

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/31

Paper 3 (Interpretations Question), maximum raw mark 40

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

| | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 31 |

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 they ask, 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 |

| | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 31 |

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.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 31 |

Indicative content

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

- 1 **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.** [40]

Interpretation/Approach

The main interpretation is that imperialism had economic causes. This is the Hobson-Lenin thesis. The extract argues that over-production for home markets is what drove the need for imperial expansion. There would have been no imperialism if home markets had absorbed all surplus production.

Section B: Topic 2 The Holocaust

- 2 **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.** [40]

Interpretation/Approach

The main interpretation is that, whilst Hitler set the tone for genocide, he did not need to issue specific orders as his subordinates were only too willing to 'work towards the Fuhrer'. Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract argues that once areas in the East were taken over by the Nazis, barbarism would inevitably ensue. This was not a system: it was driven on the ground by local leaders who assumed they were carrying out Hitler's wishes. This is an interpretation associated with Kershaw, and involves a synthesis of intentionalism and structuralism/functionalism, i.e. aspects of both these approaches.

Glossary: Candidates may use some/all of the following terms: *Intentionalism* – interpretations which assume that Hitler/the Nazis planned to exterminate the Jews from the start. *Structuralism* – 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. *Functionalism* 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 *synthesis* 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.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 31 |

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

- 3 **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.** [40]

Interpretation/Approach

The main interpretation is that prospects for post-war cooperation between the former allies were destroyed by the Soviet Union's determined expansionism. This is a traditional view as it makes little attempt to discuss how both sides might share the blame for the Cold War. The extract argues that the Western powers behaved responsibly and were aware of Soviet security needs, but still hoped that the Soviets would nonetheless show some respect for the principles of the Atlantic Charter. Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion not merely of how the extract blames Stalin/USSR, but also exonerates the West.

Glossary: *Traditional/Orthodox* interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after WW2. They blame the Soviet Union and Stalin's expansionism for the Cold War. *Revisionist* 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. *Post-revisionists* 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 *post-post-revisionist* 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. In reality, even *within* each of the interpretations summarised above, there are great differences between the views of different historians.