



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY**9389/31**

Paper 3 Interpretations Question 31

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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

The interpretation is taken to be what the historian says in the given extract, the nature of the claims made and the conclusions drawn. 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 relationship between the interpretation and the approach, since the former emerges from the latter. 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, or show awareness of elements of the BM but make demonstrable errors elsewhere in the answer.

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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p data-bbox="316 248 1145 282">The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939</p> <p data-bbox="316 315 655 349">Interpretation/Approach</p> <p data-bbox="316 351 1305 483">The main interpretation is that <u>the British Empire was in some ways an illusion, and depended on the acceptance of this illusion by subject peoples.</u> Showing complete understanding of this interpretation (Big Message) will involve discussion of both these aspects.</p> <p data-bbox="316 517 1305 1021">The extract focuses mainly on defining the nature of the British Empire, and on how far the British could exert control over the Empire. It argues that the Empire depended on the cooperation of those they ruled, and that this was as true of white colonists as of other subject peoples. There was force behind the illusion of power, but this could only ever be used selectively. It was the Second World War that destroyed the mystique of British power. In L5, candidates will explore how, and the extent to which, the Empire was illusory, explaining why subject peoples nonetheless accepted it. In L4, answers will focus on only one of these elements, without adequately developing and illustrating the other. L3 answers will focus on the extract as an interpretation, but only properly supporting sub-messages, rather than the central aspects. Sub-messages could include e.g. that the British faced similar problems of control both in white colonies and in non-European territories, or that British rule in India produced political activity that challenged it.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1055 1313 1391"><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
2	<p>The Holocaust</p> <p>Interpretation/Approach</p> <p>The main interpretation is <u>that the decision for genocide was contingent on the behaviour of other nations once the war had started, but that once the decision to destroy Soviet Jewry was taken, the process escalated.</u> Showing complete understanding of this interpretation (Big Message) will involve discussion of both these aspects.</p> <p>The existence of plans for alternative solutions is proof that Hitler was not determined on genocide before later 1941. The extract offers no support for the view that Hitler had a pre-existing plan to kill the Jews, and is therefore functionalist in its view that the circumstances of war produced the Holocaust. The interpretation is unusual in the prominence given to the influence of other countries on Hitler's decision for genocide. However, it has another functionalist dimension in arguing that once genocide commenced, it led to further escalation. No label other than functionalism can be argued for a response to be awarded in L4/L5. Simply arguing that it was the war that brought genocide is not sufficient in L5; the unusual argument about the impact of other nations' policies must be properly explained, as must the impact of the invasion of the Soviet Union on further escalation. In L4, only one of these two aspects will be properly developed. Similarly, arguing that the interpretation cannot be intentionalist because the existence of emigration policies shows the absence of prior intent, is not in itself engaging with the central aspects of the interpretation – it is showing what the interpretation is not, and not what it is. A response of this nature would be sufficient for L3, but no more. Other L3 answers will focus only on sub-messages, for example the idea that there was widespread hatred of the Jews amongst the German people and armed forces.</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

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p data-bbox="316 248 1126 282">The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950</p> <p data-bbox="316 315 655 349">Interpretation/Approach</p> <p data-bbox="316 349 1289 584">The focus of the extract is on the Soviet Union, and the main interpretation must therefore be about the Soviet Union, not the USA. The main interpretation is that <u>the fundamental driving force behind Soviet policy in the Cold War was the desire for security, but that this does not necessarily mean that Stalin/the Soviet Union was solely to blame for the Cold War.</u> Showing complete understanding of this interpretation (Big Message) will involve discussion of both these aspects.</p> <p data-bbox="316 618 1313 1223">Whilst not dismissing the importance of Marxist ideology, the interpretation effectively rejects the idea that ideology was the prime determinant of policy. For Stalin, all else was subordinated to the need to enhance Soviet, and thus his own, power. Responses may be shaped by the reference to ‘newly-opened archives’, though the interpretation is not typically post-post-revisionist. Conclusions using this label, and thus concluding that Stalin/the Soviet Union was to blame for the Cold War, are clearly misunderstanding the interpretation as a whole, and would be awarded a mark within L3. The same would be true of conclusions that the interpretation is traditionalist/orthodox. Arguments that focus on both sides being to blame, without a proper focus on Soviet policy (i.e. post-revisionism), would also be L3, but calling the Big Message post-revisionist on the basis of the comparisons made in the extract between the Soviet Union and the USA could move a response into L4/L5. The last two paragraphs contain developed points about both superpowers’ policies, and these need to be used as part of the Big Message that the Soviet Union was not solely to blame. There is no logical argument that labelling the extract revisionist could work beyond L3.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1256 1310 1659"><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