

Paper Reference 1GB0/02
Pearson
Level 1/Level 2 GCSE (9–1)

Geography B
PAPER 2: UK Geographical Issues

Wednesday 5 June 2024 – Morning

Diagram Booklet

THIS DIAGRAM BOOKLET MUST BE RETURNED
WITH THE QUESTION PAPER AT THE END OF THE
EXAMINATION.

In the boxes below, write your name, centre number and
candidate number.

Surname					
Other names					
Centre Number					
Candidate Number					

Contents

Page

SECTION A

4	Figure 1
5	Figure 2 – Information
6	Figure 2 – Key (Colour)
7	Figure 2 – Diagram (Colour)
8	Figure 2 – Key (Black and White)
9	Figure 2 – Diagram (Black and White)

SECTION B

10	Figure 3
11	Figure 4
12–13	Figure 5

SECTION C1

14	Figure 6
15	Figure 7

(continued on the next page)

Contents continued.

Page

SECTION C2


16–17 Question 10 – Information

18 Figure 8

19–20 Question 11 – Information

21 Figure 9

Figure 1



- KEY
- | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|-------------|---|-------|---|----------------|
|  | Sand |  | Sea |  | Path |  | Wooden barrier |
|  | Fence |  | Grass slope |  | Trees | | |

Figure 2 – Information

- June rainfall was **24%** below the long-term average. Southern and eastern areas of the UK were the driest regions.
- July rainfall was **44%** below the long-term average but the north-west of Scotland was slightly wetter than average.
- August rainfall was **46%** below the long-term average. Southern and eastern areas were again the driest regions.

Figure 2 – Key (Colour)

KEY

Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) above long-term average

 less than 0.5

 0.6–1.0

 1.1–1.5

 more than 1.5

Figure 2 – Diagram (Colour)




Figure 2 – Key (Black and White)

KEY

Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) above long-term average

 less than 0.5

 0.6–1.0

 1.1–1.5

 more than 1.5

Figure 2 – Diagram (Black and White)




Figure 3

Region	FDI £ billion in 2015	FDI £ billion in 2019
London	416	661
South East England	119	197
Scotland	78	85
East of England	52	80
North West England	70	74
All other regions	289	460
TOTAL FDI	1,024	1,557

Figure 4




Figure 5

City	Population in 2021 (to nearest 100)	Percentage (%) growth in population since 2011
London	10,076,300	7·8
Birmingham	2,574,300	6·4
Manchester	2,538,600	7·4
Newcastle	853,100	2·9
Sheffield	822,300	1·5
Leeds	812,000	8·1
Bristol	762,800	10·4
Nottingham	664,800	3·7
Liverpool	640,600	4·6
Bradford	564,400	4·6

(continued on the next page)

Turn over

Figure 5 continued.

- **The population of England as a whole grew 6·5% to an estimated 56,536,000, the highest rate of the four countries of the UK.**
- **The fastest growing cities were medium sized cities e.g. Cambridge grew by 17·6%.**
- **Growth was frequently in the inner city, within a kilometre of the city centre, many of which had been regenerated.**

Figure 6

Enquiry Question	
What is the impact of geology on beach profiles in two contrasting locations?	
Location of fieldwork	The beaches are about 20 km apart – the closest is 40 km from the school. Both beaches are close to a road.
Methods used	Measuring beach gradient (steepness) along three transects: each with six sites, on both beaches.
Issues	The second beach is privately owned and we will need to collect a key on arrival.
Secondary data needed	We need to check on the geology of the two beaches. We could also ask the tourist office about any management problems.

Figure 7

Enquiry Question What is the impact of geology on river gradient in two contrasting locations?	
Location of fieldwork	The rivers are about 20 km apart – the closest is 40 km from the school. Parking looks to be easy for both rivers.
Methods used	Measuring river gradient (steepness) along both rivers: each with six sites about 200 metres apart.
Issues	One section of the second river is privately owned and we will need to collect a key from the landowner on arrival.
Secondary data needed	We need to check on the geology of the two rivers. We could also ask the landowner about any flood problems.

SECTION C2

Question 10 – Information

As part of their urban fieldwork a group of students carried out an environmental quality survey (EQS) along a street in each of four different residential areas. Two are in the inner city, one in the suburbs and one in an area on the rural–urban fringe.

Their survey scored each street according to four aspects of the environment. Each aspect was scored out of 5 giving 20 as the best possible score.

1. The amount of graffiti (5 = none, 0 = visible almost everywhere)
2. The amount of litter (5 = none, 0 = visible almost everywhere)
3. The noise level (5 = very quiet, 0 = very noisy)
4. The quality of the pavements (5 = very good, 0 = cracked and uneven)

(continued on the next page)

Question 10 – Information continued.

The students also used a secondary source to discover how deprived each area was using data for Income Deprivation (ID) and how the environment was rated for Environmental Deprivation (ED).

They ranked both of these from least deprived = 1, to most deprived = 4.

The results are shown in Figure 8 on the next page.

Figure 8

Location of urban areas	Environmental quality survey Score /20	Income deprivation Ranking	Environmental deprivation Ranking
Inner City 1	9	4	4
Inner City 2	15	1	3
Suburbs	11	3	1
Rural–urban fringe	18	2	2

Question 11 – Information

As part of their rural fieldwork a group of students carried out an environmental quality survey (EQS) along a street in each of four different rural settlements. Two are just outside a large city, one **40 km** from the city and the other, an old seaside resort.

Their survey scored each street according to four aspects of the environment. Each aspect was scored out of **5** giving **20** as the best possible score.

1. The amount of graffiti (**5** = none, **0** = visible almost everywhere)
2. The amount of litter (**5** = none, **0** = visible almost everywhere)
3. The noise level (**5** = very quiet, **0** = very noisy)
4. The quality of the pavements (**5** = very good, **0** = cracked and uneven)

(continued on the next page)

Question 11 – Information continued.

The students also used a secondary source to discover how deprived each area was using data for Income Deprivation (ID) and how the environment was rated for Environmental Deprivation (ED).

They ranked both of these from least deprived = 1, to most deprived = 4.

The results are shown in Figure 9 on the next page.

Figure 9

Location of rural settlements	Environmental quality survey Score /20	Income deprivation Ranking	Environmental deprivation Ranking
Just outside city 1	9	4	1
Just outside city 2	15	1	3
40 km from city	18	2	2
Seaside resort	11	3	4

Acknowledgements

Pearson Education Ltd gratefully acknowledges all following sources used in preparation of this paper:

Figure 1: © Robert Estall photo agency/Alamy Stock Photo