



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

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

Paper 3 Interpretations question

**October/November 2022**

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 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **8** 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**

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.

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

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Analyse and evaluate how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented.</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• These responses explain all elements of the historian's interpretation.</li> </ul>	<b>18–20</b>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<b>15–17</b>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses use the extract, but only demonstrate partial understanding of the interpretation and approach(es) of the historian.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<b>12–14</b>
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses demonstrate understanding that the extract contains interpretations, but those explained are only sub-messages.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<b>9–11</b>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses summarise the main points in the extract.</li> <li>• Responses focus on what the extract says, but explanations of the extract as an interpretation lack validity.</li> </ul>	<b>5–8</b>
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses include references to some aspects of the extract.</li> <li>• Responses may include fragments of material that are relevant to the historian's interpretation.</li> </ul>	<b>1–4</b>
Level 0	No creditable content.	<b>0</b>

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

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>The origins of the First World War</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b></p> <p>The main interpretation is <u>that Austria/Germany were to blame for following an irresponsible policy risking war, leaving Russia with no choice but to respond</u>. Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. The focus of the interpretation is on Russian decision-making, and, broadly speaking, it exonerates them, though there are hints that Russian policy was a product of weakness rather than strength. The aggressors are clearly Austria and Germany, who, at the very best, were careless about the prospect of causing a general European war.</p> <p><u>Glossary</u>: Early post-First World War interpretations tended to blame Germany, but quickly a reaction against this occurred, with a variety of interpretations blaming 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, though most historians would still place a significant burden of responsibility on Germany.</p>	40

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>The Holocaust</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b></p> <p>The main interpretation is <u>that even though the implementation of genocide was confused and chaotic, the Holocaust was nonetheless intended.</u> Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. The historian, despite making the point about the chaotic nature of implementation, is also clear that there was a central decision for the Final Solution. Even amongst the confusion, there was no lack of evidence of evil intent towards the Jews; it was simply the details that were in doubt. For this extract if candidates do use historiographical labels, they should be credited as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reach L5/L6 only intentionalism can be accepted.</li> <li>• Synthesis can be credited in L4 if the intentionalist aspect is explained.</li> <li>• Any other labels will be L3 at best – there is no proper way structuralism or functionalism can be illustrated from the extract.</li> </ul> <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> 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

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>The origins and development of the Cold War</b></p> <p><b>Interpretation/Approach</b></p> <p>The main interpretation is <u>that Stalin was responsible for the Cold War because of domestic considerations, and that ideology (i.e. hostility to the West) gave him a way of reasserting his dominance over the Soviet Union by providing him with an external enemy.</u> Showing complete understanding of the Interpretation will involve discussion of both these aspects. The focus on ideology, rather than on Soviet expansionism, and the focusing of blame on Stalin, mark this out as a post-post-revisionist interpretation, which is the only label that can be rewarded in L5/L6. It is notable, however, that Stalin is seen as rational. This, and the lack both of exoneration of the West and of Soviet expansionism, indicate that it cannot be traditional/orthodox. Post-revisionism would be acceptable at L4 if it included some/all of the main interpretation on Stalin, as could traditionalist/orthodox. However, blaming the West is not valid, so revisionism can be credited at L3 at best.</p> <p>Answers that deal properly with some/all of the main interpretation, but also include discussion of inevitability/Stalin having no choice, need not be penalised as showing lack of understanding, as long as these ideas are not carried through to a post-revisionist conclusion.</p> <p>Be careful not to credit ideology if presented simply as a clash between US and the Soviet Union – it's the use of ideology by Stalin for his domestic purposes that matters in this interpretation.</p> <p><u>Glossary:</u> <i>Traditional/Orthodox</i> interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after the Second World War. 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 United States 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, but which often places great importance on ideology. 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