

---

**GCSE**  
**HISTORY**  
**8145/1B/D**

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

---

**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](http://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.

	<b>Performance descriptor</b>	<b>Marks awarded</b>
High performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy</li><li>• Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall</li><li>• Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate</li></ul>	4 marks
Intermediate performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy</li><li>• Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall</li><li>• Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate</li></ul>	2–3 marks
Threshold performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy</li><li>• Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall</li><li>• Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate</li></ul>	1 mark
No marks awarded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The learner writes nothing</li><li>• The learner's response does not relate to the question</li><li>• The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning</li></ul>	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 President Nixon's policies in Vietnam. 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, in 1972, Nixon ordered heavy bombing of North Vietnam. The cartoon is an example of the anti-war protest movement that criticised Nixon for the failure of Vietnamisation to enable the ARVN to defeat the Vietcong.

**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 image suggests that Nixon is gambling with American money with his policy of Vietnamisation; he does not have control over what will happen.

**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 development of the Korean 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, the sources show how and why the Korean War developed over time. When Truman made his statement in 1950 he did not anticipate that the war would involve China and the USSR by 1951. It transpired that the UN were unable to achieve a decisive victory once the communist forces had the support of the USSR. The war became a stalemate until its end in 1953.

**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 an example of Truman's policy of containment and the fulfilment of his promise in the Truman Doctrine to help countries defend their independence against communist invasion. He is using the authority of the UN to justify America's involvement in Korea.

Source C is an example of Chinese propaganda produced to celebrate the effect of having joined the war on North Korea's side. China became involved because the UN forces advanced beyond the 38th parallel towards the Yalu River and the Chinese border. Chinese troops were equipped with military supplies from the USSR and this enabled them to successfully stop the advance.

**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 that the US became involved in the Korean War to stop the spread of communism from the North to the South.

Source C is useful because it shows how the support of Communist China helped North Korea to push the UN back towards the 38th parallel.

**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 that the USA will send troops to help South Korea. Source C shows that China's soldiers fought on North Korea's side.

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

0 3

Write an account of how events in Vietnam increased opposition in America to the war.

**[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, opposition increased because events in Vietnam did not bring victory any closer. Despite the continued drafting of soldiers and military spending the USA seemed unable to win. When the war widened into Laos and Cambodia protest movements which were begun by pacifists spread to include more groups in society such as university students and Vietnam veterans.

**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, events such as the Tet Offensive shocked the American public because they saw that the Vietcong were strong enough to attack South Vietnam and seize control of the US embassy in Saigon. Even though US forces regained control, many Americans were disillusioned about the prospect of every winning the war and called for an end to the fighting.



<b>Level 2:</b>	<p><b>Simple analysis of causation/consequence</b>  <b>Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b></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, thousands of young American soldiers were killed or injured in Vietnam and more were sent every month from 1964. Thousands of Vietnamese civilians were killed. The war cost billions of dollars and America did not appear to be winning.</p>	<b>3–4</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<p><b>Basic analysis of causation/consequence</b>  <b>Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b></p> <p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as America began a large scale bombing campaign against North Vietnam.</p>	<b>1–2</b>
	<p><b>Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b></p>	<b>0</b>

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 reason American forces stayed in Vietnam for so long was because of the Domino Theory.'

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 Domino Theory was the main short-term reason for America's initial involvement in Vietnam and it also became the long-term reason why forces stayed for so long. The theory had become so well accepted at home in America that the government could not afford to admit defeat and withdraw from Vietnam. However, in the absence of a decisive victory, it took several years for the American government to find a politically acceptable exit strategy.

**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, Domino Theory kept American forces in Vietnam for so long because they feared that if they left Laos, Cambodia and Thailand would all become communist. American policy was initially to support the South Vietnamese Government via the Strategic Hamlets programme but it developed into stationing US soldiers in Vietnam to engage directly with the Vietcong. They spent several years trying to hold back the communist advance in South East Asia.

For example, the guerrilla tactics used by Vietcong prevented the American forces from securing a quick victory. Rather than launching full scale attacks the Vietcong used tactics such as booby traps, ambushes and ‘Hanging on the belts’ to undermine the American forces’ military strength and morale.

**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, American forces were not equipped to fight in the jungles of Vietnam; their machines guns and uniforms did not perform well in the humidity of the jungles. American forces could not identify the enemy because the Vietcong did not wear a uniform.

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

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 Domino Theory was the belief that if communism spread across Vietnam, it would also spread to other neighbouring countries.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, American forces could not compete with the guerrilla tactics of the Vietcong.

<b>Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>
---	----------

### Spelling, punctuation and grammar

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