
HISTORY

9389/31

Paper 3 Interpretations Question

May/June 2018

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 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

IGCSE™ is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **7** printed pages.

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.

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. It is not what the extract says: it is what you can infer from the extract. The approach is seen as what the historian brings to their study of the topic, what they are interested in, the questions s/he asks, 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 |

| 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. They may only cover part of the BM. They may think the extract has *other* BMs, which actually are only sub-messages. 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.

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.

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939 | | |
| 1 | <p data-bbox="316 315 1230 412">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.</p> <p data-bbox="316 450 655 479">Interpretation/Approach</p> <p data-bbox="316 517 1315 815">The main interpretation is that <u>whereas up to the 1870s the only part of the ‘formal’ empire vital to the British economy was India, thereafter, despite difficulties/because of competition, it became increasingly important elsewhere.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract argues that the move to formal empire was forced on Britain by competition, and that even though there was no compelling reason to annex tropical territories, the formal empire did serve to protect the British economy up to the Second World War against the worst effects of international competition.</p> <p data-bbox="316 853 1315 1182"><u>Glossary:</u> the two main areas of interpretation have been (i) on whether imperial policy was determined at the centre (the metropole) or at the periphery (in the territories of the empire). This can involve debates on who was making the decisions at the centre (the ‘official mind’, ‘gentlemanly capitalists’, etc.) or at the periphery (the ‘man on the spot’); and (ii) on whether the British Empire was characterised by a preference for formal (i.e. direct rule over annexed territory) or informal (i.e. indirect control mainly through and for commercial interests). 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.</p> | 40 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------------------|---|-------|
| The Holocaust | | |
| 2 | <p data-bbox="316 315 1230 412">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.</p> <p data-bbox="316 450 655 479">Interpretation/Approach</p> <p data-bbox="316 517 1310 949">The main interpretation is that <u>the USA and Britain were (pre-war) half-hearted about helping the Jews, and that learning of the Holocaust, if anything, hardened their attitude, AND that the historian disapproved of/blamed them for this reluctance.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. Simply spotting the reluctance of the Allies is not enough for that aspect of the BM – they must use the continuity of attitude pre/during the war as part of their argument. Reluctance on its own would be L3 (unless supported by disapproval, which would then take it to L4). The extract is about the two most important ‘bystanders’ and argues that the Western Allies were not prepared to be seen as fighting a war on behalf of the Jews. The writer clearly disapproves of this stance, and suggests that there were practical alternatives to abandoning the Jews to the Nazis.</p> <p data-bbox="316 987 1310 1518"><u>Glossary:</u> despite the fact that this extract is not directly concerned with causation of the Holocaust, answers may include some/all of the following terms: <i>Intentionalism</i> – interpretations which assume that Hitler/the Nazis planned to exterminate the Jews from the start. <i>Structuralism</i> – 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. <i>Functionalism</i> 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. Answers may also refer to <i>synthesis</i> 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. <i>In this particular question, use of one of these labels will point to a lack of understanding of the interpretation.</i></p> | 40 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|---|--|-------|
| The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950 | | |
| 3 | <p data-bbox="316 315 1230 412">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.</p> <p data-bbox="316 450 655 479">Interpretation/Approach</p> <p data-bbox="316 517 1318 882">The main interpretation is that <u>the USA bears most of the blame for the Cold War as a result of its own expansionism, and for exaggerating the Soviet threat to help them achieve their ends (i.e. not just misunderstanding the USSR, but deliberately misrepresenting it for their own purposes)</u>. Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The historian shows that, although the USA had valid reasons for suspecting the Soviets, in practice there was no need for them to fear Soviet power. Despite the fact that the extract has elements which might seem to blame both sides (i.e. post-revisionism), the opinion and focus of the writer is clearly on the USA and on arguing that it is more to blame. Thus a proper conclusion in L4/L5 will see this as a revisionist interpretation.</p> <p data-bbox="316 920 1318 1317"><u>Glossary:</u> <i>Traditional/Orthodox</i> interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after WW2. They blame the Soviet Union and Stalin's expansionism for the Cold War. <i>Revisionist</i> 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. <i>Post-revisionists</i> 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 <i>post-post-revisionist</i> 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.</p> | 40 |