



GCSE

HISTORY

8145/1B/E

Paper 1 Section B/E Conflict and tension in the Gulf and Afghanistan,
1990–2009

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

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 Assessment Writer.

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 © 2019 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

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 is critical of the American government. 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, answers may refer to details of the image and link explicitly to factual knowledge eg explains US claims that Saddam had WMD and how they were used to justify intervention and/or explains why these claims proved difficult to evidence following invasion.

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, references (from the source) made to (the absence of) WMD, which are difficult to see even with a microscope; and/or the destruction shown in the background as a consequence of US invasion; and/or contrast the expression of confidence/disbelief on the figure representing 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 impact of the Iraq War?

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, students might recognise that while provenance determines the different purposes for each source, they still provide unwitting testimony of the contrasting claims about success over Iraq.

In assessing utility, Source C might be seen as a richer source as it exposes the problems faced by the Coalition in rebuilding a country where administration and authority had fallen apart, and in trying to defeat warring racial and religious factions

While Source B only tells us that Bush was premature, only two months after in the Coalition invasion, in trying to claim success and thereby boost his reputation as the architect behind the campaign to destroy Saddam Hussein.

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, the cartoon (Source C) was designed to provoke people into questioning how successful the Coalition had been in its claims of victory over Saddam in the light of allied military action against Insurgents and rival factions. On the other hand, Bush (Source B) is using the speech to gain support, claim success for leading the battle for Iraq and justify his decisions to invade in order to remove Saddam from power.

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, students may suggest that the cartoon (Source C) is useful as it suggests that success was still incomplete over a year after Bush's 'Mission Accomplished' speech. Source B may be used to understand that Bush's aim was to emphasise military success, although he realised that Iraq still had to be rebuilt.

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, Bush claims victory because the battle has been won; the cartoon shows that US tanks were still being used to deal with Iraqi fighters.

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

0 3

Write an account of how the actions of the Taliban in Afghanistan led to opposition in the West, 1996 to 2001.

[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 anger increased because of more than one feature of Taliban policies.

For example, an answer might offer an additional consequence to that exemplified in L3. For instance, the strict imposition of Sharia law also caught the attention of the international community – this was considered so extreme in its human rights abuses that the regime was not widely recognised abroad.

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, one consequence of Taliban policies was anger in the west caused by sponsoring jihad, a claim strengthened by evidence that al-Qaeda, as well as its leaders Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri, enjoyed favoured status within Afghanistan, including areas of refuge where young militants could be trained. From there, ‘holy war’ could be exported to the west.

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
	Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding. For example, the answer describes the Taliban’s strict enforcement of Sharia law and/or the running of al-Qaeda training bases.	
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
	Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as Taliban extremism which was seen as anti-Western and therefore a threat.	
	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 main cause of the Gulf War, 1990, was because Iraq needed Kuwait's oil.'

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 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 way reasons interacted; they may argue, for instance, that Saddam needed to bolster his power in Iraq after eight years of damaging conflict. By invading Kuwait he could claim more propaganda victories, solve his debt crisis and rearm, thereby recovering the military damage suffered during the Iran War. Without Kuwait's oil wealth however, Saddam would achieve little of this.	13–16
Level 3:	Developed explanation of the stated factor and other factor(s) 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.	9–12

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, restoring Saddam's reputation after the Iran-Iraq War, strengthening his power base in Iraq and threatening Saudi Arabia would provide a tangible propaganda victory. Saddam needed to divert attention away from eight years of warfare as he was well aware that opposition groups aimed to overthrow his regime. He could pose as the hero who had expanded Iraq's borders.

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

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, students may focus on the prospect of Iraq gaining Kuwait's oil wealth to rearm and discharge debts incurred during the Iran-Iraq War, debts which Arab states had refused to write off; income from Iraq's own oilfields had also dropped following a drop in world prices – so Kuwait's output would make up the shortfall.

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

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, taking Kuwait which was oil rich to pay off Iraq's debts.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, Saddam claimed to be retaking Kuwait which was, he said, part of Iraq.

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