

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/31**

Paper 3 Interpretations Question

**October/November 2017**

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 October/November 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

**General levels of response**

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

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

### **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.

**Section A: Topic 1 The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939**

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b> The main interpretation is that <u>by the end of the First World War the end of the British Empire was in sight, even if the British themselves had not yet realised it.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract argues that the way the British perceived empire was changing. They were losing interest in empire. They were moving towards concessions to those they ruled, without grasping that these concessions could never be enough.</p>	40

## Section B: Topic 2 The Holocaust

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b>            The main interpretation is that <u>Hitler's plans for war against the Soviet Union implied his intention to annihilate the Jews, but the precise nature of the genocidal process was determined by the circumstances of war.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract is clearly not totally intentionalist, as it accepts that it was war that determined what form the Final Solution would take, but neither is it totally functionalist, since it accepts that Hitler was central in determining that the war would have a racial/ideological nature, and that those 'working towards the Führer' knew exactly what was required. An intentionalist conclusion would be supportable, but an overall synthesis judgement is most satisfactory. A conclusion that the extract is structuralist is not acceptable in L4/L5 – though functionalism can be perceived in the contingencies of war, structuralism doesn't work at all.</p> <p><u>Glossary:</u> Candidates may use 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. Candidates 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.</p>	40

## Section C: Topic 3 The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b> The extract focuses on Truman, so the Big Message must be on Truman. The main interpretation is that <u>it was Truman who made a post-war settlement between USA and the USSR impossible, because of his misunderstanding/over-simplified view of relations between the USA and the USSR.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The interpretation is blaming Truman (and is therefore revisionist). Candidates taking the latter part of para.2 to argue that the interpretation is post-revisionist can therefore only be awarded L3.</p> <p><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