1.5 Earthquake Case Study in a Poorer Country: Nepal, 2015: 30-minute Pack

AQA 8035 · Calculators not allowed · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions. Show all your working.

1 State the commonly reported death toll from the 2015 Nepal (Gorkha) earthquake.

(Total for Question 1 is 1 mark)

2 Give TWO primary effects of the 2015 Nepal earthquake. Give one mark for each correct effect.

(Total for Question 2 is 2 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

3 Assess the effectiveness of the responses to the Nepal (Gorkha) earthquake, 2015.

(Total for Question 3 is 15 marks)

4 Give TWO secondary effects that followed the Nepal earthquake in 2015. Give one mark for each correct effect.

(Total for Question 4 is 2 marks)

5 Describe how the pattern of damage differed between rural mountain villages and the urban area of central Kathmandu after the 2015 Nepal earthquake. Use one or two specific details.

(Total for Question 5 is 3 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

6 The government survey reported 498,852 houses destroyed and 256,697 houses damaged, giving a combined total of 755,549 houses affected. Calculate the percentage of affected houses that were destroyed. Give your answer to one decimal place.

(Total for Question 6 is 2 marks)

---

7 Explain TWO long-term responses to the 2015 Nepal earthquake and how they attempted to reduce future risk.

(Total for Question 7 is 4 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 1.5 Earthquake Case Study in a Poorer Country: Nepal, 2015: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

8,964 deaths (or rounded figure close to this total), oe **B1**

Answer: About 8,964 people were killed.

Question 2

collapsed homes/buildings (e.g. many houses destroyed), oe **B1**

deaths/injuries (e.g. about 8,964 deaths), oe **B1**

Answer: Collapsed buildings/homes; deaths and injuries (about 8,964 deaths).

Question 3

Level 1 Simple statements about responses with little or no use of named facts or case detail. Limited judgement about effectiveness. **1-3**

Level 2 A clear assessment that uses some named facts or examples from Nepal and makes comparative points about strengths and weaknesses of responses, but with limited depth or balance. **4-6**

Level 3 A detailed, balanced assessment using accurate named facts and figures from Nepal (and where relevant another case study), weighing immediate and long-term responses, considering constraints and reaching a justified judgement about overall effectiveness. **7-9**

Level 4 A comprehensive, well-balanced assessment that uses detailed named evidence and figures from Nepal and other cases, evaluates both short-term and long-term responses against clear criteria (speed, coverage, sustainability), considers limitations such as funding, access and governance, and reaches a well-supported, nuanced conclusion. **10-12**

Indicative content:

- Immediate responses: international search-and-rescue teams from countries such as India, China and the UK, field hospitals, delivery of emergency food, water and shelter; these reduced immediate mortality and provided lifesaving medical care.
- Use named figures: around 8,964 deaths; large numbers of houses destroyed (498,852) and damaged (256,697) show scale that responders had to address.
- Strengths of immediate response: international assistance supplied specialist rescue skills and rapid emergency supplies; local volunteers and NGOs mobilised quickly.
- Weaknesses of immediate response: damaged roads and landslides slowed delivery to remote mountain villages; some communities waited longer for aid.
- Long-term responses: government-led reconstruction plans, revised building regulations and attempts to retrofit buildings; international funding and loans aimed at rebuilding schools, hospitals and infrastructure.
- Limitations of long-term response: limited government funds, slow disbursement of international aid, low insurance coverage and logistical challenges meant many people remained in temporary shelter for years, reducing effectiveness of recovery.
- Comparison with wealthier-case examples: Christchurch showed faster access to funds, higher insurance cover and stronger pre-existing building standards, highlighting Nepal's constraints in capacity and finance.
- Considerations of sustainability: rebuilding with seismic-resistant design would be effective long-term, but effectiveness depends on enforcement, funding and reaching rural areas.
- Conclude with a judgement that balances saved lives and immediate relief against slow, uneven long-term recovery; state whether overall responses were effective given Nepal's economic constraints and the earthquake's scale.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Question 4

landslides and avalanches (e.g. Everest avalanche), oe **B1**

disruption to agriculture/economy or increased disease risk due to damaged water/sanitation, oe **B1**

Answer: Landslides and avalanches (including the Everest avalanche); disruption to agriculture and the economy, and increased disease risk from damaged water and sanitation.

Question 5

rural mountain villages experienced damage from landslides and isolated building collapse, cutting off access, oe **B1**

central Kathmandu saw widespread collapse of older masonry buildings and damage to heritage sites (e.g. Durbar Square), oe **B1**

linked detail, e.g. rural areas often faced blocked roads and delayed aid, while urban areas had higher density of damaged buildings, oe **B1**

Answer: Rural mountain villages suffered landslides and isolated collapses that often cut roads and delayed aid, while central Kathmandu experienced widespread collapse or severe damage to older masonry buildings and loss of heritage sites such as Durbar Square; urban areas had a higher density of damaged buildings.

Question 6

498,852 / 755,549 seen or equivalent method, oe **M1**

66.0% cao **A1**

Answer: 66.0%.

Question 7

long-term response 1 named, e.g. government-led rebuilding and retrofitting of houses and infrastructure, oe **B1**

linked detail, e.g. rebuilding with improved seismic-resistant designs and revised building codes to reduce future collapse, oe **B1**

long-term response 2 named, e.g. international loans and aid programmes and community recovery projects, oe **B1**

linked detail, e.g. funding aimed to restore schools, roads and livelihoods though progress was slow, which should increase resilience over time, oe **B1**

Answer: Long-term rebuilding and retrofitting of houses and infrastructure, using improved seismic-resistant designs and revised building regulations to reduce future collapse. International loans, aid programmes and community recovery projects provided funds to restore schools, roads and livelihoods, aiming to increase resilience though implementation was slow.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk