



Cambridge
International
AS & A Level

Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

HISTORY

9389/32

Paper 3 Interpretations Question 32

May/June 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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 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 **6** printed pages.

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 inter-relationship 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.

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

Question	Answer	Marks
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. Interpretation/Approach The extract is about the nature of British rule in the dependent Empire. The main interpretation is that <u>the Empire in Africa was established by ‘the man on the spot’, and that this involved the use, or at least the threat, of force.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract argues that a group of talented adventurers acted as conqueror-administrators, operating independently from London, which often only reluctantly supported their actions. Lugard is used as a case study to illustrate the interpretation.	40

Section B: Topic 2 The Holocaust

Question	Answer	Marks
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. Interpretation/Approach The extract is about how the nature of the Nazi state brought about the Holocaust. The main interpretation is that <u>there was no carefully prepared plan to liquidate the Jews, but that competition within the Nazi power structure led to a constant escalation of the persecution.</u> Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve explanation of both these aspects, and how they worked. The extract clearly adopts a structuralist approach, arguing that the Holocaust grew out of the nature of the Nazi state. For any answer including a label to reach L5, the label must be structuralist. Answers arguing properly either/both elements of the BM, and concluding that the interpretation is functionalist/synthesis, could potentially reach L4. The historian sees Hitler as the ideological leader, but as neither personally involved nor particularly interested in, the extermination programme. <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 is used to support it.	40

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

Question	Answer	Marks
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. Interpretation/Approach This extract is about the views of the Soviet leadership in the immediate post-war period. The main interpretation is that <u>the Soviet Union aimed to take advantage of the post-war situation to dominate Europe, and thus were to blame for the Cold War</u>. Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract contains plenty of material suggesting Soviet culpability, but ‘eventually they plunged the world into Cold War’ is unambiguous enough to disallow any conclusion other than traditional/orthodox or post-post-revisionist. This is so clear that straightforward answers concluding and demonstrating Soviet blame will only reach L4. To get to L5 they must also demonstrate why the interpretation cannot be anything else, i.e. because there is no attempt by the historian <u>either</u> to excuse Soviet actions <u>or</u> allocate blame to the West (as a revisionist or post-revisionist would). Conversely, any reading of paragraph 1 which leads to a conclusion that the extract shows <i>blame of the West</i> cannot be better than L3. <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 is used to support it.	40