
HISTORY

9389/33

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 1310 779">The main interpretation is that <u>by the 1930s the British hold on India was weakening, and even aggressive measures to stop this were doomed to fail.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract focuses on India, seeing it as still significant to the British economy, but becoming less so. The author identifies the various social, economic and political factors that were weakening Britain’s grasp, and clearly indicates disapproval of British efforts to resist change, which by implication are viewed as futile.</p> <p data-bbox="316 817 1310 1151"><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 1315 981">The main interpretation is that <u>it was the circumstances of war that created the Holocaust, and that its implementation was as surprisingly haphazard as earlier phases of Judenpolitik (i.e. they must be making a point about continuity across the whole extract)</u>. Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract argues that the Nazis never gave top priority to killing the Jews, and that even after the outbreak of war, policy towards the Jews was not genocidal. It was failure in the war with the Soviet Union and the outbreak of war with the USA that triggered Hitler's decision to annihilate the Jews. The argument is that Nazi anti-Semitism did not initially imply destruction of the Jews and that, throughout, a feature of Judenpolitik was its muddled and inconsistent nature. In seeing the circumstances of war as central in bringing about genocide, the interpretation has strong functionalist elements. Any other approach cannot be rewarded higher than L3.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1019 1310 1482"><u>Glossary</u>: 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.</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 1305 913">The main interpretation is that <u>the Soviet Union rejected the Marshall Plan because of fears about US domination/influence over Europe, and that it was self-defeating/wrong to do so (this could be done through the author's criticism of the Soviet Union)</u>. Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract is about negotiations on the Marshall Plan, and focuses mainly on Soviet arguments for rejecting it. It is critical of the Soviet Union, portraying it as unreasonable and jealous. This is clearly a traditional view, blaming the Soviet Union. Some answers might therefore conclude that it is post-post-revisionist. Weaker answers may see Molotov's arguments as the interpretation – whereas the historian is quoting Molotov's views in order to reject them. So the interpretation is NOT revisionist.</p> <p data-bbox="316 952 1310 1352"><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