Cambridge International AS & A Level

Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

HISTORY **9389/31**

Paper 3 Interpretations Question **October/November 2016**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

© UCLES 2016

General Levels of Response

For the purposes of marking, the interpretation is taken to be what the historian says in the given extract, the nature of the claims made and the conclusions drawn. The approach is seen as what the historian brings to their study of the topic, what they are interested in, the questions they ask, the methods they use. There is a close interrelationship between the interpretation and the approach, since the former emerges from the latter, and marking will not insist on any rigid distinctions between the two.

Marks will be awarded according to the following criteria. Markers will be instructed first to determine the level an answer reaches in relation to AO2(b), and to award a mark accordingly. In general, the mark subsequently awarded in relation to AO1(a) will be in the same level, since the ability to recall, select and deploy relevant historical material will be central to any effective analysis and evaluation of the interpretation. However, in exceptional cases, generally where answers lack effective contextual support, markers will have the discretion to award marks in different levels for the two assessment objectives.

AO2(b)	Analyse and evaluate, in relation to historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways	Marks
Level 5	Demonstrates a complete understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. Explains the interpretation/approach(es) using detailed and accurate references both to the extract and to historical context.	17–20
Level 4	Demonstrates a sound understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation. Explains the interpretation/approach(es) using the extract and historical context.	13–16
Level 3	Demonstrates understanding of aspects of the interpretation. Explains points made using the extract and historical context.	9–12
Level 2	Summarises the main points in the extract. Demonstrates some understanding of the historical context.	5–8
Level 1	Writes about some aspects of the extract. Includes some accurate factual references to the context.	1–4
Level 0	Response contains no relevant discussion.	0

© UCLES 2016

AO1(a)	Recall, select and use historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of History in a clear and effective manner	Marks
Level 5	Demonstrates detailed and accurate historical knowledge that is entirely relevant, and is able to communicate this knowledge clearly and effectively.	17–20
Level 4	Demonstrates detailed and generally accurate historical knowledge that is mainly relevant, and is able to communicate this knowledge clearly.	13–16
Level 3	Demonstrates mainly accurate and relevant knowledge, and is able to communicate this knowledge adequately.	9–12
Level 2	Demonstrates some accurate and relevant knowledge, and can communicate this knowledge.	5–8
Level 1	Demonstrates some knowledge, but ability to communicate is deficient.	1–4
Level 0	Demonstrates no relevant historical knowledge.	0

Interpretation of the General Levels of Response

The critical decision in marking is on the correct level in AO2 in which to place an answer. All depends on the meaning of certain key words:

L5 – *complete* understanding of the interpretation: these answers show a consistent focus on the Big Message, with appropriate support from the extract and knowledge (which can be knowledge of interpretations as well as contextual knowledge).

L4 – *sound* understanding of the interpretation: these answers engage with elements of the Big Message, but without explaining the BM as a whole. They may only cover part of the BM. In effect, they are consistent and accurate, but not complete. They will probably cover sub-messages too, but these will be seen as less important. They will also be properly supported.

L3 – understanding of *aspects* of the interpretation: these answers see the extract as an interpretation (i.e. the creation of an historian), but only engage with sub-messages which are supported, or identify aspects of the BM without properly supporting them, or use a part of the extract to argue for an interpretation which would not be sustainable on the whole of the extract. Typically, they think there are multiple interpretations, often a different one in each paragraph.

L2 – summarises the main points in the extract: at this stage there is work on the extract but this is simply on what it says. There is no valid explanation of the extract as an interpretation.

L1 – writes about some aspects of the extract: these answers barely engage with the extract. There are merely fragments of relevant material.

In L4 and L5, you may allow minor slips in accuracy, relevance, consistency, etc. as long as you judge that they do not undermine the argument as a whole.

© UCLES 2016

Section A: Topic 1

The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939

1 What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the British Empire to explain your answer. [40]

Interpretation/Approach

The main interpretation is that developments within the Empire were determined at two different but interrelated levels. The metropole decided high-level political issues, but at the local level, private individuals pursued their own interests. The metropole would not involve itself in local issues unless these affected the broader national interest. The two levels interacted but neither was on its own decisive. The interactions were mediated by a 'man on the spot' who in practice decided the extent to which imperial policies or local pressures would prevail. Showing understanding of the Big Message will require explanation of how this interaction between the two levels operated.

© UCLES 2016

Section B: Topic 2

The Holocaust

2 What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Holocaust to explain your answer. [40]

Interpretation/Approach

The main interpretation is that the function of the Judenrate, and of the behaviour of the Jewish leaders, changed over time. Any answer getting into L4 or L5 must make this change over time the central aspect (L4 for function OR leaders; L5 for function AND leaders). Showing understanding of the Big Message will require explanation of both these aspects. This may be reflected in comment about the opinion of the author (moving from understanding to critical). The Judenrate started with a social welfare function but this evolved into implementation of Nazi decrees. In parallel, the leadership moved from reluctance/fear into complicit behaviour. Although most Jewish leaders tried to alleviate suffering in the ghettoes, they were complicit in their unquestioning obedience to the Nazis, and some leaders went beyond this in exploiting the power they had been given.

Candidates may attempt to attach labels – functionalist, intentionalist, etc. – to their answer. Mere mention of these is not necessarily evidence of misunderstanding, but any developed attempt to argue them as the interpretation would be (and would mean max. L3).

Glossary: Candidates may use some/all of the following terms: *Intentionalism* – interpretations which assume that Hitler/the Nazis planned to exterminate the Jews from the start. *Structuralism* – interpretations which argue that it was the nature of the Nazi state that produced genocide. There was no coherent plan but the chaotic competition for Hitler's approval between different elements of the leadership produced a situation in which genocide could occur. *Functionalism* is closely related to structuralism. It sees the Holocaust as an unplanned, ad hoc response to wartime developments in Eastern Europe, when Germany conquered areas with large Jewish populations. Candidates may also refer to *synthesis* interpretations, i.e. interpretations which show characteristics of more than one of the above. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it.

© UCLES 2016

Section C: Topic 3

The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950

3 What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Cold War to explain your answer. [40]

Interpretation/Approach

The main interpretation is post-post-revisionist. The historian argues that the real cause of the division of Europe was Stalin's errors and tactical incompetence. A consistent argument for this (probably identified as a traditionalist view) would be worth L4. However, there is evidence in the extract which proves that it cannot be traditionalist: the US is NOT exonerated, and the historian shows awareness of revisionism. The argument is simply that what the US did made no difference. A L5 response will therefore deal both with Stalin's primary responsibility AND with the US being not guilty, but not innocent either, i.e. it will coherently argue post-post-revisionism. The extract shows that aggressive developments like the Truman Doctrine made little difference to Stalin, who, because of his own rigidity and aggressive tactics, failed to use US initiatives like the Marshall Plan to his own best advantage.

Arguments for post-revisionism usually fail (but if based on the first paragraph might make sense in L3), but arguments for revisionism are based on misreading of the extract.

Glossary: *Traditional/orthodox* interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after WW2. They blame the Soviet Union and Stalin's expansionism for the Cold War. *Revisionist* historians challenged this view and shifted more of the focus onto the United States, generally through an economic approach which stressed the alleged aim of the US to establish its economic dominance over Europe. *Post-revisionists* moved towards a more balanced view in which elements of blame were attached to both sides. Since the opening of the Soviet archives post-1990, there has been a shift to attributing prime responsibility to Stalin – a *post-post-revisionist* stance which often seems very close to the traditional view. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it.

© UCLES 2016