



GCSE

HISTORY

8145/1B/E

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

Mark scheme

Additional Specimen Material

Version E1

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 © 2018 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 Taliban. 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 individual interpretations (AO4a)
Analyse how interpretations of a key feature of a period differ (AO4b)

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 writing uses language to put the Taliban in a bad light, eg suggesting cowardly fighters who hide amongst civilians; Kemp would inevitably suggest his antipathy towards the Taliban as he was a British Commander and part of the coalition fighting the Taliban.

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, Kemp was fighting the Taliban so would speak out against them; the Taliban are accused of hiding amongst innocent people.

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 start of the war in Afghanistan in 2001?

Explain your answer using **Sources B** and **C** 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)**
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, taken together the sources are useful because they reflect the importance of the link between 9/11 and bin Laden with the intervention in Afghanistan. The purpose of the cartoon was to question the basis of military intervention, but is limited because it cannot reflect broader knowledge, eg that Afghanistan was a refuge and training ground for Islamic extremists. Source C may be regarded as more useful as it reflects this knowledge, although there is an element of Blair justifying his decision to take military action, so it has a clear purpose. This may be seen to endow this source with utility in different ways.

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 because it might reflect British attitudes that Bush and Blair's intelligence about bin Laden was not proven and the purpose of the cartoon was to reflect reluctance about the wisdom of military action. Source C is useful as it confirms an attitude that Afghanistan was a rogue state and that the Taliban regime had to be dealt with because of its actions/policies and links to Islamic extremism.

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 explain that the cartoon (Source B) is useful because it shows that there is some doubt that bin Laden was in Afghanistan but that wouldn't stop the Americans.

The Blair speech (Source C) may shed light on official grounds for the British military intervention in Afghanistan, highlighting Blair's belief that the Taliban were harbouring bin Laden.

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, Blair suggests that this war is in retaliation for 9/11; the cartoon suggests that some thought that Blair and the Americans were wrong.

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

0 3

Write an account of how the difficulties faced by weapons inspectors in Iraq became an international crisis in 2002 and 2003.

[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, the crisis was played out partly in the UN because the US used Resolution 1441 at the end of 2002 as authority, to urge attacks on Iraq for allegedly delaying the work of weapons inspectors and having WMD. France wanted to give Saddam more time to comply and argued that it would veto another UN resolution. Russia and China were also opposed to war. Iraq agreed to weapons inspectors returning to Iraq.

In February 2003 when weapons inspectors reported the Iraqis were cooperating and destroying some missiles, impatient US and UK leaders said that Saddam was still delaying disarmament. Other countries joined in the protest against the US/UK such as Germany, but their objections were brushed aside. No further UN resolution was passed – Bush went ahead amidst an international outcry against alleged US militarism.

Level 3: Developed analysis of causation/consequence **5–6**
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

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 quarrel broke out in the UN because the US used Resolution 1441 as authority to urge attacks on Iraq for allegedly delaying the work of weapons inspectors. France wanted to give Saddam more time to comply and argued that he would veto another UN resolution. Russia and China were also opposed to war, but Bush and Blair ignored objections and authorised air strikes.

Level 2: Simple analysis of causation/consequence **3–4**
Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

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 UN was divided about action to be taken against Saddam for allegedly ‘delaying’ the work of IAEA weapons inspectors. USA and UK wanted war which was opposed by France, China and Russia. The US and UK wanted to go ahead and gave Saddam a 48 hours ultimatum. Although France and others voiced opposition in the UN, US and UK air attacks began in March.

Level 1: Basic analysis of causation/consequence **1–2**
Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such there were quarrels in the UN about how to deal with Saddam’s obstruction of weapons inspections. Some wanted action, others asked for more time.

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 result of the Gulf War, 1990–1991, was that Iraqi forces were removed from Kuwait.'

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, students will make a judgment about the short term result, ie success in liberating Kuwait with the long term results of leaving Saddam in power. There may be a suggestion that a judgement depends on the point of view – did the coalition consider oil supplies more important than dealing with a dictator who inflicted further brutality on his own people. Or students might consider that in the long term Saddam still had to be dealt with and it led to another Iraqi war, so this was a more important result.

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 fragile international coalition had come together in order to expel Saddam's forces from Kuwait. This was an important result because Iraqi forces had been defeated in 4 days and Saddam had lost tens of thousands of troops who had been killed. For the coalition, losses were light. Saddam no longer controlled Kuwait's oil, which was a vital interest for the West.

Students may additionally explain alternatives, such as the longer term results suggesting 'failure'. Explanations might include the results of allowing a ceasefire, allowing Saddam to withdraw his army for use against the Kurds in the north and Shias in the south; hence this was why it was necessary to impose 'no fly zones' because of the consequences of Saddam remaining in power.

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, students may focus on judgment made against the purpose of Operation Desert Storm, it was a successful result because, Iraqi forces had been defeated, and Kuwait with its oil had been liberated, following a coordinated Coalition campaign by land and air.

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, the Coalition didn't take long to overcome Iraqi forces which were quickly defeated.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, Saddam's forces survived and so did his dictatorship.

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