonic Activity and Hazards**

- Research the varied reasons why some tectonic hazards become disasters.
  - Research the different types of tectonic hazard to examine the reasons why there are differences in their predictability and impacts.
- 

### **OPTION 2: Feeding the World's People**

- Research the varied physical and human causes of food supply inequalities.
  - Research a range of locations to examine how climate, environmental and economic factors contribute to food supply inequalities.
- 

### **OPTION 3: Cultural Diversity: People and Landscapes**

- Research the reasons why there are different values attached to cultural landscapes by the range of players and groups involved.
  - Research a range of locations to explore different ways cultural landscapes are protected.
- 

### **OPTION 4: Human Health and Disease**

- Research the reasons why health risks and mortality rates may change over time.
- Research a range of locations to investigate the impact of air and water pollution on human health and disease.



<b>Generic mark scheme</b>	
<b>I</b>	<b>Introduction; defining and focusing on the question</b>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No attempt to introduce report.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Title referenced but not deconstructed, although topic addressed.</li> <li>Neither focus nor framework addressed.</li> <li>One or two key terms partially defined.</li> </ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some reference to title but limited deconstruction.</li> <li>Focus of report implied but unclear.</li> <li>Framework implicit but appropriate indication of framework, either by concepts and/or case studies.</li> <li>Some accurate definitions of key terms.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear deconstruction of title.</li> <li>Focus of report on geographical question/issue is both clear and rational.</li> <li>Framework is both explicit and appropriate, either by places, environment and/or concepts.</li> <li>Accurate definitions of all appropriate terms.</li> </ul>
<b>R</b>	<b>Research knowledge</b>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of research.</li> </ul>
<b>1-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some case studies/concepts but lacks selection and range so significant gaps.</li> <li>Concepts and/or theories may be referenced/stated but neither explored nor applied to question.</li> <li>Very limited range of evidence presented with very limited use of numeric and qualitative data.</li> <li>Processes not addressed directly but simply asserted.</li> </ul>
<b>6-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A range (scale/location) of all/mostly relevant case studies used.</li> <li>A limited set of concepts/theories used that assist in focusing on the question.</li> <li>Mostly accurate evidence used but with gaps in the numeric and qualitative data.</li> <li>Some relevant processes explained but with inaccuracies.</li> </ul>
<b>11-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wide range of relevant case studies used (by scale and or location).</li> <li>Relevant concepts and/or theories/models used to support focus.</li> <li>Factual, accurate and topical evidence used which includes both quantitative and qualitative data.</li> <li>Relevant processes, interactions and changes accurately explained.</li> </ul>

<b>A</b>	<b>Analysis, application and understanding</b>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding or analysis.</li> </ul>
<b>1-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No obvious report.</li> <li>• A few simple statements related to topic as a whole but not to question asked.</li> <li>• Understanding stated in a few simple phrases but no development.</li> <li>• Statement that views/perspectives might vary but without evidence/support.</li> <li>• Any maps/diagrams are rarely used to support answer.</li> </ul>
<b>6-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report is unclear and direction of argument is obscure.</li> <li>• Generalised material often weakly linked to question with focus unclear.</li> <li>• Some conceptual understanding delivered through basic unqualified statements.</li> <li>• Limited appreciation of how identifiable values/perspectives might vary with no support.</li> <li>• Any maps/diagrams are sometimes used to support answers.</li> </ul>
<b>11-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report is clear but not always easy to follow with some hesitancy in the argument.</li> <li>• Most of the research is used to support the question which remains in focus.</li> <li>• Some conceptual understanding and argument although largely asserted/stated.</li> <li>• Some appreciation of how identifiable values/perspectives vary although limited support.</li> <li>• Any maps/diagrams are usually used to support answer.</li> </ul>
<b>16-20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report has a clear direction which is argued coherently.</li> <li>• All research interpreted and applied directly to the question set.</li> <li>• Strong conceptual understanding with coherent argument and counter argument.</li> <li>• Appreciation of different interactions/values/perspectives that are supported by evidence/examples.</li> <li>• Any maps/diagrams are accurate and used to support answer.</li> </ul>



<b>C</b>	<b>Conclusion and evaluation</b>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No conclusion or evaluation in report.</li> </ul>
<b>1-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content of report weakly related to C and E.</li> <li>Evaluation limited to statement of inadequate methods.</li> <li>Conclusions made but much is unrelated to content.</li> <li>No qualifications.</li> </ul>
<b>6-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selective recall of content of report with some evidence ignored.</li> <li>Some evaluation, either on-going or in final conclusion largely about methodological flaws.</li> <li>Some conclusions although linkages with evidence occasionally tenuous.</li> <li>One or two qualifications/exceptions stated but not explained</li> </ul>
<b>11-15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly stated conclusion with explicit references to title.</li> <li>Thorough use of content/case studies on places and environments used in report to inform conclusion.</li> <li>Consistent return to the focus.</li> <li>Evaluation offers a judgement, but also recognises the complexity of the question.</li> </ul>
<b>Q</b>	<b>Quality of written communication, methodology and sourcing</b>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic standards of quality of written communication not met.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disjointed organisation and sequencing although may have some subsections.</li> <li>Many errors in punctuation and spelling that make report hard to follow.</li> <li>Very limited use of appropriate geographical vocabulary.</li> <li>Methodology unclear with no detail of rationale for selection of research evidence.</li> <li>Almost no referencing evidencing/sourcing from very limited range of sources.</li> </ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally clearly written with some report style subsections.</li> <li>Sound standard of punctuation and spelling but with errors although meaning remains clear.</li> <li>Some good use of appropriate geographical vocabulary.</li> <li>Sound methodology demonstrating some rationale for evidence selection with simple comments about possible partiality.</li> <li>Occasional but patchy referencing from several different sources.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coherent structure and sequencing with obvious report style subsections.</li> <li>Excellent standards of spelling and punctuation, including geographical vocabulary, with very few errors.</li> <li>Clear methodology showing a rationale for evidence selection, including potential issues of partiality.</li> <li>Accurate referencing of a wide range of sources.</li> </ul>