

GCSE
HISTORY
8145/1B/E

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

Mark scheme

June 2020

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 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 © 2020 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 Saddam Hussein. 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 which project Saddam Hussein in a negative light, and link explicitly to factual knowledge; eg the date of the cartoon in 1991 is when Saddam's forces had been defeated and expelled from Kuwait; Saddam boasted of winning the 'Mother of all Battles', when in fact it is he who is being punished by a 'mother' figure which represents the coalition.

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 cartoon shows Saddam being 'punished' and humiliated by a figure representing the coalition.

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 invasion of Iraq in 2003?

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 military action over Iraq.

In assessing utility, Source C might be seen as a rich source as it exposes Kurdish relief as the persistent threat from Saddam's chemical attacks had been lifted; although it uses language which is extreme, the testimony was valid because of was supported by documented evidence of Iraqi policy against minorities.

Source B would be used by historians as further evidence of the well-known Arab view that America's actions were explained by its insatiable need for oil which was threatened by Saddam's regime. However, its anti-US prejudice does affect its validity.

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 was designed to provoke hostility against the United States because Palestinians felt America always took Israel's side against their interest in setting up a Palestinian state. On the other hand, the report in the British newspaper was backed up by knowledge of Saddam's attacks on the Kurdish minority inside Iraq using chemical weapons.

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 is useful as it provides evidence that Arabs thought that the US acted purely out of self-interest for oil; Source C proves useful as it shows how a British newspaper backed invasion by publishing stories to support an anti-Saddam point of view.

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, the cartoon suggests that America were only interested in maintaining oil supplies.

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

0 3

Write an account of how the end of the Iran-Iraq War led to problems in the region.

[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, an answer might offer an additional consequence to that exemplified in L3 (ie the threat to international peace from Saddam's attack on Kuwait). For instance, Arab states such as Saudi Arabia would regard Saddam's ambitions and rising power as a significant problem and would support the West's intervention against him.

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, one consequence was Saddam Hussein's aim to rebuild Iraq's wealth following the Iran-Iraq War by threatening Kuwait and seizing its oil; however this would create international tension because the West would oppose this threat to its oil supplies.

Level 2:	<p>Simple analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</p> <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, both Iran and Iraq had suffered huge casualties and were economically and militarily exhausted; the West had supported Saddam Hussein's campaign against Iran's Islamic Revolution.</p>	3–4
Level 1:	<p>Basic analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</p> <p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as Iraq was facing bankruptcy.</p>	1–2
	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 was the main reason for the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 was to capture Osama bin Laden.'

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 way reasons interacted; they may argue, for instance, that while bin Laden played a key role as an individual in focussing and organising opposition against the West it was more important to remove the Taliban and prevent Afghanistan being used as a terrorist base and haven and thereby stem the impact of jihadis against US targets.

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, students may focus on bin Laden’s key role in forming al-Qaeda and organising its campaigns against US targets, referencing 9/11 and other global attacks such as on US embassies in Africa. Bin Laden was blamed for provoking and exporting Holy War on the West and for the Fatwa against US citizens. Hence the US imperative to capture him.

Students may additionally identify alternative factors, such as 9/11, which led to Bush and the West pursuing a ‘War on Terror’, part of the campaign against the ‘axis of evil’ - the defeat of the Taliban in Afghanistan was supposed to deprive al-Qaeda of its training bases and hasten its defeat. Afghanistan had the reputation as a ‘rogue state’ - the strict imposition of Sharia law was considered so distasteful and extreme in its execution that this provided another reason for military action.

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 bin Laden’s key role in forming al-Qaeda and organising its campaigns against US targets, referencing 9/11 and other global attacks such as on US embassies in Africa. Bin Laden was blamed for provoking and exporting Holy War to the West. Hence the US imperative to capture him.

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 capture of bin Laden who was blamed for organising al-Qaeda and masterminding attacks on the West.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, by attacking Afghanistan, it could undermine al-Qaeda terrorist bases there.

For example, to destroy the Taliban regime and its policies of which the West disapproved.

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