Cambridge Assessment International Education

# Cambridge International AS & A Level

**HISTORY** **9489/31**

Paper 3 Interpretations Question 31 **May/June 2021**

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.



© UCLES 2021

**[Turn over**

## Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

© UCLES 2021

## General levels of response

Process for awarding marks:

- Markers review the answer against the AO4 marking criteria, and award a mark according to these criteria.
- Generally, the subsequent mark awarded for AO1 will be the same level. In exceptional cases, markers could award marks in different levels for the two AOs. This is because the ability to recall, select and deploy relevant historical material will be central to any effective analysis and evaluation of the interpretation.
- Responses that focus on contextual knowledge without reference to the interpretation cannot be rewarded.

© UCLES 2021

Underlining is used in this mark scheme to indicate the main interpretation of the extracts.

| AO4 | **Analyse and evaluate how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented.** | **Marks** |
|---|---|---|
| Level 6 | • Responses use the extract in a detailed and accurate manner and demonstrate a complete understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation.<br>• These responses explain all elements of the historian's interpretation. | **18–20** |
| Level 5 | • Responses use the extract in a detailed and accurate manner and demonstrate a sound understanding of the interpretation and of the approach(es) used by the historian in reaching this interpretation.<br>• These responses engage with elements of the historian's interpretation, but without explaining it as a whole – they are consistent and accurate, but not complete and may cover less important sub-messages. | **15–17** |
| Level 4 | • Responses use the extract, but only demonstrate partial understanding of the interpretation and approach(es) of the historian.<br>• These answers identify elements of the historian's interpretation, but without adequately explaining them, typically explaining other less important message(s) as equally or more important. | **12–14** |
| Level 3 | • Responses demonstrate understanding that the extract contains interpretations, but those explained are only sub-messages.<br>• Responses may use a part of the extract to argue for an interpretation that is not supported by the whole of the extract, or may refer to multiple interpretations, often a different one in each paragraph. | **9–11** |
| Level 2 | • Responses summarise the main points in the extract.<br>• Responses focus on what the extract says, but explanations of the extract as an interpretation lack validity. | **5–8** |
| Level 1 | • Responses include references to some aspects of the extract.<br>• Responses may include fragments of material that are relevant to the historian's interpretation. | **1–4** |
| Level 0 | • No creditable content. | **0** |

© UCLES 2021

| AO1 | **Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and effectively.** | **Marks** |
|---|---|---|
| Level 6 | Demonstrates detailed and accurate historical knowledge that is entirely relevant. | **18–20** |
| Level 5 | Demonstrates detailed and mostly accurate historical knowledge that is mainly relevant. | **15–17** |
| Level 4 | Demonstrates mostly relevant and accurate knowledge. | **12–14** |
| Level 3 | Demonstrates generally accurate and relevant knowledge. | **9–11** |
| Level 2 | Demonstrates some accurate and relevant knowledge. | **5–8** |
| Level 1 | Demonstrates limited knowledge. | **1–4** |
| Level 0 | Demonstrates no relevant historical knowledge. | **0** |

© UCLES 2021

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | **The Origins of the First World War** | **40** |
| | **Interpretation/Approach**<br><br>The main interpretation is that in 1914, European leaders deliberately chose to go to war because they feared that their prospects of success would deteriorate if they waited. Showing complete understanding of the interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. The interpretation is an explicit rejection of Lloyd George's 'slide to war' thesis. It places prime responsibility on Germany, Austria, and Russia as the three states that could have prevented war but chose not to. However, this is a sub-message of the extract.<br><br>Glossary: Interpretations soon after World War I tended to blame Germany, but this was quickly countered by a variety of interpretations that blamed other nations. This may be termed revisionism. The turning point in the historiography was Fischer's work of the early 1960s, which went back to blaming Germany – sometimes known as anti-revisionism. Since then, there has been a vast variety of interpretations, looking at the importance of culture, individuals, contingent factors, etc., with no clear consensus. Even so, most historians would still place a significant burden of responsibility on Germany.<br><br>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. | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | **The Holocaust** | **40** |
| | **Interpretation/Approach**<br><br>The main interpretation is that the Final Solution was not pre-planned, but that the nature of the Nazi state made it clear that it could not happen without Hitler's approval. Showing complete understanding of the interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. The interpretation addresses Hitler's responsibility for the Final Solution, but without claiming that it was pre-planned. This may be concluded as a functionalist viewpoint, with the situation in late 1941 closing all alternatives except genocide. An intentionalist conclusion is limited to a maximum of Level 4 and would need to be argued properly using the second aspect of the main interpretation. This applies also to claims that the interpretation is synthesis, which if argued properly could be Level 5 or Level 6. There are also structuralist aspects to the extract, but these are sub-messages in nature.<br><br>Glossary: Candidates may use some or all the following terms:<br><br>*Intentionalism* – interpretations which assume that Hitler/the Nazis planned to exterminate the Jews from the start.<br><br>*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.<br><br>*Functionalism* – interpretations which sees the Holocaust as an unplanned, ad hoc response to wartime developments in Eastern Europe, when Germany conquered areas with large Jewish populations.<br><br>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 2021

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | **The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950** | **40** |
| | **Interpretation/Approach**<br><br>The main interpretation is that neither side deliberately started a cold war, and that its cause was the mutual misunderstanding that the two sides had of each other. Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. Though the extract has more material on the USA, there is enough also on the USSR to sustain the argument that both/neither was responsible for the misunderstanding that led to the deterioration of relations after the war. Overall, the extract advances a clear post-revisionist view, and no other 'label' could be accepted as a conclusion in Level 5 or Level 6. Some candidates will see the extract as revisionist and, if properly argued, such answers could achieve Level 4. Arguing traditional/orthodox is unsustainable and would be limited to Level 3.<br><br>Glossary: Candidates may use some or all the following terms:<br><br>*Traditional/Orthodox* interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after World War II. They blame the Soviet Union and Stalin's expansionism for the Cold War.<br><br>*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.<br><br>*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, but which often places great importance on ideology.<br><br>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. | |