



GCSE HISTORY 8145/1B/D

Paper 1 Section B/D: Conflict and tension in Asia, 1950–1975

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 G 8 1 4 5 / 1 B / D / M S

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Step 3 Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG)

Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in question 04.

	Performance descriptor	Marks awarded
High performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate 	4 marks
Intermediate performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate 	2–3 marks
Threshold performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate 	1 mark
No marks awarded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learner writes nothing • The learner's response does not relate to the question • The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning 	0 marks

Question 04 is an extended response question. They give students the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0 1 **Source A** opposes American involvement in the Korean War. How do you know?

Explain your answer using **Source A** and your contextual knowledge.

[4 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target **Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)**

Level 2: Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance **3–4**

Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source.

For example, the leaflet is opposed to American involvement in the Korean War because it is telling the American soldiers to go home. It was produced by North Korea who were being attacked by American troops. It is trying to lower the morale of the American troops.

Level 1: Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance **1–2**

Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the leaflet says the Americans are killing Korean women and children. North Korea was fighting against America.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question **0**

0 2

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** to an historian studying the Tet Offensive?

Explain your answer using **Sources B** and **C** and your contextual knowledge.

[12 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target

Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)
Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)

In analysing and evaluating sources, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4: Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance **10–12**

Students may progress from a developed evaluation of the sources by complex reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and provenance. They may evaluate the relationship between the sources based on analysis of provenance and contextual knowledge.

For example, the sources are useful because they show a longer-term effect of the attack by the Vietcong. The fact that the Embassy building in Saigon could be attacked was seen as a form of defeat for America. The setback was such a blow to public support for the war that President Johnson announced he would not seek re-election. Even though the sources are from different sides of the conflict, they both show that the Tet offensive was hugely damaging to the American war effort.

Level 3: Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance **7–9**

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example, Source B is useful to show that the Tet Offensive was a new tactic. The Vietcong mainly used guerrilla tactics in the jungles but the large-scale attack in 1968 during the Tet holiday was well planned. It was a simultaneous attack in hundreds of towns and US military bases in South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong lost many soldiers. They failed to drive the Americans out permanently. Source C is useful to show that the Tet Offensive did cause damage but the US army were able to gain back control. The grounds of the US Embassy building were only occupied for a few hours.

For example, Source C shows that the American newspapers were critical of the way the army kept releasing the message that the war was going well. Even though the building is damaged, the officer is saying that everything is fine. It is useful as an example of the growing opposition which began after the Tet Offensive. People questioned why America was involved in a war that they did not seem to be able to win. Source B is useful to explain why the Tet Offensive was seen as a victory by the North Vietnamese. It was a turning point in the war because the American public were shocked that the Vietcong could be so successful.

Level 2: Simple evaluation of source(s) based on content and/or provenance 4–6

Students may progress from a basic analysis of the source(s) to simple evaluation of the content and/or provenance.

For example, Source B is useful to explain why the Tet Offensive was seen as a victory by the North Vietnamese. It was a turning point in the war because the American public were shocked that the Vietcong could be so successful.

Source C is useful to show that the Tet Offensive did cause damage but the US army were able to gain back control. The grounds of the US Embassy building were only occupied for a few hours.

Level 1: Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Source B says the Tet Offensive was a victory for the North Vietnamese.

Source C shows that the American Headquarters was damaged in the Tet Offensive.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0

0 3

Write an account of how the Geneva Agreement, 1954 led to further conflict in Vietnam.

[8 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)

Level 4: Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question **7–8**

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and /or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.

For example, conflict arose because of national political opposition to Diem's corrupt government in the South but it escalated into a large-scale international war because of America's belief in Domino Theory. America followed an anti-communist foreign policy of containment and was prepared to go to war to stop South Vietnam being taken over by Ho Chi Minh.

Level 3: Developed analysis of causation/consequence
Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question **5–6**

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.

For example, the agreement led to conflict because neither side was happy with the arrangement and a Civil War broke out as both sides wanted to get control of the whole country. Ho Chi Minh supplied weapons for the political opposition (NLF) to Diem that emerged in the South. America provided financial support for Diem and the South Vietnamese army (ARVN).

Level 2:	Simple analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	3–4
	<p>Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For example, North Vietnam was to be ruled by Ho Chi Minh who was communist and South Vietnam by Diem who was anti-Communist. It was agreed that a general election would be held in 1956 for the whole country to choose its future government.</p>	
Level 1:	Basic analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	1–2
	<p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as the Geneva Agreement divided Vietnam into two halves to be ruled separately.</p>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

Question 04 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0	4
---	---

'The events at Kent State University were the main reason why American public opinion turned against the Vietnam War.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

[16 marks]
[SPaG 4 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target **Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8)**
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)

Level 4: **Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement** **13–16**
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a complex, sustained line of reasoning which has a sharply-focused coherence and logical structure that is fully substantiated, with well-judged relevance.

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding to form a sustained judgement.

For example, the level of uncensored media coverage that existed during the entire Vietnam War was a greater reason for the turning of public opinion than any individual event. As TV ownership increased during the 1960s this became the dominant form of media. As real-time reporting became possible, the American population were more fully informed than in any other previous war.

Level 3: Developed explanation of the stated factor and other factor(s) **9–12**
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a developed, sustained line of reasoning which has coherence and logical structure; it is well substantiated, and with sustained, explicit relevance.

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

Students may progress from a simple explanation of causation with developed reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the events at Kent State University caused public opinion to turn against the war because it brought the anti-war protest movement to a wider audience for the wrong reasons. A student led protest on a university campus became violent and National Guardsmen opened fire on the unarmed protesters. This led to the death of four students and hardened public opinion against the government.

Another reason for public opinion turning against the war was when the truth about the My Lai Massacre became public in 1969. The investigation revealed that 500 innocent people were killed in My Lai by US troops but the incident had been covered up. The American public were shocked by the details of the actions of ‘Charlie Company’ during a search and destroy mission.

Level 2: Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s) **5–8**
Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

Students may progress from a basic explanation of causation by simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, public opinion changed because the war cost so much and America did not seem to be winning. New strategies such as Vietnamisation did not work as planned. The war widened into Cambodia and Laos.

Level 1: Basic explanation of one or more factors **1–4**
Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a basic line of reasoning, which is coherent, structured with some substantiation; the relevance might be implicit.

Students recognise and provide a basic explanation of one or more factors.

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as an anti-war demonstration at Kent State University got out of hand and four students were shot dead.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, public opinion was opposed to the war because there was colour TV coverage that showed the horrors of war to every home in America.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question **0**

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

	Performance descriptor	Marks awarded
High performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate 	4 marks
Intermediate performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate 	2–3 marks
Threshold performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate 	1 mark
No marks awarded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learner writes nothing • The learner's response does not relate to the question • The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning 	0 marks