



GCSE

History

8145/1B/E- Paper 1 Section B/E Conflict and tension in the Gulf and
Afghanistan, 1990–2009
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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

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.

In many of our mark schemes we use the following terms to describe the qualities and levels of reasoning of an answer:

Complex: Answers build on the qualities of developed answers. Answers display reasoning that shows the links or connections between evidence or details that are explicitly relevant to the question. Answers may show originality or sophistication. Answers demonstrate substantiated judgement or an awareness of the provisional and problematic nature of historical issues, evidence and interpretations.

Developed: Answers that display more than one step of reasoning or detailed explanation that is explicitly relevant to the question. Answers will sustain an explanation of the differences or similarities in sources or interpretations.

Simple: Answers that describe evidence, features or material relevant to the question. Answers that display simple one step reasoning or brief explanation of a point or comment that is explicitly relevant to the question. Answers may recognise, describe and may explain, simple similarities or differences in sources or interpretations.

Basic: Answers that identify evidence, features or material relevant to the question. Explanation is likely to be implicit or by assertion. Answers take features of sources or interpretations at face value. Material discussed may have implicit relevance.

When a question tests AO1 and AO2 in conjunction, the AO2 element of the level descriptor always is the first statement in the descriptor and the AO1 element is the second statement in the descriptor. It is also important to remember that the 'indicative' content, which accompanies the level descriptors, is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. Other historically accurate and valid answers should be credited.

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. It gives 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 Hamid Karzai. 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 Karzai in a negative light, and link explicitly to factual knowledge; eg despite being President since 2004, he still relied on Coalition money/forces to maintain his Presidency and fight the Taliban. Meanwhile he was blamed for lack of progress; contrast the strain on the Coalition; while Karzai stood idly by.	
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, Karzai has been made to appear as if he is making little effort in the tug-of-war to defeat his enemies.	
	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 Gulf War, 1990–1991?

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 Kuwait.

In assessing utility, Source C might be seen as a richer source as it exposes Saddam's need for popular support following the crippling eight-long year war against Iran and his willingness to use language which appeals to jihadi instincts and quite unjustifiable historic claims to Kuwait.

While Source B only tells us the well-known view that Saddam's actions were provoked by his ambitions for status and power.

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 Saddam and support for Australia's contribution to the Coalition – implying that inactivity would feed Saddam's warlike ambitions. On the other hand, Saddam is using the speech to buttress his power and gain support from his people for yet more military action (following the Iran War) appealing to historic claims and Muslim religious prejudices against the West.

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 B) is useful because it shows that Australia, as a member of the Coalition, shared the belief that Saddam had to be stopped as his main aim was to continue to seize neighbouring lands and expand Iraq's power

The Saddam speech (Source C) may be used by historians to highlight his high sounding claims for invading Kuwait; either the religious - against western invaders on Muslim soil or excuses built on historic claims to take back land which he considered rightfully theirs.

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 Saddam was ambitious for more land; while he himself claims he was more interested in fighting a religious war against western invaders (or that Saddam was just claiming land which was historically Iraq's).

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

0 3

Write an account of how the 11th September attacks led to an international crisis in 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
	<p>Extends Level 3.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For example, an answer might offer an additional consequence to that exemplified in L3 (ie the escalation of a terrorist act leading to the formation of Coalition forces and invasion of Afghanistan). For instance, there were disagreements internationally about the scale of the response. UN counselled caution supporting the right of countries to self-defence but not military action. Bush and Blair decided to go ahead regardless.</p>	
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
	<p>Extends Level 2.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For example, one consequence of 9/11 was how it was seen globally as an ‘act of war’. Bush announced a ‘War on Terror’; the West, including the UK and NATO, as well as the Muslim world denounced the terrorists and intervened to build a coalition to attack Afghanistan. This became known as ‘Operation Enduring Freedom’.</p>	

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, 9/11 struck at New York, at the heart of a major US city; this led to Bush declaring a 'War on Terror' and direct military action in Afghanistan.

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 as Bush decided to take action because of terrorism.

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 reason for the invasion of Iraq in 2003 was to defeat al-Qaeda.'

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 students will make a judgment about the way reasons interacted; they may argue, for instance, that while insatiable demand for oil was an constant throughout (Iraq had at that time the 5th largest reserves), it was Bush and Blair's rhetoric about Saddam's links to terrorism and the perceived threat from WMDs which occasioned the events.	13–16

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 Saddam's alleged support for jihad and al-Qaeda. This took the form of military intelligence, arms shipments and providing training camps for young terrorist fighters. Following 9/11, Bush and the West were pursuing a 'War on Terror' – the defeat of Iraq was supposed to deprive al-Qaeda of a major source of support and hasten its defeat.

Students may additionally explain alternative factors, such as the need to negate what was seen as a credible threat from Saddam's development of WMDs; UNSCOM was investigating Iraq's capabilities to technically build a warhead which could deliver WMDs in the light of Saddam's use of banned biological weapons against minority groups inside Iraq. While some stocks had been discovered and destroyed, the existence of other sites where scientific and engineering developments were allegedly taking place were the matter of speculation. It was thought that if Saddam might have full capabilities within two or three years, then an invasion of Iraq would rid the world of this threat.

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 Saddam's alleged support for jihad and al-Qaeda. This took the form of military intelligence, arms shipments and providing training camps for young terrorist fighters. Following 9/11, Bush and the West were pursuing a 'War on Terror' – the defeat of Iraq was supposed to deprive al-Qaeda of a major source of support and hasten its defeat.

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 attack on Saddam Hussein was meant to deprive al-Qaeda of arms support.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, eg by defeating Saddam, the US could acquire Iraq's oil reserves;
 eg to negate what was seen as a credible threat from Saddam's development of WMDs;
 eg to more effectively defend the human rights of minority groups who had suffered abuses from Saddam's regime within 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