



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY**9389/33**

Paper 3 Interpretations Question 33

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	The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850–1939 Interpretation/Approach The main interpretation is that <u>whilst Europeans could claim that the Scramble for Africa was undertaken for Africa's benefit, the reality was that it was about power, markets and the protection of vital interests.</u> Showing complete understanding of this interpretation (Big Message) will involve discussion of both these aspects. The historian is concerned to explore the motives of the Europeans involved in the Scramble. In the early phase this is seen through the motives of the individual imperialists. However, the effect of other nations becoming involved is seen as transforming the Scramble into essentially a matter of self-interest, ultimately imposed by force. In L5, candidates will explain and illustrate both the altruistic and self-interested dimensions of European motivation, making the point that the reality contradicted the claim. In L4, only one of these aspects will be properly developed. L3 answers will be focused on sub-messages, for example that Europeans were willing to use force to achieve their aims, or that the British were worried that other Europeans might intervene in Africa. <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.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	The Holocaust Interpretation/Approach The main interpretation is <u>that the proper and accurate definition of the Holocaust should comprise only the planned annihilation of the Jews, because the motivation for it was Nazi anti-Semitism. Other groups targeted by the Nazis should not be regarded as victims of the Holocaust, as the motivation for their murder was different.</u> Showing complete understanding of this interpretation (Big Message) will involve discussion of both these aspects. The historian is concerned with defining the Holocaust. He sees a direct connection between Nazi anti-Semitism and the Holocaust, which gave the perpetrators a unique motive for genocide that applied only to the Jews and not to other victims of the Nazis. Whilst victims other than Jews suffered as much as Jews, they were not victims for the same reasons. The interpretation is an explicit rejection of attempts to define the Holocaust as including all victims of Nazi racial violence. L5 answers will illustrate both aspects of the Big Message but show also that they appreciate the historian's intention to refute other definitions. L4 answers will properly develop only one of the aspects. L3 answers will adequately engage only with sub-messages, such as the idea that support from the majority of German people facilitated the Holocaust, or that the Nazis were anti-Semitic. If a label is attached to this interpretation it can only plausibly be intentionalist. Developed attempts to argue any other label will limit the answer to L3. <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.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950 Interpretation/Approach The main interpretation is that <u>the USA did a good thing in offering the Marshall Plan to rebuild European economies, even though he concedes that much of the motivation was self-interested.</u> Showing complete understanding of this interpretation (Big Message) will involve discussion of both these aspects. The historian focuses on US motives and writes from an American perspective. Whilst he accepts that some of the motives were selfish, there are enough hints of approval for the interpretation as a whole to be seen as traditional/orthodox in character. Marshall is portrayed as solemn and dignified, and his message is seen as important. It is also possible to detect an anti-Soviet perspective in remarks about Soviet expansion, and the Moscow Foreign Ministers' conference. Arguing any label other than traditional/orthodox is unlikely to work and will limit the answer to L3. L5 answers will illustrate both how the extract shows the historian's approval of Marshall's actions, and how it explains the motives of the USA, to reach a conclusion that understands the historian's idea that what was good for USA could also be good for Europe. L4 answers will only properly develop one of these aspects. Answers in L3 will only address sub-messages adequately, for example the idea that the USA had been considering a European recovery plan for some time, or that there were many different motives behind the Plan. Glossary: <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.	