



---

GCSE

**HISTORY**

**8145/1B/D**

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

---

**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](http://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"> <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** supports ending the war 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 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 artists' depiction of Nixon's exhaustion because of US efforts against 'Hanoi' – this was the punch-bag representing the North, which had not been beaten into submission. The legend infers that both sides needed peace and the Americans were too exhausted to win; this was 1973 and the cartoonist seems to be suggesting that the Paris talks must succeed and bring peace, as Nixon had promised.

**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, it was time for peace; the Americans were too weak and couldn't now win because they couldn't throw any more punches at the North Vietnamese punch-bag; it was a cartoon from the British side which was not fighting in Vietnam and so were neutral.

**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 anti-Vietnam War protests in the United States?

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, this may relate to the way that, taken together, the sources are useful because they reflect similar reactions and the need to expose what really happened. But they also have limitations. Source B is a photograph and exhibits the horrors faced by protestors, but it doesn't explain the National Guard's actions, responsibility for what happened or why it happened. Source C is from an eye witness. In assessing utility students may observe that Source C has particular value because the evidence was from a respected professor and his testimony is confirmed by Source B, as well as our knowledge that the Guardsmen did use live ammunition because tear gas had run out and they over reacted when students followed them as they retreated.

**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.

They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain that the sources are useful because, for example, the photojournalist showed how anti-war messages could be communicated in the media and / or how this particular outrage was exposed (Source B) – or that the Professor clearly had been alienated from the war by the National Guard shooting dead unarmed student protestors without warning (Source C).

**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, the photograph (Source B) is useful because it suggests how an American photographer wanted to portray the horror of how protests against the war were dealt with by the government.

The report (Source C) is useful because he was eye witnesses and saw what happened at first hand.

**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 Professor in Source C is shocked because they expected that blank, instead of live bullets were being used; the message of the photo (B) supports this sense of shock and horror.

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

0	3
---	---

Write an account of how events at Dien Bien Phu created an international problem in 1954.

**[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, there was an international conflict of interest as China backed the Viet Minh and the US backed a capitalist South. Once the French had been defeated, the vacuum of power caused the convening of the Geneva peace conference to decide Vietnam's future.

A temporary division of the country was decided while elections were held. This caused further problems as the US decided to prevent elections to stop the Communists winning. Their belief in Domino Theory caused the US to support the government of the South against the Chinese backed guerrillas leading to an extension of Cold war tensions.



**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 that the French were the controlling power but its defeat by the Viet Minh caused a Geneva peace conference to be held as the future of Vietnam had to be decided. This was an international problem because the Chinese favoured a Communist Vietnam, while the US backed a Communist free South Vietnam. The conference decided on a division across the 17th parallel.

**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 French were defeated by the Viet Minh. An international peace conference had to be held to decide the future of Vietnam. This took place at Geneva in 1954. The US had difficulty in abiding by what was agreed and started to lend help to South Vietnam to stop the spread of Communism.

**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 the French were defeated so there was the problem of coming to a peace settlement.

**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 war in Korea, 1950–1953, was that Communist forces had been removed from South Korea.’

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 ways results linked because, when the campaign is measured against the purpose of the UN and its original aim of ‘punishing’ aggression, then North Korean forces were defeated and the border restored. But if the UN campaign is measured against the aims of the US’ containment policy, the moment the UN exceeded the initial aims by invading another country itself, it failed. Evidence might emphasise the dangers it provoked in provoking China, and that the war proved ‘unwinnable’ because it ended with an armistice and continuing armed stand-off across the 38th parallel. In the long term then, these were more important results.

**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 UN objectives had been achieved, North Korean forces were cut off, defeated and the original border at the 38th Parallel restored. But that was a limited success when set against other results.

Hence, students may argue that the UN forces had provoked a ‘Chinese’ invasion, when they had exceeded the UN brief and threatened the Yalu River border. Students might explain that MacArthur’s sacking had revealed the possibility of the use of atomic weapons and an escalation of the conflict. Alternative results might focus on the lengthy stalemate of the war 1951–3, the suffering of civilians and a death toll of around 1.4 million.

**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, the US led coalition had prosecuted its campaign with the initial objective of expelling invading North Korean forces. This had been successful because Communist forces had been cut off and defeated, and the border restored on the 38th parallel. The UN might argue that it had resisted aggression and restored South Korea’s territory.

**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 identify basic factual and general statements which are valid about the period related to the event. For example the UN troops were sent to Korea and were too strong for the Communists, forcing them to surrender.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s). For example, the military stalemate, the human and financial costs, the dangers of China’s involvement.

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

**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